Georgia State University
Digital Archive @ GSU

Educational Policy Studies Dissertations | Department of Educational Policy Studies

9-12-2006

Are Public Schools Worth Saving? If So, By Whom?

Philip Edward Kovacs
philipkovacs@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/eps_diss

Recommended Citation
Kovacs, Philip Edward, "Are Public Schools Worth Saving? If So, By Whom?" (2006). *Educational Policy Studies Dissertations.* Paper 6.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Educational Policy Studies at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Policy Studies Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact digitalarchive@gsu.edu.

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, ARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS WORTH SAVING? IF SO, BY WHOM?, by PHILIP KOVACS, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

_____
Deron Boyles, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

_____
Susan Talburt, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Philo Hutcheson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Wayne Urban, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Date

_____
Sheryl Gowen, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Educational Policy Studies

_____
Ronald Colarusso, Ed.D.
Dean, College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without my written permission.

_____

Philip Kovacs

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Philip Kovacs
230 Holtzclaw Street
Atlanta, GA 30316

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Deron Boyles
Department of Educational Policy Studies
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083

VITA

Philip Edward Kovacs

ADDRESS:

230 Holtzclaw Street
Atlanta, Georgia, 30316

EDUCATION:

Ph.D. 2006 Georgia State University
Educational Policy Studies
M.Ed. 2000 Georgia State University
Department of MSIT
B.A. 1996 University of Georgia
Department of English

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2002-Present Teaching and Research Assistant
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
1999-2002 High School Teacher
Starr's Mill High School, Fayetteville, GA
1996-1997 High School Teacher
Kayson High School, In Chon, South Korea

REFEREED ARTICLES:

Deron Boyles and Philip Kovacs, "Intellectualism, Infiltration, and the Imaginary: The Challenges of Conservative Think Tanks in Developing Democratic Community," *The Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy* 3, no. 1 (2006), forthcoming.

Philip Kovacs and Deron Boyles, "Institutes, Foundations, and Think Tanks: Neoconservative Influences on U.S. Public Schools," *Public Resistance* 1, no. 1 (May 1, 2005): www.publicresistance.org.

REFEREED PAPERS:

Philip Kovacs, "Once a Teacher, Always a Teacher: Educational Policy and Educational Elites," presented at the Southern History of Education Society, Oxford, Mississippi, March 5-6, 2006.

Philip Kovacs, "The Anti-School Movement: Are Philosophers Part of the Problem?," presented at the Southeast Philosophy of Education Society, Decatur, Georgia, February 3-4, 2006.

Bethany Hedges and Philip Kovacs, "Sylvan Learning: Terrorizing Parents and Children with the Help of Your Tax Dollars," presented at the Southeast Philosophy of Education Society, Decatur, Georgia, February 3-4, 2006.

Deron Boyles and Philip Kovacs, "Immigration, Infiltration, and the Imaginary: Opportunities for Engagement and Border Crossing in Developing Epistemic Community," presented at the Curriculum and Pedagogy conference, Oxford, Ohio, October 5-8, 2005.

Wayne Urban vs. Philip Kovacs, "In Defense of the Educational Policies Commission," presented at the Southern History of Education Society, Atlanta, Georgia, March 11-12, 2005.

Philip Kovacs and Deron Boyles, "Mind Your Own Business: Corporate Influences in U.S. Schools," presented at the Southeast Educational Studies Association, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, February 25-26, 2005.

Philip Kovacs, "The NRC Report: It's All Right," presented at the Southeast Philosophy of Education Society, Orlando, Florida, February 4-5, 2005.

Philip Kovacs, "Democratic No More: A Lament for the Death of Democracy in Education," presented at the Southern History of Education Society, Fairhope, Alabama, March 12-13, 2004.

Carolyn VanderSchee and Philip Kovacs, "Citizens, the Public Sphere, and the Education President," presented at the Southeast Philosophy of Education Society, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, February 20-21, 2004.

Philip Kovacs, "Operation Enduring Freedom: Paulo Freire and the Spread of American Democracy," presented at the Southeast Philosophy of Education Society, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, February 20-21, 2004.

Philip Kovacs and Shayla Mitchell, "Race and the World Wide Web: It's Not All White…Yet," presented at the Curriculum and Pedagogy conference, Decatur, Georgia, October 15-18, 2003.

Carolyn VanderSchee and Philip Kovacs, "Relationality in the Classroom, the Democratic Potential," presented at the Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society, Dayton, Ohio, September 29-30, 2003.

Philip Kovacs, "I Seem to Have Lost My Democracy," presented at the Southern History of Education Society, Atlanta, Georgia, March 14-15, 2003.

Philip Kovacs, "An Argument for Emerson," presented at the Southeast Philosophy of Education Society, St. Augustine, Florida, Jan. 31-Feb 1, 2003.

CHAPTERS:

Philip Kovacs, "Think Tanks, Institutes, and Foundations: Converting Americans Against Their Respective Wills," in *Knowledge and Power in the Global Economy* 2nd ed., David Gabbard, ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), forthcoming.

Philip Kovacs, "The Anti-School Movement," in *Knowledge and Power in the Global Economy* 2nd ed., David Gabbard, ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), forthcoming.

ABSTRACT

ARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS WORTH SAVING? IF SO, BY WHOM?
by
Philip Kovacs

While there is a loose coalition of individuals and organizations attacking the institution of public schools, there does not appear to be a coordinated defense of public schools. Without a coordinated defense of the institution, public schools will arguably 1) grow increasingly regulated and/or 2) be shut down altogether. Given that progressive scholars believe schools should exist to maintain a pluralistic and participatory democracy, should 1) or 2) continue, the progressive goal of democracy through education becomes increasingly removed from possibility. The failure of progressive educational reformers to enter the same spheres as think tank and foundation-housed neointellectuals is partially to blame for the increasingly corporatist ideology governing public school reform. While scholars such as Henry Giroux call for "new articulations," new languages, and new theories, I believe the problem lies not in the message but in the failure of progressives to promote their ideas in various public, private, and legislative spheres. In order to defend public schools as sites for the generation and maintenance of a participatory democratic social order, this research investigates the possibility that progressive educational reformers, acting as prophetic pragmatists, can save public education by acting publicly and politically to check, counter, and silence the anti-democratic educational initiatives forwarded by neoconservative and neoliberal educational reformers.

ARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS WORTH SAVING? IF SO, BY WHOM?

by
Philip Kovacs

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Social Foundations
in
the Department of Educational Policy Studies
in
the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA
2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge the editor for not editing my acknowledgements. Such restraint is rare.

I wish to thank my immediate family for providing support—emotional, physical, spiritual, and financial. It is difficult for me to make prescriptions for public schools when I know that many children do not have a family for support, nurturance, and growth. Without my mother, father, and sister, this project would never have been possible. Conception and creation work that way.

I would also like to thank each of the professors who suffered through various iterations of this draft, especially my advisor, Deron Boyles, who I desperately tried to drive insane. I know that he found particular portions of the text quite moving, and I thank him for his help refining those, arguably, obtuse edges. I look forward to our continued work together.

Dr. Talburt, Dr. Hutcheson, Dr. Urban, and Dr. Baez deserve thanks and apologies. While I know I couldn't please each of them, I do hope the slights are only mildly offensive, and I hope they recognize their wisdom and scholarly advice in the more impressive parts of the text, should they discover such parts. Conversations with each of these individuals led to considerable revisions in this draft, despite my kicking and screaming. The doors remain open for continued debate, which I look forward to continuing in less formal settings.

There are about 2 dozen individuals on the 4th floor who have helped me out a great deal: Sherry, Jeff, Tenia, impressive grad students, good Dr.'s and other distinguished guests: Thank You! I would also like to thank the Chair for her time and availability, though waiting until I moved before upgrading the 4th floor is a little suspect. Good luck with Tony; you'll need it.

Special thanks to Andy Peck and Belinda Gibs for the time and effort they spent keeping my head, if not cool, then at least on my shoulders.

Finally, and most importantly, none of this would have been possible without the care, generosity, and patience shown to me by my wife Michelle, especially over the past six months. I acknowledge you for your strength, integrity, resiliency, care, and inquisitiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abbreviations v

Chapter

1 INTRODUCTION 1
The Problem 1
Questions 1
Methods and Theoretical Frameworks 1
Significance 2
Definitions 3

2 WHO AND WHAT ARE THE ORGANIZATIONS ATTACKING PUBLIC SCHOOL 6
A Brief History 6
Ideological Underpinnings 11
The Arenas of Policy Creation, Debate, and Maintenance: The ASM's Operational Spheres and Methods 20

3 WHAT DOES THE ASM MEAN FOR U.S. PUBLIC SCHOOLS? 37
Bradley and Choice 39
Bradley and NCLB: Standardize and Privatize 45
Teacher Quality Under NCLB 48
NCLB's Real-Time Effects on Quality Teaching and Classroom Experience 60
Has the ASM Been Successful? 74

4 WHAT ARE PROGRESSIVE "COUNTER-NARRATIVES" TO THE ASM? 78
Authority for Shaping Goals Lies in the Hands of the People 85
Education is Political 91
Democratic Participation Requires a Specific Type of Voice and Literacy 99
Justice, While Elusive, Is Worth Striving For; Injustice, When Discovered, Requires Action 104
Education Is More Than Job Training 108
Education Serves Both Productive and Reproductive Processes 114
Education Engenders Both Independence and Interdependence 118
Democracy Requires a Certain Type of Teacher and a Certain Type of Teaching 129
Democratic Education Requires a Certain Type of Space 136

5 IF PUBLIC SCHOOLS NEED SAVING, WHO WILL DO SO?.....142
The Public Intellectual 143
Who Will Counter the Neointellectual?.....155
University-Housed Intellectuals.....168
Border Crossers.....173

References.....178

ABBREVIATIONS

ALEC	American Legislative Exchange Council
ASM	Anti-School Movement
BAEO	Black Alliance for Educational Options
NCLB	No Child Left Behind

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

While there is a loose coalition of individuals and organizations attacking the institution of public schools, there does not appear to be a unified, coordinated defense of public schools. Without a coordinated defense of the institution, public schools may continue to 1) grow increasingly regulated or 2) be shut down altogether. Given that progressive scholars believe public schools should exist to develop and maintain a pluralistic and participatory democracy, should 1) or 2) continue, the progressive goal of democracy through education becomes increasingly removed from possibility.

The Questions

Who and what are the individuals and organizations attacking public schools? Where and how is this attack taking place? What does this attack mean for America's public schools? Do progressive reformers have a counter narrative to this attack? If so, what is it? What roles might progressive scholars play in order to 1) defend public education from neoconservative and neoliberal reformers, and 2) realize progressive alternatives to neoconservative and neoliberal educational policy?

Methods and Theoretical Frameworks

This dissertation utilizes conceptual and political analysis. The literature for this dissertation includes both scholarly and lay texts, journals, magazines, newspapers, and news-forums which span the past century. I examine the finances and recent activities of

neoconservative and neoliberal institutions, organizations, and individuals in order to a) better understand the attack on public education, b) offer ideas for a possible progressive defense of public education, and c) encourage progressive scholars to enter public and political spheres in order to level that defense.

Significance

While several studies concerning the activities of neoconservative and neoliberal educational reformers exist, only one study has examined the lack of response to the activities of neoconservative and neoliberal reformers in great detail.[1] In addition to outlining how and where neoconservative and neoliberal educational reformers operate, this dissertation seeks to understand why they have been successful in order to begin to formulate a response to their activities. Although numerous theorists offer counter narratives to regimentation and privatization,[2] they do not appear to be successful in persuading larger audiences. While scholars such as Henry Giroux call for new

---

[1] See David C. Johnson and Leonard M. Salle, *Responding to the Attack on Public Education and Teacher Unions* (Menlo Park: Commonweal Institute, 2004). Available online at http://commonwealinstitute.org/reports/ed/EdRespondReport.html. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[2] See, for example, Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); Linda Darling-Hammond, "Education, Equity, and the Right to Learn," in *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling* ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997); Deron Boyles, *American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to School* (New York: Garland, 1998); Michael Engel, *The Struggle for Control of Public Education: Market Ideology vs. Democratic Values* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000); Deborah Meier, "Educating a Democracy," in *Will Standards Save Public Education?*, ed. Deborah Meier (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000); Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2003); William B. Stanley, "Schooling and Curriculum for Social Transformation: Reconsidering the Status of a Contentious Idea," in *Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century*, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3 (Westport: Praeger, 2004); and Kathy Emery and Susan Ohanian, *Why is Corporate America Bashing Our Public Schools?* (Portsmouth: Heinmann, 2004.).

articulations and new theory to defend public schools,[3] this dissertation argues that the issue, contra Giroux, is not one of theory, but one of engagement. In addition to offering insight into how neoconservative and neoliberal organizations generate consent for their reform proposals, this work offers a blueprint for countering the activities of neoconservative and neoliberal reformers, suggesting ideas and avenues for making more progressive educational visions a reality.

Definitions

I include a few brief definitions here for purposes of clarity. Each of the terms defined below will receive greater attention throughout the dissertation.

Neoconservativism—A political and social philosophy that seeks to return the United States to the glory days before the culture wars. Furthermore, neoconservatives believe America must claim its rightful role as global leader and that all cultural institutions should support that end.

Neoliberalism—An economic philosophy that asserts markets should govern all economic, social, and political activity. Economic productivity, rather than social justice, dominates discourse and agenda setting.

Educational Corporatism—Educational corporatism is elitist, authoritarian, techno-rationalist (objective technology can be used to chart correct courses), homogenizing, profit-driven and final. Relations are hierarchical, and the needs of the state, or dominating ideologies, dictate the process and products of public schools. Reform efforts, while claiming to help raise student achievement, funnel tax dollars into

---

[3] Henry Giroux, The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy (Boulder: Paradigm, 2004). See, for example, 133.

private accounts, with or without public consent. Student voice and various interpretations of the facts are not necessary.

Voice—The means by which a group or an individual makes their histories, experiences, needs, and desires heard.

Anti-School Movement (ASM)—A coalition of neoconservative and neoliberal educational reformers seeking to corporatize and privatize American public schools.

Democracy—A system of associated living where individuals take part in the institutions shaping their lives. Democratic societies rely on lateral social control. Individuals share responsibility for governance, unlike corporatist societies where individuals receive dictates for action.

Educational Left—Those individuals opposing neoconservative and neoliberal reform efforts, at least in theory. While the educational Left is satisfied by examining humanity, progressive educational reformers wish to move beyond the status quo, as opposed to merely studying it, utilizing resources and humanity to create and maintain a pluralistic and participatory democratic social order.

Prophetic Pragmatist—A scholar willing to work publicly and politically in defense of democratic institutions.

Progressive educational scholars—Those individuals, housed in universities, who believe public schools should be used to create and maintain a participatory and pluralistic social order. I use the term progressive to include any scholar who believes U.S. society would be better served by public schools that progressed beyond standardization, surveillance (in the form of standardized testing), and corporate governance.

Public school—For progressives, public schools are sites for the creation and maintenance of democracy. For neoconservatives, public schools are sites for creating obedient citizens. For neoliberals, public schools are sites for creating a workforce. It is my intention to argue that public schools today serve neoconservative and neoliberal ends, despite the neoconservative/neoliberal refrain that public schools are "failing."

Scholars—Individuals who generate knowledge through research, participate in larger communities of research and publication, show great integrity with their research and work, and adhere to high standards of assessment and evaluation; scholars forward their work via peer reviewed journals and regulated classrooms.

Public intellectual—An individual who enters public spheres in order to shape public opinion.

Neointellectual—An individual serving the interests of corporate and/or fundamentalist America. An individual such as Dianne Ravitch, who is housed in a university but receives grants from the Bradley Foundation, must drop the mantle of scholar, replacing it with neointellectual, as corporate America directly influences her work.

CHAPTER 2

WHO/WHAT ARE THE INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONS ATTACKING PUBLIC SCHOOLS? WHERE AND HOW IS THE ATTACK TAKING PLACE?

> Rule by an economic class may be disguised from the masses; rule by experts could not be covered up. It could be made to work only if the intellectuals became the willing tools of big economic interests.[4]

A Brief History

In the decade following the defeat of Barry Goldwater, members of the far right reacted to what they perceived to be a growing threat, coordinated by a liberal intelligentsia, to the American way of life.[5] Two individuals in particular, future Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell and former Treasury Secretary William Simon, attempted to galvanize corporate leaders, wealthy philanthropists, and disaffected politicians, urging them to protect American business interests from what they perceived to be an overbearing federal government.[6] Their proposed solution to this "rising tide of socialism" was the creation of a well-funded network of neoliberal and neoconservative organizations involved in shaping opinion and policy in ways favorable to capitalism.

---

[4] John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (Chicago: The Swallow Press, Inc., 1927), 205-206.

[5] See Andrew Rich, *Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[6] See William E. Simon, *A Time for Truth* (New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1978). Lewis D. Powell's memo, entitled "Attack on American Free Enterprise System," released August 23, 1971, is available in its entirety at http://www.mediatransparency.org/story.php?storyID=22. Last accessed 03/14/06.

Powell, concerned that the "assault on the enterprise system" was "gaining momentum and converts," circulated a memo detailing strategies for dealing with the "Communists, New Leftists and other revolutionaries" whom he believed to be destroying America.[7] While Powell feared the growing power of these fringe groups, he also feared the growing amount of criticism "from perfectly respectable elements of society: from the college campus, the pulpit, the media, the intellectual and literary journals, the arts and sciences, and from politicians."[8] His suggestions for eliminating what he perceived to be a growing threat to capitalism included monitoring campuses for liberal bias and placing conservative scholars within universities; evaluating textbooks (at both the collegiate and secondary levels) to make sure America was being portrayed positively; using the media (television, radio, and the press) to advance conservative ideology; publishing in both popular and scholarly journals; using paid advertisements to shape opinion; and becoming active in courts at all levels of government.[9]

Most importantly, Powell believed that businessmen and corporate leaders needed to become active and influential in politics. "Few elements of American society today," Powell argued, "have as little influence in government as the American businessman, the corporation, or even the millions of corporate stockholders."[10] "One does not exaggerate to say," continued Powell, "that, in terms of political influence with respect to the course of legislation and government action, the American business executive is truly the

---

[7] Powell, "Attack on American Free Enterprise System," ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

'forgotten man.'"[11] Powell's solution was for business to become more aggressive and to learn the same lesson learned by "labor and other self-interest groups."

> This is the lesson that political power is necessary; that such power must be assidously [sic] cultivated; and that when necessary, it must be used aggressively and with determination—without embarrassment and without the reluctance which has been so characteristic of American business.[12]

Following Powell's lead, William Simon, President Nixon's Secretary of the Treasury and director of the ultra-conservative John M. Olin Foundation, sought out business leaders and philanthropists to support and finance a "counterintelligentsia" capable of stopping the activities of the "elite intelligentsia" housed primarily in "leftist" universities, which he considered to be dens of socialism and threats to the free market.[13] He is worth quoting at length, as his words underscore the urgency of his argument.

> I know of nothing more crucial than to come to the aid of the intellectuals and writers who are fighting on my side. And I strongly recommend that any businessmen with the slightest impulse for survival go and do likewise. The alliance between the theorists and men of action in the capitalist world is long overdue in America. It must become a veritable crusade if we are to survive in freedom.[14]

In order to protect liberty and free enterprise, Simon called on business leaders to act on three fronts. The first was the creation and support of foundations which would house scholars, social scientists, writers and journalists who understood "the relationship between political and economic liberty and whose work [would] supplement and inspire

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] See Simon, *A Time for Truth*, chapter 7.

[14] Ibid., 233.

and enhance the understanding and the work of others to come."[15] "Funds must rush by the multimillions," wrote Simon, "to the aid of liberty, in the many places where it is beleaguered."[16] Those funds would come from corporate profits, from foundations, and from individuals.[17] Simon also called on business leaders to "cease the mindless subsidizing of colleges and universities whose departments of economics, government, politics, and history are hostile to capitalism and whose faculties will not hire scholars whose views are otherwise."[18] "America's major universities," continued Simon, "are today churning out young collectivists by legions, and it is irrational for businessmen to support them."[19] Finally, Simon argued

> …business money must flow away from the media which serve as megaphones for anticapitalist opinion and to media which are either pro-freedom or, if not necessarily "pro-business," at least professionally capable of a fair and accurate treatment of procapitalist ideas, values, and arguments.[20]

Were Powell and Simon successful? Arguably, yes. Media outlets such as Fox News, Sinclair Broadcast Group, and Clear Channel forward messages that are undeniably "pro-business," often refusing to broadcast messages or advertisements that attack conservative causes.[21] Organizations such as the American Legislative Exchange

---

[15] Ibid., 230.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid., 231.

[19] Ibid., 232

[20] Ibid.

[21] See for example "Clear Channel 'Censors' Billboard," *People's Weekly World Newspaper*, online at http://www.pww.org/article/articleview/5519/0/. Last accessed

Council (ALEC) provide pre-crafted, pro-business legislation to legislators across the country.[22] Conservative foundations such as the John M. Olin Foundation, The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, and The Richard and Helen Devos Foundation support neoconservative/neoliberal scholars and departments at universities nationwide, ensuring that researchers produce findings favorable to their causes.[23]

Most importantly, a handful of conservative foundations continue to direct "multimillions" of dollars to over 500 organizations nationwide.[24] While these organizations work towards shaping opinion and policy in a number of areas, neoconservatives and neoliberals spend a great deal of time, energy, and capital reforming public education. Between the years of 1999 and 2001 alone, neoconservative and neoliberal donors gave think tanks, institutes, alliances, and foundations over 26 million dollars targeted specifically towards shaping educational policy in the United

---

03/16/06. See also "Give it Back Jim," online at http://www.giveitbackjim.com/main.asp. This is a campaign launched by the democratic congressional candidate Lois Murphey to force Clear Channel to put up a billboard concerning her opponent's financial ties to Tom Delay and Jack Abramoff. Last accessed 03/17/06. For a lengthy treatment of neoconservative use of media see former Right wing commentator David Brock's *The Republican Noise Machine: Right-Wing Media and How it Corrupts Democracy* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2004). See also Joe Conason, *Big Lies: The Right-Wing Propaganda Machine and How it Distorts the Truth* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003).

[22] For more on this organization see http://www.alec.org/. Last accessed 03/21/06.

[23] See Jeff Krehely, Meaghan House, and Emily Kernan, *Axis of Ideology: Conservative Foundations and Public Policy* (D.C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2004). Report available for purchase online at www.ncrp.org. Last accessed 01/10/06.

[24] Ibid.

States.[25] These organizations use this money to support researchers, to lobby elected officials, to create policy, and to access and influence the public sphere, with the shared purpose of reform public education according to corporate needs.[26]

Ideological Underpinnings

The underlying ideologies of these school reformers are both neoliberal and neoconservative. Neoliberals seek to create educational systems suited to increasing economic productivity.[27] Measuring productivity requires controlled conditions and repeated assessments, which exist today in the form of schools operating under a testing regime. Neoliberals then use these tests to claim schools are failing in a variety of ways. School failure, according to neoliberal logic, will result in America's loss of dominance in the global market place, a refrain kept alive since the early 1980s when the Reagan administration used *A Nation at Risk* to scare Americans into educational restructuring.[28]

---

[25] Ibid., 22. The authors of the report estimate the figure to be much higher. My own search on Media Transparency's engine resulted in 3,135 grants under the term "education" for fiscal year 2003 alone. The total sum of grants with the term "education": $321,668,432. See www.mediatransparency.com

[26] For more on this see Philip Kovacs and Deron Boyles, "Institutes, Foundations, and Think Tanks: Conservative Influences on U.S. Public Schools," *Public Resistance* 1, no. 1 (May 2005). http://www.publicresistance.org/journals/1.1archived.htm. See also Kathleen Demarrais, "The Haves and the Have Mores," 2005 American Educational Studies Association Presidential Address. I will detail these activities through an examination of the Bradley Foundation in Chapter 2 of this work.

[27] See Dave Hill, "Global Neo-Liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance," *Journal of Critical Educational Policy Studies* 1, no. 1 (March 2003). Available online at http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7. Last accessed 03/16/06.

[28] For a critical history of this campaign see David Gabbard, "A Nation at Risk Reloaded: Part I & II," *Journal for Critical Educational Policy Studies* 1, no. 2 (October 2003). Accessed 5/18/06 from http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=15.

The irony behind the refrain today is the World Economic Forum's research, which ranked America number one in global competitiveness for 2004.[29]

Neoliberals believe that embracing free-market reforms will save America's schools.[30] Embarking on multiple media and political campaigns to color all schools failures (facilitated by a federal program which recently branded 1 out of 3 American schools as failing[31]), neoliberal educational reformers argue that parental choice will result in the best schools succeeding. Parents, informed through objective test scores (now available everywhere due to federal requirements), can select which schools they wish to support, thus determining which schools survive in the market. "Public schools," explains the neoliberal Milton & Rose D. Friedman Foundation, "respond positively to competition."[32]

Despite their use of the word "free," neoliberals need a strong State to create and regulate markets,[33] and neoliberal reformers have been successful at using the State to

---

[29] This is a non-profit organization located in Switzerland. See Gerald W. Bracey, "The 15th Bracey Report on the Condition of Public Education," *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 2 (October 2005). Available online from http://www.america-tomorrow.com/bracey/EDDRA/. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[30] Neoliberals, in fact, believe free-market reforms should replace a number of the democratic state's social functions, i.e. social security. See Henry Giroux, *The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy* (Boulder: Paradigm, 2004).

[31] Monty Neill, et al., *Failing Our Children: How "No Child Left Behind" Undermines Quality and Equity in Education* (Cambridge: Fair Test, 2004). Available online from http://www.fairtest.org/Failing_Our_Children_Report.html Last accessed 12/30/2005.

[32] See the Friedman Foundation's homepage, "frequently asked questions" at http://www.friedmanfoundation.org/schoolchoice/faqs.html Accessed 3/09/06.

[33] See Dave Hill, "Global Neo-Liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance."

meet their demands, working with local, state, and federal judicial and legislative bodies to force privatization on citizens who are, by most accounts, happy with their schools.[34] These "anti-public school" initiatives include vouchers, charters, and state funding of for-profit schools.[35] Once the market replaces the public, according to neoliberal reformers, the best schools, those with the highest test scores, will force the worst schools to shut down, and every American child will get a high quality education, allowing America to retain its status as a global economic superpower.

While neoliberals focus on the economic function of schools, neoconservatives concentrate on moral, social, and political functions. Essential to understanding the neoconservative impact on public education is understanding the larger neoconservative project. "The historical task and political purpose of neoconservatism," explains longtime neoconservative champion Irving Kristol, "would seem to be this: to convert the Republican party, and American conservatism in general, against their respective wills, into a new kind of conservative politics suitable to governing a modern democracy."[36] Schools represent one place where such a conversion can take place.

---

[34] See "The 37th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 1 (Sep 2005). Available online from http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kpollpdf.htm Last accessed 12/30/05.

[35] I label these "anti-public school" because these measures ultimately reduce the public's participation in educational agenda setting. Vouchers, for example, send money to religious schools, which most parents cannot influence because of their orthodoxy a priori to parental involvement. While many parents do not petition local schools for change, they have the theoretical ability to successfully do so. I will return to this point in Chapter 3.

[36] Irving Kristol, "The Neoconservative Persuasion," *The Weekly Standard* 8, no. 47 (2003). Retrieved 3/14/2006 from www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/003/000tzmlw.asp.

Here the word "return" might be better than convert, as neoconservatives believe America has lost its moral compass and that focusing on a common culture and hard work will return American society to the happy days before the culture wars, a time when, apparently, there were no problems with schools because everyone was working hard and attending church.[37] Irving Kristol explains:

> The steady decline in our democratic culture, sinking to new levels of vulgarity, does unite neocons with traditional conservatives—though not with those libertarian conservatives who are conservative in economics but unmindful of the culture [i.e. neoliberals who believe in legalized drugs and are pro-choice]. The upshot is a quite unexpected alliance between neocons, who include a fair proportion of secular intellectuals, and religious traditionalists. They are united on issues concerning the quality of education, the relations of church and state, the regulation of pornography, and the like, all of which they regard as proper candidates for the government's attention.[38]

Neoconservatives have linked what they perceive to be a steady decline in America's culture directly to public schools, attacking the institution with works such as Sandra Stotsky's *Losing Our Language: How Multiculturalism Undermines Our Children's Ability to Read, Write and Reason* and Joe Turtel's *Public Schools, Public Menace: How Public Schools Lie To Parents and Betray Our Children*.[39] These attacks attempt to undermine the public's confidence in public schools, thus opening them up for reform, by coloring them as amoral and relativistic, unsuitable for preparing America's children for life in the 21st century.

---

[37] See Henry Giroux, Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life: Democracy's Promise and Education's Challenge, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Paradigm, 2005), Chapter 2.

[38] Kristol, "The Neoconservative Persuasion."

[39] See Sandra Stotsky, Losing Our Language: How Multiculturalism Undermines Our Children's Ability to Read, Write and Reason (New York: Encounter Books, 2002) and Joel Turtel, Public Schools, Public Menace: How Public Schools Lie To Parents and Betray Our Children (New York: Liberty Books, 2004-2005).

Neoconservative educational reformers, operating under the assumption that their version of American democracy is the ultimate social system, also seek to reintroduce civics and history to schools' curricula, producing reports for teachers and administrators such as the Thomas B. Fordham Institute's *Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy: What Our Children Need to Know*.[40] Fordham's brand of civics, however, is removed from the community, requires a history that is one-sided, and favors an uncritical examination of the events that have shaped the world both before and after 9/11.[41] Perhaps more troubling for individuals who believe in progressive solutions to local and global issues is former Secretary of Education, and current Senator from Tennessee, Lamar Alexandar's demand that all U.S. students be asked "to stand, raise their right hand, and recite the Oath of Allegiance, just as immigrants do when they become American citizens."[42] That oath, notes Alexander, requires students to "agree to bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law."[43]

---

[40] For a neoconservative defense of democracy as the be-all-end-all social system to be implemented via force if necessary, see Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992). For a rejection of the same doctrine after 14 years of use see Francis Fukuyama's *America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power, and the Neoconservative Legacy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). Fordham's report, *Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy: What Our Children Need to Know* is available online at http://edexcellence.net/institute/publication/publication.cfm?id=316. Accessed 03/13/06.

[41] For a lengthy treatment of the Fordham's report, as well as works produced by other neoconservative think tanks, institutes, and foundations, see Philip Kovacs and Deron Boyles, "Institutes, Foundations, and Think Tanks."

[42] Lamar Alexander, "Seven Questions About September 11," in Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy: What Our Children Need to Know, 44.

[43] Ibid.

Ignoring issues like class size, crumbling buildings, health care, funding, and a growing poverty rate, neoconservatives believe the problems with schools are the students, teachers, and administrators.[44] Using terms like "mean accountability" and "coercive reform," neoconservative educational reformers seek to replace teachers and administrators with individuals willing to indoctrinate students into ways favorable to the larger neoconservative project.[45] Neoconservatives, like neoliberals, are anti-public school in two seemingly contradictory ways. While they favor increased federal involvement into local schools, seeking to regulate behavior and ways of knowing, they also favor privatization initiatives. Neoliberals seek the creation of an education market, with guaranteed customers; neoconservative religious organizations seek money for their denominations, via the transfer of tax dollars to their schools. Neoconservatives heavily fund the voucher movement, as private religious schools stand to benefit most from the initiative.[46] In Cleveland for example, 97% of students using vouchers attend a church-affiliated school; 67% of Cleveland voucher money goes to Catholic schools specifically.[47] While not all Catholics are neoconservative, Catholic schools, and by default the Catholic church, clearly benefit from neoconservativism writ large.

---

[44] See for example Frederick M. Hess, "Refining or Retreating? High-Stakes Accountability in the States," and Terry M. Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," in *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West (Washington: Brookings, 2003).

[45] See Ibid.

[46] See People for the American Way, *The Voucher Veneer: The Deeper Agenda to Privatize Public Education* (D.C.: People for the American Way, 2004). Available online from http://www.pfaw.org/pfaw/general/default.aspx?oid=11371. Accessed 12/30/05.

[47] Gerald W. Bracey, *Setting the Record Straight: Responses to Misconceptions About Public Education in the U.S.* (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2004), xi. See also Alan J. Borsuk, "Religious Schools Are a Top Choice," Milwaukee Journal Sentinal Online, 14

Evidence of both ideologies undergird the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which represents efforts by neoconservatives and neoliberals to reform and ultimately privatize public education. The legislation 1) regulates knowledge and meaning according to market and neoconservative demands, 2) provides an initial platform for a competitive educational market by requiring all schools to standardize assessment for easy comparison, 3) forces "failing" schools to embrace market-based reforms, and 4) directs public money to private corporations, organizations, and alliances in order to further undermine public education. Recall that both neoconservatives and neoliberals require a strong, regulatory State; neoconservatives need the State to reinforce norms of belief and ethics, and neoliberals need the State to regulate markets and mold the workforce according to market demands. NCLB, with its focus on standards, accountability, choice, and competition, serves both ends.

As I intend to show in Chapter 2, the neoconservative/neoliberal reformers and the reform/restructuring efforts they forward are anti-school, anti-voice, and anti-democracy. For example, NCLB 1) regulates meaning, ultimately reducing teachers' ability to pursue various subjects/topics and 2) silences individual need and voice by turning public schools over to private alliances, either via curricular control or through outright privatization. Because NCLB reduces schooling to high scores in reading, mathematics, and science, a claim I will support in Chapters 2 and 3, it undermines the ability of individuals and communities to freely explore (and possibly intelligently reject) democracy, making the act "anti-school," where public schools are understood to be sites

---

June 2005. Accessed 5/27/06 from http://www.jsonline.com/news/metro/jun05/3338000.asp?format=print. Borsuk reports that 2/3 of Milwaukee students using vouchers attend religious schools.

for realizing and problematizing democracy. Furthermore, since NCLB gives primacy to the voice of corporate America, reducing the ability of teachers and students to identify and vocalize their own needs and realities, the act is "anti-voice," where voice is understood to mean the ability for any individual to speak up and act for one's needs and/or dreams. Finally, if democracy is understood through scholars such as John Dewey to be a system of associated living where individuals participate in the institutions which shape them,[48] then NCLB is "anti-democracy," as it does not engender the type of criticality and agency necessary for individuals to participate in a democracy. For purposes of this dissertation, I will name the neoconservative and neoliberal reformers behind NCLB the anti-school movement (ASM), with the implication that the actions of these reformers undermine schools as potential sites for the creation and maintenance of a democracy. I contrast the ASM with progressive educational reformers, individuals and organizations that believe public schools, schools free from corporate intrusion and attack, are better suited to U.S. democracy.

Specifically, members of the ASM include any organization, alliance, or individual working to reform public education through "accountability" and "choice" initiatives. Foundations that provide millions of dollars annually to support accountability movements and privatization schemes, such as the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Broad Foundation, the Adolph Coors Foundation, the Scaife Family Foundation, the John M. Olin Foundation, and the Walton Family Foundation are part of the ASM.[49]

---

[48] For John Dewey's definition of democracy and the role schools should play in both realizing and maintaining it, see *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: The Free Press, 1944), 87.

[49] See Krehely, House, and Kernan, *Axis of Ideology*, and see David C. Johnson and Leonard M. Salle, *Responding to the Attack on Public Education and Teacher*

Think tanks, which produce and peddle research and policy, are part of the ASM. These include, but are not limited to, the Heritage Foundation, the Evergreen Freedom Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, the Manhattan Institute, the Hoover Foundation, the Hudson Institute, the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, and the Heartland Institute. Various corporate alliances, such as Achieve and The Business Roundtable, which bring legislators and business leaders together to bash public schools, are part of the ASM.[50] The American Legislative Exchange Council, which delivers pre-fabricated privatization bills to legislators across the country, is part of the ASM. The Black Alliance for Educational Options, funded by the same neoconservatives who paid for *The Bell Curve*, is part of the ASM.[51] Reporters who produce work under the guise of objective journalism while at the same time parroting neoconservative intellectuals are part of the ASM.[52] Radio personalities who continuously attack public schools are part of the ASM. The Edison School project and its attempt to make a profit from schools nationwide is part of the ASM.[53] NCLB and its reliance on the market represents efforts

---

Unions (Menlo Park: Commonweal Institute, 2004). Available online at http://commonwealinstitute.org/reports/ed/EdRespondReport.html. Last accessed 03/16/06.

[50] See Philip Kovacs, "Bill Gates and the Corporatization of U.S. Schools," *Common Dreams*. Available online at http://www.commondreams.org/views05/0406-31.htm. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[51] See "Bush Funds Black Voucher Front Group: Your Tax Dollars Pay for Propaganda Blitz," *The Black Commentator* 16 (Nov. 14, 2002). Available online at http://www.blackcommentator.com/16_thw.html. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[52] See Joe Williams, *Cheating Our Kids: How Politics and Greed Ruin Education* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

[53] For more on Edison see Kenneth J. Saltman, The Edison Schools: Corporate Schooling and the Assault on Public Education (New York: Routledge, 2005).

by members of the ASM to open the door for private companies to run "failing" schools. Therefore, the federal government, under the current administration, is part of the ASM.

The Arenas of Policy Creation, Debate, and Maintenance: The ASM's Operational Spheres and Methods

Jürgen Habermas defines the public sphere as "a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed. Access," explains Habermas, "is granted to all citizens."[54] Public opinion, according to Habermas, is formed through the use of "newspapers and magazines, radio and television [which] are the media of the public sphere."[55] To this list I would only add film and the Internet, as both shape public opinion today.[56] While I agree with Habermas that all citizens should have access to the public sphere, some citizens, and more specifically, some groups of citizens, have been more effective at using the public sphere than others. A brief historical analysis of public education reveals competing interest groups using the public sphere to help make educational policy suit their needs.[57] It is my contention that, when it comes to discourse

---

[54] Jürgen Habermas, "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article," in *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*, ed. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner (New York: Routledge, 1989), 136.

[55] Ibid.

[56] For a classic treatment of media and opinion see Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon, 1988). Also see Brian McNair, *An Introduction to Political Communication*, 3rd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2003). In terms of the Internet and opinion, see www.dailykos.com, www.redstate.org, www.commondreams.org, and www.instapundit.com. Each of these sites receive more traffic than does the mainstream media, thus legitimating them as spaces where public opinion is shaped and formed.

[57] For histories of multiple interest groups and ideologies vying for control of public education, see Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1986), David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University

regarding educational reform today, the ASM dominates the public sphere, generating public support for reform efforts ranging from strict enforcement of standards to privatizing public schools. Dewey asserts that "the smoothest road to control of political conduct [in this case the conduct of schools] is by control of opinion."[58] Taking Dewey's words to heart, the ASM creates and shapes opinion via aggressive marketing of ideas.

"I make no bones about marketing," explains William Baroody of the American Enterprise Institute, "We pay as much attention to the dissemination of product as to the content."[59] Commenting on the importance of marketing to the Heritage Foundation's mission, former vice president for communication Herb Berkowitz further underscores the importance of marketing to the ASM's project:

> Our belief is that when the research product has been printed, then the job is only half done. That is when we start marketing it to the media….We have as part of our charge the selling of ideas, the selling of policy proposals. We are out there actively selling these things, day after day. It's our mission.[60]

Press, 1995), Wayne Urban and Jennings Wagoner, *American Education: A History*, 3rd ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003). See also Joel Spring, *Political Agendas For Education: From the Christian Coalition to the Religious Right*, 2nd ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001), and Joel Spring, *American Education*, 12th ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006).

[58] Dewey, The Public and Its Problems, 182.

[59] Baroody as cited by Laurie Spivak, "The Conservative Marketing Machine," *Alternet*, 11 January 2005. Available online at www.alternet.org/mediaculture/20946. Accessed 03/16/06.

[60] See Andrew Rich, "War of Ideas: Why Mainstream and Liberal Foundation and the Think Tanks They Support are Losing in the War of Ideas in American Politics," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Spring 2005): 25. Rich interviewed Berkowitz July 22, 1996.

The result of the ASM's focused-attention is a "message amplification infrastructure [that] has a broad reach, repeating coordinated strategic messages through multiple communication channels."[61] These channels, according to Johnson and Salle, include

> …conservative talk radio, Fox News, Internet sites like the Drudge Report, op-ed pieces in newspapers [and magazines] across the country, prefab letters-to-the-editor, books, pundits and columnists, talking points distributed to politicians and public speakers, advertisements, and newspapers such as *The Washington Times* and *The Wall Street Journal*.[62]

Conservative-run magazines such as *Commentary*, *The Weekly Standard*, the *City Journal*, and *Insight*, provide further avenues for publication.[63] Thanks in part to this vast infrastructure, the Manhattan Institute's J. P. Greene claims to have been cited on television, radio, or in print over 500 times in one year alone.[64]

The results of flooding the public sphere are arguably two-fold. First, the repetition of themes such as "the schools are failing" results in Americans buying into the argument regardless of whether or not it is valid. Alfie Kohn asserts that "the demand for accountability didn't start in living rooms; it started in places like the Heritage Foundation."[65] Thanks to its budget and ties to media moguls, including Rupert Murdoch, the Heritage Foundation can make sure that individuals in living rooms across the nation

---

[61] Johnson and Salle, Responding to the Attack, 29.

[62] Ibid., 39.

[63] See Eric Alterman, "Neoconning the Media: A Very Short History of Neoconservatism." Available at www.mediatransparency.org/story.php?storyID=2. Last accessed 03/16/06.

[64] See Sean Cavanagh, "Greene Machine," *Education Week*, 13 October 2004. Available online at www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/10/13/07jaygreene.h24.html. Accessed 03/16/06. Subscription required.

[65] Alfie Kohn, "Test Today, Privatize Tomorrow," *Education Digest* 70, no. 1 (September 2004): 20.

hear what Heritage Foundation neointellectuals have to say, repeatedly.[66] "After a time," notes Kohn, "even parents who think their own children's school is just fine may swallow the generalizations they've been fed about the inadequacy of public education in general."[67]

The second result of media flooding is that progressives invested in using schools as sites for the creation and maintenance of a more democratic social order are kept on the defensive, having to respond to the ASM's charges rather than exploring new possibilities for U.S. schools. Constantly playing defense to the activities of the ASM allows neoconservative and neoliberal ideologues to frame educational debates, inhibiting discussion of more democratic educational discourse. This is problematic, as Michael Apple explains, because

> The very categories themselves—markets, choice, national curricula, national testing, standards—bring the debate onto the terrain established by neo-liberals and neo-conservatives. The analysis of "what is" has led to a neglect of "what might be."[68]

The public sphere, however, is not the only place where educational policy is marketed and contested. Policy has a political element, and the ASM effectively uses its resources to shape policy at local, state, and federal levels. For example, Chester Finn and other members of the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation spoke before multiple

---

[66] Fox News repeatedly draws on research from neoconservative foundations, including, but not limited to the Heritage Foundation, American Enterprise Institute, and the Cato Institute. See, for example, Brett D. Schaefer, "'Unilateralism' Saved Lives In Asia," *Fox News*, 12 January 2005. Accessed 3/05/06 from http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,143955,00.html.

[67] Kohn, "Test Today, Privatize Tomorrow," 20.

[68] Michael W. Apple, "Creating Difference: Neo-liberalism, Neo-Conservatism and the Politics of Educational Reform," *Educational Policy* 18, no. 1 (January-March 2004): 40.

organizations, including the Ohio state legislature, in order gain control of schools in Dayton, Ohio.[69] When parents in Boulder, Colorado wanted to pass pro school choice initiatives in their community they called on various organizations within the ASM for help.[70] When they knew they did not have enough votes to win, they switched their efforts to creating charter schools, and

> …advocates showered legislators with papers and briefs put out by various foundations and think tanks. They pushed newspapers to promote the values of choice [and] they sponsored a Charter School conference designed to win over enough legislators to pass the bill.[71]

When the state of Georgia decided to rewrite its history standards, the board of education hired Diane Ravitch as a consultant.[72] The Walton Family Foundation, funded by the fortunes of Wal-Mart, supports a broad variety of ASM advocacy organizations at local levels. In Florida, for example, the Florida School Choice Fund, Inc. received $1,383,585 and Floridians for School Choice received $337,750; both organizations work publicly and politically to forward privatization initiatives.[73]

---

[69] For Fordham's takeover of Dayton schools see Ed. Excellence Press Release, "Thomas B. Fordham Foundation to Sponsor Charter Schools in Dayton." Last accessed 12/13/04. Available online at http://www.edexcellence.net/foundation/about/press_release.cfm?id=11

[70] For more on the Boulder story see Mary Lee Smith, et al., *Political Spectacle and the Fate of American Schools* (New York: Routledge/Falmer, 2003), 86-93.

[71] Ibid., 96.

[72] See Kathleen Kennedy Manzo, "Ga. History Plan Stirs Civil War Fuss," *Education Week*, 18 February 2004. Last accessed 9/17/2005. Available online at http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/02/18/23civil.h23.html?querystring=ga%20history%20plan%20stirs%20civil%20war%20fuss.

[73] These figures were obtained from Media Transparency's search engine, online at www.mediatransparency.com. Last accessed 9/9/2005.

Members of the ASM are even more active, and arguably more influential, at the federal level, providing scholars for testimony before the House, Senate, and Supreme Court.[74] Newt Gingrich, for example, represented the American Enterprise Institute, testifying before the Senate that failing to increase math and science scores was a national security threat second only to the detonation of an atomic bomb.[75] Krista Kafer of The Heritage Foundation spoke before the House Budget Committee Democratic Caucus, using think tank sponsored research to support her claim that an increase in funding will not help U.S. education.[76] John Boehner (R-OH), Chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, used a Manhattan Institute "working paper" to attack "left-wing" criticism of No Child Left Behind.[77] The author of that study, J. P. Greene, was cited four times in the Supreme Court's *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris* school voucher decision, which declared vouchers used at Catholic schools to be constitutional.[78]

---

[74] For more on this see Kovacs and Boyles, "Think Tanks, Institutes, and Foundations."

[75] See Newt Gingrich, "We Must Expand Our Investment in Science," testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, available online at www.aei.org/include/news_print.asp?newsID=15562. Last accessed 11/9/04.

[76] See Krista Kafer, "The Promise of No Child Left Behind." Testimony Before the House Budget Committee Democratic Caucus Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Available online at www.heritage.org/Research/Education/tst071703.cfm. Last accessed 11/9/04.

[77] See the Committee on Education and the Workforce, "New Report Debunks NEA-MoveOn.org Excuses for Poor School Performance; Proves High Standards are Key to Closing Achievement Gaps in Education," 9 September 2004. Press release accessed 5/18/06 from http://edworkforce.house.gov/press/press108/second/09sept/nclb090904.htm

[78] Cavanaugh, "Greene Machine."

Indeed there is a symbiotic relationship between the ASM and both the White House and Capitol Hill. For example, while scholars from neoconservative and neoliberal institutes and foundations within the ASM are invited to speak to Congress, these institutes also return the favor, inviting representatives to ASM supported seminars and conferences.[79] Additionally, many members of the ASM have worked as administrative assistants to various policy makers. In some cases, as with Chester Finn, Diane Ravitch, and William Bennett, they have served as under-secretaries, or secretaries, of education in the U.S. Department of Education. Newt Gingrich, former Speaker of the House, still has contacts on the Hill, and Lynn Cheney, Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, has quick access to the current Vice-President. The State Department sponsors the Diplomat in Residence Program where "diplomats can, between assignments, take up residence at think tanks to write, conduct research, and deliver lectures."[80] Or, if they are invited, policy makers and congressional staffers can attend one of the Hoover Institution's exclusive seminars in Palo Alto, California. The Hoover Institution believes

> …these meetings and seminars are now playing a critical role in the ongoing dialogue between scholars and policymakers, which is so important to the effective development and implementation of legislative and executive department policies and programs.[81]

When influential politicians or journalists need extra persuasion to attend seminars, think tanks, institutes, and foundations will pay them to attend. Such was the case with the

---

[79] See Donald E. Abelson, *Do Think Tanks Matter?* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), 80.

[80] Ibid., 81.

[81] Ibid.

Manhattan Institute and *The Bell Curve*, a book that claimed African Americans and members of lower social classes are intellectually inferior to others.[82]

While access to policy makers is one thing, convincing them to adopt specific policies is another. Deborah Stone's theory of causal stories proves instructive for understanding how specific policies are created, marketed, changed, and contested.[83] Stone believes "political actors use narrative story lines and symbolic devices to manipulate so-called issue characteristics, all the while making it seem as though they are simply describing facts."[84] Neoconservative and neoliberal educational reformers take their facts before Congress to create stories such as Newt Gingrich's declaration that failing to increase math and science scores is a national security threat second only to the detonation of an Atomic Bomb.[85] What many individuals fail to recognize is that the people "simply describing facts" are beholden to particular ideologies that shape facts in particular ways; when individuals misuse or misrepresent research for political ends, science becomes pseudoscience.

Chris Mooney's recent work, *The Republican War on Science*, helps distinguish between the two.[86] Mooney argues that science is more than just facts; "science," explains Mooney,

---

[82] See Spring, *Political Agendas for Education*, 33. Spring notes that individuals were paid $500-$1,500 to attend a seminar discussing the research behind the book.

[83] See Deborah A. Stone, "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas," *Political Science Quarterly* 104, no. 2 (1989).

[84] Stone, "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas," 282.

[85] See Gingrich, "We Must Expand Our Investment in Science."

[86] Chris Mooney, *The Republican War on Science* (New York: Basic Books, 2005).

> amounts to a *process*—institutionalized at leading universities, research facilities, and scientific journals worldwide—for systematically pursuing knowledge about nature and, in the social sciences, ourselves. As its core, this process features the testing and retesting of hypotheses to ensure that they withstand the most withering scrutiny.[87]

Science becomes politicized and turned into pseudoscience when this process is ignored or tampered with. Mooney calls such tampering "political science abuse," which he defines as "any attempt to inappropriately undermine, alter, or otherwise interfere with the scientific process, or scientific conclusions, for political or ideological reasons."[88]

Continuing to draw on Mooney's work, I include a few brief examples of how this abuse occurs in the field of educational policy setting, as this examination helps explain how the ASM uses and abuses science to forward both accountability and privatization initiatives.[89] According to Mooney, individuals abuse science by:

- *Undermining science itself*—such as when creationists call evolution "just a theory" or when members of the ASM attack multiculturalism, a theory and product of social science, as dangerous and partisan.[90]
- *Suppression*—quashing scientific reports that don't support political philosophies, as was the case with a 2004 Department of Education report critical of charter schools.[91]

---

[87] Ibid., 14.

[88] Ibid., 17.

[89] For a much longer treatment of each of type of abuse see ibid., 17-24.

[90] For an example of this see Gregory Rodrigues of the New America Foundation, "Why Multiculturalism Should Scare You," *Los Angeles Times*, 18 January 2006, M5.

[91] See Gerald Bracey, The 15th Bracey Report on the Condition of Public Education," *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 2 (October 2005): 145. Available online at http://www.america-tomorrow.com/bracey/EDDRA/. Accessed 3/17/06.

- *Targeting individual scientists*—either discrediting scientists or attempting to silence them, as is the case with David Horowitz's list of dangerous college professors and social scientists.[92]

- *Rigging the process*—controlling the input of data in a policy debate by either packing a panel with scientists who are like-minded or by airing one side of the story, as was the case with Krista Kaffer's testimony before the House Budget Committee concerning educational reform.[93]

- *Hiding errors and misrepresentations*—making false claims or distorting data, as is the case when neoliberals and neoconservatives claim all schools are failing or claim there has been no increase in test scores despite doubling the amount of money spent on public schools.[94]

- *Magnifying uncertainty*—hyping scientific uncertainty to prevent one type of action or to allow another, such as when members of the ASM claim there is no scientific evidence supporting teacher certification.[95]

- *Relying on the fringe*—when politicians handpick experts whose views match what they want to hear, as was the case when John Boehner (R-OH), used one of Jay P. Greene's "working papers" to support NCLB.[96]

---

[92] See David Horowitz, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Professors in America* (D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc, 2006).

[93] See Kovacs and Boyles, "Think Tanks, Institutes, and Foundations." The authors note that Kaffer presented lopsided arguments before the panel, neglecting to tell them that much of her research relied on think tank housed researchers.

[94] For a lengthy treatment of misrepresented data and public education see Gerald W. Bracey, *Setting the Record Straight: Responses to Misconceptions About Public Education in the U.S.,* 2nd ed. (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2004).

[95] See, for example, Frederick M. Hess, "The Predictable, But Unpredictably Personal, Politics of Teacher Licensure," *Journal of Teacher Education* 56 no. 3 (May/June 2005): 192-198.

[96] See Krista Kafer, "The Promise of No Child Left Behind." Testimony Before the House Budget Committee Democratic Caucus Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Available online at www.heritage.org/Research/Education/tst071703.cfm. Last accessed 11/9/04.

- *Ginning up contrary science*—generating science in order to manufacture uncertainty or consent, as is the case when neoconservative think tanks, institutes, and foundations manufacture report after report in order to build consensus for accountability based reform and choice initiatives.[97]

- *Dressing up values in scientific clothing*—claiming scientific justification for purely political moves, such as when market fundamentalists claim competition works, despite having no research to prove it or basing their claims on research with one of the above flaws.[98]

Mooney claims that the Right's politicizing of science, and the use of the above strategies, began in earnest as a reaction to the wave of environmental, health, and safety rules enacted in the early 1970s, and he cites Lewis Powell as one of the more prominent individuals urging business leaders to ally with scientists in order to protect their interests.[99] "The proliferation of think tanks," explains Mooney, "created extremely propitious conditions for the politicization of science."[100] The primary reason for these conditions, in my opinion, were the profits Simon wished to see directed to the "theorists" working to protect capitalism. As a result of these profits, borrowing here from Dewey, some "intellectuals became the willing tools of big economic interests."[101] These "willing tools" deliver their politicized science to public, private, and

---

[97] See Kovacs and Boyles, "Think Tanks, Institutes, and Foundations." The authors focus on four neoconservative organizations and their attempts to undermine public education with the use of in-house reports.

[98] Ibid. Greene circumvents the peer review process by publishing outside of scientific journals, dubbing his research "working papers."

[99] Mooney, The Republican War on Science, 32.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Dewey, The Public and Its Problems, 206.

governmental bodies in order to add legitimacy to various causes, i.e. accountability and choice.

For the remainder of this dissertation, I will no longer use the term scientist, scholar, or researcher to refer to members of the ASM. In addition to participating in political science abuse, thus delegitimating their scholarship and their science, they act publicly, privately, and politically to change policy according to the needs of "big economic interests." Therefore, I will use the term "neointellectual," a word I arrived at via analogy. Neointellectuals are to intellectuals what neoliberals are to liberals and what neoconservatives are to conservatives. Where liberals, for example, seek to use government to mitigate social crises, neoliberals believe the government, or at least government by the people, is the problem and must be destroyed; the two are polar opposites. The same holds true for the relationship between conservative and neoconservative. Conservatives, at least conservatives of the Jeffersonian model, believe in limited government, constitutional law, and anti-imperialism,[102] while neoconservativism has, arguably, led to unprecedented increases in federal spending,[103] multiple attacks on the Constitution,[104] and a vision of empire akin to Alexander the

---

[102] My understanding of Jeffersonian Conservativism is based on Kevin Mattson's *Creating a Democratic Public: The Struggle for Urban Participatory Democracy During the Progressive Era* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998). See Chapter 2.

[103] See Richard Wolfe, "Growth in Federal Spending Unchecked," *USA Today*, 4 March 2006. Retrieved 6/27/2006 from http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-04-02-federal-spending_x.htm.

[104] See Nat Hentoff, "Bush v Constitution," *The Washington Times*, 3 April 2006. Accessed 6/27/06 from http://www.washingtontimes.com/op-ed/20060402-112827-5127r.htm

Great's.[105] Intellectuals, as I will show in Chapter 4, were traditionally defined as those who serve people in the face of corporate or federal power. As Noam Chomsky explains the role: "it is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies."[106] Specifically, Chomsky argues that "intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions."[107] As I intend to show in both this chapter and the next, neointellectuals—such as Krista Kaffer, Jay P. Greene, Newt Gingrich, Armstrong Williams, Chester Finn, Frederick Hess, et al.—housed in corporate-funded think tanks, institutions, and foundations, use their positions to manipulate multiple publics, explaining certain causes without revealing hidden interests or intentions. Where, traditionally, the intellectual sought to help citizens in the face of power, the neointellectual uses power to forward corporate interests, in essence turning the term "intellectual" on its head.[108]

Douglass Kellner's work on the "functional intellectual" is instructive for understanding the neointellectual. Functional intellectuals produce, use, and misuse

---

[105] See John B. Judis, The Folly of Empire: What George W. Bush Could Learn from Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson (New York: Scribner, 2004).

[106] Noam Chomsky, "The Responsibility of Intellectuals," in *The Dissenting Academy*, Theodore Roszak, ed. (New York: Random House, 1967), 256.

[107] Ibid., 255. Universalization of truth will be dealt with in Chapter 4.

[108] I will discuss the public intellectual in depth in Chapter 4.

research in order to further corporate power. In the words of Kellner, they "serve to reproduce and legitimate the values of existing societies."[109] Kellner elaborates:

> Functional intellectuals were earlier the classical ideologues, whereas today they tend to be functionaries of parties or interest groups, or mere technicians who devise more efficient means to obtain certain ends, or who apply their skills to increase technical knowledge in various specialized domains (medicine, physics, history, etc.) without questioning the ends, goals, or values that they are serving, or the social utility or disutility of their activities.[110]

One problem with Kellner's definition is his assertion that these individuals do not question the ends, goals, or values they are serving. Functional intellectuals such as Newt Gingrich and Chester Finn, believe very strongly in what they are doing. The result of their efforts, as I will show in the first three chapters of this work, benefits both neoconservative and neoliberal reformers, a goal of both Simon and Powell. A second problem with Kellner's use of the term "functional" is that all intellectuals function, some for authoritarianism and others for participatory democracy.[111] Recognizing these two problems, Kellner's larger point still holds for neointellectuals, who function to "reproduce and legitimate" business interests, via the distribution and amplification of "research," as called for by Powell and Simon.

C. Wright Mills offers further insight into the neointellectual. He calls this type of intellectual a "consultant" and often a consultant to "men [sic] of dubious character," men

---

[109] See Douglas Kellner, "Intellectuals, the New Public Spheres, and Techno-Politics," available online at http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner. Accessed 12/30/05.

[110] Ibid.

[111] See Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, trans. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 3-23.

he describes as being neither "king-like" nor "philosophical," in reference to Plato's ideal leaders.[112] To prevent the deterioration of their role, Wright argues that intellectuals should "remain independent to do one's own work, to select one's own problems, [and] to direct [their] work at kings as well as to 'publics.'"[113] Neointellectuals are not independent, as they are bought and paid for by corporate interests. While they may be able to direct their work at kings and publics, that work always represents the interests of the individuals paying for it. The Manhattan Institute will not, indeed cannot, publish research in support of a progressive educational platform.[114]

Richard Hofstadter, also troubled by intellectuals aligning themselves with power, explains a second issue with neoconservatives:

> it would be tragic if all intellectuals aimed to serve power; but it would be equally tragic if all intellectuals who become associated with power were driven to believe they no longer had any connection with the intellectual community: their conclusion would almost inevitably be that their responsibilities are to power alone.[115]

Both Kellner's "functionaries of parties or interest groups" and Mills' "consultants to power" remain disconnected from the larger intellectual community, the community where, according to Mooney, the process of science takes place. Instead of participating

---

[112] See C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), Chapter 10.

[113] Ibid., 181.

[114] See Kovacs and Boyles, "Think Tanks, Institutes, and Foundations." The authors discuss four neoconservative think tanks, institutes, and foundations, showing how they act publicly, privately, and politically to support neoconservative ideologies in opposition to participatory democracy. A progressive educational platform is addressed in Chapter 3.

[115] Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 430.

in the larger scientific community, neointellectuals lodge themselves in think tanks, institutes, and foundations, publishing in their own, non-peer reviewed journals, committing various forms of "political science abuse" to justify neoconservative and neoliberal educational ends.

Since Stone's "causal stories need to be fought for, defended, and sustained,"[116] neoliberal and neoconservative reformers have created a "message amplification infrastructure" to help neointellectuals generate, market, and maintain ideas. As I will show in the next chapter, the ASM uses this message amplification superstructure to undermine public education, a process that takes place through: repeated attacks on schools, teachers, administrators, unions and colleges of education; the generation, transmission, and amplification of research that favors corporatist ends; the use of tax dollars, and the use of propaganda. Importantly, Deborah Stone explains, "people choose causal stories not only to shift the blame but to enable themselves to appear to be able to remedy the problem."[117] This appears true for the ASM. Ignoring many existential realities faced by public schools—issues like class size, crumbling buildings, health care, funding, and a growing poverty rate—neoconservatives and neoliberals shift the blame to students, teachers, administrators, unions, and colleges of education. These reformers claim that they have the solution to the problems these individuals cause in the form of standards, accountability, and choice. In America's public schools today, their reform efforts have arguably served two ends: 1) they have turned schools into disciplinary institutions in charge of creating a hyper-productive, hyper-patriotic workforce via the

---

[116] Stone, "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas," 293.

[117] Ibid., 297.

federal No Child Left Behind Act, and 2) they have used the public sphere, private resources, and the State to build support for dismantling public education altogether. I will attempt to substantiate these two claims by examining the research, advocacy, and actions of the Bradley Foundation, whose activism is instructive for understanding ASM efforts.

CHAPTER 3

WHAT DOES THE ASM MEAN FOR U.S. PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

> We want to change the conversation about parental choice by positively influencing individuals who are resisting parental choice options and get them to reconsider their outlook.[118]

In this chapter, I examine the The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, one of the conservative funders that continues to respond to Powell and Simon's calls for reform. Recall from Chapter 2 that their imperatives included supporting conservative advocacy organizations, increasing pro-business media and legislation, monitoring texts for anti-business bias, generating pro-business texts, countering leftist universities, and using U.S. courts to shape various institutions, including public education.[119] The Bradley Foundation, connected to multiple organizations identified in Chapter 2, is illustrative of larger ASM activity. By looking at who and what Bradley funds, and how the recipients of those funds operate, I reveal how the ASM both attacks and regulates U.S. public schools. I begin this chapter with an analysis of Bradley's privatization initiatives, which I follow with a critique of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), a policy made possible

---

[118] Undersecretary of Education Gene Hickok. See *The Black Commentator*, "Bush Funds Black Voucher Front Group: Your Tax Dollars Pay for Propaganda Blitz." Accessed 12/30/05 from http://www.educationforthepeople.org/bush%20funds%20black%20vouchers.htm.

[119] For more on other conservative funders responding to both Simon and Powell's call see Jeff Krehely, Meaghan House and Emily Kernan, *Axis of Ideology: Conservative Foundations and Public Policy* (D.C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2004). Report available for purchase online at www.ncrp.org. Last accessed 01/10/06.

and kept in place with the help of Bradley support. NCLB, as I will attempt to argue in this chapter, imposes standards on schools and teachers in an effort to regulate student achievement. Importantly, as I hope to show, NCLB regulates the regulators, focusing on teachers and teaching in order to reform public education in accordance to corporate need. If schools and teachers cannot regulate achievement according to industry standards, those schools and teachers must "reconstitute" and cede control to private, charter, or for-profit educational management organizations. The result, arguably, is a pre-emptive end to any sort of schooling for progressive purposes, as education for democracy cannot take place in schools serving a corporatist agenda.[120]

Recall from Chapter 2 that the ASM undermines public confidence through repeated attacks on schools, teachers, administrators, unions, and colleges of education; through the generation, transmission, and amplification of findings that support corporate need; and with the use of propaganda, occasionally paid for by the public. Coloring all schools as failing, recall from Chapter 2, opens the door for reform.

The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation is one organization that makes all of these activities possible, giving large sums of money to institutes, alliances, and individuals working to privatize public schools. With total assets for 2004 over $706,000,000, the Bradley Foundation sends funds by the "multimillions" to pro-business interests across the country.[121] The foundation's mission is "to strengthen institutions and

---

[120] In chapter 3 I explore what education for a democracy might look like. By corporatist agenda, I mean a system of school governance and curriculum maintenance that places corporate needs before the needs of schools, teachers, and students.

[121] See the Bradley Foundation, *2004 Annual Report* (Milwaukee: Bradley Foundation, 2005), 45. Available online from http://www.bradleyfdn.org/publications.html. Last accessed 11/18/05.

individuals which contribute to the nurturing of those ideas that form the cornerstone of our intellectual, cultural, and economic way of life."[122] The cornerstone is free market capitalism, something public schools, according to the institutes, organizations, and individuals receiving Bradley support, threaten. I turn now to an examination of how Bradley uses corporate profit to enforce a system of public school governance which leads to further privatization of U.S. public schools.

Bradley and Choice

In order to eliminate public schools, the Bradley Foundation funds a number of organizations and alliances pushing privatization; in 2004 Bradley gave over $5 million dollars to school choice and charter initiatives.[123] Not included in that figure is Bradley support of Marquette University's Institute for the Transformation of Learning (ITL). Since 1996 the foundation has given ITL over 2 million dollars, including $250,000 in 2004 alone.[124] Founded by Howard Fuller, a former superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools, the ITL acts as a charter school incubator, providing research and developmental support for individuals and organizations seeking to start their own charter schools. ITL's research is indicative of most research conducted by members of the ASM, as it draws conclusions that consistently support privatization initiatives. Relying heavily on the work of functional intellectuals like the Manhattan Institute's J. P. Greene, Gerard Robinson concludes ITL's "Survey of School Choice Research" with the assertion that school choice "improves academic performance, increases parent satisfaction and

---

[122] Ibid., 25.

[123] Ibid., 13.

[124] For total giving to ITL see www.mediatransparency.org. For fiscal year 2004, see the Bradley Foundation, *2004 Annual Report*, 31.

involvement, and appear[s] to have a positive impact on student achievement in public schools."[125] There are, obviously, a number of researchers who argue otherwise.[126]

As explained in Chapter 2, members of the ASM frame the national debate over school reform in ways favorable to privatization. The Bradley Foundation furthers this end by supporting organizations and functional intellectuals that use media to create and distribute politicized science. One such organization is the Encounter for Culture and Education, "a tax-exempt, non-profit corporation dedicated to strengthening the marketplace of ideas and engaging in educational activities to help preserve democratic culture."[127] Encounter for Culture and Education funds Encounter Books, which helps "preserve democratic culture" by publishing works such as J. Martin Rochester's *Class Warfare: Besieged Schools, Bewildered Parents, Betrayed Kids and the Attack on Excellence*, Myron Lieberman's *The Teacher Unions: How They Sabotage Educational Reform and Why*, Sandra Stotsky's *Losing Our Language: How Multiculturalism Undermines Our Children's Ability to Read, Write and Reason*, and Sol Stern's *Breaking Free: Public School Lessons and the Imperative of School Choice*.[128]

The neoconservative Heartland Institute, publisher of *School Reform News*, also benefits from Bradley grants, which allow the organization to disseminate pro-school

---

[125] Gerard Robinson, *Survey of School Choice Research* (Milwaukee: Institute For The Transformation of Learning, 2005), 7. Accessed 12/30/05from http://www.itlmuonline.com/content.asp?cat=2&id=60.

[126] See for example Gerald W. Bracey, *What You Should Know About the War Against America's Public Schools* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2003), especially chapter 6.

[127] Quote taken from Encounter Books' homepage. Available online at http://www.encounterbooks.com/main_web/about/about.html. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[128] To read excerpts of these works visit http://www.encounterbooks.com/-main_web/catalog/education_family.html. Last accessed 12/13/05.

choice propaganda all over the nation. For example, Joseph L. Bast, president of Heartland, recently edited *Public Schools, Public Menace: How Public Schools Lie To Parents and Betray Our Children*; the book, which contains notes, misrepresents the past and present in its attempt to scare parents into taking their children out of public schools. Chapters include section headings like "Sexual Corruption of Children in Public Schools," "Turning Children into Spies Against Their Parents," "Anti-Judeo-Christian Values," and "Pagan Religions in the Public Schools."[129] The book, according to radio personality Laura Schlessinger, "is a must-read for every parent." She explains:

> it is sad but true that the public school system in America threatens the values of families and the welfare of students. It is for that reason that Dr. James Dobson [of the ultra-conservative Focus on the Family] and I urge parents to take their children out of public school….[130]

Besides supporting colleges, institutes, scholars, journals, and religious organizations, the Bradley Foundation has given over $2 million since 2000 to the Black Alliance for Educational Options (BAEO), an organization created to sell school choice initiatives to the African American community.[131] The chair of the organization, Howard Fuller, is also the head of the Institute for the Transformation of Learning, which indicates a type of incestuousness within the ASM. Individuals like Fuller may hold positions on six or seven different councils all funded by similar organizations with identical ideologies and missions, making the anti-school movement's "experts" look

---

[129] See Joel Turtel, Public Schools, Public Menace: How Public Schools Lie To Parents and Betray Our Children (New York: Liberty Books, 2004-2005).

[130] Ibid., Quote taken from the first inset.

[131] See "Voucher Tricksters: The Hard Right Enters Through the Schoolhouse Door," *The Black Commentator* 7 (July 11, 2002). Available online at http://www.blackcommentator.com/7_voucher_tricksters.html. Last accessed 12/30/05.

more impressive than they actually are via resume padding and other forms of inter-institutional back patting. Fuller, married to the CCO of Edison Schools, also sits on the board of directors of Advocates for School Choice, the sister organization of the Alliance for School Choice. As Tom Siebold argues, the cloning of think tanks and organizations, the use of university space and prestige, [132] and the subsequent manufacturing of experts helps buy credibility for the ASM, in this particular case making Fuller's BAEO look like more than it actually is, an attempt to manipulate black voters.[133]

In 2002, the BAEO effectively partnered with the Department of Education, which gave the organization $600,000. Then Undersecretary of Education Gene Hickok (formerly a Bradley fellow at the Heritage Foundation) explained the purpose of the grant: "We want to change the conversation about parental choice by positively influencing individuals who are resisting parental choice options and get them to reconsider their outlook."[134] This "full scale media campaign," according the Department of Education's press release, used "direct mail, television, radio, newspapers, the Internet and door-to-door visits."[135] Essentially, tax dollars were spent on a media campaign for

---

[132] For more on this point see Gerald W. Bracey, *Reading Educational Research: How to Avoid Getting Statistically Snookered* (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2006), xvi.

[133] For more on the cloning of think tanks and the manufacturing of expertise, see Tom Siebold, "A Brief Framework for Understanding the Anti-Public School Movement." Essay available online from http://susanohanian.org/show_commentary.php?id=294. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[134] See *The Black Commentator*, "Bush Funds Black Voucher Front Group: Your Tax Dollars Pay for Propaganda Blitz." Available online at http://www.educationforthepeople.org/bush%20funds%20black%20vouchers.htm. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[135] See "Education Department, BAEO Form Partnership to Reach Parents About Landmark No Child Left Behind Act." Press release available online from http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2002/10/10152002a.html. Accessed 12/30/05.

privatizing schools. Hickok, it should be noted, has also been accused of "positively influencing individuals" by withholding reports, commissioned by his own office, that are critical of charter schools. *The New York Times* had to use the Freedom of Information Act to gain access to one such report.[136]

In addition to funding the BAEO, the Bush administration attempted to positively influence individuals through the use of paid journalists, as was the case with black commentator Armstrong Williams. Williams, one of the founding directors for BAEO, received $240,000 to support NCLB, legislation that relies on "choice" for school improvement.[137] William's payment was part of a 1.3 million dollar contract given to Ketchum Public Relations, and Ketchum's payment was part of a much larger campaign to sell NCLB to various American publics. According to the Office of the Inspector General, "media relations firms, advocacy groups, and other private companies received nearly $5 million in grants to help galvanize public support for [NCLB] without disclosing that they received taxpayer funds to do so…."[138] The ASM cannot survive without changing the hearts and minds of Americans across the country. When foundations, alliances, and organizations aren't enough, the ASM can use tax dollars to buttress its efforts.

---

[136] See Gerald Bracey, The 15th Bracey Report on the Condition of Public Education," *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 2 (October 2005): 145. Available online at http://www.america-tomorrow.com/bracey/EDDRA/. Accessed 3/17/06.

[137] Greg Toppo, "White House Paid Commentator to Promote Law," *USA Today*. Available online at www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2005-01-06-williams-whitehouse_x.htm. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[138] See Corey Murray, "Critics Blast ED's 'Propaganda' Probe," *eSchool News*. Available online at www.eschoonews.com/news/pfshowStory.cfm?ArticleID=5874. Last accessed 12/30/05.

In addition to using the public sphere to shape opinion, the Bradley Foundation works behind closed doors to shape policy directly. The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), for example, received nearly a quarter of a million dollars from Bradley in the late 1980s and early 1990s.[139] Today, ALEC actively campaigns for privatization, offering publications and pre-fabricated bills in order to "help lawmakers fashion highly effective, constitutionally sound school choice legislation in their state."[140] In September of 2005, ALEC hosted a two-day conference for legislators from 24 states:

> The legislators joined policy advisors and school choice experts for a full day of seminars on current school choice programs, litigation strategies, research conclusions, and successful policy development. The goal was to identify the facts and myths surrounding school choice issues and to provide lawmakers with the information and tools needed to successfully advance education options across the nation.[141]

Present at the conference to discuss the "facts and myths" was the leader of the Alliance for School Choice, an organization which considers itself to be "the nation's vanguard organization for promoting, implementing and enhancing K-12 educational

---

[139] See http://www.mediatransparency.org/recipientgrants.php?recipientID=585. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[140] See Robert C. Enlow and Matt Ladner, *School Choice: A Reform That Works* (D.C.: American Legislative Exchange Council, 2005). Last accessed 5/18/06 from http://www.alec.org/meSWFiles/pdf/0424.pdf.

[141] See Lori Drummer, "School Choice Academy Spurs Legislative Interest," *School Reform News*, 1 November 2005. Available online from the Heartland Institute at http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=17939. Last accessed 12/30/05.

choice."[142] In January of 2005, the Alliance helped ALEC send model "choice" legislation to over 3,000 legislators across the country.[143]

Bradley also helps fund the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, and the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation; all three organizations had individuals appear before various state and federal House and Senate committees concerning education.[144] Furthermore, while Bradley cannot take full responsibility for NCLB, its money goes to several organizations that helped craft and continue to support the legislation, specifically the American Enterprise Institute, The Heritage Foundation, The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, the Manhattan Institute, and the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution, and Peace.[145] I turn now to NCLB, as the legislation represents a certain victory for the ASM, which has its ends legitimized as federal policy.

Bradley and NCLB: Standardize and Privatize

Because my larger argument contends the ASM movement seeks to regulate voice and behavior according to neoliberal and neoconservative needs, I include a detailed analysis of NCLB, as the act is evidence of their success at both. The governing ideology behind the legislation is ultimately authoritarian and a success for neoliberals and neoconservatives who seek to regulate behavior, as U. S. schools must follow a federally

---

[142] Quote taken from the Alliance's homepage. Available online at http://www.allianceforschoolchoice.org/about.aspx. Last accessed 12/30/05.

[143] Press release available online from http://www.allianceforschoolchoice.org/public_policy.aspx. Accessed 12/30/05.

[144] For think tanks and organizations receiving Bradley money see http://www.mediatransparency.org/funderprofile.php?funderID=1. Last accessed 05/12/06.

[145] For detailed analysis of these organizations and NCLB see Kovacs and Boyles, "Think Tanks, Institutes, and Foundations."

mandated testing regime, limiting class time to preset curricula and goals. Because teachers, according to proponents of NCLB, have strictly defined roles (increasing student performance), their autonomy and voice must be eliminated.[146] What I hope to show is that while ostensibly requiring a "highly qualified" teacher in every classroom, NCLB's adherence to hierarchical governance, the threat of sanctions, the narrowing of the curriculum, and resultant deskilling of the workforce actually undermines teacher quality, reducing the likelihood that schools can be spaces for individual empowerment or democratic growth.

While several individuals call NCLB the most massive federal intervention in the history of American public education, the ideology behind the legislation has been gaining support and momentum for some time, and there has been bipartisan political support for standardizing U.S. public education since the first Bush presidency. [147] George H. W. Bush's reform effort, *America 2000*, required a substantial increase in accountability practices, especially standardized testing, and Bill Clinton's reform package, "called *Goals 2000*, differed little in its formal statement of goals."[148] George

---

[146] I address teacher and student voice and agency in Chapter 3.

[147] For individuals claiming NCLB represents unprecedented federal involvement in education, see Eric W. Robelen, "40 Years After ESEA, Federal Role in Schools is Broader Than Ever," *Education Week* 24, no. 31 (April 2005); James E. Ryan, "The Perverse Incentives of The No Child Left Behind Act," *New York University Law Review* 79 (June 2004); Ann McColl, "Tough Call: Is No Child Left Behind Constitutional?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 86, no. 8 (April 2005); and Theodore R. Sizer, "Preamble: A Reminder for Americans," in *Many Children Left Behind*, Meier and Wood, eds., xvii-xxii.

[148] See Wayne Urban and Jennings Wagoner, *American Education: A History*, 3rd ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003), 362. For more information regarding the history of accountability and the standards movement, see Andrew Rudalevige, "Forging a Congressional Compromise," in *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2003), 24-25.

W. Bush's NCLB, the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, builds on both of the "*Goals*" programs, though its accountability measures make federal demands more specific and adds teeth. Requiring states that receive federal aid to implement wide-scale testing—every year in reading and math from grades 3 to 8—the federal government can now level punitive sanctions on local schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards universal proficiency in these subjects.[149]

A brief examination of NCLB's sanctions is in order here, as the sanctions reveal the neoconservative and neoliberal ideologies undergirding the legislation. In Chapter 2 I showed that neoconservatives rely on mean accountability for reform; the sanctions represent the federal government threatening U.S. public schools, and the teachers and administrators within them, with closure and restructuring should they fail to perform. The fact that sanctions open the doors for private companies to make money inside of schools, as well as making money through control of failing schools, represents a victory for neoliberals, who, recall from Chapter 2, believe privately managed schools competing for students will ultimately lead to greater educational success, where educational success means higher scores in math and science.[150]

---

[149] Science tests are to be instituted in 2006, and the Bush administration plans on extending the testing requirement through high school.

[150] For evidence that NCLB has generated profits for private companies see See also Barbara Miller, "Testing Companies Mine for Gold," *Rethinking Schools* 19, no. 2 (Winter 2004/2005). Web accessed 12/30/2005. Available online from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/19_02/test192.shtml; Sarah Greenblatt, "Law Gives Boost to Private Firms," *Courier-Post*. Available online from www.courierpostonline.com/news/southjersey/m080805e.htm. Accessed 12/30/2005. See also Gerald W. Bracey "No Child Left Behind: Where Does the Money Go?" Available online at http://edpolicylab.org. Accessed 12/30/2005. Also see the "Top 15 Most Frequently Approved Providers," available online at

The sanctions grow more punitive over time, beginning by labeling schools that fail to meet AYP goals as "needs improvement" and placing them on a watch list. After two years on the "needs improvement list," a school must allow students to transfer to another school within the district, with transportation to be paid for by the failing school. If a school remains on the needs improvement list for a third year, it must offer supplemental educational services (SES). Schools have a great deal of leeway in the types of SES they provide; they might allow for one-on-one tutoring at the school or with private tutoring firms, or they might offer online instruction or tutoring. Schools that are labeled in need of improvement, however, must outsource SES services, opening the door to for-profit tutoring companies such as Sylvan Learning Centers. After a fourth year of failing to make AYP, schools have a number of options which include replacing parts of the school's staff, implementing a new curriculum, working with outside experts for advice, extending the school year and/or the school day, and restructuring the school's internal organization. A fifth year of failing requires a school to replace its staff, reopen as a charter school, or allow an outside educational management organization (EMO) to take control and run the school.

Teacher Quality Under NCLB

Frederick M. Hess of the American Enterprise Institute and Terry M. Moe of The Hoover Institute's Korett Task Force on Education place the blame for failing schools on teachers, a problem they believe will be solved by standards-based reform and increased accountability, which will cause teachers to either 1) reform their "failing" practices, or

---

www.tutorsforkids.org/Top15Providers.asp. Accessed 12/30/2005. This listing points out the top 15 companies approved by states as providers of Supplemental Educational Services for students in failing schools.

2) leave the profession altogether. I will draw heavily on their work, as their discourse reveals how high stakes testing and teacher accountability—the bedrock of NCLB—satisfy points 1 and 2, reshaping teachers and teaching in ways more suitable to neoliberal and neoconservative needs. As I argued in Chapter 2, neoliberals require a teaching force capable of preparing students for the global marketplace, while neoconservatives need teachers willing to indoctrinate students into ways of knowing which support a particular version of U.S. democracy both at home and abroad. Strict regulation of teachers, attracting certain types of teachers to the field, and forcing the wrong types of teachers out, serves both ends.

Public school teachers, according to Terry Moe, have become accustomed to a system

> in which they have substantial autonomy, their pay and jobs are secure, and they are not held accountable for their performance. Indeed, it is likely that these properties were part of what attracted many of them to the profession in the first place.[151]

Joseph Newman's work contradicts Moe's assertion; the majority of people entering teaching do so because they want to make some sort of meaningful difference in people's lives.[152] Ignoring the work of scholars such as Newman, Moe asserts that the people who have stayed in teaching are the ones "who have found these qualities [autonomy, security, and lack of accountability] particularly to their liking."[153] Note here that, according to

---

[151] Terry M. Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," in *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West (Washington: Brookings, 2003), 84.

[152] See Joseph Newman, *America's Teachers: An Introduction to Education*, 4th ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2005), Chapter 1.

[153] Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," 84.

Moe, the individuals who have remained in America's classrooms have done so for self-serving reasons alone. The problem: schools suffer from a problem of "adverse selection." "They have not only attracted certain types of people to work for the school system, but have actually attracted the *wrong* types and repelled the right types."[154] He goes on to conclude, "the current system is probably filled with teachers and administrators who are the wrong types."[155]

Autonomy is a key issue here as autonomy must be given up in order to be a functional member of Moe's ideal institution. "Virtually all organizations," writes Moe, "need to engage in top-down control because the people at the top have goals they want the people at the bottom to pursue, and something has to be done to bring about the desired behaviors."[156] The right type of teacher, arguably, gives up autonomy in order to better serve state and federal demands. In schools, where corporations and ideologues compete to shape and limit the mental, physical, and ethical development of children via standardization and imposed curricula, "something has to be done" about the wrong type of teacher. The wrong type of teacher might actually open her mouth and complain about corporatist goals, their potential influence, the fact that they do not represent the needs of the community, or that, perhaps, some individuals have used power and influence to make their own goals everyone else's too. [157]

---

[154] Ibid. Italics in original.

[155] Ibid., 85.

[156] Ibid., 81.

[157] For more on the problematics of critical teaching in schools dominated by corporate interests see Deron Boyles, *American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to School* (New York: Falmer Press, 2000), especially chapters 1 & 5.

While the wrong type of teacher, according to Moe, has too much autonomy, cares nothing for accountability, and is only interested in job security, I wonder whether Moe's wrong type of teacher might not actually be the type of teacher some parents want. If I understand autonomy to mean a willingness to speak out against antidemocratic movements within schools, then teacher autonomy has the potential to foster educative learning environments for children. If I understand autonomy to mean a willingness to trust teachers as professionals in their selection, creation, and delivery of information and ideas, then autonomy engenders diversity, creativity, innovation and care. If I understand teachers' refusal of accountability to be a refusal of a specific type of accountability, one that actually limits student growth and punishes public schools, then their refusal might not be solely related to job security. Rather, their refusal might come in the name of genuine interest, student development, and participatory democracy.[158]

The wrong type of teacher, according to the work forwarded by the ASM, picks up her bad habits from colleges of education where she was forced to undergo hours of worthless pedagogy classes on her way to meaningless certification.[159] To understand the level of contempt the current administration has for colleges of education, one need look no further than presidential advisor Reid Lyon, who once remarked, "You know, if there was any piece of legislation that I could pass, it would be to blow up colleges of

---

[158] Sonia Nieto's recent work supports this assertion. See *Why We Teach*, Sonia Nieto, ed. (Columbia: Teachers College Press, 2005). The work is a collection of stories from 21 individuals teaching in public k-12 classrooms. None of the authors link their decision to teach to limited accountability or high levels of autonomy, which Moe claims to draw teachers to the field in the first place.

[159] For attacks of teacher colleges see Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," 87 and Checker Finn, "What's a 'Qualified' Teacher and How Can We Get More of Them?" Accessed 12/30/2005 from http://www.edexcellence.net/institute/gadfly/issue.cfm?id=110#1383.

education."[160] In NCLB's world of increased standards, high-stakes tests, and accountability, ironically, the right type of teacher does not need pedagogical training or certification. Moe asserts:

> All states currently require teachers to be certified (or, if hired on an emergency basis, to become certified eventually), but there is no good evidence that certification promotes student achievement. Thus certification drastically limits the pool of potential hires with no payoff in productivity.[161]

Here Moe participates in a type of political science abuse identified in Chapter 2: magnifying uncertainty. Mooney defines this as "the hyping and exaggerating of scientific uncertainty, frequently with the goal of preventing political action."[162] What is being prevented here, or rather undermined, is teacher certification, something neoliberals and neoconservatives seek to do away with in order to replace one type of teacher with another.

The assertion that teachers need no pedagogical training or certification is a frequent refrain from individuals pushing NCLB; a great deal of research contradicts the claim. For example, in a recent study concerning improving mathematical ability "in a standards based environment," Cheri Fancsali found that how teachers teach, what questions they ask, how they ask the questions, and what requests they make of their

---

[160] See Marilyn Wilson, "NCLB: Taylor-Made for De-Skilling Teachers," online at http://www.ncte.org/about/issues/slate/117626.htm. Accessed 12/30/2005. The definition of terrorism, according to Microsoft Word OSX, is "violence or the threat of violence, especially bombing, kidnapping, and assassination, carried out for political purposes."

[161] Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," 87.

[162] Chris Mooney, *The Republican War on Science* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 20.

students all affect student performance.[163] The Southeast Center for Teaching Quality shares similar findings. In a review of case studies post-NCLB, the organization argues that "successful teachers have both content knowledge and teaching skills, such as knowing how to address different students' learning needs, especially those whose primary language is not English."[164] At a minimum, colleges of education provide future teachers with practices and approaches to instruction that are more successful than others, more developed, better researched, and more critically analyzed. Indeed, if I were to critique colleges of education, it would be to argue that too often, they promote a Moe-like standardization and limited time to develop the very criticality democratic public schools require as a necessary feature of their coming into being.

For neoliberals and neoconservatives, however, raising political consciousness—fundamental to participatory democracy—is not the job of teachers, regardless of what they might have learned in their foundations courses. In fact, Moe

---

[163] Cheri Fancsali, "Teacher Leaders for Mathematics Success: Final Evaluation Report." Posted online by the City University of New York's Academy for Educational Development at http://www.aed.org/Education/US/mathstudy.cfm. Last accessed 12/30/2005. I do not wish to reduce teacher certification, courses on pedagogy, or colleges of education to raising test scores. Child development and the creation of a democratic sensibility might necessarily include theory and discussion only available in colleges of education. The question here is whether or not teaching and schooling provide an experience that is necessarily above and beyond "achievement." See Linda Darling-Hammond, "Research and Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Response to 'Teacher Certification Reconsidered,'" *Educational Policy Analysis Archives* 10, no. 36 (September 2002). Available online at http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html. Accessed 12/30/2005.

[164] Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, *Unfulfilled Promise: Ensuring High Quality Teacher for Our Nation's Students* (Chapel Hill: Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2004). See page 1. Available online at http://www.teachingquality.org./publications/reports.htm. Accessed 12/30/2005.

cites democracy as one of the fundamental problems with implementing increased accountability under high-stakes tests:

> public schools are agencies of democratic government. As government bodies, everything about their structure and operation, including whether and how they are held accountable, is subject to determination through the political process—and the actors that carry the most weight in that process are not necessarily interested in creating accountability systems that work. That is the problem.[165]

Moe's dilemma generates two immediate questions: 1) Who are the actors that carry the most weight in the process of education, and 2) why aren't they interested in creating accountability systems that work? Moe answers that teachers and teacher unions are the primary actors, who refuse accountability systems that work because of their complacency with the status quo. I disagree. The primary actors, or at least the ones with the most influence and power in public education, are individuals such as Moe: well placed neointellectuals who view democratic schooling and critical teaching as obstacles to their goal of using schools as factories for workforce production and cultural maintenance.

Long-time educational researcher and an outspoken proponent for high quality teaching, Linda Darling-Hammond argues that the U. S. undervalues teachers and teaching, resulting in a teaching force that cannot reach all students. "Because this nation has not yet invested heavily in teachers and their knowledge," she writes, "the capacity to teach all students to high levels is not widespread."[166] I wish to revise her argument as it is not only a lack of investment, it is the type of investment, coupled with an assault on

---

[165] Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," 90.

[166] See Linda Darling-Hammond, "From 'Separate but Equal' to 'No Child Left Behind': The Collision of New Standards and Old Inequalities," in *Many Children Left Behind*, 26.

the teaching profession altogether. Consider the words of Frederick M. Hess, echoing Moe's sentiments:

> For several decades, the American public education establishment has embraced a vision of professional, autonomous, teachers who operate out of a sense of duty and commitment. Whatever the strengths and weaknesses of such a system, it is the one to which current teachers have grown accustomed and in which they have acculturated. The premise of high-stakes testing challenges this culture by pressing teachers to teach the content and skills mandated by the state, regardless of their personal preferences.[167]

While there are undoubtedly a number of teachers and administrators who are professional, semi-autonomous individuals operating out of a sense of duty and commitment, this has not been the dominant educational paradigm over the past century.[168] The strengths of such a system would be participatory governance of schools, where communities and individuals shape educational ends with "a sense of duty and commitment." Hess believes this phantom culture can be challenged by forcing teachers to adhere to strict rules, regardless of—or perhaps because of—their level of professionalism. Hess's "challenge" requires a certain type of teacher, one untainted by colleges of education and willing to deliver the content and skills mandated by the state.

---

[167] Frederick M. Hess, "Refining or Retreating? High-Stakes Accountability in the States," in *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West (Washington: Brookings Institution, 2003), 61.

[168] For dominant paradigms over the last century see Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1986), David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), Wayne Urban and Jennings Wagoner, *American Education: A History*, 3rd ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003), Joel Spring, *Political Agendas For Education: From the Christian Coalition to the Religious Right*, 2nd ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001), and Joel Spring, *American Education*, 12th ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006).

NCLB increases the number of potential candidates for such a job. According to Rod Paige, the former Secretary of Education who once claimed that the NEA was a "terrorist" organization, "NCLB gives the green light to states that want to lower barriers to the teaching profession."[169] Paige, it should be noted, has been on the receiving end of Bradley support, and he continues to speak at Bradley funded institutes and foundations.[170] Chester Finn, expanding on Paige's remark, explains:

> That doesn't mean letting anybody enter. Teachers still need to hold a college degree and to demonstrate subject-area competence. But they don't necessarily need to spend a single day in an ed. school or pedagogy class and they certainly don't need to endure a conventional four or five year pre-service preparation program. States could, in fact, move to a wholly test-based certification system rather than a time-and-transcript-and-practice-teaching approach.[171]

The notion that teachers "don't need to spend a single day in an ed. school" has been addressed, but the test-based approach to ensuring teaching quality warrants further consideration. In "The Near Impossibility of Testing for Teacher Quality," David Berliner counters Finn's assertion.[172] "If we genuinely want a highly qualified teacher in

---

[169] See Chester Finn, "What's a 'Qualified' Teacher?" For Paige's claim that the NEA is a terrorist organization see John King, "Paige Calls NEA 'Terorist Organization,'" *CNN.com* (Febraury 23, 2004). Accessed 3/23/06 from http://www.cnn.com/2004/EDUCATION/02/23/paige.terrorist.nea/.

[170] During his reign as Secretary of Education, Paige gave guest lectures at American Enterprise Institute. See http://www.aei.org/events/eventID.709,filter.all/event_detail.asp. Paige has also published work on AEI's website; see for example http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.19737,filter.all/pub_detail.asp. The same holds true for the Hoover Institution. See, for example, http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/pubaffairs/newsletter/03031/default.htm. All accessed 12/30/05.

[171] Finn, "What's a 'Qualified' Teacher?"

[172] See David Berliner, "The Near Impossibility of Testing for Teacher Quality," *Journal of Teacher Education* 56, no. 3 (May/June 2005): 205-213. Available online at

every classroom," writes Berliner, "we should not confuse a highly qualified taker of tests about teaching with a highly qualified teacher."[173] The confusion Berliner refers to is not any different from the confusion between an educated student and a well-trained taker of tests. While Berliner calls this "confusion," proponents of standardization refer to it as "alignment."

For individuals like Moe, Hess, Paige and Finn, and others in the ASM, a highly qualified teacher needs to do nothing more that deliver the content, which has been aligned to match the standardized tests. According to ASM logic, teacher content knowledge can be tested before the teacher enters the classroom, and teacher delivery of the subject matter can be tested on students repeatedly. If the students are failing, it must be the teacher's fault. Teacher tests, however, do not and in fact cannot, adequately assess teacher "quality" before they enter the profession, as there are too many variables in play. Berliner explains:

> Such tests usually fail to adequately measure the construct of genuine interest, which is quality in teaching and, thus, they fail to identify for the public the promised highly qualified teachers. These tests fail in part because of the complexity of classroom environments and the near impossibility of capturing that reality in paper-and-pencil formats. They also fail because they rely on one correct answer to questions for which many answers are appropriate.[174]

The shortcomings for teacher tests resemble the problems with many of the tests used on America's children. They fail to measure genuine interest, ignore the complexities of classroom and community life, and reduce learning and discourse to

---

http://www.asu.edu/educ/epsl/EPRU/epru_2005_articles_of_interest.htm. Last accessed 12/30/2005.

[173] Ibid., 208.

[174] Ibid., 211.

multiple-choice formats, ignoring that learning and teaching also involve creation, synthesis, reflection, and occasional physical action. Lois Weiner extends the argument, explaining that once teachers get into classrooms,

> school conditions as well as students' desire and preparedness to engage in intellectually-demanding study, factors closely related to social, economic, and political supports outside the school, also influence the sort of preparation [and therefore any assessment] teachers require.[175]

In addition to these factors, there are psychological factors and dimensions to teaching that are difficult to assess. These include "demonstrations of caring, motivating, encouraging, rewarding, punishing, planning, evaluating, and so forth."[176] Finally, teacher tests cannot measure innovation, the ability of teachers to create new lessons as life warrants; nor can tests measure a teacher's ability to come up with new ways of helping a variety of students learn to the best of their abilities. However, since NCLB was authored to regulate voice and behavior, forcing teachers and students to align to industry sanctioned standards, innovation and creativity are no longer required for classroom teachers.

While Finn and Paige believe the use of tests will regulate the types of teachers entering U. S. classrooms, they must also deal with the teachers already in there. Recall Moe's assertion that the teachers and administrators working in schools are the "wrong types." The issue facing the ASM is forcing them out. Hess provides the solution, laying out a two-part plan for dealing with the "wrong type" of teacher and administrator:

---

[175] See Lois Weiner, "Neoliberalism, Teacher Unionism, and the Future of Public Education," *New Politics* 10, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 7. Web accessed 12/30/2005. Available online from http://www.wpunj.edu/~newpol/issue38/weiner38.htm.

[176] Berliner, "Testing for Teacher Quality," 208.

> Proponents can seek to make standards more palatable to educators by tramping down the leading source of opposition. One way to do this is to accelerate the turnover of teachers and administrators while ensuring that new personnel are familiarized with standards and high-stakes testing as a condition for their entry into the field. This increases the percentage of teachers trained and acculturated in an environment where high-stakes accountability is the norm. Similarly, encouraging districts to recruit more entrepreneurial administrators and to train them in the strategies of outcome-based management will help to reduce educator opposition to standards, to make the transition to standards-based schools an easier one, and to foster the ranks of public educators who are supportive of transformative accountability.[177]

In short then, the best way to deal with teachers and administrators who oppose standards-based reform is to tramp them down, via coercion and "mean accountability," and then replace them. "Entrepreneurial" administrators will be encouraged to hire teachers who have acculturated in environments where data centrism and test administration is the norm. Hess's words can be deconstructed in at least two ways. First, given the number of times "scientifically based" appears in NCLB, there is no scientific evidence that "entrepreneurial" administrators will help student growth and development, however one chooses to define them. Second, given the fact that NCLB seeks to reduce administrative and teacher autonomy, entrepreneurial thinking would appear to be a liability, as entrepreneurs, by implication, tend to chart their own course.[178]

If teachers and administrators resist or protest, as autonomous professionals are wont to do, Hess believes outside support must be called in. "Specific entities," he writes, "have an interest in putting resources and energy into backing accountability systems."[179]

---

[177] Hess, "Refining or Retreating?," 74.

[178] According to Microsoft OS X for Macintosh computers, an entrepreneur is someone who sets up and finances new commercial enterprises to make a profit.

[179] Hess, "Refining or Retreating," 68.

> The most significant of these is the *business community*, which depends on schools to help lure and retain employees and to train its next generation of employees and customers. In some states, such as Texas, the business community takes an active role in promoting coercive reform, helping to provide counter pressure and resources that may keep officials from accepting compromise measures they might otherwise adopt.[180]

According to Hess, it is not American democracy, not communities, nor the individuals within them that have the most at stake under NCLB; it is the business community. Because of its funding and connections, this "interest" can pressure schools into accepting reform efforts or systems of school governance which help meet one of its primary goals: using schools "to help lure and retain employees and to train its next generation of employees and customers."[181] Should schools prove incapable of doing so, they will be turned over—in accordance with federal law—to organizations such as Edison Schools, the Gates Foundation, the Walton Family Fund, or any number of for-profit, charter, or private organizations.

NCLB's Real-Time Effects on Quality Teaching and the Classroom Experience

Are "professional, autonomous, teachers who operate out of a sense of duty and commitment," being compelled to leave? Arguably, as I hope to show in the following section, yes. Public school implementation of NCLB has led to narrowed curricula, increased teacher deskilling, the further reduction of already limited teacher autonomy, and a melancholic, punitive workplace. Each of these issues are disincentives for staying in the profession or entering in the first place.

---

[180] Ibid. Italics added.

[181] See Emery and Ohanian, Why is Corporate America Bashing Our Public Schools?.

Lois Weiner contends "NCLB's definition of a 'highly qualified' teacher actually deskills teaching because it assumes that all one needs to teach well is content knowledge in selected disciplines in the liberal arts."[182] The notion that teachers do not need training to teach well has already been addressed, but the selection of which disciplines are to be studied requires attention, as administrators and teachers must eliminate coursework in some areas in order to raise scores in others. Hess approves of eliminating some coursework, claiming that education officials must "designate a prescribed body of content and objectives to be tested. Such a course necessarily marginalizes some other goals, objectives, content, and skills."[183] The question then becomes which goals, objectives, content, skills, classes, and teachers should be marginalized?

"Across the nation," writes Alfie Kohn, "schools under intense pressure to show better test results have allowed those tests to cannibalize the curriculum."[184] Kohn continues:

> Administrators have cut back or even eliminated vital parts of schooling: programs in the arts, recess for young children, electives for high schoolers, class meetings (and other activities intended to promote social and moral learning), discussions about current events (since that material will not appear on the test), [and] the use of literature in the early grades (if the tests are focused narrowly on decoding skills)….[185]

---

[182] See Weiner, "Neoliberalism, Teacher Unionism, and the Future of Public Education," 7.

[183] Frederick M. Hess, "The Case for Being Mean," *AEI Online*. Available at www.aei.org/include/pub_print.asp?pubID=19614. Last Accessed 3/15/06.

[184] Alfie Kohn, "Fighting the Tests: A Practical Guide to Rescuing Our Schools." Article available online at http://eserver.org/clogic/4-1/kohn.html. Last accessed 12/30/2005.

[185] Ibid.

Elimination of recess and the arts has been occurring for some time, but the "cannibalization" of the curriculum seems to be a growing problem.[186] Researchers are now beginning to see a greater reduction in the amount of time some children spend in classes traditionally referred to as the "liberal arts." For example, in a survey of 956 elementary and secondary school principals about changes under NCLB, the Council for Basic Education found

> …ample evidence of waning commitment to the arts, foreign language, and elementary social studies. What's more, [they] found that the greatest erosion of the curriculum is occurring in schools with high minority populations—the very populations whose access to such a curriculum has been historically most limited.[187]

Corroborating the Council's findings is the work of the Center on Education Policy. Their 2006 report on NCLB, *From the Capital to the Classroom*, indicates similar trends. According to their work, 71% of the nation's 15,000 school districts "reported reducing instructional time in elementary schools for one or more subjects in order to make more time for reading and/or math."[188] The subjects that have seen a reduction in time include social studies (history, geography, and civics), science, art and music, and physical education.[189]

---

[186] For the elimination of recess see Jennifer D. Jordan," Not Your Father's Kindergarten: Play Loses Out to 3 R's," *The Providence Journal*, 9 August 2005. Available online at www.projo.com/cgi-bin/bigod_print.cgi. Accessed 8/11/2005.

[187] Claus Von Zastrow, *Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools* (D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 2004), 7. Available online at http://downloads.ncss.org/legislative/AcademicAtrophy.pdf. Accessed 12/31/05.

[188] See the Center on Education Policy, *From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*, (D.C.: Center on Education Policy, 2006), 1. Available online from http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/Year4/Press/. Last accessed 05/15/06.

[189] Ibid., 98.

To understand the problem here, one must see schools as more than competitive spaces for minimum competency in math, reading, and science. A parent interested solely in his child's economic future might be pleased to know his child is not "wasting" time in P.E, art, music, social studies, or civics. However, a myopic focus on possible economic futures is no guarantee of a good job or the good life, as arguably, the "good life" requires more than financial security and freedom.[190] Arguably, discussion of the good life, what it means and competing notions of how to live it, generally takes place in liberal arts classrooms. "Because the liberal arts span the domains of human experience," write the authors of *Academic Atrophy*,

> …they afford the best foundation for the diverse challenges that confront us in this rapidly evolving world. At the same time, a liberal arts education returns us to the first principles, fostering an understanding of what it means to be human, an understanding that transcends limiting conceptions of occupation, social class, race, or nationality.[191]

Could schools be places where students develop the capacities and insights necessary for democratic living through classes such as philosophy, sociology, arts, and foreign language, for example, classes that afford students opportunities for reflecting on, and engaging with, their selves and others?[192] As these subjects go, so go their teachers.[193]

---

[190]For more on this see Mathew Herper, "Money Won't Buy You Happiness," *Forbes*, 21 September 2004. Last accessed 6/27/06 from http://www.forbes.com/work/2004/09/21/cx_mh_0921happiness.html.

[191] Von Zastrow, *Academic Atrophy*, 9.

[192] This question is explored at length in the next chapter.

[193] For more on NCLB driving teachers out of classrooms see Patricia Hinchey and Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, "The Future of Teacher Education and Teaching: Another Piece of the Privatization Puzzle," *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* 3, no. 2 (October 2005). Accessed 5/15/06 from http://www.jceps.com/print/php?articleID=48.

Philosophers, scientists, foreign language teachers, and artists are to be replaced by individuals committed to putting the standardized demands of the state first.

Reducing the number of quality teachers even further is NCLB's authoritarian and demoralizing sanctions; both work together to create a melancholic school environment. In a comprehensive survey of 49 states, the Center on Education Policy found that in addition to undermining district reforms underway before NCLB's implementation, the legislation was also damaging staff morale.[194] One participant in the study explained that NCLB had "put a lot of pressure on teachers and principals and that hasn't been all that healthy."[195] Since all subgroups within a school must make AYP, the failure of a handful of students results in the failure of the school.[196] An exceptional English teacher might not be willing to stay in a school labeled failing because three of its special education students failed to meet AYP goals; it is far more likely that she will look for work in a more stable environment.

Pressure to improve, lest schools be shut down, children transported, and entire staffs replaced, also creates disincentives for staying in classrooms. In a national survey comparing states with high-stakes testing to states with low-stakes testing, the National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy found "teachers in high-stakes states reported feeling more pressure than those in lower-stakes states."[197] This pressure comes

---

[194] See the Center on Education Policy, *From the Capital to the Classroom*, 1.

[195] Ibid., 10.

[196] One school in Utah, for example, failed to meet AYP because of low scores by three students with disabilities. See Amanda Ripley, "Inside the Revolt Over Bush's School Rules," *Time* 165, no. 19 (May 2005).

[197] See Joseph J. Pedulla, et al., *Perceived Effects of State Mandated Testing Programs on Teaching and Learning: Findings from a National Survey of Teachers*

from a number of sources. Not only is there pressure to drop content in favor of test preparation but teachers reported various levels of pressure from parents, principals, and superintendents all in demand of higher test scores.[198] The pressure exists by design, as the architects of NCLB believe that the increased pressure will actually help raise test scores because the teachers will be fighting for their jobs and schools. This only makes sense if one believes, as do Moe and Hess, that test scores are low because of complacent, self-serving, misdirected teachers.

Coupled with the increased pressure is a loss of autonomy, which also contributes to the lowering of teacher quality. In "The Perverse Incentives of the No Child Left Behind Act," James Ryan argues that a decrease in autonomy directly correlates with teachers leaving the profession.[199] Ryan goes on to discuss a "recruitment crisis" in countries with low levels of teacher autonomy as these countries have a great deal of trouble finding and then keeping teachers.[200] Under NCLB teachers lose autonomy because the selection of curricula and the measurement of goals is outside of their hands. As sanctions are imposed, teachers must cede greater responsibility to outside sources, regardless of the job they are doing in their individual classrooms. Their loss of voice and

---

(Boston: National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy, March 2003), 2. Available online from www.bc.edu/research/nbetpp/statements/nbr2.pdf. Last accessed 12/30/2005. See also Center on Education Policy, *From the Capital to the Classroom*, 10.

[198] Pedulla, et al., Perceived Effects of State Mandated Testing Programs on Teaching and Learning, 2.

[199] See Ryan, "The Perverse Incentives of The No Child Left Behind Act," 972.

[200] Ibid.

classroom control not only reduces teacher autonomy, it further undermines teacher professionalism, as professions require, among other things, autonomy.[201]

Overworked, underpaid, in a negative work environment, with limited, if any, autonomy, and under threat of losing their jobs, many high quality teachers will understandably look for work elsewhere. There is the "real potential," according to researchers from the Harvard Civil Rights Project,

> that the negative consequences of the NCLB high stakes test accountability policies will create a more negative teaching environment and contribute to teachers wanting to leave, either the profession or those schools serving the most disadvantaged students.[202]

If high quality teachers are defined as professional, critical, and autonomous individuals who oppose standardization and "mean accountability," not because they are lazy, but because they are committed to creating classrooms where children grow with democratic direction and democratic purpose, and those types of teachers, by design, are leaving the profession, then NCLB seems to be working according to Hess and Moe's plans. The

---

[201] For more on this point see Mary Bushnell, "Teachers in the Schoolhouse Panopticon: Complicity and Resistance," *Education and Urban Society* 35, no. 3 (May 2003): 251-272. For discussions of teacher professionalism see Newman, *America's Teachers: An Introduction to Education*, Chapter 4. See also Kevin Ryan and James M. Cooper, *Those Who Can, Teach* 10th Ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004), Chapter 14.

[202] See Gail Sunderman & Jimmy Kim, Teacher Quality: Equalizing Educational Outcomes (Cambridge: Harvard Civil Right's Project, 2005), 7. Accessed 5/18/06 from www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu. For more on NCLB and the growth of various gaps see George Wood "Introduction," in *Many Children Left Behind*, ed. Meier and Wood; Stan Karp, "NCLB's Selective Vision of Equality: Some Gaps Count More than Others," in *Many Children Left Behind*, ed. Meier and Wood. See also Sandra Mathison, "The Accumulation of Disadvantage: The Role of Educational Testing in the School Career of Minority Children," *Workplace* 5(2). Accessed 12/31/05 from http://www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue5p2/mathison.html. Also see Orfield and Lee, *Why Segregation Matters*. For more on race and class as they relate to education in general see Richard Rothstein, *Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004).

lower standards for individuals entering the workforce and the effort to force teachers out of classrooms work together to open free classroom space for the type of teacher willing, according to Hess, "to teach the content and skills mandated by the state, regardless of their personal preferences."[203]

Troops to Teachers

The question then becomes what would these teachers look like and do? The Department of Education's "Troops to Teachers" (TTT) program offers one powerful example. With no disrespect to the men and women of the armed forces, they are perfect, if I follow Hess and Moe's logic, for delivering the content and skills mandated by the state, regardless of their personal preferences, as disregarding one's personal preferences is one of the first lessons learned in the military. Military men, notes Judy Block, "are no-nonsense men, trained as leaders with high senses off discipline and loyalty, who expect their subordinates and trainees to dutifully follow their lead."[204] These nonsense men are, arguably, perfect for teaching "the content and skills mandated by the state, regardless of their personal preferences."

Established in 1994 by the Department of Defense as the "Teacher and Teacher's Aid Assistant Program," TTT attempts to "help improve public school education by providing funds to recruit, prepare, and support former members of the military services as teachers in high-poverty schools."[205] According to *Connections*, a newsletter for

---

[203] Hess, "Refining or Retreating?," 61.

[204] Judy Block, "Children as Collateral Damage: The Innocents of Education's War for Reform," in *Schools or Markets? Commercialism, Privatization, and School-Business Partnerships*, ed. Deron Boyles (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005), 110.

[205] Content taken from the Troops to Teachers homepage. Available online at http://www.ed.gov/programs/troops/index.html. Accessed 12/31/2005.

retiring troops considering teaching, Senator John McCain was instrumental in keeping the program alive.[206] Recognizing the "powerful, positive attributes that military veterans bring to public education: dedication, commitment, maturity, and understanding of diverse cultures, along with subject matter knowledge and experience," McCain introduced language in the 2000 Defense Authorization Bill which officially established the program as "Troops To Teachers."[207] Two years later, under NCLB, TTT became a part of the Department of Education. After the move, the program's budget grew from $3 million dollars in 2001 to nearly $15 million in 2005. Since the authorization of NCLB in 2002, the Department of Education has appropriated $94,161,274 for Troops to Teachers.[208]

Recall Hess's proposal for accelerating the turnover of teachers and administrators. "New personnel" must be familiarized with high-stakes tests before "entry into the field." In order to "foster the ranks" of educators who believe in high-stakes tests, schools should "recruit" entrepreneurial administrators. In the case of Troops to Teachers, "new personnel" (teachers?) are former soldiers, "recruited," "trained" (not educated), and fast tracked "into the field" (communities and classrooms?) in order to "foster the ranks" of educators who support NCLB. While the program is fairly small when compared to other Department of Education initiatives, nationwide interest

---

[206] See "A Brief History," *Connections* 1, no.1 (September 2004). Pdf available online at http://www.ed.gov/programs/troops/resources.html. This is the only issue of *Connections* available. Accessed 12/31/05.

[207] Ibid.

[208] See http://www.ed.gov/programs/troops/funding.html. Accessed 03/30/06.

continues to grow.[209] Peter E. Peters, TTT's assistant director, explains: "Afghanistan has settled down. We've got Saddam. People are beginning to think about getting out and making some plans."[210]

While the program undeniably benefits the troops, who get cash bonuses for entering high poverty areas, what about the children? In terms of content knowledge, the hallmark of a good teacher if one believes neointellectuals such as Hess, Moe, Finn, and Paige, military personnel enter the classroom "highly qualified." After all, "You have nuclear engineers going in to teach math," notes Peters, who continues, "You don't get that from people coming out of college."[211] In addition to bringing in knowledge from outside the classroom, former soldiers have "a bearing that makes them unlikely to be intimidated, even by the most unruly middle school students."[212] Finally, troops-turned-teachers "can make good ambassadors for the military."[213] If a high quality teacher means one who knows math and science, has an intimidating demeanor, and actively recruits for the military, then Troops to Teachers appears to attract high quality teachers.

---

[209] See Rosalind S. Helderman, "Turning Troops Into Teachers," *Washington Post*, January 18, 2004. Last accessed 12/31/2005 from http://www.susanohanian.org/show_nclb_news.html?id=275.

[210] Ibid. I wish to note here that the article dates from January of 2004. As of June 30, 2006, American forces are still involved in operations in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Despite Hussein's capture, the number of dead and wounded continues to climb. As the number of "stop loss" orders grows, fewer soldiers are "getting out and making some plans."

[211] Ibid.

[212] Ibid.

[213] Ibid.

There may be a number of problems with the program's "benefits." Block asks whether or not "soldiers trained to obey orders without question, including orders to kill, are truly the role models that students in the public schools need."[214] While it might be exciting to have a former nuclear engineer as a teacher (students in one TTT classroom were treated to a video clip of a ballistic missile being fired from a submerged nuclear submarine),[215] neither a degree in nuclear engineering nor experience on a nuclear submarine guarantee a highly qualified, effective, or successful teacher. Peters' assertion that former soldiers have a bearing that makes them "unlikely to be intimidated" is also problematic. Is that bearing also less likely to make them democratic, attentive, and compassionate? In terms of "unruly" students, are Troops to Teachers more likely to "shoot first and ask questions later?" While former soldiers might make "good ambassadors for the military," should classrooms and schools become recruitment centers? And, with all due respect to the architects of TTT, carrying a machine gun in the dessert does not necessarily give an individual a greater understanding of diverse cultures.

While soldiers may have some attributes making them potentially high quality teachers, I argue against fast tracking anyone into the profession, whether they be soldiers, doctors, CEOs, firefighters, nannies, college professors or _____. Based on theory, study, and practice, I will attempt to show that courses in pedagogy, philosophy, cognition, pedagogy, politics, and human development/relationships are vital

---

[214] Block, "Children as Collateral Damage," 109.

[215] See Helderman, "Turning Troops Into Teachers."

for students who wish to develop into high quality teachers.[216] Blitzing low-income neighborhoods with troops-turned-teachers, individuals lacking the attributes, skills, and vision necessary for helping children develop into participatory citizens of a larger democratic social order, serves only to further disenfranchise members of those communities. This, according to Kenneth Saltman, has been the goal all along.

Linking TTT to a larger movement to militarize schools, Saltman argues that the program is one of many tied to "a politics of containment rather than investment, [and] the political efficacy of keeping large segments of the population uneducated and miseducated."[217] Saltman continues:

> As well, the working class, employed in low skill, low-paying service sector jobs, would be likely to complain or even organize if they were encouraged to question and think too much. Education and literacy are tied to political participation. Participation might mean that noncorporate elites would want social investment in public projects or at least projects that might benefit most people. That won't do. There is a reason that the federal government wants soldiers rather than say the glut of unemployed Ph.D.s in classrooms.[218]

Not only does Saltman identify TTT as part of an attack to genuine learning and political engagement, his charge extends beyond TTT to include NCLB itself. While Troops to Teachers focuses on the poor and working class, the same ideology now operates in American public schools writ large. The teachers most likely to engage students in critical examination of social, political, and economic issues, those autonomous agents operating out of a sense of duty and commitment, are being forced

---

[216] In chapter 3 I will explore various learnable practices that individuals, including former soldiers, might "carry" into classrooms.

[217] Kenneth J. Saltman, "Introduction," in *Education As Enforcement*, ed. Kenneth J. Saltman & David A. Gabbard (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003), 20.

[218] Ibid.

out of schools to make room for individuals willing to train students to work rather than think, as genuine thinking, genuine social engagement, and genuine political participation threaten corporate governance. NCLB must then be seen not as an act to save failing schools but as an act designed to undermine democratic education, an education which might lead to a citizenry that critiques its representatives, its media, and its policies, a citizenry less willing to obediently stand to attention whenever elites give the command.

Saltman is not alone in asserting that NCLB was designed to undermine public education. Gerald Bracey asks, "Would an administration with such an anti-regulatory, pro-private sector policy perspective turn around and impose harsh, straitjacket requirements on schools, demands that would bankrupt any business?"[219] The answer, obviously, is no. The law's "straightjacket requirement" that 100% of students score at or above proficient by 2014 is, according to Alfie Kohn, "something that has never been done before and that few unmedicated observers believe is possible."[220] Finally, explains E. Wayne Ross, the law "creates conditions where public schools [and the teachers within them] can only fail, thus providing 'statistical evidence' for an alleged need to turn education over to private companies in the name of 'freedom of choice.'"[221]

---

[219] Gerald W. Bracey, *The No Child Left Behind Act, A Plan for the Destruction of Public Education: Just Say No* (Tempe: Education Disinformation Detection and Reporting Agency, 2005). Retrieved 12/30/05 from www.america-tomorrow.com/bracey/EDDRA/EDDRA32.htm. See also Monty Neill et al., *Failing Our Children*, Chapter 1.

[220] Alfie Kohn "Test Today, Privatize Tomorrow: Using Accountability to "Reform" Public Schools to Death," *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 2004). Available online from http://www.alfiekohn.org/teaching/testtoday.htm. Accessed 12/30/05.

[221] See E. Wayne Ross, et al., "Saving Public Education—Saving Democracy," *Public Resistance* 1, no. 1 (May 2005). Available online at www.publicresistance.org. Last accessed 12/31/2005.

Kohn explains that he has spent a year challenging NCLB's defenders to "name a single school anywhere in the country whose inadequacy was a secret until yet another wave of standardized test results was released."[222] This is the right spirit, but the wrong challenge; the intent of the law is to remove all schools from public control. The Center on Education Policy notes that in 2002-2003 15% of school districts reported at least one school identified as in need of improvement, by 2004-2005 the number climbed to 20%.[223] Kohn is mistaken; under NCLB's expansive requirements many schools that succeed in a number of ways earn labels like inadequate, needs improvement, and failing. Almost one-third of American schools have been placed on needs improvement lists, and these are not just schools in low-income, minority areas (though the heaviest concentration of failing schools is in these areas), they are schools in neighborhoods and communities spread throughout the country.[224]

Hess, lamenting the difficulty of enacting and maintaining standardized schools, contends that

> Building a stable rigorous accountability system is far easier when the public will shrug off five thousand students denied diplomas or fifty schools reconstituted than when it will accept only a fraction of that number. The effect of public sensitivity is directly analogous to the manner in which the public's willingness to accept military casualties

---

[222] Alfie Kohn, "No Child Left Behind and the Effort to Privatize Public Education," in *Many Children Left Behind*, ed. Meier and Wood, 86.

[223] Center on Education Policy, *From the Capital to the Classroom*, 71.

[224] See Monty Neill, et al., *Failing Our Children*, especially Chapter 1, "Set up to Fail." FairTest reports that in 2004 an estimated 26,000 of the nation's 93,000 public schools failed to make AYP.

> constrains national security officials as they consider military deployment.[225]

Though I am not sure that Hess is completely correct in his assertion that 5,000 student failures would result in a large public outcry, the idea that U.S. citizens would stand up against interests attacking their schools seems optimistic. Encouraging action requires increasing awareness of the dubious and misleading science underlying NCLB as well as how much money corporations earn from the legislation. Recall Moe's comments on schools as "agencies of democratic government." "As government bodies," he points out, "everything about their structure and operation, including whether and how they are held accountable, is subject to determination through the political process."[226] While Moe finds this problematic to implementing high-stakes accountability, I see it as central to challenging corporate classroom control. Progressive political agents, described in Chapter 5, could be working with teachers to forward alternative educational reforms.

Has the ASM Been Successful?

Arguably, yes. In this chapter I have attempted to show that neoconservative and neoliberal think tanks, institutes, and foundations have been instrumental in creating the "what is" in public education today. Recall that Powell and Simon's goals for altering America's political landscape included, 1) funding large sums of money to pro-business interests, 2) placing conservative scholars in universities; 3) setting up a counterintelligentsia to challenge "leftist" universities; 4) monitoring textbooks to make certain America was being portrayed in the best light; 5) using the media to frame and

---

[225] Hess, "Refining or Retreating?," 72. In Operation Enduring Freedom, the Bush administration has refused to allow photographs of returning, dead soldiers.

[226] Moe, "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability," 90.

forward debate; 6) publishing in scholarly and mainstream journals; and 7) becoming active in courts at all levels of government.

In chapter 3 I have attempted to show how 1-7 have been met in the field of educational policy. 1) Using the Bradley Foundation as an example, I have shown how millions of dollars from one conservative foundation goes directly (and indirectly) to answering Powell and Simon's call. This money supports conservative causes and conservative neointellectuals who advance ASM causes in public, private, and governmental spheres. 2) Placing themselves in universities and building networks for bypassing scholarly protocol, neointellectuals generate study after study to be used (or secreted away) by activists and politicians seeking to regulate and/or dismantle public education at local, state, and federal levels.[227] 3) The think tank network briefly explored in this chapter effectively, in terms of policy setting, counters "leftist" universities. 4) Thanks to the work of functional intellectuals such as Diane Ravitch, E.D. Hirsch, William Bennett, Chester Finn, and the late Alan Bloom, as well as institutes and organizations scattered across America, U.S. textbooks (and television) have not only been monitored for pro-American bias, they have been manufactured to engender certain ideological beliefs about America's past, present, and future.[228] 5) The Right effectively uses the mainstream media, as well as private and scholarly journals (6), to forward their neoliberal and neoconservative agendas. 7) If readers are to believe scholars such as Joel

---

[227] This has been demonstrated throughout this chapter.

[228] Diane Ravitch recently received $10,000 (from the Hoover Institution) for her efforts in policing America's textbooks. See "*The Language Police* by Diane Ravitch Wins Hoover Institution's 2004 Uncommon Book Award." Press release available online at http://www-hoover.stanford.edu/pubaffairs/releases/2005/09ravitch.html. Accessed 12/31/05.

Spring and Johnothan Kozol, the courts have been effectively used to undo 50 years worth of desegregation efforts.[229] Perhaps the greatest victory for Powell and Simon, however, is the increasing number of schools, nearly 2,000 last year alone, which have been taken, in accordance with NCLB, from public control and reconstituted as private, charter, or for profit schools.[230] Given 1-7 and the forced closure of public schools across the country, the ASM appears to be successfully attacking public education, preventing public schools from becoming sites where democracy (as outlined in the next chapter) can flourish.

I have attempted to show in chapters 2 and 3 that public schools as sites for democratic rebirth and renewal are under attack. The next question I will address is should they be realized and saved as such sites? In *The Public and Its Problems*, John Dewey contends that "only through constant watchfulness and criticism of public officials by citizens can a state be maintained in integrity and usefulness."[231] Citizens have to be prepared to be watchful somewhere, and progressives have long argued that, if America is to have a democracy, then schools should be that preparatory space, and that space, as I will show in the next chapter, should be used to engender democratic

---

[229] See Spring, American Education, Chapter 3. See also Jonathan Kozol, The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America (New York: Crown, 2005).

[230] These numbers are only expected to rise. See Ben Feller, "1,750 schools face serious penalties," *The Associated Press*, 10 March 2006. Accessed online 5/14/2006 from http://www.sltrib.com/ci_3804282?source=rss. Some schools districts are fighting the restructuring. Such is the case with 33 Montana schools, all on Indian reservations. See "33 Schools told to restructure," *Billings Gazette*, 10 March 2006. Accessed 05/14/06 from http://billingsgazette.net/articles/2006/05/10/news/state/40-schools.txt.

[231] John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (Chicago: The Swallow Press Inc., 1927), 69.

capacities. "Capacities," notes Dewey, "are limited by the objects and tools at hand. They are still more dependent upon the prevailing habits of attention and interest."[232] Turning schools over to corporate governance and reducing them to regulatory test-prep centers limits democratic capacity by reducing time spent engaging with the types of people and the sorts of tasks that arguably lead to democratic capacities in the first place. The capacities for individuals living under corporate rule are by necessity different than the capacities required for individuals participating in a democracy. When corporate leaders shape public institutions according to their needs and individuals develop capacities more suitable to authoritarianism and fundamentalism (religious or market), countries move away from democracy and toward corporatism, a relative of, and arguably a precursor to, fascism. One way of preventing such a move is to make public schools places where individuals can come together to determine, debate, and question what democracy, and fascism, mean. Public schools are worth saving, if and only if, they are spaces which defend individuals and communities from authoritarianism and fundamentalism by engendering the capacities necessary for democratic life.

---

[232] Ibid., 210.

CHAPTER 4

WHAT ARE PROGRESSIVE "COUNTER-NARRATIVES" TO THE ASM?

> We might even ask, as postmodern theorists have, whether the idea of progress – and the project of progressivism – might best be abandoned in this post-utopian age. We think it makes more sense to think about progress, and progressivism, in new ways that open up opportunities to advance democratic projects in diverse educational sites. At a time when the language of "making progress" has been appropriated by those on the political right to mask some very undemocratic projects, progressives will need to articulate forceful counter-narratives of progress in education that open up democratic counter-paths.[233]

As I noted in the previous chapter, the ASM offers two primary discourses for reforming U.S. public education. The first is a call for more regimentation; the second is a call for privatizing schools that fail to meet corporate benchmarks. I now wish to outline progressive alternatives to both ideas. Let me be clear from the beginning: progressives do not defend public schools as they now operate. Not willing to abandon public education to the ASM, the progressives I include in this chapter offer theories for keeping public education public in order to help create and maintain a participatory and pluralistic democratic social order. While scholars such as Henry Giroux assert, repeatedly, that what the Left needs are "new articulations," viable curricula, "forceful counter narratives," etc., I disagree.[234] As I will demonstrate in this chapter, the Left has

---

[233]Text taken from the American Educational Studies Association's 2006 "Conference Announcement and Call for Proposals." Accessed 04/20/06 from http://www3.uakron.edu/aesa/CFP2006.html.

[234] For a recent example of this call see Henry Giroux, *The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy* (Boulder: Paradigm,

much theory; the problem is a failure to successfully market those ideas in defense of public schools as institutions for democratic revival. Setting the second half of this claim aside for Chapter 5, my intention here is to highlight progressive theories in order to convince the reader, Giroux, AESA, et al. that "forceful counter-narratives" to the ASM exist in abundance. In fact, given the number of progressive narratives concerning education in and for democracy, reviewing them all, or even a significant portion, is beyond the scope of this work. With due respect to the many authors I have omitted then, and with equal respect to the authors whose work I have labeled "progressive," I turn now to education in and for democracy, "a radical idea that, as yet, has not come into being."[235]

I employ a definition of democracy influenced greatly by John Dewey and two of his biographers: Jay Martin and Paul Westbrook.[236] Democracy, as I understand it through Dewey, is a form of associated living that fosters the growth of the individual through his or her participation in social affairs.[237] Free, reflective, critical social inquiry and the welfare of others undergird interaction, communion, and community building. Unlike authoritarian modes of government, democracy requires its members to participate in the political, social, cultural, and economic institutions affecting their

---

2004). See the Preface. I do not disagree with everything Giroux says, as his work undergirds much of this chapter's argument. On this particular point, however, I disagree.

[235] Deron Boyles, American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to School (New York: Garland, 1998), 181.

[236] See Jay Martin, *The Education of John Dewey* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2003); and Robert B. Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

[237] See John Dewey, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (New York: The Free Press, 1944), 87.

development and, unlike authoritarian states, democracies believe in the capacity of ordinary individuals to direct the affairs of their society, including schools. Active participation in various institutions—the reshaping and reinvention of norms, laws, and communities—should prevent homogenizing authoritarianism and allow for individual and community re-creation and growth.

Finally, and importantly, democracy is not static. As individuals engage with, reflect on, and critique the worlds they inhabit, democracy itself evolves. As Zygmunt Bauman explains:

> Democracy expresses itself in a continuous and relentless critique of institutions; democracy is an anarchic, disruptive element inside the political system; essentially, a force for dissent and change. One can best recognize a democratic society by its constant complaints that it is not democratic enough.[238]

A political system that ossifies cannot take into account new realities or exigencies. Therefore, democracy requires complaint and challenge, as it is through complaint and challenge that democracies evolve with social, political, and environmental realities. Refusing democratic growth, believing that democracy has for all times been defined, "is an invitation for revolt and revolution."[239] If a State does not invite and allow individuals to participate in its remaking, and if the State does not create spaces for that very challenge, then the State is either a monarchy, authoritarian, theocratic, totalitarian, or fascist; it cannot be called democratic. This organic or evolving understanding of

---

[238] Zygmunt Bauman, *The Individualized Society* (London: Polity Press, 2001), 55.

[239] For more on this see John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (Chicago: Swallow Press, 1927), 34.

democracy helps avoid the potential for a universalizing or totalitarian employment of the term.

With this caveat in place, there are several central tenets that democracy, as outlined in this chapter, embodies. "Democracy," in the words of Mark Olssen, "insists on the protection of human rights, recognizes the distinctiveness of sub-cultures, ensures the principles of inclusion and openness, and ensures the universal application of the rule of law…."[240] Importantly, "democracy is always a movement of an energized public to make elites responsible—it is at its core and most basic foundation the taking back of one's power in the face of the misuse of elite power."[241] Democracy, always and forever, protects human rights, recognizes sub-cultures, ensures the rule of law, allows for challenges to existing law, and values people power over corporatism, oligarchy, plutocracy, theocracy, fascism, fundamentalism, and authoritarianism.

William B. Stanley asserts "democracy does not just happen; it must be cultivated and learned."[242] It is the contention of this chapter that the cultivation of and the learning for democracy should take place in the spaces traditionally called public schools. In an organic, evolving, and participatory democratic state, students, parents, teachers, and communities would have a shared voice—shared, not equal—in educational agenda

---

[240] Mark Olssen, "Neoliberalism, Globalisation, Democracy: Challenges for Education," *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 2, no. 2 (July 2004): 264.

[241] Cornel West, *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight Against Imperialism* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2004), 68.

[242] William B. Stanley, "Schooling and Curriculum for Social Transformation: Reconsidering the Status of a Contentious Idea," in *Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century*, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3 (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 192.

setting.[243] Schools influence the communities that they serve, and in a democracy the individuals being influenced the most should have the largest say, to the best of their abilities, in how they are being influenced. If communities cannot act together democratically to shape school outcomes, which should include the creation of students capable of participating in democratic decision-making and action, then those communities, and the schools within them, cannot be called democratic. "If social and educational purposes are dictated by forces beyond popular control," explains Michael Engel, "the avenues of reinvention and growth are closed off."[244] Said differently, if interest groups, ideologues, and corporations dictate educational policy in ways suitable to their needs alone (via curricular control or via privatization), schools cease to be public, inhibiting the reinvention and growth of individuals and communities.

> If the debate over the future of the schools is conducted entirely within the limits of one theoretical or ideological framework [i.e. choice and standards], the quality of that debate degenerates…If only one point of view on the goals and purposes of education predominates, democratic political decision making ends.[245]

Democratic societies must ensure that the quality of debates, whether they concern the reasons for going to war, the reinterpretation of the Constitution, or the purposes of education, never degenerates to authoritarianism or fundamentalism. In order to keep debate free and critical, democratic societies must help their citizens acquire the

---

[243] Ideally, we have experts and scholars in society to help us make informed decisions. In law, in medicine, and in education individuals who spend significant time studying, learning, and growing in a particular field should, depending on their intentions and interests, have more say in decisions than others.

[244] Michael Engel, The Struggle for Control of Public Education: Market Ideology vs. Democratic Values (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 2.

[245] Ibid., 10.

skills and dispositions to intelligently engage one another in substantive discussions, discussions which may lead to solutions to their most pressing problems. In line with Engel, I contend that citizens should acquire those skills and dispositions in public schools, schools committed not only to the development of the individual, but to the development of individuals capable of realizing and maintaining an organic, evolving, and participatory democratic social order.

Heeding Engel's warning, I am not laying out the Ten Commandments of a democratic education; I am merely laying out broad guidelines, as to do otherwise would violate democratic principles. "In a democracy," explains Deborah Meier:

> there are multiple, legitimate definitions of "a good education" and "well-educated," and it is desirable to acknowledge that plurality. Openly differing viewpoints constitute a healthy tension in a democratic, pluralistic society. Even where a mainstream view (consensus) exits, alternate views that challenge the consensus are critical to the society's health.[246]

I recognize multiple, and often conflicting, definitions of "democratic education" or "education for democracy," and I offer a broad outline here in order to frame this chapter's argument: progressives do not need new theories or counter-narratives, as what they have appears both theoretically sound and compelling. This chapter explores 10 tenets of democratic education; each one might be thought of as a counter-narrative called for by AESA. The point here is not to argue for the truth or relevance of each tenet, but to counter the idea that progressivism suffers from lack of theory as implied by AESA's call. As I hope to show in Chapter 5, it isn't ideas that progressives suffer from, it is a failure to widely promote their ideals, 10 of which follow.

---

[246] Deborah Meier, "Educating a Democracy," in *Will Standards Save Public Education?*, ed. Deborah Meier (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), 16.

1. Authority for shaping goals lies in the hands of the people.
2. Education is political.
3. Democratic participation requires a specific type of voice and literacy.
4. Justice, while elusive, is worth striving for; injustice, when discovered, requires action.
5. Education is more than job training.
6. Education serves both productive and reproductive processes.
7. Education engenders independence and interdependence.
8. Children should not be standardized.
9. Democracy requires a certain type of teacher and a certain type of teaching.
10. Democratic education requires a certain type of space.

John Dewey warns against establishing a "a hierarchy of values among studies. It is futile," he explains, "to attempt to arrange them in an order, beginning with one having least worth and going on to that of maximum value."[247] The same holds true with the above list; Tenet 1 cannot obtain and maintain without Tenet 10. The interconnectedness of each tenet, therefore, leads to a certain amount of unavoidable repetition. For example, while I discuss standardized testing in at least half of the tenets, I still give it its own category, as standardization dominates reform efforts today. Furthermore, the above list is not all-inclusive and is therefore open to debate, revision and extension. I am not suggesting that these ideas and these ideas alone will lead to democratic schools and a

[247] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 239.

more democratic society. Ultimately I cannot be certain as schools have neither had the freedom nor the support to pursue education for pluralistic and participatory democracy on a widespread scale.

Authority for Shaping Goals Lies in the Hands of the People

> The ultimate support for democracy at all levels, and in all contexts….resides in the active participation and willingness of citizens to contest policies.[248]

Democratic schools recognize the right of citizens to shape and contest educational goals and outcomes. Placing children in authoritarian, top-down environments and removing parents and teachers from policy setting, experimentation, reflection, and change teaches children, parents, and teachers that the needs of outside interests are more important than their own. Rather than allowing ASM interests to dominate educational discourse, progressive scholars must help communities work together to create schools responsive to diverse needs, as required by democracy. This requires educators working with, rather than working for, various experts and elites.[249] In keeping with Engel, teachers and administrators, and to varying degrees parents and students, should have the freedom, flexibility, and the prescience to develop curricula suitable to time, point, place, and being. This does not mean uncritical affirmation of every desire willy-nilly; it requires listening and valuing difference and diversity when making decisions. "Within a truly participatory democracy," explains Pepi Leistyna, "a committed sign of respect and inclusion is that all voices be recognized, heard, and

---

[248] Olssen, "Neoliberalism, Globalisation, Democracy," 248.

[249] For more on this point see Meier, "Educating a Democracy," 16.

critically engaged for their theoretical insights and weaknesses, rather than simply affirmed."[250]

NCLB, with its hierarchical control and disciplinary sanctions, eliminates teacher and administrator autonomy and authority, negating the possibility for recognizing, hearing, and critically engaging with diverse voices; today's public schools are undemocratic by default. Barber argues that "the secret to our strength as a nation" is "our respect for difference."[251] If this is true, an education that standardizes ultimately weakens the U.S. In order to respect and nurture difference, Linda Darling-Hammond contends that "a democratic education should enable all people to find out and act on who they are, what their passions, gifts, and talents may be, what they care about, and how they want to make a contribution to each other and the world."[252] If the U.S is to remain strong through respect for difference, diversity, and innovation, then legislators must allow for teachers and teaching that nurture and engender difference; requiring all communities to align curriculum along ASM lines does just the opposite.

While there may appear to be a danger of extremism in some communities, democratic schools must ultimately abide by the Constitution, which should exist to protect individuals from coercion and oppression. As Amy Guttman explains, "education

---

[250] Pepi Leistyna, "Facing Oppression," in *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*, ed. Kenneth J. Saltman and David A. Gabbard (New York: Routledge Falmer, 2003), 122.

[251] Benjamin R. Barber, "Education for Democracy," in *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling*, ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 29.

[252] Linda Darling-Hammond, "Education, Equity, and the Right to Learn," in *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling* ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 45.

is not democratic if citizens do not collectively influence the purposes of primary schooling *nor* if they control the content of classroom teaching so as to repress reasonable challenges to dominant political perspectives."[253] Schools that repress forms of knowledge due to political, market, or religious ideology inhibit discourse and diversity making them fundamentalist or authoritarian rather than democratic. Democratic schools must discuss various ideologies ensuring that one, including democracy, does not ascend to oppress. I owe a debt to feminist poststructural theory for this point, particularly to the work of Elizabeth A. St. Pierre and Wanda S. Pillow. They outline poststructuralism as a system which "offers critiques and methods for examining the functions and effects of any structure or grid of regularity that we put into place, including those poststructuralism itself might create."[254] While they attach the word "poststructural" to this critique of self and system, I, along with Bauman, don't believe democracy can exist without it, as democracy requires "continuous and relentless critique of institutions."[255]

There are over 299 million Americans. While they undoubtedly share many traits and values, American communities reveal a great deal of diversity. Educational goals in hurricane-prone Florida might necessarily be different from educational goals in earthquake-prone California. Atlanta, Georgia's growing Latino population might have

---

[253] Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 75. Italics added.

[254] Elizabeth A. St. Pierre and Wanda S. Pillow, "Introduction," *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*, ed. Elizabeth A. St. Pierre and Wanda S. Pillow (New York: Routledge, 2000), 6.

[255] The institution of democracy is by necessity critiqued. Bauman, *The Individualized Society*, 55.

needs different from those students living in Chinatown, New York.[256] Minority students might need different types of education than children born into the dominant culture;[257] boys might need different types of education than girls;[258] poor students might need different types of education than wealthier students;[259] students struggling with sexual identity, who are five times more likely to skip school due to fear, might need different types of education than students comfortable with who and where they are;[260] all students might benefit from education which responds to the unique ways they interface with their worlds.[261]

> If schools are going to be effectual and relevant, and if they are to meet their moral obligations to a democratic public, they must have the

---

[256] For examples of cultural differences to take into account in the education of Hispanic children in particular, see Sandra J. Altshuler and Tresa Schmautz, "No Hispanic Student Left Behind: The Consequences of 'High Stakes' Testing, *Children and Schools* 28, no. 1 (January 2006): 5-14. For the needs of English language learners in particular see Valerie Ooka Pang and Evangelina Bustamante Jones, "Caring Centered Multicultural Education: Addressing the Academic and Writing Needs of English Learners," *Defending Public Schools: Teaching for a Democratic Society*, ed. Kathleen R. Kesson and E Wayne Ross, vol. 2 (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 137-148.

[257] See for example James A. Banks, *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (Columbia: Teacher's College Press, 2000).

[258] See for example Michael Gurian and Kathy Stevens, *The Minds of Boys: Saving Our Sons From Falling Behind in School and Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

[259] On this point see Richard Rothstein, Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap (D.C.: Economic Policy Institute, 2004).

[260] See Connie J. Callahan, "Protecting and Counseling Gay and Lesbian Students," *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, and Development* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 5-10.

[261] For more on this point see Howard Gardner, *Development and Education of Mind: The Selected Works of Howard Gardner* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

> prescience and flexibility to adapt independently to changes in their surroundings and in the specific populations they serve.[262]

Schools forced to adhere to norms established by think tanks and corporate and federal leaders lose flexibility, independence, and freedom.[263] As a result, the teachers, students, and parents learn that their needs are secondary to the standards set by federal legislators, often acting under the demands of business leaders and other interests.[264]

The United States is a diverse nation, and unique, temporal, geographic events occur within its borders that impact citizens differently. These events might call for different responses from different communities and schools. As a recent example, I cite Katrina. The children displaced by one of the most horrendous natural disasters in U.S. history arguably have more on their minds than school books, and addressing their needs might involve more than sitting them into desks and filling their heads with X, Y, and Z content. The shock and awe of suffering through the storm, as well as living in one of the poorest parts of the country, might explain why Katrina evacuees are doing so poorly on this year's battery of tests. On the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, for example, "Only 58 percent of evacuees in third grade passed the reading portion, compared with 89 percent of all students. In fifth grade, 46 percent of evacuees passed

---

[262] John I. Goodlad, Corinne Mantle-Bromley, and Stephen John Goodlad, *Education for Everyone: Agenda for Education in a Democracy* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 2004), 73.

[263] See Daniel de Vise, "Trying Times for Special Ed," *Washington Post*, 26 April 2005, B1. The author tells the story of several special ed students, (one who is blind, cannot speak and cannot move) who have to set aside their individualized educational programs to spend 40-100 hours, each, taking a single test.

[264] For support of this assertion see Kathy Emery and Susan Ohanian, *Why is Corporate America Bashing Our Public Schools?* (Portsmouth: Heinmann, 2004.)

the reading portion, versus 80 percent among all students."[265] It is my contention that a more democratic system of education would have taken the plight of these children, 38,000 in Texas schools alone, into account before forcing them to take reading tests.[266] Holding these children back, as Texas authorities plan to do, is not only undemocratic, it is unconscionable, as this "mean accountability" will do nothing for the stress and emotional fatigue undeniably affecting the children.

In democratic schools student experience should be central to a student's education. Who is this student? Where has she been? Where does she want to go? Why must we force this student to read about and think about the same exact same things as the next? Responding to such questions before standardizing students allows for what Henry Giroux calls a "pedagogy of possibility," a pedagogy where "student experience provides the basis for analyzing the social forms that reconstruct the subjective character of the stories, memories, and meanings that are in place when students come to schools."[267] This type of pedagogy, one responsive to the subjective nature of student experience, cannot take place in standardized or ASM controlled schools (whether privatized or dominated by corporate sanctioned legislation) as their curricula meet ASM needs first, reducing student development to the development necessary for a neat fit into a hyper-nationalistic, hyper-productive United States of America. The words of Ralph Waldo Emerson are apropos here, for Emerson believed that education must "respect the

---

[265] See "Katrina Refugees Score Worse Than Texas Youngsters," *KTC3 NEWS*. Available online at http://www.katc.com/Global/story.asp?S=4674962. Accessed 03/31/06.

[266] Ibid.

[267] Henry Giroux, Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life: Democracy's Promise and Education's Challenge, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Paradigm, 2005), 197.

child."[268] "It is not for you to chose what he shall know, what he shall do," explained Emerson, who warned educators that through too much "tampering and thwarting and too much governing, [the child] may be hindered from his end and kept out of his own."[269] NCLB, with its restrictions and prescriptions, its tampering and thwarting, violates various principles of liberty and freedom by placing ASM demands before the needs of children and the democracy the inhabit. The result appears to be an increasingly standardized population, one kept out of its own.

Education is Political

> In the end, it comes down to a question about the purposes of public schooling and its role in a democratic society.[270]

Democracies cannot exist without people participating in them. If students are to become citizens who participate in and protect their democracies, communities must educate them with that end in mind. "Education not only speaks to the public," argues Benjamin Barber,

> …it is the means by which a public is forged. It is how individuals are transformed into responsible participants in the communities of the classroom, the neighborhood, the town, the nation and (in schools that recognize the new interdependence of our times) the world to which they belong.[271]

---

[268] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Education," in *Readings in American Educational Thought: From Puritanism to Progressivism*, ed. Andrew J. Milson, Chara Haeussler Bohan, Perry L. Glanzer, and J. Wesley Null (Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 2004).

[269] Ibid., 236.

[270] Kevin D. Vinson, Rich Gibson, E. Wayne Ross, "Pursing Authentic Teaching in an Age of Standardization," in *Defending Public Schools: Teaching for a Democratic Society*, ed. Kathleen R. Kesson and E Wayne Ross, vol. 2 (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 95.

[271] Benjamin R. Barber, "Taking the Public Out of Education: The Perverse Notion That American Democracy can Survive Without its Public Schools," *School*

If schools are to be such spaces, spaces where "individuals are transformed into responsible participants" in various communities, then schools must be transformed from regulatory test-prep centers into something they have never been.[272] While Henry Giroux argues that over the past two decades we have "seen a split develop between politics and education in which the latter became increasingly more concerned with training and rote learning rather than critical thinking, civic consciousness, and social justice," I do not believe there was ever a connection. Never in the history of public education has the institution privileged these capacities.[273]

Regardless of the past, today's students appear to lack appreciation for the qualities that make the United States a country that nearly a million people a year risk their lives sneaking into.[274] Consider, for example, a recent study by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. Working with The Department of Public Policy at the University of Connecticut, "the project surveyed more than 100,000 high school students,

---

Administrator, May 2004. Available online from www.looksmart.com. Accessed 05/13/06.

[272] After reading Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1986); Richard Brosio, *A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994); David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); Joel Spring, *Political Agendas For Education: From the Christian Coalition to the Religious Right*, 2nd ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001); Wayne Urban and Jennings Wagoner, *American Education: A History*, 3rd ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003); and Joel Spring, *American Education*, 12th ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006), I assert that the creation of a participatory, critical, and active democratic citizenry has never been the goal of U.S. public education.

[273] Giroux, Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life: ix.

[274] For illegal immigration numbers in America see Brad Knickerbocker, "Illegal Immigrants in the U.S.: How Many Are There?," *Christian Science Monitor*, 16 May 2006. Accessed 05/16/06 from http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0516/p01s02-ussc.html.

nearly 8,000 teachers and more than 500 administrators and principals at 544 high schools across the United States."[275] The goal of the study was

> …to determine whether relationships exist—and, if so, the nature of those relationships—between what teachers and administrators think, and what students do in their classrooms and with news media, and what they know about the First Amendment.[276]

Given that the First Amendment is one of the bedrocks of U.S. democracy, their report is not encouraging:

1. 49% of students believed that the government should regulate newspapers.
2. 35% of students believed that the First Amendment goes too far in the rights it guarantees. An additional 21% did not know enough about the First Amendment to state an opinion.
3. Students are, on the whole, unclear about constitutionally protected First Amendment rights.[277]

A key finding, however, is that students who participate in school media activities such as newspapers or video production not only know more about the First Amendment, they are far more likely to believe that it is important.[278] This suggests that students can be taught, through participation in school media programs, to understand and appreciate their First Amendment rights. The finding substantiates Henry Giroux's claim that, if the U.S. is to have a democracy, then

> …students need to learn how to produce their own newspapers, records, television programs, music videos, and whatever other technology is necessary to link knowledge and power….Put simply, young people need

---

[275] See Dr. David Yalof and Dr. Kenneth Dautrich, *The Future of the First Amendment* (Miami: The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, 2004). Available online at http://firstamendment.jideas.org/findings/findings.php. Last accessed 05/18/06.

[276] Ibid., 1.

[277] Ibid., 3-5.

[278] Ibid., 8, 12.

> access to subsidized, noncommodified public spheres that allow their artistic, intellectual, and critical talents to flourish.[279]

Troubling for democracy as explored in this chapter then, is that 21% of schools surveyed reported offering "no student media whatsoever."[280] It is not lack of want that prevents schools and students from participating in such activities. According to the report, "most administrators say they would like to see their school expand existing student media, but lack of financial resources is the main obstacle."[281] Over the past five years then, as humanities courses have been replaced by math and reading, and social scientists, artists, and philosophers have made way for troops-turned-teachers, participation in, and funding for, media related programs has become less of a priority than achievement narrowly defined. Further compounding the problem are outright attacks on school media programs period. Over the past year, for example, over a dozen high schools have had their radio licenses bought out from underneath them by local churches.[282]

Individuals concerned by the fact that one-third of American high school students believe the First Amendment goes too far in its protections might ask why these students think this way. Where, outside of schools, do students learn about First Amendment rights? If schools have focused more on skills than on rights and responsibilities, and

---

[279] Henry Giroux, *The Mouse that Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999).

[280] Yalof and Dautrich, The Future of the First Amendment, 13.

[281] Ibid., 10.

[282] See "School Radio Stations Fight for Survival," eSchool News 9, no. 1 (January 2006): 1, 19.

there is ample evidence of this,[283] should anyone be surprised that American students think this way? Furthermore, if legislation such as NCLB drives what Deron Boyles refers to as critically transitive teachers out of the profession, replacing them with automatons, why should any American expect students in public schools to understand, let alone value, democracy?[284]

Ultimately, schools with a myopic focus on accountability and test scores fail in the preparation of democratic citizens due to how they spend their time and resources: policing, disciplining, and punishing. In order to avoid the authoritarianism and fundamentalism such curricula might lead to, Kurt Salamun argues that there are three "political intentions" that must guide education in democratic societies. These intentions include:

- teaching as many people as possible to appreciate and to justify basic values of political democracies, such as pluralism, tolerance, individual freedom, social justice, respect for human rights, and especially freedom of speech and the press;
- influencing as many people as possible to resist antidemocratic tendencies in policy making; and

---

[283] For evidence that schools have focused more on skills than on the creation of a critical and engaged citizenry see Brosio, A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education, especially Chapter 1. See also Spring, Political Agendas For Education. Spring's work focuses on various special interests groups and the influences they have had. Based on Brosio and Spring's work, I conclude workforce preparation has been the dominant discourse in schools over the past 50 years. Upon reading Spring's American Education, Urban and Wagoner's American Education, 3rd ed., and Kliebard's The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958, I draw the same conclusion.

[284] For discussion of critically transitive teachers see Deron Boyles, *American Corporations and Education: The Free Market Goes to School* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998). I include a brief treatment of critically transitive teachers in response to the neoconservative/neoliberal redefinition of "quality teacher" later in this chapter.

- enabling as many people as possible to criticize thought patterns and worldviews that are spread by the enemies of a democratic, open society.[285]

These three intentions require a flexibility, an appreciation for diversity, and a critical consciousness that might make some individuals uncomfortable. How much freedom should students have to speak? If children are taught to sit obediently, never questioning the teacher, will they grow into citizens capable of and willing to challenge "worldviews that are spread by the enemies of a democratic, open society?" If students don't learn to resist antidemocratic tendencies in America's schools (surveillance, authoritarianism, and market-fundamentalism), will they suddenly become adults capable of identifying what Freire refers to as "anti-dialogical" behavior, behavior that impedes democracy through conquest, manipulation, divide and rule, and cultural imperialism?[286]

Consider two important points. First, schools should not be turning students into Molotov-cocktail tossing radicals. Turning children into uncritical, bomb-tossing contrarians is no different than the indoctrination used in Jihadist academies in several Middle Eastern countries.[287] I believe there is a time and place for dissent, and most importantly, appropriate forms of dissent. These should be taught and engendered lest students turn to dangerous behaviors in order to get their points across. Here I refer

---

[285] See Kurt Salamun "Liberal Education in the Face of Antidemocracy" in *Educating For Democracy: Paideia in an Age of Uncertainty*, ed. Alan M. Olson, David M. Steiner, and Irina S. Tulli (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 171.

[286] See Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2003), Chapter 4.

[287] For details of such schooling see Jeffrey Goldberg, "The Education of A Holy Warrior," *New York Times*, 25 June 2000. Accessed 05/16/06 from http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/Terrorism/news_us/education_holy_warrior_june_25.htm.

specifically to Columbine high school and the two students who responded to oppression with guns. Second, while education is political, it is not the place for partisan politics. Using class time to indoctrinate students is a violation of a teacher's charge. Critical thinking and reflection requires seeing two sides, at least, to every issue. As Perry Marker explains:

> teachers should never insist that students repeat or blindly adopt the ideas that they themselves believe; to do so would be to engage in antidemocratic teaching techniques that dangerously threaten personal liberty and our democratic way of life.[288]

Holding a class hostage while railing against presidential policies, for example, is undemocratic. Should the class and the curriculum require discussion of U.S. policy, the teacher in charge must do her or his best to lead a critical discussion based on examination of various perspectives, histories, arguments, and possibilities. While no teacher will ever be able to remain neutral, teachers must allow for and argue with competing viewpoints.[289]

A democratic high school, however, might have a course that critiques the current party in power, regardless of which group ascends. Today, such a course might ask questions about the present administration's problems with the law. A teacher running a course entitled, for example, "The Current Administration and the Law" might ask her students:

---

[288] Perry M. Marker, "Old Wine in a New Bottle: Twentieth-Century Social Studies in a Twenty-First-Century World," in *Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century*, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3 (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 27.

[289] See Ibid. 26-27. See also Howard Zinn and Donaldo Macedo, *Howard Zinn On Democratic Education* (Boulder: Paradigm, 2005), chapter 4.

1. What is happening to Dick Cheney's Chief of Staff Scooter Libby, who resigned after being indicted on felony charges of obstruction of justice, perjury and making false statements in a federal investigation?[290]

2. Does the Patriot Act violate 1st Amendment rights?[291]

3. Did President Bush violate the 4th Amendment by authorizing the NSA wiretap program?[292]

4. Does No Child Left Behind, with its testing mandates, violate the 4th Amendment?

5. Did the Bush administration violate the 6th Amendment by authorizing the use of torture?[293]

6. What are the connections between former GOP house leader Tom DeLay, under indictment in Texas, and convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff?[294]

7. If leading Bush 2000 Campaign contributor Ken Lay obtained donation money through fraud, should Bush return the money to the Enron investors who lost it?[295]

---

[290] See Associated Press, "Top Cheney Aide Indicted, Libby Quits Post," *MSNBC.com*, 28 October 2005. Online at http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9837835/. Accessed 04/06/06.

[291] See David L. Hudson Jr., "Patriot Act Overview." Research brief made available by the First Amendment Center, Accessed 04/06/06 from http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/speech/libraries/topic.aspx?topic=patriot_act

[292] See Kelli Arena, "Bush Says He Signed NSA Wiretap Order," *CNN*, 17 December 2005. Available online at http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/12/17/bush.nsa/ Accessed 04/06/06.

[293] See Dana Priest and R. Jeffery Smith, "Memo Offered Justification for Use of Torture," *Washington Post*, 8 June 2004. Accessed 04/06/06 from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23373-2004Jun7.html

[294] See Mathew Continetti, "Nothing to See Here," *The Daily Standard*, 4 April 2006. Accessed 04/06/06 from http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/012/068uouro.asp

[295] See Matt Daily, "U.S. Scored Against Enron's Lay, Skillings: Experts," *ABC News*, 29 March 2006. Online at http://abcnews.go.com/Business/wireStory?id=1783229. Accessed 04/06/06.

8. How does bribe taking undermine democracy?[296]

This is only a brief list of questions that students might ask in order to develop a critical awareness of how their elected officials act and work. Importantly, such questions should not be leveled to imply that only one party potentially violates laws; rather, they should be leveled so students develop into citizens capable of monitoring their representatives and maintaining their state in "integrity and usefulness," regardless of the nature of the party in control.

Democratic Participation Requires a Specific Type of Voice and Literacy

> Multiple voices are moving us forward. The broader the diversity of voices, the better the quality of society. Our society is becoming more vibrant, more enriched, and more exciting. It represents more of us. This traditional monovoice is transforming itself into multivoice, and not everyone is happy about it.[297]

If democracies require citizens to participate in the institutions that shape their lives, citizens must acquire a specific type of voice, and a specific type of literacy, to do so. "Voice," explains Peter McLaren, "suggests the means that students have at their disposal to make themselves 'heard' and to define themselves as active participants in the world."[298] A state cannot be maintained in "integrity and usefulness" if the citizens of the state do not have the ability to level complaints which "make themselves heard." Doing so necessitates a certain type of voice, one comfortable with expressing needs and

---

[296] See Tony Perry, "Tough Sentence Urged for Cunningham," *L.A. Times*, 1 March 2006. Accessed 04/06/06 from http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-duke1mar01,1,6267222.story?ctrack=1&cset=true.

[297] Joan Wink, *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the Real World*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Pearson, 2005), 60.

[298] Peter McLaren, Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education, 4th ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000), 245.

challenging status quo givens. However, under NCLB the construction of mathematicians and scientists takes precedent over the development of such a voice, as the only voice required is the one needed to give the correct response to the teacher's questions. Ultimately this is a voice regulated and shaped by ASM need, not one prepared for democratic engagement.

Rejecting ASM regulated voice, democratic schools empower student voice by valuing and exploring who students are, where students have been, and what students have to say. Giroux explains:

> The concept of voice represents the unique instances of self-expression through which students affirm their own class, cultural, racial, and gender identities. A student's voice is necessarily shaped by personal history and distinctive lived engagement with the surrounding culture.[299]

As students grow and develop in varied and unique cultures, they also develop varied and unique voices. Public schools must respect cultural, racial, gender, sexual, and class differences, and the voices expressing them; otherwise, they teach children that neither their lived experience nor their cultural heritage matter. Such a lesson is ultimately oppressive and miseducative. As Freire argues, schooling is oppressive when teachers legitimate one set of values, for example the Bradley Foundation's, and marginalize others.[300] This oppressive behavior ultimately creates a miseducative environment, causing some students to reject schooling completely. John Ogbu asserts that some students resent and resist the teacher's efforts, no matter how well intentioned or creative,

---

[299] Giroux, Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life, 199.

[300] See Freire's discussion of "cultural imperialism" in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Chapter 4.

leading to "counteracademic attitudes" and behaviors.[301] These behaviors result in low grades, student-teacher conflict, suspensions, and dropouts, thus reducing the child's chances of becoming an engaged, contributing, and free (relatively) member of society. When teachers deligitimate student voice, or ignore it altogether, they forward authoritarianism and fundamentalism, as both –isms reject the belief that an individual's voice matters. At best, in authoritarian and fundamentalist institutions, students learn to keep their voice down so as to avoid mockery and abuse. At worst they shed their voice entirely, appropriating a pony-show voice to please the teacher.

In addition to valuing student experience, democratic schools help students explore and develop their voices through engendering a specific type of literacy. Memorizing vocabulary words, learning algebra, identifying bodies of water, and running computer programs represent a very basic notion of literacy (and an important one at that), but being able to complete any of these tasks does not necessarily give a student the ability to define themselves in a world where marketers, elites, and their still-developing peers are constantly telling them who and how to be. If students are going to mature into citizens capable of raising their intelligent, critical, and compassionate voices, they need a type of literacy above and beyond factual comprehension. Unlike authoritarian and fundamentalist regimes, democracy requires a "critical literacy," a literacy which 1) disrupts the commonplace, and 2) interrogates multiple viewpoints.[302]

---

[301] See John Ogbu, "Class Stratification, Racial Stratification, and Schooling," in *Class, Race, & Gender in American Education,* ed. Lois Weis (Albany: SUNY Press, 1988): 163-183.

[302] See Mitzi Lewison, et al., "Taking on Critical Literacy: The Journey of Newcomers and Novices," *Language Arts* 79, no. 5 (May 2002): 382.

Disrupting the commonplace asks students to look at texts and their worlds through multiple lenses, understanding that ideas, peoples, histories, medias, and events shape us in particular ways.[303] Students experience the world through a variety of media and formats. They read newspapers, listen to music, talk with neighbors and friends, watch television and movies, and log-on to various websites. Some of these encounters require attention to what is being said, how it is being said, who is saying it and why, lest students, and citizens, appropriate ideas and ideologies that are not necessarily beneficial or healthy. If progressives want citizens to identify potential threats to democracy, as discussed under Tenet 2, then democratic schooling needs to provide teachers and students with the tools, time, and freedom to read their "commonplace" worlds, and the medias reflecting them, for those very threats.

Interrogating multiple viewpoints requires that students understand and consider multiple interpretations and expressions of history and experience.[304] In order to do so, students need

> … such skills as critical inquiry [that is] knowing how to ask questions and what kinds of questions need to be asked in a given circumstance; knowing how to evaluate the legitimacy and accuracy of an argument and the data that accompany it, to view issues from a variety of perspectives, and to evaluate the implications of a given text, read between the lines, and recognize and understand the unstated, the omitted, the subtext.[305]

Such skills cannot be evaluated simply through paper and pencil testing, as these skills require examining, accepting, rejecting, producing, and voicing parts and pieces of multiple arguments. Ultimately, this sort of inquiry cannot be reduced to Scantron™

---

[303] Ibid.

[304] Ibid., 383.

[305] Goodlad et al., *Education for Everyone*, 8.

tests, as critical inquiry requires much more than formulaic intelligence. Reducing education to neat, fill in the blank worksheets undermines critical literacy, explains Svi Shapiro, by negating "those learning possibilities that emphasize the development of a critical intelligence, the stimulation of our imagination, or the quest to make meaning out of experience."[306] Stimulating intelligence, using imagination, and making meaning require students to cultivate "attitudes that question so-called correct answers or knowledge and to seek, instead, what is unfamiliar, even irreverent or subversive."[307] Finally, standardized fill-in-the-blank tests cannot measure critical literacy, as critical literacy never ends. When students arrive at answers to tough questions, they should also be looking at the beginnings of tough new questions. The entire process results in "continued capacity for growth," which, according to Dewey, is the "object and reward of learning."[308]

NCLB undermines this sort of inquiry, replacing the critical with the standard. As NCLB forces schools to align teaching and testing to corporate sanctioned curricula, the types of teaching and the sorts of courses that engender a critical literacy (i.e. history, the arts, and the social sciences) are being discarded to make room for math, science, and a specific type of reading.[309] At the end of the school day, this reduces the number of

---

[306] H. Svi Shapiro, "Public School Reform: The Mismeasure of Education," in *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in a Globalizing World* 3rd ed., H. Svi. Shapiro and David E. Purpel, eds. (Mahwah: Lawrence Earlbaum, 2005), 289.

[307] Ibid.

[308] Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 100.

[309] For evidence of this see Claus Von Zastrow, *Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools* (D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 2004), 7. Available online at

students who have developed the voice, literacy, and awareness necessary for participating in democratic deliberation. "In deliberation," explains Mark Olssen, "an understanding of the need for exceptions, the recognition of differences, or the need for modifications can be brought to light and assessed."[310] This sort of deliberation—the recognition of individual differences and the need for modifications—leads to a more just democratic social order, an order that cannot obtain as long as schools (whether they be publicly or privately controlled) require students to appropriate a voice and literacy reduced to ASM demands.

Justice, While Elusive, is Worth Striving for;

Injustice, When Discovered, Requires Action

> Schooling for democratic equality sees the school as a place for the creation of democratic citizens capable of consensual deliberation with the potential for social transformation.[311]

"Students need to understand that social conflict and struggle are a constant part of American history, and that history is, in fact, made through struggle."[312] As our country has aged, women, ethnic minorities, the working class, and (more recently) lesbians and gays, have slowly and laboriously made significant gains towards equal treatment under the law; clearly, more work remains to be done. Their struggles would

---

http://downloads.ncss.org/legislative/AcademicAtrophy.pdf. Accessed 12/31/05. Also see the Center on Education Policy, *From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*, (D.C.: Center on Education Policy, 2006), 89. Available online from www.cep-dc.org/nclb/year4/press. Last accessed 05/17/06.

[310] Olssen, "Neoliberalism, Globalisation, Democracy," 261.

[311] Kenneth J. Saltman, *Collateral Damage: Corporatizing Public Schools—A Threat to Democracy* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 1.

[312] David T. Sehr, *Education for Public Democracy* (New York: SUNY Press, 1997), 93.

not have led to any form of justice without the loud voices and public activity of individuals and groups committed to their various causes. If democracy allows individuals to reshape the world in more just and equitable ways, then democratic schools should encourage students to explore their realities, identify injustice, and act in concert to alter or end oppressive and unjust conditions.

Standing up to injustice often begins with protest—vocally confronting wrongs in daily life. Such confrontation requires a person who has the will, and the voice, to challenge and change status quo givens. Derek Bell, the first black law professor at Harvard, speaks authoritatively on the subject. Bell, fired from his tenured position because of his protest over the law school's failure to grant tenure to any women of color, explains:

> By challenging authority, the protester undermines the assumption that things are either as they are supposed to be or as they must be. What is most heretical, though, is that, in every case, the protester asserts the right to have a meaningful—as opposed to a token—voice.[313]

In addition to engendering a meaningful voice (as discussed under Tenet 3), democratic schools help students seek out and confront injustice in their daily lives. As Giroux explains, "public education must fulfill the task of educating citizens to take risks, to struggle for institutional and social change, and to fight for democracy and against oppression both inside and outside schools."[314]

Today's schools do just the opposite. On March 27, 2006, over 36,000 students from 25 Los Angeles County school districts walked out of class in protest over proposed

---

[313] Derek Bell, *Confronting Authority: Confessions of an Ardent Protester* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1994), 8.

[314] Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*, 202.

changes to U.S. immigration laws.[315] They were not alone, as students in Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas also left classes in similar protests. While authorities in Los Angelges have not yet decided how to punish these students, school officials in Texas, where students also left schools in record numbers, want to send a strong message to future protestors. According to Terry Abbott, the spokesman for the Houston school district, "Any student who engages in [protest] today can be suspended for up to three days, and may be removed from school outright….There also are severe academic consequences."[316]

Abott might consider revisiting her history books, as those students were participating in a process fundamental to the creation of this country. The United States of America is a nation founded through protest. Had there been no Tea Party, no Stamp Act protest, no refusal to quarter British troops, it is arguable that there would be no United States of America. If women had stayed in the proverbial kitchen and not gathered and marched banner in hand, it is not likely they would have earned the right to vote when they did. Had there been no protests in the mid 1960s, there would have been no Civil Right's movement, and without large protests, it is likely that the war in Vietnam would have dragged on for much longer than it actually did. If students are to become active members of a participatory democratic social order, punishing them for engaging in one of the hallmarks of such an order is counter productive. Indeed, given the apathy

---

[315] See the Associated Press, "Student Immigration Protests Continue," 28 March 2006. Accessed 05/17/06 from http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/03/28/national/-main1447009.shtml

[316] See Jennifer Radcliff, "Opinions Split Over Red, White, and Green," *Chron.com*, 30 March 2006. Last accessed 05/16/06 from http://www.susanohanian.org/-show_inthenews.html?id=276.

and consumerist mentality of many students today, the country should celebrate the fact that students rallied in such numbers period.

Howard Zinn speaks directly to the student protests and to Tenet 4 in general: *injustice, when discovered, requires action.* I quote him here at length, as his words, written in 1968, remain relevant. Believing that the late 1960s required "revolutionary changes" but that "classic revolutionary war in our country is not feasible," Zinn wrote:

> …that the only way to escape the twin evils of stagnation and chaotic violence at home, and to avoid devastating wars abroad, is for citizens to accept, utilize, [and] control the disorder of civil disobedience, enriching it with countless possibilities and tactics not yet imagined, to make life more human for us and others on this earth.
>
> It is very hard, in the comfortable environment of middle-class America, to discard the notion that everything will be better if we don't have the disturbance of civil disobedience, if we confine ourselves to voting, writing letters to our Congressmen, speaking our minds politely. But those outside are not so comfortable. Most people in the world are hungry, have no decent place to sleep, no doctor when they are sick; and some are fleeing from attacking airplanes. Somehow, we must transcend our own tight, air-conditioned chambers and begin to feel their plight, their needs. It may become evident that, despite our wealth, we can have no real peace until they do. We might then join them in battering at the complacency of those who guard a false "order," with that healthy commotion that has always attended the growth of justice.[317]

Can students learn to challenge injustice if they are housed in authoritarian institutions? And, importantly, if students don't learn to challenge injustice when they are young, are they likely to become adults who do so? If schools punish students for walking in solidarity for the hungry, the poor, and the sick, what lessons do schools send? I would argue that students, parents, teachers, and communities learn that test scores are more important than basic human rights. Dewey concurs:

---

[317] Howard Zinn, Disobediance and Democracy: Nine Fallacies on Law and Order (New York: Vintage, 1968), 123-124.

> To oscillate between drill exercises that strive to attain efficiency in outward doing without the use of intelligence, and an accumulation of knowledge that is supposed to be an ultimate end in itself, means that education accepts the present social conditions as final, and thereby takes upon itself the responsibility for perpetuating them.[318]

If, according to Bauman, democracy "is an anarchic, disruptive element inside the political system; essentially, a force for dissent and change,"[319] then education for democracy must prepare future citizens to be that force. NCLB, with its strict adherence to the accumulation of corporate sanctioned knowledge does quite the opposite; it prepares children to perpetuate the present social, political, and environmental conditions as final.

Education is More Than Job Training

> Surveys have repeatedly found that most jobs are dull and boring, with no intrinsic meaning. Should schools collude in the preparation of students to endure the boredom of meaningless, small, repetitive, dull, unhealthy tasks?[320]

Nearly a century ago, while John Dewey argued for a more democratic approach to public education, Elwood P. Cubberly forwarded another idea. He believed that American public schools were "in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life."[321]

---

[318] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 137.

[319] Bauman, *The Individualized Society*, 55.

[320] Gerald Bracey, *On the Death of Childhood and the Destruction of Public Schools: The Folly of Today's Education Policies and Practices* (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2003), 40.

[321] Elwood P. Cubberly, *Public School Administration* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), 338. This quote appears in Alfie Kohn's *What Does it Mean to Be Well Educated? And More Essays on Standards, Grading, and Other Follies* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 21. I cannot obtain a copy of Cubberly.

While it is true that a democratic education seeks to fashion children in a specific manner, all education does, the manner is above and beyond workforce preparation. Children are not products for manufacture and dispersal, though one would not realize that looking at U.S. public schools today. Children move along on conveyor belts, as they have for decades, stopping when the bells signify that it is time for the teacher to deposit A, B, and C. Once C has been deposited, and the students' performance assessed, the bells ring again and the process repeats ensuring a standardized product "fashioned to meet the various demands of life." Today, due to growing ASM influence over U.S. schools, those demands serve increasingly economic and ideological ends, as shown in Chapter 3 through the enforcement of math, science, reading, and particular versions of history over courses like history, art, music, debate, philosophy, psychology, etc.

Arguably, the "products" of schools today are students with a narrow understanding of who they are and what futures they might have beyond their future jobs. If schools are to have any progressive effect on democratizing society, Richard Brosio argues that they must further a "democratic-egalitarian initiative," one that would produce

> …critical, well-rounded, citizen-workers who are committed to complex roles beyond work—and who may use their critical skills to analyze capitalist work relations and command of the economy. The democratic-egalitarian imperative seeks to have the public schools help develop a society which is based upon authentic, participatory decision making; moreover, it favors the existence of basic equality of opportunity and of ultimate life experience.[322]

Instead of following the democratic-egalitarian imperative, ASM reformers and leaders have followed a corporatist mentality, one wedded to the maintenance of an

---

[322] Brosio, A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education, 1.

obedient and productive workforce. Educational corporatism indicates a culture, an ideology, and a way of seeing schools and students and their roles in the world. Educational corporatism is elitist, authoritarian, techno-rationalist, homogenizing, profit-driven and final. Relations are hierarchical, and the needs of the state, or dominating ideologies, dictate the process and products of public education. Student voice and various interpretations of "the facts" are not necessary. Moreover, students do not need history or geography; they simply need to be able to complete a given task in a given amount of time. Ultimately, I link educational corporatism to an attack on liberal principles, especially participation and pluralism since schools serving the dictates of corporations do not require student, teacher, or parent participation in agenda setting or governance. According to Linda Darling-Hammond, the result of classrooms and schools "organized for conformity and compliance at the expense of intellectual habits of mind" are classrooms which "undermine the development of skills needed for enlightened and responsible citizenship—the ability to deliberate, to think critically, to develop and express one's voice articulately so as to participate in the shaping of one's society."[323] Arguably, a society which desires citizens who can deliberate, think critically, express themselves articulately, and care enough to participate locally and nationally requires schools, classrooms, and teachers that do more than prepare children for work.

What makes the entire issue more frustrating is that many people appear sympathetic to corporatist language and ideology. Many parents and teachers (and as a result, students) want schools to prepare their children for jobs. Often what is desired, however, is an overly-vocational approach to learning that so narrowly defines,

---

[323] Linda Darling-Hammond, "Education, Equity, and the Right to Learn," 49.

constricts, and restricts what schools do that students really lose out on developing a critical citizen role in favor of an uncritical corporatist view of life. A seriously democratic, critical, socially responsible approach to schooling will yield employees. They will just be smarter and able to question more than what neoliberals and neoconservatives want. One must wonder if individuals who view profit as the bottom line truly want a citizenry which questions advertising claims, profit margins, safety records, environmental impacts, living wages, immigration, and so forth. If they did, it is arguable that U.S. curricula, U.S. standards, U.S. schools, and U.S. communities would look and act much different than the way they do.

In Chapter 3 I argued that a corporatist mentality dominates U.S. public schools, an argument that numerous scholars and theorists support. Scholars such as Deron Boyles, Linda McNiel, Alex Molnar, Kenneth Saltman, Susan Ohanian, and Kathy Emery have done significant work exploring and problematizing business influence over public education today.[324] Alfie Kohn offers a partial synthesis of what the above authors forward, listing a number of examples of how academic corporatism infiltrates public education:

> [It] can happen when businesses succeed in creating "school-to-work" programs by which children are defined as future workers and shaped to the specifications of their employers. It can happen when the whole notion of education as a public good is systematically undermined—an ideological shift that paves the way for privatizing schools. It can happen

---

[324] See Boyles, American Education and Corporations; Linda M. McNeil, Contradictions of Reform: The Educational Costs of Standardized Testing (New York: Routledge, 2000); Alex Molnar, School Commercialism: From Democratic Ideal to Market Commodity (New York: Routledge, 2005); Kenneth Saltman, The Edison Schools: Corporate Schooling And The Assault On Public Education (New York: Routledge, 2005); and Emery and Ohanian, Why is Corporate America Bashing Our Public Schools?

> when a business ethos takes over education, with an emphasis on quantifiable results, on standardized procedures to improve performance, on order and discipline and obedience to authority. Students expect to be controlled with rewards and punishments, to be set against their peers in competitions, to be rated and evaluated by those who have more power than they do. None of this is particularly effective at preparing children to be critical thinkers, lifelong intellectual explorers, active participants in a democratic society—or even, for that matter, good friends or lovers or parents. But the process is exceedingly effective at preparing them for their life as corporate employees.[325]

There are at least three levels of irony to corporate dominance over public education. On one level, despite their undeniable influence over public education, corporatists continue to forward the idea that schools are failing; if so, it would appear to be their fault. On another level, it seems the free market of ideas ends at the schoolhouse door, as the only acceptable ideas for reform of public education are those ideas forwarded by the business community: standardization, surveillance, accountability, and privatization. Finally, if one consults the Bureau of Labor Statistics and examines the job outlook for the next 12 years, the vast majority of jobs are in industries which have nothing to do with math and science and everything to do with serving other human beings in multiple spheres.[326]

John Dewey, nearly a century ago, proposed turning the situation on its head. Rather than "making schools an adjunct to manufacture and commerce," Dewey argued for "utilizing the factors of industry to make school life more active, more full of immediate meaning, [and] more connected with out-of-school experience."[327] The question then, and the question today, is how? Larry Cuban offers one answer: ask the

---

[325] Alfie Kohn, *What Does it Mean to Be Well Educated?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 17-19.

[326] For job forecasts over the next 12 years see the Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment Projections." Accessed 05/16/06 from http://www.bls.gov/emp/home.htm

[327] Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 316.

business leaders currently dominating school reform to conceive of schools as more than factories for workforce production. Cuban asserts:

> If business leaders decided that the best ways for them to improve public schools and increase public trust in schools were to better educate their own employees and to encourage schools to stress civic engagement, practitioners' ownership of reforms, and service to the common good, the entire nation would owe such men and women a deep debt of gratitude.[328]

Giving ownership to educational practitioners may be appealing, but business leaders do not want control of public education in the hands of the people, as that runs the risk of challenging the status quo. As Howard Zinn explains, "in both material goods and in ideas, [oligarchs, business leaders, and neoconservatives] want the market to be dominated by those who have always held power and wealth."[329] In order to maintain their dominance, they must control the institutions that perpetuate domination, as schools under their present governance do. Furthermore, expecting business leaders to stress civic engagement, when the U.S. is plagued by corporate scandal and price gauging at public expense seems a bit naïve. The "service to the common good" called for by Cuban hasn't materialized in the corporations underwriting school reform today.

That might be a reflection of the corporations participating. For example, the Walton Family Foundation is "the single most generous backer of school choice in the United States."[330] Arguably, Walton's ability to level serious educational policy power is made possible through undemocratic practices in other arenas. For example, the Walton

---

[328] Cuban, Education and the Bottom Line, 191.

[329] Howard Zinn with Donaldo Macedo, Howard Zinn on Democratic Education (Boulder: Paradigm, 2005), 120.

[330] See Richard Lee Colvin, "A New Generation of Philanthropists and Their Great Ambitions," in With the Best of Intentions: How Philanthropy is Reshaping K-12 Education, ed. Frederick M. Hess (Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2006), 44.

Family was one of 18 families behind the drive to eliminate the estate tax, a move that promises to remove $71.6 billion from public institutions.[331] The Walton family alone stands to save an estimated 32.7 billion dollars, which is money they can then use to influence educational policy.[332] Additionally, Wal-Mart has been accused of unfair labor practices that cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars a year, creating a large burden for the state.[333] Wal-Mart also makes profits illegally; in 2005 the federal government forced Wal-Mart to pay $11 million dollars to settle allegations that the corporation had been using undocumented workers to clean stores.[334] Also problematic is Wal-Mart's current involvement in the largest sex-discrimination class-action lawsuit ever, involving more than 1.5 million women.[335] Rather than count on the good intentions of corporations such as Wal-Mart, I propose a much more radical solution. Raise the tax rates for businesses to 1986 levels (34% versus the 7.4% rate today) and ask business leaders to lower their benefits.[336]

Education Serves Both Productive and Reproductive Processes

---

[331] See Conor Kenny, Taylor Lincoln, Chuck Collins, and Lee Farris, *Spending Millions to Save Billions: The Campaign of the Super Wealthy to Kill the Estate Tax* (D.C.: Public Citizen and United for a Fair Economy, 2006), 11. Policy analysis available online from http://www.citizen.org/documents/EstateTaxFinal.pdf. Accessed 5/16/06.

[332] Ibid., 13.

[333] See National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, *The Waltons and Wal-Mart: Self-Interested Philanthropy* (D.C.: NCRP Press, 2005), 10. Available for purchase online from http://www.ncrp.org.

[334] Ibid.

[335] Ibid.

[336] For percentages see Joel Friedman, *The Decline of Corporate Income Tax Revenues*, (D.C.: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2003). Accessed 05/12/06 from http://www.cbpp.org/10-16-03tax.htm.

> I propose that how we think about you and me and how we regard one another determines whether democracy is a real possibility or just another in a string of political myths.[337]

Because democracy requires interaction with and concern for others, education must integrate what Jane Roland Martin calls "productive and reproductive" knowledge.[338] Productive knowledge, according to Martin, concerns political, social, cultural, and economic processes, while reproductive knowledge concerns nurturance, connectedness, and care. Roland asserts that the problem with education today is that it serves productive knowledge first, leaving little room for concern with and connection to others. The result of this sort of "liberal education" is that students leave schools lopsided. Roland explains the problem:

> The liberally educated person will be provided with knowledge about others, but will not be taught to care about their welfare or to act kindly toward them. That person will be given some understanding of society, but will not be taught to feel its injustices or even to be concerned over its fate. The liberally educated person will be an ivory tower person—one who can reason but has no desire to solve real problems in the real world—or else a technical person who likes to solve real problems but does not care about the solutions' consequences for real people and for the earth itself.[339]

Martin's solution to the disassociated student is to incorporate what she calls "the traits associated with women as wives and mothers" into K-12 education. Specifically, these

---

[337] Donna Kerr, "Toward a Democratic Rhetoric of Schooling," in *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling*, ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 75.

[338] See Jane Roland Martin, "Becoming Educated: A Journey of Alienation or Integration?," in *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in a Globalizing World*, ed. H. Svi Shapiro and David E. Purpel, 3rd ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005), 197-209.

[339] Ibid., 199. See also Nel Noddings, *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education* 2nd ed. (New York: Teacher's College Press, 2005).

are: "nurturance, care, compassion, connection, sensitivity to others, a willingness to put aside one's own projects, [and] a desire to build and maintain relationships."[340]

While Martin runs the risk of ostracizing some feminists with phrases such as "women as wives," I believe her larger point holds. Western, and Eastern for that matter, societies view care and connectivity as feminine, and U.S. public education, arguably, pays less attention to feminine aspects of humanity. My contention here, supported by the work of such scholars as Jane Roland Martin, Nel Noddings, and Donna Kerr, is that U.S. democracy, and global security, would be better served by a populace that treated care and connectivity with as much respect as reason and individuality. Unfortunately, aligning schools with corporate need serves only to make the feminine (care and concern) less visible, and by default, a caring and concerned public less likely.

In public schools today, due to the reform efforts plaguing them, masculine words such as accountability and performance dominate discourse, marginalizing concepts such as nurturance and growth, both of which are essential to democracy, as democracy requires concern for the other. Moving towards democracy requries changing conversations over school reform to include care and concern for each other. "Developing a vocabulary that affirms non-market values such as love, trust, and compassion," asserts Giroux, "is particularly important for the public schools, whose function, in part, is to teach students about the importance of critical dialogue, debate, and decision making in a participatory democracy."[341] As explained under Tenet 3,

---

[340] Roland Martin, "Becoming Educated: A Journey of Alienation or Integration?," 207.

[341] Henry Giroux, "Kids for Sale: Corporate Culture and the Challenge of Public Schooling," in *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in*

critical literacy, a prerequisite for critical dialogue, is connected with social justice, and social justice is not possible without care and connectivity. If we are not connected to others, if we do not care for others, there is no need to enter dialogue or debate in order to seek justice with others.

This is not a call for eradicating productive knowledge altogether; it is a call for balance. While Noddings argues that care should be "the main goal of education,"[342] I believe that runs the risk of ostracizing parents who want education to help their children "get a good job." Finding work is a valid concern; we have to work to live. If progressives wish to save public education from the ASM, they must garner the support of diverse parents. This requires explaining how care and reproductivity work in conjunction with, rather than replace, reason and productivity. As an example of the problem with education without a reproductive side, progressives might point to any number of corporate or federal scandals. The individuals behind such scandals are extraordinarily intelligent and have very good jobs, but in the case of Enron, for example, their lack of concern for others resulted in tens of thousands of people losing their livelihoods.[343] Math, science, and reading taught without concern for the other promises more of the same: a population, recall from Martin, who have "some understanding of society," but are unable "to feel its injustices or even to be concerned over its fate." Therefore, the care and concern for others called for by scholars such as Martin, Kerr,

---

a Globalizing World, ed. H. Svi Shapiro and David E. Purpel, 3rd ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005), 155.

[342] Noddings, The Challenge to Care in Schools, 173.

[343] For an insightful look at how a few very intelligent individuals did so, see Bethany McLean and Peter Elkind, The Smartest Guys in the Room: The Amazing Rise and Scandalous Fall of Enron (New York: Portfolio Press, 2003).

Noddings, Giroux, and Dewey, requires an education which values the social as much as the individual.

Education Engenders Both Independence and Interdependence.

> A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men [sic] from perceiving the full import of their activity.[344]

Democracy exists when multiple and diverse groups come together for free and intelligent interchange, as different points of view must be shared, respected, critiqued, and then acted upon. Democratic citizens understand that, for better and for worse, regardless of their colors or their creeds or their preferences, they require one another for survival. Solving local, state, national, and global problems requires individuals capable of raising voices, sharing voices, navigating differences, and pressing forward, together. Therefore, while individual voice must be nurtured and respected (see Tenet 3), students must also learn how to share and use their voices with others. It is through sharing, conjoint use of voice, and action that individuals become citizens: competent, responsible, informed, thoughtful, engaged participants in local, state, federal, and global affairs.[345] In order to become citizens, students must have what Dewey calls an education

---

[344] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 87.

[345] For more on the definition of citizen see The Carnegie Corporation and The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, The Civic Mission of Schools (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 2003). Available online at http://downloads.ncss.org/legislative/CivicMissionofSchools.pdf. Last accessed 04/27/06.

that leads to "a personal interest in social relationships."[346] Unfortunately schools today do quite the opposite.

While the standardization of schools under NCLB (discussed in Chapter 3) undermines each of these democratic tenets, it most adversely affects the social aspect of schooling. Schools cannot be places for individuals and groups to come together to express and navigate differences if children, schools, and communities are forced to compete with one another for survival. Due to NCLB, individual students must maintain a myopic focus on their individual test scores, individual teachers must maintain a similar focus upon their individual classrooms, and individual schools have no choice but to focus on testing's bottom line.[347] The problem, as Bruce Boston explains, is that in public schools today, the preoccupation "with reshaping academics and raising academic performance has all but overpowered a task of equally vital importance—educating our young people to become engaged members of the communities as citizens."[348]

Imagining for a moment that the yolk of standardized testing might be thrown off, the issue for progressives is determining what type of education will engender the capacities necessary for citizenship. Drawing on the combined efforts of the American Youth Policy Forum and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, I propose sending children into communities as participatory citizens, a type of education

---

[346] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 99.

[347] For more on standardization and its effects on the social aspects of schooling see Linda M. McNeil, Contradictions of Reform: The Educational Costs of Standardized Tests (New York: Routledge, 2000), Chapter 7.

[348] Bruce O. Boston, et. al, Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools (D.C.: American Youth Policy Forum, 2005), 3.

also known as service learning.[349] As these groups define it, service learning is not the same as community service. Community service requires neither planning nor reflection, nor does it have to be grounded in the curriculum.[350] In fact, in many communities, community service is used as a form of punishment. Rather, these groups call for a service learning that asks students to identify problems in their communities (rather than being told what those problems are) and then asks students to work together to solve those problems. As Benjamin Barber explains the concept, service learning "needs to be experiential as well as cognitive. Serving others is not just a form of do-goodism or feel-goodism; it is a road to social responsibility and citizenship."[351] Members of a democracy are responsible, to varying degrees, for themselves and each other, and learning to be responsible is just as important, if not more so, than memorizing the periodic table of elements. However, service learning does not require abandoning traditional academics; it requires using those disciplines to serve society. Examples of service learning at local and federal levels include:

- A group of students who used their own research to convince their school to use paper rather than Styrofoam products.
- A group of students who integrated science instruction into restoring local wetlands, while at the same time meeting state science standards.
- A program which developed a relationship with a local shelter for victims of domestic abuse.
- A group of students who inquired into national defense policies and personal liberties, creating a plan for teaching other students about civil liberties as well as a database for teachers wishing to discuss civil liberties in their classrooms.[352]

---

[349] Ibid., 19-22.

[350] Ibid., 20.

[351] Barber, "The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling," 30.

[352] Ibid., 20.

Given Tenet 1, which asserts that authority for shaping school goals lies with the people, students might choose service learning projects based on various types of unique, local realities. The displaced victims of Hurricane Katrina, for example, might consider a study over the integrity of local levees, which, according to recent news reports, are not yet ready for the next hurricane season.[353] That same group of students might also consider an investigation into fraud and deception, holding local, state, and federal leaders accountable for how and where tax dollars are spent.

The importance of service learning is the reconnection of students to each other and their communities. Boston makes the danger of an alienated citizenry clear:

> When young people become too disengaged or disinclined to vote, volunteer at school or with neighborhood groups, support civic goals, or give of themselves for the betterment of others, then the community's collective energy is diminished. Historically, people who neglected their civic obligations often found that others had quietly, and with little resistance, concentrated power into fewer hands.[354]

Said differently, a people who neglect their civic obligations cannot maintain their state in "usefulness and integrity." Ignoring the fact that service learning leads to higher grades and a reduction of "risk" behaviors,[355] service learning teaches children that democracy is not a natural occurrence, that it must be maintained through citizen participation. Shortly before World War II, George Counts argued that the greatest threat to democracies came from within democracies themselves; education, he believed, needed to engender a

---

[353] See "Quick Guide and Transcript: Bush Visits Arizona to Push Border Security, Week In Review," *Cnn.com*, 19 May 2006. Accessed online 05/19/06 from http://www.cnn.com/2006/EDUCATION/05/18/transcript.fri/.

[354] Boston, et. al, *Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools*, 10.

[355] Ibid., 22.

watchful and engaged public.[356] Arguably, had America listened to individuals such as Counts and Dewey and reared a citizenry mindful of what its government does, a citizenry which understood the important role it played in monitoring and serving government, then American citizens would never have allowed their government to, arguably, violate the First Amendment, the Fourth Amendment, the Sixth Amendment, the eight amendment, basic human rights, environmental regulations, and various international treaties. The claim is difficult to "prove" given that public schools have never asked children to turn a watchful eye upon their communities or leaders. Given the amount of public outrage over the current administration, now seems like the proper time for progressives to argue, vocally, for schooling which connects children to their communities and their government.

I want to end here with a rather lengthy quote from Donna Kerr, as it speaks to the proceeding tenet, the current discussion, and the next section of this chapter.

> The moral grounds for institutional and other political arrangements of a democracy, for all their historical complexity, can be stated succinctly in both the negative and the positive. The negative rendering is this: one should neither dominate nor be subservient to another, neither use another nor be used by another. Stated in the positive (though not in any sense equivalent) form: persons have a right to relationships of mutuality. The latter is underwritten by the psychological fact that for the self to develop, the soul to flourish, and character to evolve (mostly overlapping, highly interconnected matters), a person needs a social context of psychological democracy—that is, a person needs to stand in at least some relationships of mutual regard. This means that to develop as persons, humans need at least some relationships that are free of domination.[357]

---

[356] See George Counts, The Education of Free Men in American Democracy (D.C.: NEA Press, 1941).

[357] Kerr, "Toward a Democratic Rhetoric of Schooling," 79.

Service learning provides "a social context of psychological democracy." Asking children to enter and participate in their communities—whether that participation be examine water quality in a local stream or evaluating use of tax dollars—teaches children that "we are all in this together" and that by working together, as equals, children can solve problems.

Children Should Not Be Standardized

> A society which rests upon the supremacy of some factor over another irrespective of its rational or proportionate claims, inevitably leads thought astray. It puts a premium on certain things and slurs over others, and creates a mind whose seeming unity is forced and distorted.[358]

If, as Kerr claims, humans need some relationships that are free of domination, then the era of standardized testing must end, as the standardized tests currently dominating public schools today have a long history of use as forms of domination. The forcing and distorting of mind referred to by Dewey is the arguable result of tests developed and honed by scientists who believed that the majority of humankind were inferior beings and therefore not likely to "secrete cogitations of any great social fruitfulness."[359] As several scholars have shown, the logic underpinning today's standardized tests—from the IQ to the SAT to the end of course exams now required by federal law—can be directly linked to efforts to control rather than empower U.S. citizens.[360] For example, Lewis Terman and Robert Yerkes, prominent executives of the

---

[358] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 89.

[359] See Herbert M. Kliebard's discussion of Ross Finney in The Struggle For The American Curriculum: 1893-1958 (New York: Routledge, 1987), 110-112.

[360] See for example Steven A. Gelb, Garland E. Allen, Andrew Futterman, and Barry A. Mehler, "Rewriting Mental Testing History: The View from the American Psychologist," Sage Race Relations Abstracts 11, no. 2 (May 1986): 18-31. The article, a critique of work by Mark Snyderman and Richard J. Hernstein, asserts that "One cannot

American Eugenics Society, used I.Q. scores to promote the idea that intelligence cannot be separated from race.[361] "The promotion of their 'scientific' belief was so pervasive by 1929 that at least thirty states had passed sterilization laws; in California alone, over 6,000 'inferior' people [were] sterilized."[362] Using tests to keep white society pure did not end with Terman and Yerkes. Carl C. Brigham, one of Yerkes' assistants, "firmly believed that intelligence was biological and that mixing the races would diminish society's intelligence. Bingham's preventative contribution was the Scholastic Aptitude Test, a slight modification of the IQ test."[363]

Nicholas Lemann asserts that "true believers in IQ tests thought they should be given to all American children, so that the high scorers could be plucked out and given the best schooling and the average and low scorers consigned to a briefer, more limited

---

examine the relevant historical material without concluding that prominent testers promoted eugenic and racist interests and sought to, and in some degree succeeded in, providing those interests with a mantle of scientific respectability," 29. Available online at www.ferris.edu/isar/archives/mental/htm. Accessed 03/03/06. See also Elaine and Harry Mensh, The IQ Mythology: Class, Race, Gender and Inequality (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991), and Stephen C. Fleury, "The Military and Corporate Roots of State-Regulated Knowledge," in Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3 (Westport: Praeger, 2004).

[361] Fleury, "The Military and Corporate Roots of State-Regulated Knowledge," 110.

[362] Ibid.

[363] Ibid. For an analysis of the SAT's adverse impact on minority and low-income students see James Crouse and Dalte Trusheim, *The Case Against the SAT* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), chapters 5 and 6. In Brigham's defense, he would later reject his earlier beliefs in race-based intelligence and eventually come out against the overuse of tests. See Nicholas Lemann, *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy (*New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux: 1999), Chapter 3.

education."[364] True believers of IQ testing then must celebrate NCLB, as it forces low scoring schools and students to narrow and limit their education, consigning schooling to increasing math, science, and reading scores. Minority students and schools, regardless of the intentions of the testers, are the most affected. For example, Gary Orfield's Harvard Civil Right's Project consistently finds that today's high stakes tests negatively impact children of color.[365] Orfield's team confirms what Linda McNeil argued in 2000. In a now classic study of the effects of standardized tests on Texas public schools, McNeil found that "*over the long term, standardization creates inequities, widening the gap between the quality of education for poor and minority youth and that of more privileged students*."[366] What must be noted here is that the tests do not merely identify the students as inferior, they actually contribute to student inferiority. Alfie Kohn offers an explanation as to why: "The more that poor children fill in worksheets on command (in an effort to raise their test scores), the further they fall behind affluent kids who are more likely to get lessons that help them understand ideas."[367] Further exacerbating the problem is the cost of the worksheets and the test prep materials, which can add up to almost half of a school's budget.[368] As minority students continue to fail tests, they are forced to pay for less

---

[364] Lemann, *The Big Test,* 23.

[365] See for example Gary Orfield and Chungmei Lee, *Why Segregation Matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality* (Cambridge: Harvard Civil Right's Project, 2005). Online at www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/deseg/Why_Segreg_Matters.pdf. Last accessed 5/19/06. For further evidence of the negative impact on minority students see McNeil, *Contradictions of Reform*.

[366] McNeil, *Contradictions of Reform,* 3. Italics in original.

[367] Kohn, *What Does It Mean to Be Educated?*, 59.

[368] See McNeil, *Contradictions of Reform*, 174.

democratic schooling, further undermining their attempts to participate in U.S. democracy.

Importantly, it is not just minorities who suffer under standardization enforced by high stakes testing; all children suffer. McNeil argues that schools which imposed standardized controls, regardless of the color of their students, "reduced the scope and quality of course content, diminished the role of teachers, and distanced students from active learning."[369] The problem with standardization and the tests required to impose it is that the entire process is about specific talents rather than creating democrats, small d. Tests reduce children to a predetermined set of traits; if those traits cannot be detected the children and their schools are deemed in need of improvement, or failing, and subjected to disciplinary reforms until they reveal the traits and abilities desired by the neoliberals and neoconservatives behind NCLB. This process of reformation "slurs over" a number of capacities thus "forcing and distorting" children and, arguably, the society they mature into.

Gerald Bracey identifies a number of traits and capacities tests marginalize. These include

> creativity, critical thinking, resilience, motivation, persistence, curiosity, humor, reliability, enthusiasm, civic-mindedness, self-awareness, self-discipline, empathy, leadership, compassion, sense of beauty, sense of wonder, integrity, courage, cowardice, and resourcefulness.[370]

Arguably, when it comes to the last trait, Bracey is incorrect, as the nationwide cheating scandals indicate an enormous amount of resourcefulness amongst teachers and

---

[369] Ibid., 3.

[370] Bracey, *On the Death of Childhood and the Destruction of Public Schools*, 31.

administrators trying to keep their jobs and their schools.[371] His larger point, however, holds; each of the above traits require dynamic, iterative interaction with others and environments and therefore cannot be measured by standardized tests, as others and environments are diverse and nuanced. One child's sense of beauty and wonder might be similar to another's, but it will never be exactly the same. The only way to make it so, arguably, would be through cloning, which is illegal. The moment these traits are standardized all hope for democracy ends, as democracy requires individuals who offer diverse viewpoints, who are capable of dissent, and capable of offering innovative solutions to multiple problems. A standardized population, by definition, can do none of the above.

I am not arguing for the elimination of assessment, but I am (along with progressives such as Kohn, McNeil, Noddings, and Bracey) arguing for a type of assessment that helps children develop the capacities necessary for democratic participation, which include, recall from the previous tenet: competency, responsibility, thoughtfulness, and every trait listed above by Bracey. To that end, I argue for assessment that helps engender what Linda Nathan refers to as "habits of mind," habits that include invention, connection, refinement, and ownership.[372] Rather than sitting children down 3-10 times a year for standardized exams that measure math, science, and reading, I propose bi-annual interviews which, in addition to assessing a child's abilities

---

[371] For a recent example of resourceful navigation around NCLB see Christine Mahr, "Students' Scores Excluded in Loophole," *The Desert Sun*, 22 April 2006. Accessed 05/18/06 from http://www.thedesertsun.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20060422/NEWS04/604220322/1006.

[372] Linda Nathan, "Habits of Mind," In *Will Standards Save Public Education?*, ed. Deborah Meier (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), 50-56.

in math, science, and reading, help identify each of Nathan's traits. The process would be similar to what graduate students go through when they defend dissertations, only the panel might be made up of community members, family members, and both teachers and administrators.[373] Below are questions Nathan suggests children ask themselves before, during, and after assessment.

- Invention: What is my passion and how do I use it in my work? Do I take risks and push myself? What makes this work special? How do I nourish my creativity? How can I extend or play with what is given to me? What further questions could I pursue?[374]

- Connection: Who is my audience and how do I connect my work to the audience? What am I trying to say? What can I draw from in my own personal experience? What else does this work connect to? How could I interpret or analyze this work? Why does this work matter? When is work "good"? Is this approach the only one possible? What are the implications of this approach? What is the work's purpose or importance?[375]

- Refinement: What tools do I need? Have I demonstrated good craftsmanship? What are my strengths and weaknesses? When is the work finished? What further skills do I need? Have I demonstrated understanding? Have I conveyed my message?[376]

- Ownership: How does this work affect others? What or whom is this work for? How do I find the drive to go on? What do I need to be successful? How do I approach a project and follow through? How do I advocate for my work and the work of others? What am I working for? How do I cope with frustration? How do I know when to ask for help and what is the most effective way to ask? Am I proud to stand behind my work? Am I committed to my work?[377]

---

[373] I am indebted to Nel Noddings for this idea. See Noddings, *The Challenge to Care in Schools*, 179.

[374] Nathan, "Habits of Mind," 51.

[375] Ibid., 51-52.

[376] Ibid.

[377] Ibid.

While students, teachers, and parents must have some say in what they do and in how they assess their doings, if students are to develop into the responsible, connected, engaged, and contributing members of multiple communities, then schooling and assessment should work towards that end. While math, science, and reading are certainly important, favoring these factors while slurring over others arguably reduces children's capacities to participate in multiple communities and in self-governance. Unlike NCLB, which uses mean accountability to force students into thinking about particular things in particular ways, Nathan's habits of mind offer accountability more suitable to nurturing democratic students, as these habits rely on student responsibility and growth rather than on surveillance and performance.

Democracy Requires a Certain Type of Teacher and a Certain Type of Teaching

> Anyone who refuses to assume joint responsibility for the world should not have children and must not be allowed to take part in educating them.[378]

While neoliberals and neoconservatives and the patriarchal, economistic, and capitalistic ideologies they support require, recall from Chapter 3, "teachers to teach the content and skills mandated by the state, regardless of their personal preferences,"[379] education in and for a democracy requires a much different type of teacher. Democracy asks teachers to take the existential situation of each student, each classroom, and each community into account when using their professional judgment to create curricula responsive to developing individuals within diverse communities. The fact that schools

---

[378] Hannah Arendt, "The Crisis in Education," in *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: The Viking Press, 1961), 189.

[379] Frederick M. Hess, "Refining or Retreating? High-Stakes Accountability in the States," in *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West (Washington: Brookings, 2003), 61.

and communities have yet to become democratic as defined in the beginning of this chapter makes such teachers and such teaching problematic, but not, if I understand the work of Deron Boyles correctly, impossible. Boyles suggests that

> …the realities that face teachers [i.e. standardization, surveillance, and accountability] should and can be changed, but that such change will only come about when teachers are the primary, collective agents responsible for educational initiatives—not businesspeople and legislators. The claim is that more teachers must assume roles that are concerned less about acquiescence to oligopoly control, standardization, consumer materialism, training-oriented schooling and nonpropositional knowledge and concerned more with initiating democratic citizenship.[380]

Helping teachers become the "primary, collective agents responsible for educational initiatives" is a political project and will be returned to in the next chapter of this work. Important here is exploring the type of teacher who deserves such agency in the first place. Boyles calls this type of teacher the "critically transitive" teacher, a teacher who makes broad connections between the lives of their students and multiple social issues, between themselves and others, and between theories and practices.[381]

The critically transitive teacher is a teacher who understands "how the cognitive and psychological makeup of each person is a product of history and politics, and thus intimately affected by such oppressive ideologies as capitalism, racism, sexism, and heterosexism."[382] Furthermore, the critically transitive teacher is a teacher who has learned to "recognize youth as an oppressed social category," a teacher who links

---

[380] Boyles, American Corporations and Education, 175.

[381] For a recent articulation of this type of teacher see Deron Boyles, "The Exploiting Business: School-Business Partnerships, Commercialization, and Students as Critically Transitive Citizens," in Schools or Markets? Commercialism, Privatization, and School-Business Partnerships (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005), 220. For a lengthier treatment see Boyles, American Corporations and Education, Chapter 5.

[382] Leistyna, "Facing Oppression," 123.

> …the purpose of schooling, teaching, and pedagogy to analysis and struggles that attempt to rectify those conditions that deprive children of food, clothing, housing, medical care, and education. Educators need to understand the ideological and material conditions that place children at risk both in our schools and in the wider community.[383]

The critically transitive teacher understands student resistance to the educational process, differentiating resistance from pathologies that "deserve" zero-tolerance treatment. Rather than punishing students who resist, critically transitive teachers "reroute" the student's energy "so that it is connected to positive political projects of change."[384]

Finally, in order to become the type of teacher who can connect with, understand, and reroute, critically transitive teachers reject the type of hierarchical dominance called for by the ASM, refusing to acquiesce, in the words of Boyles, "to oligopoly control, standardization, consumer materialism, training-oriented schooling and nonpropositional knowledge." Maxine Greene underscores the importance of this rejection:

> If the teacher agrees to submerge himself into the system, if he [sic] consents to being defined by others' views of what he is supposed to be, he gives up his freedom 'to see, to understand, and to signify' for himself. If he is immersed and impermeable, he can hardly stir others to define themselves as individuals.[385]

While neointellectuals such as Frederick M. Hess argue that teacher preparation, licensing, and accreditation should be "downsized,"[386] such downsizing would arguably reduce the opportunities for future teachers to 1) see, understand, and signify for

---

[383] Giroux, Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life, 212.

[384] Leistyna, "Facing Oppression," 122.

[385] Maxine Greene, Teacher as Stranger: Educational Philosophy for the Modern Age (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973), 270.

[386] See Frederick M. Hess, "The Predictable, But Unpredictably Personal, Politics of Teacher Licensure," Journal of Teacher Education 56, no 3 (May/June 2005), 192.

themselves, and 2) participate in the courses that, arguably, lead to critical transitivity. These include courses traditionally referred to as "foundations" and include multicultural education, critical pedagogy, social and cultural foundations, sociology of education, philosophy of education, history of education, psychological foundations, etc. Ideally, these courses ask students to first inquire into and explore theory and then test that theory in public school classrooms. Bypassing accreditation programs which, at their best, require such classes in an attempt to fashion educators who understand their students and make broad links between their students and the worlds their students inhabit is therefore counterproductive to the development of teachers who are capable of "initiating democratic citizenship."

Teachers who lack any understanding of the unique lives and realities of their children may be able to raise test scores, but they are unlikely to be able to satisfy Tenets 1-8 of this chapter, as satisfying each of these tenets requires time for reading, consideration, practice, engagement, reflection, and re-engagement. Therefore, rather than downsize teacher education and/or reduce teacher education to the memorization of rules and practices, teacher accreditation programs should, according to Nel Noddings, "help [teachers] learn how to inquire, to seek connections between their chosen subject only for its own sake, and to inquire deeply into its place in human life broadly construed."[387] To be sure, teacher education programs have a long way to go before they offer the time and space for such practices, but that is no reason to abandon colleges of education, as Hess and other members of the ASM would have the U.S. do.

---

[387] Noddings, The Challenge to Care in Schools, 178.

Recall from Tenet 7 that citizens are competent, responsible, informed, thoughtful, engaged participants in local, state, federal, and global affairs. In order to nurture such qualities, teachers must first understand who and where their students are. This means listening critically and teaching their students to do the same. Listening critically and teaching to listen critically, what bell hooks calls the "fundamental responsibility of the teacher,"[388] ideally, leads to informed and thoughtful students, students who consider 1) what others are saying, 2) various histories, and 3) possible futures, before acting. In addition to listening critically, teachers must listen, and teach their students to listen, compassionately. As called for under Tenet 6, education must nurture both the "productive" and "reproductive" processes. Arguably, one of the reasons progressivism has failed to make a compelling case for democratic schooling has been its adherence to reason and rationality. Scholars such as Roland-Martin, Noddings, St. Pierre, and Pillow rightfully challenge education based on reason and rationality alone, arguing for teachers and teaching which involves connection, compassion, and care. Another word for all three, one frowned upon by the academy, is love. Indeed, I believe Freire's most important contribution to education is his assertion that "it is impossible to teach without a forged, invented, and well-thought-out capacity to love."[389] Teachers and teaching without love, compassion, care, and connectivity will continue to produce

---

[388] hooks, Teaching to Transgress, 150.

[389] Paulo Freire, Teachers as Cultural Workers (New York: Westview Press, 1998), 3.

students who have "some understanding of society, but will not be taught to feel its injustices or even to be concerned over its fate."[390]

Tenets 1-8 require teachers and teaching responsive to individuals and communities. In order to help develop students who inquire, reflect, and care enough to act towards reshaping themselves and their worlds, critically transitive teachers create two-way links between students and communities, sending children out to investigate and asking adults to come in to discuss.

> This presupposes that teachers familiarize themselves with the culture, economy, and historical traditions that belong to the communities in which they teach. In other words, teachers must assume a pedagogical responsibility for attempting to understand the relationships and forces that influence their students outside the immediate context of the classroom.[391]

A teacher cannot make broad connections, or help students make broad connections, between individuals and realities if the teacher does not understand, to the best of her ability, the diverse and distinct realities facing her students. As Giroux explains, when teachers ignore communities, they deny student history and voice, depriving their students of a "contextual understanding of how the knowledge they acquire in the classroom can be used to influence and transform the public sphere."[392] The critically transitive teacher then, through connecting her classroom with the world, understands each student, the world that student inhabits, and the methods and mechanisms students can use to effect change, as required under Tenet 4, in their lives.

---

[390] Roland Martin, "Becoming Educated: A Journey of Alienation or Integration?," 199.

[391] Giroux, Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life, 199-200.

[392] Ibid., 201.

Based on the tenets I am attempting to outline in this chapter, the type of pedagogy most favorable to nurturing teacher and student criticality, connection, growth, and action is, arguably, constructivism, "a theory of learning that describes the central role that learners' ever transforming mental schemes play in their cognitive [and emotional] growth…."[393] Constructivism requires teachers to take the present situation of students into account, connecting lessons to students based on the transformations taking place in their heads, homes, and hearts. Importantly, constructivism seeks to help children discover and hone their unique attributes and skills, what Emerson referred to as the child's "end" or "own." Constructivists believe "the search for understanding motivates students to learn. When students want to know more about an idea, a topic, or an entire discipline, they put more cognitive energy into classroom investigations and discussion and study more on their own."[394] Helping children reach diverse and unique emotional and cognitive ends should prevent a homogenizing democracy and ensure the diversity, difference, and nuance that Barber, Darling-Hammond, and Kerr link to the strength of our nation.

According to Brooks and Brooks, constructivist teachers help develop inquisitive, engaged, reflective, and compassionate students through four basic practices.[395]

- First, constructivist teachers seek and value students' points of view. Knowing what students think about concepts helps teachers formulate classroom lessons and differentiate instruction on the basis of students' needs and interests. (This satisfies Tenets 1, 3, and 8.)

---

[393] Martin G. Brooks and Jacqueline Grennon Brooks, "The Courage to Be Constructivist," in Educational Foundations: An Anthology of Critical Readings, ed. Alan S. Canestrari and Bruce A. Marlow (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2004), 184.

[394] Ibid., 188.

[395] Ibid.

- Second, constructivist teachers structure lessons to challenge students' suppositions. (This satisfies Tenets 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8.)

- Third, constructivist teachers recognize that students must attach relevance to the curriculum. As students see relevance in their daily activities, their interest in learning grows. (This satisfies Tenets 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8.)

- Fourth, constructivist teachers structure lessons around big ideas, not small bits of information. Exposing students to wholes first helps them determine the relevant parts as they refine their understandings of the wholes. (This satisfies Tenets 2, 4, and 7.)

- Finally, constructivist teachers assess student learning in the context of daily classroom investigations, not as separate events. Students demonstrate their knowledge every day in a variety of ways. (This satisfies Tenets 5, 7, and 8.)

Democratic Education Requires a Certain Type of Space.

> Any education given by a group tends to socialize its members, but the quality and value of the socialization depends upon the habits and aims of the group.[396]
>
> Who, then, shall conduct education so that humanity may improve?[397]

I have attempted to piece together a progressive metanarrative concerning public education's role in shaping individuals who care enough to participate in humanity's improvement.[398] Tenets 1-9 posit ways of caring, thinking, speaking, interacting, and acting, that, arguably, engender a type of citizenry which helps improve humanity in their selves, families, homes, and communities in what Dewey calls "integrity and usefulness." Tenet 10 argues that the practices and engagements discussed in this chapter require a

---

[396] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 83.

[397] Ibid., 95.

[398] I am neither interested nor willing to abandon the idea of humanistic progress, as suggested by the author of AESA's recent call for proposals. Abandoning such a project only aides neoconservative and neoliberal reformers. I will briefly address postmodern and poststructural critiques of humanism in the following chapter.

space free from ASM interference and governance. Progressives have traditionally called such spaces "public schools."

Gary Fenstermacher argues "that *all* schools, no matter how financed or how governed, are public schools in the sense that they bear a responsibility for the creation of a public within American society."[399] While Fenstermacher's larger point holds—every child leaving a U.S. public, private, or religious school enters American society—the type of child entering society, and therefore the raising and the governing of that child, are of fundamental importance, as particular forms of upbringing and governance socialize (or, Americanize[400]) individuals in particular ways. "Socialization," recall from Dewey, "depends upon the habits and aims of the group."[401] Democratic schools, I have attempted to argue, would raise, govern, socialize, and Americanize through the tenets outlined within this chapter. The ASM, as argued in Chapters 2 and 3, seeks a type of education which raises, governs, socializes, and Americanizes in ways that are antithetical to democratic growth: standardization, regulation, mean accountability, and privatization violate Tenets 1-9. As more schools restructure according to ASM need, spaces for democratic socialization disappear, replaced by private, for profit, and religious schools,

---

[399] Gary D. Fenstermacher, "On Restoring Public and Private Life," in The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling, ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 69.

[400] This is the term favored by E.D. Hirsh and a term more in line with neoconservative educational reform, as neoconservatives, recall from chapter 1, favor a particular American history and worldview, one which they would like everyone to share. For more on this point see Kristen L. Buras, "Tracing the Core Knowledge Movement: History Lessons from Above and Below," in The Subaltern Speak: Curriculum, Power, and Educational Struggles, ed. Michael W. Apple and Kristen L. Buras (New York: Routledge, 2006): 43-74.

[401] Dewey, Democracy and Education, 83.

schools that socialize according to the aims of each specific group rather than towards democracy as explored in this chapter. I conclude this chapter then, with a vision of an educational landscape where power continues to shift from public to ASM control.

Teachers, in an educational landscape dominated by private interests, will lose the protection of the Constitution, as corporate and religious schools do not have to abide by, for example, the First Amendment.[402] Stories about teachers being fired for not flying a flag, stories about teachers being fired for discussing war protests, and stories about children being expelled from school because of discussing their parents' sexual preference, will arguably rise.[403] Given that Microsoft invests so heavily in public education reform,[404] the corporation's recent "habits and aims" with China does not support serious Microsoft investment in democratic schooling. The BBC recently reported that Chinese blogs on the Microsoft network which use words "such as 'freedom,' 'democracy,' and 'demonstration' are being blocked."[405] Wal-Mart, in

---

[402] I recognize teachers do not have complete freedom to do and say whatever they wish. Arguably they will have less freedom under corporate or religious governance.

[403] See, for example, Mathew Rothschild, "Catholic High School Teacher Forced Out Over Flag," *The Progressive*, 18 October 2005. Accessed 5/18/06 from www.commondreams.org/views05/1018-29.htm. See also Jennifer Van Bergen, "Teacher and War Mom Fired for Discussing Protest Crusades for Vets," *Raw Story*, 31 August 2005. Accessed 5/18/06 from http://www.rawstory.com/news/2005/Teacher_and_war_mom_fired_for_discussing_protest_crusades_f_0831.html. See also "Christian School Expels Girl for Having Gay Parents,"*ABCnews.com*, 23 September 2005. Available 5/18/06 from http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=1151655.

[404] The Gates Foundation is second to the Walton Family Fund in charter school funding. See Colvin, "A New Generation of Philanthropists and Their Great Ambitions," 44.

[405] See "Microsoft Censors Chinese Blogs," *BBC Online*, 14 June 2005. Accessed 5/18/06 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/technology/4088702.stm

addition to problems noted earlier, also poses freedom of speech problems, as the chain allows certain books, such as the hyper-religious *Left Behind* series to be sold globally, while restricting the sale of books such as John Stewart's *America*. While public schools must allow for freedom of speech by student and teacher, privatized schools are under no such obligation to do so.

Students, in addition to losing highly qualified teachers, will lose innovation, diversity, and nuance as classrooms become increasingly scripted. Diane Ravitch, of the Brookings Institution, the Hoover Institution, and the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, and New York University, believes "Americans must recognize that we need national standards, national tests and a national curriculum."[406] She is not alone in her thinking, and the for-profit Edison schools have already embraced the idea, seeking to have classroom lessons scripted to the point where every Edison student in the nation learns the same thing at the same time.[407] As teachers nationwide regulate themselves according to corporate or national curricula, "teachable moments" will become a thing of the past, given that students and teachers will not have the freedom to stop and reflect on their unique lives.

Privatizing public education isn't only about controlling minds and bodies; it is also about governing people. Recall from Chapter 2 that Powell and Simon wanted to keep power in the hands of corporations so that policy decisions would be made accordingly. Turning public education over to corporate governance answers Powell and Simon's calls by removing power and resources from individuals and communities while

---

[406] Diane Ravitch, "Every State Left Behind," *The New York Times*, 7 November 2005, sec. A, p. 23.

[407] See Saltman, *The Edison Schools*.

empowering and enriching corporations, part of a "long-term right-wing effort to further marginalize the poor and extend the privilege of the well to do."[408] Using the work of Si Kahn and Elizabeth Minnich as an outline, I offer three examples for how NCLB (standardization into privatization) empowers corporate oligarchs while disempowering people.[409] 1) NCLB gives outright control of once democratic institutions—public schools—to corporations and their elite governors. Chris Whittle serves as one example of an elite governor as his corporation now controls hundreds of schools across the country.[410] 2) NCLB disempowers people by creating an increased dependency on corporations for providing services once provided by the State. NCLB does this in two ways. The first is by requiring sanctioned schools to outsource their tutoring, paying 20% of their Title I funds to SES providers. NCLB also forces communities to increase their dependency on corporations through forced reconstitution of schools, a process which allows corporations like Edison or Walmart to take control over or sponsor new schools. This entire process forces communities to support corporations by guaranteeing customers. 3) As NCLB forces schools to accept corporate governance via tutoring or outright corporate control, money moves from the state, further crippling local infrastructure, and into corporate bank accounts. Keeping public education free of AMS influence then, not only permits democratic schooling, it protects democracy by keeping corporations from amassing more power and influence.

---

[408] Joe L. Kincheloe, "What you Don't Know *Is* Hurting You and the Country," in *What You Don't Know About Schools*, ed. Shirley R. Steinburg and Joe L. Kincheloe (New York: Palgrave, 2006), 8. See also Chapter 1 of this work.

[409] See Si Kahn and Elizabeth Minnich, *The Fox in the Henhouse: How Privatization Threatens Democracy* (San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler, 2005), chapter 20.

[410] For more on Whittle see Saltman's *The Edison Schools*.

In an attempt to show, contra Giroux and the AESA, that progressives have plenty of theory, articulations, and counter narratives, I have explored and outlined 10 tenets of a democratic education. These tenets synthesize multiple progressive narratives defining/redefining public schools as sites that offer protected spaces for exploring, identifying, acting, interacting, reflecting, and growing. If public schools offered such spaces, then the answer to the question "are public schools worth saving" is yes. Public education *is* worth saving (perhaps constructing is the better word to use here) if public education is understood to 1) engender a democratic citizenry, and 2) keep power and money within communities and away from ASM interests. Chapters 2 and 3 argue that public education needs saving. Chapter 4 attempts to explain why. Chapter 5 attempts to answer the question: "by whom?"

CHAPTER 5

IF PUBLIC SCHOOLS NEED SAVING, WHO WILL DO SO?

> The mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer consist in eloquence, which is an exterior and momentary mover of feelings and passions, but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organizer, "permanent persuader," and not just a simple orator….[411]

> Indeed it happens that many intellectuals think that they *are* the State, a belief which, given the magnitude of the category, occasionally has important consequences and leads to unpleasant complications for the fundamental economic group which *really* is the State.[412]

In Chapter 2, I argued that reforming public education according to neoliberal and neoconservative need has been a longstanding part of a larger political project. I showed that both groups use neointellectuals, public and private connections, and public broadcast mechanisms to forward ASM policy. In Chapter 3, I argued that the Bradley Foundation, one member of the ASM, uses various public and private avenues and mechanisms to realize and enforce corporate educational agendas, specifically privatization and NCLB. Imagining school free from ASM interference, Chapter 4 explored the already-formulated progressive counter-narratives to enforcement, regulation, and corporate sanctioned choice.

---

[411] Antonio Gramsci discussing "new" intellectualism. See Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, trans. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 10.

[412] Ibid., 16.

In this chapter, I explore the concept of the public intellectual, arguing for participation from progressive scholars acting as public and political agents, as part of a larger political project intent on making progressive educational reform a viable alternative to ASM restructuring. After examining and critiquing the various concepts constituting the term public intellectual, I problematize university culture and academic conditions, conditions which arguably limit progressive scholars from taking on public and political roles. If public education is to be saved from ASM reformation and utilizes a s site for democratic creation and maintenance, I claim that progressive intellectuals will have to engage with publics and privates in order to end ASM school entrenchment while at the same time clearly and publicly articulating progressive options for democratic school renewal.

The Public Intellectual

Raja Halwani reduces the public intellectual to anyone who devotes time to address the public on issues of both public and personal concern.[413] At this most basic level, the public intellectual takes her/his thinking and delivers it to the public. Should the reader of this dissertation decide to walk outside and begin reading aloud, she/he would, according to Halwani, occupy the position of public intellectual. Halwani offers a very basic definition, but it holds for tracing the history of the term. While scholars contest both the meaning and history of the public intellectual, several assert that the term intellectual and then public intellectual, arose from the "Dreyfus affair." Dreyfus, a member of the French armed forces found guilty of treason and exiled was, according to

[413] See Raja Halwani, "Introduction to the Philosopher as Public Intellectual," *Metaphilosophy* 33, no. 5 (October 2002): 495.

the "learned men" who spoke out in his defense, falsely accused and deported, perhaps because he was Jewish.[414] Pierre Bourdieu argues that the Dreyfus affair is seminal in the genesis of the public intellectual because when the various learned men spoke out publicly in support of Dreyfus, they "affirmed their antivalues in ordinary social life, ethics—notably in sexual matters—and politics."[415] Said differently, they were willing to publicly level their intellect in opposition to political, social, and cultural norms, incidents, and happenings, rather than remain aloof and removed observers. This willingness to engage, asserts Bourdieu, unnerved the "defenders of the social order."[416]

The incident that brought life to the term public intellectual also led to the term "intellectual" being used as a pejorative. Those in support of Dreyfus published their protest under the title "Manifesto of the Intellectuels,"[417]and the opposition appropriated the term "intellectual" as part of an attempt to "isolate, discredit, and separate" the

---

[414] After public protest on the part of a number of "learned men," Dreyfus was acquitted and allowed to return. For more on the incident see Jules Chametzky, "Public Intellectuals—Now and Then," *Melus*, (Fall-Winter 2004). Last accessed 6/12/06 from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2278/is_3-4_29/ai_n9507929. See also Daniel C. Brouwer and Catherine R. Squires, "Public Intellectuals, Public Life, and the University," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 39, (Winter 2003): 201-213, and see John Patrick Diggins, "The Changing Role of the Public Intellectual in American History," in *The Public Intellectuals: Between Philosophy and Politics*, ed. Arthur M. Melzer, Jerry Weinberger, and M. Richard Zinman (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003).

[415] Pierre Bourdieu, "The Corporatism of the Universal: The Role of the Intellectuals in the Modern World," *Telos*, no. 81 (Fall 1989): 101.

[416] Ibid.

[417] Seymour Martin Lipset and Asoke Basu, "The Roles of the Intellectual and Political Roles," in *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals: Theory, Method and Case Study*, ed. Aleksander Gella (Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications Inc., 1976), 112.

intellectuals from the people.[418] This is not unlike today, notes Alcoff, where the use of the term liberal often connotes a bleeding heart, intellectual aloofness from reality.[419] Individuals such as David Horrowitz continue to forward the meme, appearing nationally to attack various colleges or professors.[420]

The public intellectual existed long before Dreyfus, both in the world writ large and on American soil. Both Socrates and Plato qualify as public intellectuals: Socrates for traveling the city publicly interrogating and Plato for recording and interpreting Socrates' work. Bourdieu traces the term to the mid 18th century, arguing that philosophers who participated in the French Revolution deserve the title.[421] Richard Hofstadter, among others, argues that it was a group of intellectuals who argued the United States into existence in both private and public venues.[422] Ralph Waldo Emerson, traveling the countryside lecturing on a variety of topics, is another example, moving from meeting-house to meeting-house speaking his truth "boldly."[423] More contemporary examples

---

[418] Linda Martin Alcoff, "Does the Public Intellectual Have Intellectual Integrity?," *Metaphilosophy* 33, no. 5 (October 2002): 523.

[419] Ibid.

[420] See David Horowitz, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America* (D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc, 2006).

[421] Bourdieu, "The Corporatism of the Universal," 100.

[422] See Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-intellectualism In American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 145. See also Gordon S. Wood, "Founding Fathers and Creation of Public Opinion," and John Patrick Diggins, "The Changing Role of the Public Intellectual in American History." Both essays appear in Melzer, Weinberger, and Zinman, *The Public Intellectuals*.

[423] For more on Emerson as an organic intellectual see Cornel West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

include individuals such as Cornell West, Richard Rorty, and the late Edward Said, though leveling the title public intellectual is contingent upon how one refines the term, as the simple definition offered by Halwani, only holds for so long.

Nicholas Garnham argues that when defining an intellectual,

> …it is best to start from the Gramscian position that all human beings are intellectuals in the sense that they are not creatures of pure instinct but constantly apply their innate powers of rational analysis and imagination to those everyday interactions with their material environment and the fellow humans that constitute their identity and project.[424]

Garnham's egalitarian definition does not convey Gramsci's position in its entirety, as Gramsci asserts "all men are intellectuals…but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals."[425] While most individuals can and do think, how many apply their thinking in order to influence or to change society? Intellectuals, especially intellectuals who seek to influence the public, function in very specific ways toward very specific ends. While all public intellectuals use publicly accessible media and venues to shape public opinion, the different motives behind intellectuals, as well as the various ways intellectuals operate, makes grouping all of them under the term "public" problematic.

Before continuing inquiry into the public intellectual, I want to make a simple argument for what a public intellectual is not: a scholar. While it takes intellect to be a scholar, few scholars are public intellectuals, as the term delineates a specific, public, and accessible *modus operandi*. "Crucial to earning the status of public intellectual is the ability to find or cultivate a broad audience," explain Brouwer and Squires, who continue: "Public intellectuals are only truly public if they can speak about issues in a

---

[424] Nicholas Garnham, "The Media and Narratives of the Intellectual," *Media, Culture, and Society* 17 (1995): 361.

[425] Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, 9.

way the resonates with an imagined lay public."[426] As I will argue at the end of this chapter, university culture and academic pressure inhibit the cultivation of broad audiences. Furthermore, most scholars cannot "speak about issues in a way that resonates" with publics, which further exacerbates the myth of the ivory tower and adds support for the pejorative use of intellectual. While the failure of scholars to engage might be a result of personal idiosyncrasies or a language embellished with jargon acquired over decades of study, scholarly removal from publics does have benefits. Scholars, for example, remove themselves from public in pursuit of inquiry, which, for those with access to their work, offers theoretical analysis of topics such as the public intellectual.

Over the past two decades a number of scholars have analyzed the form and function of the intellectual, attaching a number of adjectives to the term; these include but are not limited to: organic, traditional, rural, urban, functional, critical, specific, universal, engaged, transformative, media, professional, amateur, oppositional, negative, celebrity, information, democratic, neo-, and progressive.[427] While each acts in public,

---

[426] Brouwer and Squires, "Public Intellectuals, Public Life, and the University," 204.

[427] See, for example, Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*; Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings* 1972-1977, ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper (New York: Pantheon, 1980); Edward Said, "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community," *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 1 (1982); Cornel West, *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); Mary S. Strine, "Critical Theory and 'Organic' Intellectuals: Reframing the Work of Cultural Critique," *Communication Monographs* 58, (June 1991); Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual* (New York: Pantheon, 1994); John Michael, *Anxious Intellectuals* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000); Alcoff, "Does the Public Intellectual Have Intellectual Integrity?"; and Christopher I. Clement, "Organic Intellectuals and the Discourse on Democracy: Academia, Foreign

and is therefore public with their ideas, each acts publicly forwarding various ideas in unique ways. Their funding, histories, methods, connections, and messages, result in specific functions.[428] Furthermore, all intellectuals who speak publicly are public intellectuals, but the amplitude and the influence of a public intellectual's ideas depend on a number of factors, such as class, race, education, money, support, geotemporal location, political climate, personal connections, and experience.

Recall from Chapter 2 that I chose the term neointellectual to refer to the individuals building consensus for ASM policy. To better understand the neointellectuals of the ASM, and to begin to understand the need for progressive scholars advocating publicly and privately for an end to ASM school dominance, I turn to Antonio Gramsci, as his treatment of the organic and traditional intellectual are instructive for individuals wishing to participate in the political project of democratizing education. Gramsci's *Selections for the Prison Notebooks* begins with the question, "Are intellectuals an autonomous and independent social group or does every social group have its own particular specialized category?"[429] Linking intellectuals as a social category to class, Gramsci rejects the idea that intellectuals constitute an "independent social group,"

Policy Makers, and Third World Intervention," *New Political Science* 25, no. 3 (September 2003).

[428] See Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, 1-25. On page 8 he argues that "The most widespread error of method seems to me that of having looked for this criterion of distinction in the intrinsic nature of intellectual activities, rather than in the ensemble of the system of relations in which these activities (and therefore the intellectual groups who personify them) have their place within the general complex of social relations."

[429] Ibid., 5.

arguing instead that intellectuals fall into what he calls two main "forms," the traditional and organic.

The traditional intellectuals, explains Gramsci, are those "categories of intellectuals already in existence and which seemed indeed to represent an historical continuity uninterrupted even by the most complicated and radical changes in political and social form."[430] Traditional intellectuals, which Gramsci explains as constituting most rural intellectuals, include priests, lawyers, doctors, scientists, and teachers.[431] These intellectuals exist "uninterrupted" by "radical changes in political and social forms" as, regardless of which ideology ascends to power, doctors, scientists, and teachers will continue to exist.[432] The traditional intellectual "brings into contact the peasant masses with the local and state administration,"[433] which furthers ruling class hegemony, as the traditional intellectuals convince multiple publics to follow the party. When a new ideology or "social form" ascends to power, traditional intellectuals must be assimilated or replaced, as traditional intellectuals from the previous ruling party may not support the new power.[434] Gramsci explains that the process of converting traditional intellectuals from one ideology to another can be made more "efficacious" when the ascending group creates organic intellectuals:

---

[430] Ibid., 7.

[431] Ibid., 14.

[432] However, dominant discourses limit the amount of freedom and autonomy these individuals enjoy.

[433] Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, 14.

[434] Arguably, this helps to explain why tyrants, such as one time receiver of U.S. aid Pol Pot, kill or "rehabilitate" segments of their population upon gaining power.

> One of the most important characteristics of any group that is developing towards dominance is its struggle to assimilate and to conquer "ideologically" the traditional intellectuals, but this assimilation and conquest is made quicker and more efficacious the more the group in question succeeds in simultaneously elaboration its own organic intellectuals.[435]

The organic intellectual is problematic on a number of levels, resulting in some confusion by scholars using the word. For example, when people today hear the term organic, they automatically associate it with being good for people or the environment or both. While organic is generally associated with biodiesal fuel, hormone-free meat, or carrots grown without chemicals, organic does not always mean "good for human consumption." Therefore, when scholars such as Regina Andrea Bernard romanticize the do-gooding organic intellectual "drinking a half-caf, venti, caramel latte with extra foam in a Starbuck's Coffee Bar," dispersing sacred knowledge or fashionable trends, they sell half-truths, as organic intellectuals are not necessarily "good for" all people.[436] Organic intellectuals may represent people and people power, but they may also function to serve the interests of ascendant or dominant ideologies.

Christopher Clement argues that "a mode of thought becomes dominant in society when it expresses the particular experiences and practical dilemmas of the dominant class or group."[437] In education, the dominant mode of thought seems to be that schools are failing and can only be saved through regimentation and privatization. As I attempted to

---

[435] Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, 10.

[436] For Regina Andrea Barnard's treatment of the organic intellectual see "Live From Hell's Kitchen, NYC," in *What You Don't Know About Schools*, ed. Shirley R. Steinberg and Joe L. Kincheloe (New York: Palgrave, 2006), 263.

[437] Clement, "Organic Intellectuals and the Discourse on Democracy: Academia, Foreign Policy Makers, and Third World Intervention," 351.

show in Chapters 2-4, this mode of thought reflects ASM interests. Gramsci's organic intellectuals, Clement argues, function to sell and maintain ideas for the dominant group by providing "the means by which the dominant class advances its particular experiences and interests as a general and objective conception of all society…."[438] Importantly, the "process of 'masking' dominant interests positions intellectuals as permanent fixtures who continuously develop and reinforce a network of supportive ideas under the guise of 'true philosophy.'"[439] In educational policy today, ASM sponsored neointellectuals such as Frederick M. Hess, Krista Kaffer, and Armstrong Williams, individuals who developed within specific organizations for the explicit purpose of "advancing particular [i.e. neoconservative and neoliberal] experiences and interests," are by Clement's definition organic intellectuals, as they "mask" dominant interests while at the same time attempting to convince multiple publics that NCLB and privatization are good for them.

Gramsci explains that the political party "is responsible for welding together the organic intellectuals of a given group—the dominant one—and the traditional intellectuals."[440] Welded together by the party, traditional and organic intellectuals operate as "the dominant group's 'deputies' exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government."[441] The "subaltern functions" are twofold. The first involves generating "spontaneous" consent by the population "to the general direction

---

[438] Ibid.

[439] Ibid.

[440] Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, 15.

[441] Ibid., 12.

imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group."[442] This consent, explains Gramsci, "is 'historically' caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production."[443] Recall Chapter 3's discussion of Gene Hickok and Armstrong Williams, both organic intellectuals tasked with generating consent for NCLB. Hickok used a grant from the Department of Education for a media campaign designed "to change the conversation about parental choice by positively influencing individuals who are resisting parental choice options and getting them to reconsider their outlook."[444] Armstrong Williams functions in a similar manner, building consent (for 250,000) for African-American support of NCLB via his position and prestige as a nationally syndicated African-American radio show host.

The second "subaltern function" of intellectuals as defined by Gramsci involves using "the apparatus of state coercive power which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent' either actively or passively."[445] As I attempted to show in Chapters 2 and 3, the ASM uses organic intellectuals such as Frederick Hess, Krista Kaffer, Terry Moe, and Chester Finn to generate political support for legislation which forces schools, teachers, students, and parents to consent to standards driven privatization

---

[442] Ibid.

[443] Ibid.

[444] See *The Black Commentator*, "Bush Funds Black Voucher Front Group: Your Tax Dollars Pay for Propaganda Blitz." Available online at http://www.educationforthepeople.org/bush%20funds%20black%20vouchers.htm. Last accessed 6/06/06.

[445] Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, 12.

initiatives.[446] NCLB, federal legislation, effectively accomplishes Simon and Powell's longstanding goals by 1) regulating knowledge and meaning according to business interests and 2) transforming public education into private spaces where production and knowledge can be similarly controlled.

While Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual is useful for understanding the ASM's neointellectuals, Gramsci's concept of the urban intellectual proves instructive for understanding teachers and teaching in an educational landscape shaped exclusively by ASM expectations. "Intellectuals of the urban type have grown up along with industry and are linked to its fortunes," explains Gramsci, who continues: "their job is to articulate the relationship between the entrepreneur and the instrumental mass and to carry out the immediate execution of the production plan decided by the industrial general staff, controlling the elementary stages of work."[447] Recall from Chapter 3 the role of the teacher as explained by neointellectual Frederick Hess; teachers are "to teach the content and skills mandated by the state, regardless of their personal preferences."[448] Understood through Gramsci, teachers shape the "instrumental mass" according to ASM need, thus preparing them 1) for life in a neoconservative and neoliberal state as "decided by the industrial general staff" which today consists of neoconservative and neoliberal elite comptrollers.

---

[446] For more on the role of organic/neointellectuals and the implementation of NCLB, see Philip Kovacs and Deron Boyles, "Institutes, Foundations, and Think Tanks: Conservative Influences on U.S. Public Schools," *Public Resistance* 1, no. 1 (May 2005). http://www.publicresistance.org/journals/1.1archived.htm. Last accessed 6/06/06.

[447] Gramsci, Selections From the Prison Notebooks, 14.

[448] Frederick M. Hess, "Refining or Retreating? High-Stakes Accountability in the States," in No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West (Washington: Brookings, 2003), 61.

Douglass Kellner calls Gramsci's traditional, organic, and rural intellectuals "functional" intellectuals. These are

> …functionaries of parties or interest groups, or mere technicians who devise more efficient means to obtain certain ends, or who apply their skills to increase technical knowledge in various specialized domains (medicine, physics, history, etc.) without questioning the ends, goals, or values that they are serving, or the social utility or disutility of their activities.[449]

In Chapter 2, I renamed this type of intellectual the "neointellectual," as neointellectuals turn the meaning of public intellectual, as explored in this chapter, on its head, operating as organic representatives of specific interests to maintain hegemony rather than to liberate individuals from oppressive conditions. In order to maintain corporate governance, both Powell and Simon believed that "men of theory" had to be used to shape public opinion. "The goal was not simply to enfeeble the political and intellectual Left, it was to create a new conservative national consensus in favor of capital and the powers that be."[450] Gramsci's rural, traditional, and organic intellectual; Kellner's functional intellectual; and my offering of the neointellectual share the same function; they are consensus builders, working to persuade people, communities, and governments that what the ruling party does is ultimately good for them.

Because of their allegiance to power, scholars such as John Michael argue that the word intellectual should not be used when describing neoconservative and neoliberal activists. Michael, for example, argues that "Dinesh D'Sousa, William Bennett, Lynne

---

[449] See Douglas Kellner, "Intellectuals, the New Public Spheres, and Techno-Politics," available online at http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner. Accessed 12/30/05.

[450] Harvey J. Kaye, "Beyond the Last Intellectuals," in Education and Cultural Studies: Toward a Performative Practice, ed. Henry A. Giroux and Patrick Shannon (New York: Routledge, 1992), 26.

Cheney, and others who have sensationalized and distorted the situation of cultural intellectuals in the academy today may not accurately be described as intellectuals at all" because "they seek not to speak truth to power but rather to promulgate falsehoods on power's behalf."[451] I disagree with Michael, as individuals such as Bennett, a former talk show host and now a commentator for CNN, function to legitimate, intellectually, publicly, and politicaly, neoconservative and neoliberal discourses and agendas. Bennett is an intellectual; he is just not acting in a manner suitable to Michael. That is, he has a specific function as an intellectual, to give credibility to neoliberal and neoconservative projects, which he does via radio and television.[452]

Who Will Counter the Neointellectual?

Gramsci's organic intellectual, while problematic, does offer insight into countering neoconservative and neoliberal educational reform efforts. Therefore, I will briefly discuss the emancipatory potential of the organic intellectual before abandoning the misleading term. Mary S. Strine argues that organic intellectuals, "because of the kind of understanding gained through their personal subjection to the simultaneously oppressive yet enabling effects of ruling class power," are "in a unique position to intervene in hegemonic conceptions of the world."[453] She believes that by

> …closely aligning their theoretical work with their identified social group's internal struggles for self-empowerment and local sovereignty,

---

[451] John Michael, Anxious Intellectuals (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), 170.

[452] Indeed, William Bennett was recently attacking homosexuality on John Stewart's The Daily Show, 6/06/06. Video accessed 6/16/06 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ru1M8VdpnAY.

[453] Strine, "Critical Theory and 'Organic' Intellectuals: Reframing the Work of Cultural Critique," 195.

> organic intellectuals can ideally generate counter-theories of social and cultural processes, explanations that are at once historically grounded, contextually nuanced, and politically emancipating.[454]

According to Strine, Edward Said's "oppositional critic" qualifies for the role. The oppositional critic "advocates a theoretical stance comparable to that of Gramsci's organic intellectual, one that arises out of particular struggles with the local workings of affiliative power, yet is cognitively independent, oppositional, and interventionist."[455] The oppositional critic, understood through Strine, arises organically out of particular or local struggles applying theory to geotemporal reality as part of a larger emancipatory political project.

Strine's treatment of Said is important here, as she argues that the oppositional critic must situate himself as an "interventionist," one who understands texts to be worldly and therefore capable of being challenged and reconstructed.[456] As part of a larger political project to counter the ASM, oppositional critics would act to challenge taken for granted assumptions forwarded by neointellectuals. Such actions might be as involved and as complex as speaking before legislative bodies at the local, state, and federal level or as simple as challenging neointellectual editorials in national or regional newspapers. Progressive educational scholars, at the present moment, are excluded from such roles, as they have academic duties to attend to before public and political engagement. Whether or not they desire it, their removal from communities and policy leads to a noninterference that ultimately serves those willing to interfere. Said calls for

---

[454] Ibid.

[455] Ibid., 198-99.

[456] Ibid., 198.

something entirely different: "Instead of noninterference and specialization, there must be interference, a crossing of borders and obstacles, a determined attempt to generalize exactly at those points where generalizations seem impossible to make."[457]

While Strine refers to Said as an "engaged intellectual pare excellence,"[458] the phrase engaged intellectual implies there are intellectuals who are not engaged, which is impossible given that intellectualizing requires engagement with something: ideas, people, or the past for example. Therefore, given his call for "a determined attempt to generalize," Said might be better named a critical intellectual, as outlined by Douglas Kellner. Kellner explains that "critical intellectuals were traditionally those who utilized their skills of speaking and writing to denounce injustices and abuses of power, and to fight for truth, justice, progress, and other universal values."[459] Importantly, "a critical intellectual's task was to bear witness, to analyze, to expose, and to criticize a wide range of social events."[460] In Said's own words, the role

> …has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose raison d'être is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely swept under the rug. The intellectual does so on the basis of universal principles: that all human beings are entitled to expect decent standards of behavior concerning freedom and justice from worldly powers or nations,

---

[457] Said, "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community," 24.

[458] Strine, "Critical Theory and 'Organic' Intellectuals," 198.

[459] Douglas Kellner, "Intellectuals, the New Public Spheres, and Techno-Politics," available online at http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/newDK/intell.htm. Accessed 6/06/06.

[460] Ibid.

> and that deliberate or inadvertent violations of these standards need to be testified and fought against courageously.[461]

While Kellner situates the critical intellectual in opposition to the functional intellectual, playing the role of defender, revealer, and protector, some scholars have problems with the "universal" values attributed to the critical intellectual's actions. As I discussed in Chapter 3, democracies, ideally, are constituted on debated values, which should help avoid "universals" that might be used to disempower rather than empower. For example, as the leadership of AESA knows, "the language of 'making progress' has been appropriated by those on the political right to mask some very undemocratic projects…."[462] Consider here a few of the neointellectuals who participate in ASM educational reform and their notions of progress, notions which, arguably, favor certain constituencies over others, making universal application of the term progress difficult.

1. For Krista Kaffer of the Heritage Foundation, progress is to be measured by increasing the number of states that require school choice.[463]

2. For Frederick Hess of the American Enterprise Institute, progress is to be measured according to how many states create and adhere to rigorous standards.[464]

3. For Jay P. Greene of the Manhattan Institute and holder of an endowed chair at the University of Arkansas, progress is to be

---

[461] Said, Representations of the Intellectual, 11.

[462] Quote taken from AESA's 2006 Call for Proposals. Accessed 6/06/06 from http://www3.uakron.edu/aesa/CFP2006.html

[463] See Krista Kaffer, "Choices in Education: 2005 Progress Report," Backgrounder, no. 1848, 25 April 2005. Accessed 6/06/06 from http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=17245

[464] See Frederick M. Hess and Paul E. Peterson, "Keeping an Eye on State Standards," Education Next, 24 May 2006. Accessed 6/06/06 from http://www.aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.24438/pub_detail.asp

measured by running special interest groups, such as teacher's unions, out of schools.[465]

4. For the Hoover Foundation's Herbert J. Walberg, progress is to be measured by how many more tests, "one of the cheapest and most effective means of raising achievement," teachers give to students every year.[466]

5. For Chester Finn of the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, progress is to be measured by how much harder teachers force children to work, as currently few teachers or students work hard enough.[467]

6. For Chase Morgan and Shan Mullen of the Alliance for School Choice, progress is to be measured by how many schools are forced to close, regardless of what the immediate impact on families and children may be.[468]

7. For the American Legislative Exchange Council, progress is to be measured by how many states pass legislation forcing citizens to accept school choice or outlaw bilingual education.[469]

8. For former Secretary of Education Rod Paige, progress is to be measured by how many teachers enter classrooms without having been "forced" to attend colleges of education.[470]

---

[465] See Jay P. Greene, Education Myths: What Special Interest Groups Want You to Believe About Our Schools—And Why It Isn't So (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005). His chair is endowed by the Walton Family Foundation.

[466] See Herbert J. Walberg, "Lifting School Standards," Weekly Essays, 20 April 2005. Accessed 6/06/06 at http://www.hoover.org/pubaffairs/we/2005/walberg04.html

[467] See Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Things Are Falling Apart," Education Next, no.1 (Spring 2006). Accessed 6/06/06 from http://www.educationnext.org/20061/27.html

[468] See Chase Morgan and Shan Mullin, "Closing Schools Will Help Our Kids," The Seattle Times, 7 June 2006. Accessed 6/11/06 from http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/opinion/2003044064_alliance07.html

[469] The organization offers pre-fabricated legislation for individuals wishing to end bilingual education in their home state. See The American Legislative Exchange Council, "Bilingual Education Reform." Online resource accessed 6/07/07 from http://www.alec.org/2/1/talking-points/bilingual-education.html.

[470] See Chester Finn, "What's a 'Qualified' Teacher and How Can We Get More of Them?" Education Gadfly, 3 July 2003. Accessed 6/06/06 from http://www.edexcellence.net/institute/gadfly/issue.cfm?id=110#1383

> 9. For Rod Paige's replacement, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings, progress is to be measured by how accountable the federal government holds U.S. colleges and universities.[471]

The critical intellectual then, understood a lá Kellner and Said as a defender of universal values such as progress, is as problematic a term as organic or engaged. Indeed, the critical intellectual, should he/she act unmindfully of the particular, violates the democratic tenet of voice discussed in Chapter 3 of this work and runs the risk of becoming "the big guy representing all the little people," to the detriment of the "little people."

Michel Foucault's concept of the specific or the political intellectual offers potential solutions to oppressive universalizations, though the terms are not without their own problems, as every individual has a specific time, place, and mode of communication, and the term political says nothing about the politics behind the intellectual. Arguably, speaking out publicly is a political act, where politics is understood to mean attempting to build movements for policy change. These minor issues aside, Foucault's treatment of the intellectual is instructive here, as he attempts to remove the potentially harmful universal underpinnings that Kellner and Said attach to the term. Foucault argues:

> For a long period, the "left" intellectual spoke and was acknowledged the right of speaking in the capacity of master of truth and justice. He was heard, or purported to make himself heard, as the spokesman of the universal. To be an intellectual meant something like being the consciousness/conscience for us all.[472]

---

[471] For a number of stories on this topic, see "In Focus: Inside the Spellings Commission." This is an online database maintained by the publication Inside Higher Education. Accessed 6/08/06 from http://insidehighered.com/news/focus/commission.

[472] Foucault, "Truth and Power," 126.

The idea that the intellectual is the "conscience for us all" is implicit in the critical intellectual, as explored by Kellner and Said, as both assume that intellectuals tap into and work towards values all people share. Foucault links the association between the intellectual and the universal to the historical function of intellectuals:

> It is possible to suppose that the "universal" intellectual, as he functioned in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was in fact derived from a quite specific historical figure: the man of justice, the man of law, who counterposes to power, despotism, and the abuses and arrogance of wealth the universality of justice and the equity of an ideal law. The great struggles of the eighteenth century were fought over law, right, the constitution, the just in reason and law, that which can and must apply universally.[473]

Arguing that "some years have now passed since the intellectual was called upon to play this role," Foucault asserts that "a new mode of the 'connection between theory and practice' has been established. Intellectuals have got used to working," he continues, "not in the modality of the 'universal,' the 'exemplary,' the 'just-and-true-for-all,' but within specific sectors…."[474] These sectors are determined by an individual's life and work—the university or the think tank for example—sectors which shape the individual's awareness and treatment of the unique problems she/he is dealing with. Therefore these problems, Foucault contends, are "specific" and "non-universal."[475] He is worth quoting at length:

> It seems to me that what must now be taken into account in the intellectual is not the "bearer of universal values." Rather, it's the person occupying a specific position—but whose specificity is linked, in a society like ours, to the general functioning of an apparatus of truth. In other words, the intellectual has a three-fold specificity: that of his class position (whether

---

[473] Ibid., 128.

[474] Ibid., 126.

[475] Ibid.

> as petty-bourgeois in the service of capitalism or "organic" intellectual of the proletariat); that his conditions of life and work, linked to his condition as an intellectual (his field of research, his place in a laboratory, the political and economic demands to which he submits or against which he rebels, in the university, the hospital, etc.); lastly, the specificity of the politics of truth in our societies.[476]

Specificity, however, comes with its own unique problems and obstacles; Foucault discusses three. The first is "the danger of remaining at the level of conjunctural struggles, pressing demands restricted to particular sectors."[477] A narrow-minded parochialism prevents specific intellectuals from working across sectors for change. In academia for example, specificity isolates potential collaborators, preventing feminists, poststructuralists, and Marxists from working with broad coalitions (and often each other) against neoconservativism and neoliberalism. The second obstacle facing specific intellectuals is "the risk of letting himself be manipulated by the political parties or trade union apparatuses which control these local struggles."[478] John Dewey believed intellectuals would never have real power unless "big economic interests" (such as the Bradley Foundation) supported them, the very risk Foucault identifies. Foucault's specific intellectual then, succumbing to big economic interests, "manipulated" by political parties, is better understood as the neointellectual, the intellectual who acts against the very people intellectuals have traditionally been associated with serving. Finally, the specific intellectual faces "the risk of being unable to develop [specific] struggles for lack of a global strategy or outside support; the risk too of not being

---

[476] Ibid., 132.

[477] Ibid., 130.

[478] Ibid.

followed, or only by very limited groups."[479] Neointellectuals, supported by foundations, with access to multiple modes of mainstream media, underwritten by multimillion-dollar grants, do not face this risk. However, progressive scholars wishing to publicly counter neointellectuals most certainly do, as progressive scholars do not enjoy the capital, the freedom, or the media access granted to their neoconservative and neoliberal foils.

Foucault ends his treatment of the specific intellectual by redefining what he considers to be the "essential" political problem for an individual who takes on the role. While I agree with Foucault that the essential problem for individuals who speak out against power is political rather than theoretical, it is his closing argument as I understand it, that makes the specific intellectual problematic. Foucault believes

> The essential political problem of the intellectual is not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but that of ascertaining the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people's consciousnesses—or what's in their heads—but the political, economic, institutional régime of the production of truth.[480]

Changing the political, economic, and institutional régime of the production of truth is certainly important, but such a change cannot come about while at the same time ignoring the actions and effects of various régimes. Here I am reminded of a recurrent episode from the cartoon *The Pink Panther*, where a gardener is moving about the garden pulling up pink flowers and replacing them with yellow ones, oblivious to the Panther in another section of the garden doing exactly the opposite. As one flower, or mind, is changed, another is produced. Undoing the opposition's doings while at the same time

---

[479] Ibid.

[480] Ibid., 133.

ignoring what the opposition does is akin to putting a band-aid on a cancer patient as only that which is visible receives treatment. Therefore, while it may not be her "essential" function, the intellectual must criticize various ideological contents "supposedly linked to science" as those ideological contents help maintain various régimes through the production of a complacent populace. Arguably, it has been a refusal (or perhaps an inability) on the part of scholars to publicly criticize ASM ideology that has led to the current state of affairs in U.S. public schools in the first place, as ASM actions in the mainstream media, as well as before local, state, and federal legislative bodies leads, if one is to believe think tank-documents, to the creation of legislation such as NCLB. Furthermore, while ensuring that one's "own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology" may not be "essential," maintaining scientific integrity, which includes following the scientific process, should not be denigrated otherwise there is no difference between the neointellectual (who, recall from Chapter 1 engages in "political science abuse") and the scholar, the organic, the critical, or the specific intellectual.

Rather than essentialize one activity while minimizing the others, I propose both changing people's consciousness as well as the institutions that shape consciousness, as changing either on its own will do no good, as illustrated by the *Pink Panther*. Furthermore, if somehow, following Foucault, the political, economic, and institutional regimes of the production of truth were changed without a corresponding change in people's consciousness, people would not be able to recognize, let alone participate, in those regimes, as participation would require a consciousness that people did not yet have. Moreover, changing people's consciousnesses must occur in order to build coalitions of individuals conscious of, and willing to challenge, neoconservative and

neoliberal regimes of truth in education. If changing the way people thought, that is, changing "what's in their heads" were not important, why would scholars write books? And if being ideologically, or at least scientifically, sound was not important, why go through the process of peer review, presentations before committees, or writing a dissertation? Changing consciousness and changing the production of consciousness is a theoretical, political, and social process, requiring individuals capable of crossing borders and clearly articulating ideas across multiple publics. Cornell West's analysis of U.S. pragmatism, and his theory of prophetic pragmatism, offers support for and treatment of this claim.[481]

West accuses Foucault of devaluing moral discourse, of reducing "left ethics to a bold and defiant Great Refusal addressed to the dominant powers that be."[482] The problem with such a reduction, according to West, is that it limits critique to the negative, "failing to articulate and elaborate ideals of democracy, equality, and freedom."[483] While West praises Foucault for critiquing the "self-authorizing and self-privileging aims of 'universal' intellectuals who put forward such ideals," West asserts that Foucault's "rejection of even tentative aims and provisional ends results in existential rebellion or micropolitical revolt rather than concerted political praxis informed by moral vision and systemic (though flexible) analysis."[484] The result is, arguably, victory for an opposition willing to set aside differences in order to build large coalitions for change. Here

---

[481] See West, The American Evasion of Philosophy.

[482] Ibid., 226.

[483] Ibid.

[484] Ibid.

specifically I speak of neoliberals who favor legalization or decriminalization of drugs and support abortion rights working with neoconservatives who clearly support neither.

West places what he calls the "prophetic pragmatist" in opposition to Foucault's negative critic, explaining

> Prophetic pragmatists take seriously moral discourse—revisable means and ends of political action, the integrity and character of those engaged, and the precious ideals of participatory democracy and the flowering of the uniqueness of different human individualities.[485]

West's prophetic pragmatist, seriously invested in political action (not unlike the neointellectuals supported by the ASM) adheres to Karl Marx's 11th Thesis on Feurerbach: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it."[486]

While West understands the dangers of a universalizing philosophy, noting that change often leads to new struggles, he situates the prophetic intellectual next to C. Wright Mill's activist intellectual, one who "puts a premium on educating and being educated by struggling peoples, organizing and being organized by resisting groups."[487] Understood this way, the prophetic pragmatist is similar both to Said and Kellner's critical intellectual, in that the prophetic pragmatist works to liberate oppressed people, and to Foucault's specific intellectual, in that the prophetic pragmatist "attempts to be entrenched in and affiliated with organizations, associations, and, possibly, movements of

---

[485] Ibid.

[486] Karl Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach," in The Marx-Engels Reader 2nd ed., Robert C. Tucker, ed. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1978), 145 Italics in original.

[487] West, The American Evasion of Philosophy, 234.

grass-roots folk."[488] This association reduces, but does not eliminate, the possibility of changing the world from one system of oppression to another, which West recognizes as an impossible, and perhaps dangerous, task.[489] Prophetic pragmatism then, "promotes the possibility of human progress and the human impossibility of paradise."[490] While progress is tentative, difficult, and dangerous, the prophetic pragmatist does not fear change, in fact actively works towards an impossible paradise by transcending Marx's 11th thesis and combining, hesitantly, interpretation and change.

The ASM undeniably understands the importance of the point, and they focus as much on change as they do on interpretation, with little hesitation. Recall from Chapter 1 Herb Berkowitz's explanation of the Heritage Foundation's role in advocating for political transformation.

> Our belief is that when the research product has been printed, then the job is only half done. That is when we start marketing it to the media….We have as part of our charge the selling of ideas, the selling of policy proposals. We are out there actively selling these things, day after day. It's our mission.[491]

Unlike the neointellectuals on the right, the organic intellectual (as articulated by Strine, and to a certain degree West), the critical intellectual (as articulated by Kellner and Said), and the specific or political intellectual (as articulated by Foucault and problematized by West) focus solely on interpretation and articulation in hopes that distributing critical

---

[488] Ibid.

[489] Ibid., 228-229.

[490] Ibid., 229.

[491] See Andrew Rich, "War of Ideas: Why Mainstream and Liberal Foundation and the Think Tanks They Support are Losing in the War of Ideas in American Politics," Stanford Social Innovation Review (Spring 2005): 25.

analysis to large audiences will lead to change through a process not unlike Freire's description of conscientization. However, as I argue in Chapter 1, policy creation and change do not occur exclusively in the public realm and focusing entirely on changing the public via public intellectualism only solves half of the problem. As Berkowitz rightly explains, "when the research product has been printed, then the job is only half done."

The second half of that job involves marketing the research to publics, privates, and governmental bodies, a task the prophetic pragmatist, as articulated by West, understands. He believes prophetic pragmatists offer a

> reconception of philosophy as a form of cultural criticism that attempts to transform linguistic, social, cultural, *and political* traditions for the purposes of increasing the scope of individuals' development and democratic operations.[492]

The transformation of political traditions in order that individuals might develop into agents capable of participating in democratic operations (possibly through a democratic education as explored in Chapter 3) is made real through engagement in "strategic and tactical modes of thinking and acting."[493] While the ASM, as illustrated in Chapters 1 and 2, "engage in strategic and tactical modes of thinking and acting," progressive scholars do not. I turn now to obstacles to such engagement, as well as a brief discussion as to why progressive scholars should, borrowing from West, engage "prophetically" in the first place.

University-Housed Intellectuals

There are numerous, and often times contradictory, obstacles inherent to higher education which prevent scholars from entering public realms as prophetic pragmatists:

---

[492] West, The American Evasion of Philosophy, 230. Italics added.

[493] Ibid., 226.

these include scholarly duties, unapproachable language, a fetishlike worship of objectivity, various responsibilities toward the academy, the corporatization of the university, and, to a certain extent, postmodern theory.

Brouwer and Squires argue that "pressure to specialize and publish in top journals read only by scholars led to an insularity among scholars, who became more invested in the politics of tenure than in the issues of the people."[494] While not all professors have ignored the people intentionally, Brouwer and Squires point out that publishing requires the mastery of specific styles of writing, as well as specific jargon, language often inaccessible to the public, rendering much of what scholars produce unintelligible even to other scholars. Additionally, academic writing tends to be dry and stilted, keeping a tone of "dispassionate objectivity" lest too much emotion color one's research and/or findings.[495] Because of these requirements

> …the modern academic intellectual usually cannot, as earlier generations of intellectuals could and did, pitch his writing at a level that is accessible to a general audience yet does not strike the author's peers as lacking in rigor….[496]

Even if scholars did alter the tone and pitch of their work in order to make it more accessible (a request I am not making), universities do not currently reward those in search of tenure for publishing in mainstream venues, creating little incentive for busy

---

[494] Brouwer and Squires, "Public Intellectuals, Public Life, and the University," 205.

[495] See Joy James, "Academia, Activism, and Imprisoned Intellectuals," Social Justice 30, no. 2 (2003): 5.

[496] Richard Posner, Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 53.

scholars, burdened by teaching loads and other responsibilities, to write for lay audiences, let alone engaging in "strategic and tactical modes of thinking and acting."

Another major factor preventing scholars from being more public, and therefore more political, with their work has been the worship of "pure science," the pursuit of mythical objectivity and the ultimate shunning of conducting research for political ends. As Michael Burawoy succinctly explains, "the 'pure science' position that research must be completely insulated from politics is untenable since antipolitics is no less political than public engagement."[497] Not only is all research political, all research is value laden (and therefore never objective), as subjective individuals ultimately determine questions, interpret data, and draw conclusions.[498] Peter Novick gives a comprehensive treatment of the "objectivity question" in his work *That Noble Dream*, a thorough history of historians searching for objective truth. Novick contends that objectivity is a "confused notion," one meaning different things to different people at different times, subject to "changing social, political, cultural, and professional contexts."[499] Objectivity, therefore, is subjective, a point Novick uses various examples to illustrate, identifying a number of individuals who have used history to prove just about anything. Scientists, to be sure, are just as guilty as historians, using objective research that proves that blacks are genetically

---

[497] Michael Burawoy, "Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities," Social Forces 82, no. 4 (June 2004): 1605.

[498] For more on this topic see Margaret D. LeCompte, "Some Notes on Power, Agenda and Voice: A Researcher's Personal Evolution toward Critical Research," in Critical Theory and Educational Research, Eds. Peter L McLaren and James M. Giarelli (New York: SUNY Press, 1995).

[499] Peter Novick, That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 628.

inferior to whites, among other nonsense.[500] Undoubtedly, postmodern thought has helped to unseat objectivity, identifying multiple perspectives and regimes of truth and power that make notions of objectivity problematic.

While postmodern theory has done a great deal to debunk the myth of objectivity, postmodern thought can stand in opposition to academics acting as prophetic pragmatists. On one hand, postmodernist thinkers tend to reject "master narratives" such as the Enlightenment (and its inherent notions of justice, freedom and democracy); on the other hand, they rarely offer solutions to the various issues they spend so much time critiquing. Postmodernism, while recognizing diverse voices and problematizing totalitarian uses of Enlightenment ideals—achievements to be celebrated—has failed to offer anything for those voices to organize around or act together towards. Richard Rorty correctly asserts that

> …the Foucauldian academic Left in contemporary America is exactly the sort of Left that the oligarchy dreams of: a Left whose members are so busy unmasking the present that they have no time to discuss what laws need to be passed in order to create a better future.[501]

While the "Foucauldian academic Left" remains busy interrogating, neoconservatives and neoliberals work on various projects designed, arguably, to maintain a limited democratic order.

Christine Shea, critiquing the Enlightenment, argues that

> …while the Enlightenment dream entered history as a progressive force promising to liberate humankind from ignorance and irrationality, its

---

[500] Here specifically I am referring to Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray, The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life (New York: The Free Press, 1994).

[501] Richard Rorty, Achieving Our Country: Leftist Though in Twentieth-Century America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 139.

> nightmarish fulfillment in the concentration camps, Hiroshima, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf have obliterated any continuing naïve commitment to its social ideals.[502]

Before post-theorists get too carried away obliterating, Peter McLaren (predating Rorty) offers Shea a poignant rejoinder:

> We court disaster unless we realize that totality and universality should not be rejected outright, but only when they are used unjustly and oppressively as global, all-encompassing, and all-embracing warrants for thought and action in order to secure an oppressive regime of truth.[503]

While it is true that certain elements of the Enlightenment have been used oppressively—Marx in Stalin's hands needs less comment here than America's current democratic initiatives abroad—progressives must not avoid narratives, such as those discussed in Chapter 3 which might benefit children developing in an evolving world.

Rather than abandoning Enlightenment ideals totally, which would allow the ASM to continue their assault on public education unimpeded, progressive scholars should find ways to use the collective voices identified and legitimated by postmodern theorists in order to build coalitions capable of working against the ASM. In addition to coalition building, scholars must offer, and work to realize, alternatives to the status quo. As I showed in Chapter 3, the task is halfway completed, as the educational Left is not short on alternatives, counter-narratives, or articulations. Completing the task means rejecting the postmodern abandonment of Enlightenment goals and possibilities, as "the

---

[502] Christine M. Shea, "Critical and Constructive Postmodernism: The Transformative Power of Holistic Education," in Critical Social Issues in American Education: Transformation in a Postmodern World, 2nd ed., H. Svi Shapiro, David E. Purple ed. (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998), 338.

[503] Peter L. McLaren and James M. Giarelli, "Introduction," in Critical Theory and Educational Research, ed. Peter L McLaren and James M. Giarelli (New York: SUNY Press, 1995), 9.

Enlightenment, with all its problematic pretensions to universality, continues to ground any progressive politics that intellectuals can imagine."[504] One such solution is for progressive scholars to make their voices heard across various publics and privates, as well as before local, state, and federal legislative bodies.

Border Crossers

Importantly, I am not asking all scholars to act organically as prophetic pragmatists, as that would reek of the same standardization problematized in Chapter 3. Rather, I want to argue for departmental support of scholars with the specific function of acting as prophetic pragmatists, border crossers who take department work and make it known in multiple publics, privates, and legislative spheres. This requires some translation of scholarly work. John Raulston Saul asserts that "the principal occupation of the academic community is to invent dialects sufficiently hermetic to prevent knowledge from passing between territories."[505] While Saul raises a valid concern, such hermeticism, I contend, is occasionally necessary to produce and explore multiple physical, intellectual, and spiritual realms. Therefore, I am not asking scholars to dumb down their work. I am, however, asking them to consider 1) how their work impacts multiple publics and 2) how to get their work to those publics. The failure of scholars to make their work known, to make a case for what they do, explaining why the humanities, interdisciplinary study, and higher education in general is critical to the future of our democracy, has resulted in the under-funding and elimination of programs run by individuals who, by their accounts, claim to be serving the public good.

---

[504] Michael, Anxious Intellectuals, 10.

[505] John Ralston Saul, The Doubters Companion: A Dictionary of Aggressive Common Sense (Toronto: Viking, 1994), 301.

While Henry Giroux uses the term public intellectual, he uses it in a way consistent with West's prophetic pragmatist, and his work is instructive here. "If the university is to remain a site of critical thinking, collective work, and social struggle," and therefore wedded to democracy, then

> …public intellectuals need to expand its meaning and purpose. That is, they need to define higher education as a resource vital to the moral life of the nation, open to working people and communities whose resources, knowledge, and skills have often been viewed as marginal.[506]

Important to that expansion, arguably, is making those people and communities aware of what resources, skills, and knowledges exist for individual and community growth and development. Again Giroux:

> the educator as public intellectual becomes responsible for linking the diverse experiences that produce knowledge, identities, and social values in the university to the quality of moral and political life in the wider society; and he or she does so by entering into public conversations unafraid of controversy or of taking a critical stand.[507]

Here I would add that this linking must be conducted in spheres accessible to public, private, and legislative bodies using language that various groups can understand and utilize. Burying research in obscure journals read by handfuls of academics (the ones who can afford them anyway) undeniably (and importantly) furthers scholarship, but if these ideas are kept for the elite few, they remain foreign both to the public at large and to the legislators purportedly representing those publics, which partially explains how the public could come to see "public" universities as a waste of tax dollars. This isolation only serves to further what Hofstadter called anti-intellectualism in the public writ large,

---

[506] Henry A. Giroux, "Public Intellectuals and the Politics of Education," Revista Praxis 1, (May 2002): 5-6. Accessed 6/18/06 from http://www.revistapraxis.cl/ediciones/-numero1/giroux_praxis_1.htm.

[507] Ibid., 9.

as all of the "intellects" are busy hiding their research away in journals rather than engaging. If John McGowan is to be believed, and "fifteen percent of the population reads eighty-five percent of the books that get read in the United States," then an undeniably even smaller percentage spends time perusing academic journals.[508] Philosopher David Hull concurs, asserting "that publishing a paper is roughly equivalent to throwing it away."[509]

Engaging public, private, and political organizations means scholars will have to enter spaces and venues that they have traditionally shunned, venues the neointellectuals have used to their advantage. Scholars tasked with acting prophetically for democratic change then, should begin disseminating their work in newspapers, magazines, through radio and television interviews, trade books and on-line, refusing to let the results of their work speak for themselves, lest they are ignored or co-opted and used in ways never intended by the researcher.[510] This also means leaving the protected halls of academia and entering multiple venues (such as public schools, clubs, bookstores, local school boards, state boards of education, federal legislative bodies, courts, etc.) to speak, critique, and respond to questions posed by a public that will hopefully grow more engaged through increased participation in passionate and intelligent discourse. Gordon Mitchell points out two additional benefits to increased contact between academics and nonacademic audiences. He argues that grounding political work

---

[508] McGowan, Democracy's Children, 79.

[509] David L. Hull, "The Social Responsibility of Professional Societies," Metaphilosophy 33, no. 5 (October 2002): 554.

[510] See Cathleen Burnett, "Passion Through the Profession: Being Both Activist and Academic," Social Justice 30, no. 4 (2003): 141.

> …in a rigorous program of scholarly research checks the dogmatic tendencies of activism. In turn, the drift toward academic provincialism in scholarly research is countered by engagement in public spheres of argument with such engagement continuously putting the meaning and significance of academic work in 'big picture' context.[511]

Critical pedagogues argue that the world has been made and can therefore be unmade and remade; I believe the same holds true for academia. Scholars who wish to be a part of realizing a more just democracy must not only adapt to the contours of various groups and associations, they must also work to remake the academy, changing it from an isolating institution to one more engaged with various democratic publics and initiatives.[512]

The obstacles to such a project, discussed earlier, are surmountable. Academics should be rewarded, not punished, for engaging with the public in a language it can understand. Sabin explains that "in the current academic system, assistant professors have to keep quiet and seek tenure before they may safely take on a significant public role."[513] Instead, as Sabin suggests, scholars whose work deals with pressing public issues, offering contributions to public conversations and policy development, should be rewarded. These public conversations take place in various public spheres, which

---

[511] Gordon R Mitchell, "Public Argument, Action Research and the Learning Curve of New Social Movements," Argumentation and Advocacy 40, (Spring 2004): 222.

[512] For more on this point see Ellen Earle Chaffee, "Listening to the People We Serve" and Kent M. Keith "The Responsive University in the Twenty-first Century," in The Responsive University: Restructuring High Performance, ed. William G. Tierney (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Beyond the Corporate University, ed. Henry Giroux and Kostas Myrsiades (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001); and Frank Newman, Lara Couturier, and Jamie Scurry, The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and the Risks of the Market (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004), Chapter 12.

[513] Paul Sabin, "Academe Subverts Young Scholars' Civic Orientation," The Chronicle Review, The Chronicle of Higher Education, 8 February 2002, B24.

scholars, acting as prophetic pragmatists, should be rewarded for entering. "Departments also need to foster more internal dialogue about the relationship between scholarship and public service so that young academics can pursue both responsibly."[514] Such dialogue is essential to changing the requirements for tenure to include work that oscillates between "scholarly and wider lay audiences, the ideal result of which would be relevance through translation of knowledge across publics."[515]

While objectivity is a "noble dream" and worthy of continued interrogation, scholars must not let a cult-like worship of objectivity stop them from direct involvement with public/political projects. As the ASM dismantles public schools as sites for democratic growth and revival, the scholarly Left conferences and journals. Taking a public and political stance does not require abandoning "sound" scholarship, it requires amplifying the scholarship and turning it into action. Finally, since postmodern thought and postmodern/poststructural ways of knowing are not going away anytime soon, progressive scholars acting as prophetic pragmatists should translate more difficult work, making it accessible to multiple groups in order to build coalitions of individuals who, despite their differences, envision a world where individuals have the freedom and ability to participate in the institutions that shape their lives, as required by a Deweyan understanding of democracy.

---

[514] Ibid.

[515] Brouwer and. Squires, "Public Intellectuals, Public Life, and the University," 212.

References

Abelson, Donald. *Do Think Tanks Matter?* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

Alcoff, Linda. "Does the Public Intellectual Have Intellectual Integrity?" *Metaphilosophy* 33, no. 5 (October 2002): 521-534.

Alexander, Lamar. "Seven Questions About September 11." In *Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy: What Our Children Need to Know,* ed. Chester Finn, 42-45. Dayton: Fordham Foundation, 2003.

Altshuler, Sandra and Tresa Schmautz. "No Hispanic Student Left Behind: The Consequences of 'High Stakes' Testing." *Children and Schools* 28, no. 1 (January 2006): 5-14.

American Legislative Exchange Council. "Bilingual Education Reform." Online resource accessed 6/07/07 from http://www.alec.org/2/1/talking-points/-bilingualeducation.html.

Apple, Michael. "Creating Difference: Neo-liberalism, Neo-Conservatism and the Politics of Educational Reform." *Educational Policy* 18, no. 1 (January-March 2004): 12-44.

Arendt, Hannah. "The Crisis in Education." In *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: The Viking Press, 1961.

Banks, James. *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* Columbia: Teacher's College Press, 2000.

Barber, Benjamin. "Taking the Public Out of Education: The Perverse Notion That American Democracy can Survive Without its Public Schools." *School Administrator*, May 2004. Accessed 5/13/06 from www.looksmart.com.

Barber, Benjamin. "Public Schooling: Education for Democracy." In *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling*, ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon, 21-32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Barnard, Andrea. "Live From Hell's Kitchen, NYC." In *What You Don't Know About Schools*, ed. Shirley R. Steinberg and Joe L. Kincheloe, 262-275. New York: Palgrave, 2006.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *The Individualized Society*. London: Polity Press, 2001.

Bell, Derek. Confronting Authority: Confessions of an Ardent Protester. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994.

Berliner, David. "The Near Impossibility of Testing for Teacher Quality." *Journal of Teacher Education* 56, no. 3 (May/June 2005): 205-213.

Block, Judy. "Children as Collateral Damage: The Innocents of Education's War for Reform." In *Schools or Markets? Commercialism, Privatization, and School-Business Partnerships*, ed. Deron Boyles, 83-118. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.

Boston, Bruce, et. al. *Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools*. D.C.: American Youth Policy Forum, 2005.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Corporatism of the Universal: The Role of the Intellectuals in the Modern World." *Telos*, no. 81 (Fall 1989).

Boyles, Deron. "The Exploiting Business: School-Business Partnerships, Commercialization, and Students as Critically Transitive Citizens." In *Schools or Markets? Commercialism, Privatization, and School-Business Partnerships*, ed. Deron Boyles, 217-240. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.

Boyles, Deron. *American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to School.* New York: Falmer Press, 2000.

Bracey, Gerald. *The No Child Left Behind Act, A Plan for the Destruction of Public Education: Just Say No*. Tempe: Education Disinformation Detection and Reporting Agency, 2005. Accessed 12/30/05 from www.america-tomorrow.com/-bracey/EDDRA/EDDRA32.htm.

Bracey, Gerald. *No Child Left Behind: Where Does the Money Go?* Tempe: Educational Policy Studies Research Unit, 2005. Accessed 12/30/05 from http://edpolicylab.org.

Bracey, Gerald. "The 15th Bracey Report on the Condition of Public Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 2 (October 2005): 138-153.

Bracey, Gerald. *Setting the Record Straight: Responses to Misconceptions About Public Education in the U.S.* Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2004.

Bracey, Gerald. *What You Should Know About the War Against America's PublicSchools*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2003.

Bradley Foundation. *2004 Annual Report*. Milwaukee: Bradley Foundation, 2005. Accessed 11/18/05 from http://www.bradleyfdn.org/publications.html.

Brock, David. *The Republican Noise Machine: Right-Wing Media and how it Corrupts Democracy*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2004.

Brooks, Martin and Jacqueline. "The Courage to Be Constructivist." In *Educational Foundations: An Anthology of Critical Readings*, ed. Alan S. Canestrari and Bruce A. Marlow, 184-194. Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2004.

Brosio, Richard. *A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

Brouwer, Daniel and Catherine R. Squires. "Public Intellectuals, Public Life, and the University." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 39, (Winter 2003): 201-213.

Buras, Kristen. "Tracing the Core Knowledge Movement: History Lessons from Above and Below." In *The Subaltern Speak: Curriculum, Power, and Educational Struggles,* ed. Michael W. Apple and Kristen L. Buras, 43-74. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Burawoy, Michael. "Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities." *Social Forces* 82, no. 4 (June 2004): 1603-1618.

Burnett, Cathleen. "Passion Through the Profession: Being Both Activist and Academic." *Social Justice* 30, no. 4 (2003): 135-150.

Bushnell, Mary. "Teachers in the Schoolhouse Panopticon: Complicity and Resistance. *Education and Urban Society* 35, no. 3 (May 2003): 251-272.

Callahan, Connie. "Protecting and Counseling Gay and Lesbian Students." *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, and Development* 40, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 5-10.

Cavanagh, Sean. "Greene Machine." *Education Week*, 13 October 2004. Accessed 03/16/06 from www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/10/13/07jaygreene.h24.html.

Center on Education Policy. *From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. D.C.: Center on Education Policy, 2006. Accessed 0515/06 from http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/Year4/Press/.

Chaffee, Ellen. "Listening to the People We Serve." In *The Responsive University: Restructuring High Performance*, ed. William G. Tierney, 13-37. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Chametzky, Jules. "Public Intellectuals—Now and Then." *Melus*, (Fall-Winter 2004): 211-226.

Chomsky, Noam. "The Responsibility of Intellectuals." In *The Dissenting Academy*, ed. Theodore Roszak, 254-298. New York: Random House, 1967.

Clement, Christopher. "Organic Intellectuals and the Discourse on Democracy: Academia, Foreign Policy Makers, and Third World Intervention." *New Political Science* 25, no. 3 (September 2003): 351-365.

Colvin, Richard. "A New Generation of Philanthropists and Their Great Ambitions." In *With the Best of Intentions: How Philanthropy is Reshaping K-12 Education*, ed. Frederick M. Hess, 21-48. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2006.

Conason, Joe. *Big Lies: The Right-Wing Propaganda Machine and How it Distorts the Truth*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003.

Counts, George. *The Education of Free Men in American Democracy*. D.C.: NEA Press, 1941.

Crouse, James and Dalte Trusheim, *The Case Against the SAT*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, "From 'Separate but Equal' to 'No Child Left Behind': The Collision of New Standards and Old Inequalities." In *Many Children Left Behind How the No Child Left Behind Act is Damaging Our Children and our Schools*, ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood, 3-32. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Research and Rhetoric on Teacher Certification: A Response to 'Teacher Certification Reconsidered.'" *Educational Policy Analysis Archives* 10, no. 36 (September 2002). Accessed 12/30/05 http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Education, Equity, and the Right to Learn." In *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling* ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon, 41-54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Demarrais, Kathleen. "The Haves and the Have Mores." 2005 American Educational Studies Association Presidential Address. Speech obtained from the author.
Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.* New York: The Free Press, 1944.

Dewey, John. *The Public and Its Problems*. Chicago: The Swallow Press, Inc., 1927.

Diggins, John. "The Changing Role of the Public Intellectual in American History." In *The Public Intellectuals: Between Philosophy and Politics*, ed. Arthur Melzer, Jerry Weinberger, and M. Zinman, 91-108. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Education." In *Readings in American Educational Thought: From Puritanism to Progressivism*, ed. Andrew J. Milson, Chara Haeussler Bohan, Perry L. Glanzer, and J. Wesley Null, 235-242. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 2004.

Emery, Kathy and Susan Ohanian, *Why is Corporate America Bashing Our Public Schools?* Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2004.

Engel, Michael. *The Struggle for Control of Public Education: Market Ideology vs. Democratic Values*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.

Enlow, Robert and Matt Ladner. *School Choice: A Reform That Works*. D.C.: American Legislative Exchange Council, 2005. Pdf accessed 5/18/06 from http://www.alec.org/meSWFiles/pdf/0424.pdf.

Fenstermacher, Gary. "On Restoring Public and Private Life." In *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling*, ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon, 55-72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Finn, Chester. "What's a 'Qualified' Teacher and How Can We Get More of Them?" *The Education Gadfly* 3, no. 27, 31 July 2003. Pdf accessed 12/30/2005 from http://www.edexcellence.net/institute/gadfly/issue.cfm?id=110#1383.

Finn, Chester, ed. *Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy: What Our Children Need to Know*. Dayton: Fordham Foundation, 2003. Pdf accessed /313/06 from http://edexcellence.net/institute/publication/publication.cfm?id=316.

Fleury, Stephen. "The Military and Corporate Roots of State-Regulated Knowledge." In *Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century*, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Foucault, Michael. "Truth and Power." In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings* 1972-1977, ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper, 109-133. New York: Pantheon, 1980.

Fancsali, Cheri. *Teacher Leaders for Mathematics Success: Final Evaluation Report*. New York: Academy for Educational Development, 2004. Pdf accessed 12/30/2005 from http://www.aed.org/Education/US/mathstudy.cfm.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 2003.

Freire, Paulo. *Teachers as Cultural Workers*. New York: Westview Press, 1998.

Friedman, Joel. *The Decline of Corporate Income Tax Revenues*. D.C.: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2003. Accessed 05/12/06 from http://www.cbpp.org/10-16-03tax.htm.

Fukuyama, Francis. *America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power, and the Neoconservative Legacy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1992.

Gabbard, David. "A Nation at Risk Reloaded: Parts I & II." *Journal for Critical Educational Policy Studies* 1, no. 2 (October 2003). Pdf accessed 5/18/06 from http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=15.

Gardner, Howard. *Development and Education of Mind: The Selected Works of Howard Gardner* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

Garnham, Nicholas. "The Media and Narratives of the Intellectual." *Media, Culture, and Society* 17 (1995): 359-384.

Gelb, Steven, Garland E. Allen, Andrew Futterman, and Barry A. Mehler. "Rewriting Mental Testing History: The View from the American Psychologist." *Sage Race Relations Abstracts* 11, no. 2 (May 1986): 18-31. Accessed 03/03/06 from http://www.ferris.edu/isar/archives/mental/htm.

Gingrich, Newt. "We Must Expand Our Investment in Science." Testimony before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 22 May 2002. Accessed 11/09/05 from www.aei.org/include/news_print.asp?newsID=15562.

Giroux, Henry. *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life: Democracy's Promise and Education's Challenge,* 2nd ed., Boulder: Paradigm, 2005.

Giroux, Henry. "Kids for Sale: Corporate Culture and the Challenge of Public Schooling," in *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in a Globalizing World*, 3rd ed., ed. H. Svi Shapiro and David E. Purpel, 143-162. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.

Giroux, Henry. *The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy*. Boulder: Paradigm, 2004.

Giroux, Henry. "Public Intellectuals and the Politics of Education." *Revista Praxis* 1, (May 2002): 5-11.

Giroux, Henry and Kosatas Mysiades, ed. *Beyond the Corporate University*, ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.

Giroux, Henry. *The Mouse that Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.

Goodlad, John, Mantle-Bromley, Corinne, and Stephen John Goodlad. *Education for Everyone: Agenda for Education in a Democracy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 2004.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Translated by Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Greene, Jay. *Education Myths: What Special Interest Groups Want You to Believe About Our Schools—And Why It Isn't So*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005.

Greene, Maxine. *Teacher as Stranger: Educational Philosophy for the Modern Age*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.

Gurian, Michael and Kathy Stevens. *The Minds of Boys: Saving Our Sons From Falling Behind in School and Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Gutmann, Amy. *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Habermas, Jürgen. "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article." In *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*, ed. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner, 136-144. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Halwani, Raja. "Introduction to the Philosopher as Public Intellectual." *Metaphilosophy* 33, no. 5 (October 2002): 495-501.

Herman, Edward and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon, 1988.

Herrnstein, Richard and Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Hess, Frederick and Paul E. Peterson, "Keeping an Eye on State Standards." *Education Next* 6, no. 3 (Summer): 28-29. Pdf accessed 6/06/06 from http://www.aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.24438/pub_detail.asp.

Hess, Frederick. "The Predictable, But Unpredictably Personal, Politics of Teacher Licensure." *Journal of Teacher Education* 56, no. 3 (May/June 2005): 192-198.

Hess, Frederick. "Refining or Retreating? High-Stakes Accountability in the States." In *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West. Washington: Brookings, 2003.

Hess, Frederick. "The Case for Being Mean." *AEI Online*, 1 December 2003. Pdf accessed 1/15/06 from www.aei.org/include/pub_print.asp?pubID=19614.

Hill, Dave. "Global Neo-Liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance." *Journal of Critical Educational Policy Studies* 1, no. 1 (March 2003). Pdf accessed 03/16/06 from http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7.

Hinchey, Patricia and Karen Cadiero-Kaplan. "The Future of Teacher Education and Teaching: Another Piece of the Privatization Puzzle." *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* 3, no. 2 (October 2005). Pdf accessed 5/15/06 from http://www.jceps.com/print/php?articleID=48.

Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.

Horowitz, David. *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Professors in America*. DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc, 2006.

Hull, David. "The Social Responsibility of Professional Societies." *Metaphilosophy* 33, no. 5 (October 2002): 552-564.

James, Joy. "Academia, Activism, and Imprisoned Intellectuals." *Social Justice* 30, no. 2 (2003): 3-7.

Johnson, David and Leonard Salle. *Responding to the Attack on Public Education and Teacher Unions*. Menlo Park: Commonweal Institute, 2004. Pdf accessed 03/23/06 from http://commonwealinstitute.org/reports/ed/EdRespondReport.html.

Judis, John. *The Folly of Empire: What George W. Bush Could Learn from Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson*. New York: Scribner, 2004.

Kaffer, Krista. "Choices in Education: 2005 Progress Report." *Backgrounder*, no. 1848, 25 April 2005, Accessed 6/06/06 from http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=17245.

Kaffer, Krista. "The Promise of No Child Left Behind." Testimony Before the House Budget Committee Democratic Caucus Senate Democratic Policy Committee. 108th Cong., 1st sess., 17 July 2003. Accessed 04/06/06 from www.heritage.org/Research/Education/tst071703.cfm.

Kahn, Si and Elizabeth Minnich, *The Fox in the Henhouse: How Privatization Threatens Democracy*. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler, 2005.

Karp, Stan. "NCLB's Selective Vision of Equality: Some Gaps Count More than Others." In *Many Children Left Behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act is Damaging Our Children and our Schools*, ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood, 53-65.Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Kaye, Harvey. "Beyond the Last Intellectuals." In *Education and Cultural Studies: Toward a Performative Practice*, ed. Henry A. Giroux and Patrick Shannon. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Keith, Kent. "The Responsive University in the Twenty-first Century." In *The Responsive University: Restructuring High Performance*, ed. William G. Tierney, 162-172. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Kellner, Douglas. "Intellectuals, the New Public Spheres, and Techno-Politics." Online course material accessed 12/30/05 from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner.

Kenny, Conor, Taylor Lincoln, Chuck Collins, and Lee Farris. *Spending Millions to Save Billions: The Campaign of the Super Wealthy to Kill the Estate Tax*. D.C.: Public Citizen and United for a Fair Economy, 2006. 11. Accessed 05/16/06 from http://www.citizen.org/documents/EstateTaxFinal.pdf.

Kerr, Donna. "Toward a Democratic Rhetoric of Schooling." In *The Public Purpose of Education and Schooling*, ed. John Goodland & Timothy McMannon, 73-84. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Kincheloe, Joe. "What you Don't Know *Is* Hurting You and the Country," in *What You Don't Know About Schools*, ed. Shirley R. Steinburg and Joe L. Kincheloe, 1-30. New York: Palgrave, 2006.

Kliebard, Herbert. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958.* New York: Routledge, 1986.

Krehely, Jeff, Meaghan House, and Emily Kernan. *Axis of Ideology: Conservative Foundations and Public Policy*. D.C.: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2004.

Kohn, Alfie. *What Does it Mean to Be Well Educated? And More Essays on Standards, Grading, and Other Follies*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Kohn, Alfie. "No Child Left Behind and the Effort to Privatize Public Education." In *Many Children Left Behind How the No Child Left Behind Act is Damaging Our Children and our Schools*, ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood, 79-100. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Kohn, Alfie. "Test Today, Privatize Tomorrow: Using Accountability to 'Reform' Public Schools to Death." *Education Digest* 70, no. 1 (Sep. 2004): 14-28.

Kohn, Alfie. "Fighting the Tests: A Practical Guide to Rescuing Our Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 82, no. 5 (January 2001): 349-357.

Kovacs, Philip, and Deron Boyles. "Institutes, Foundations, and Think Tanks: Conservative Influences on U.S. Public Schools." *Public Resistance* 1, no. 1 (May 2005). Pdf accessed 7/06/06 from http://www.publicresistance.org/journals/1.1archived.htm.

Kozol, Jonathan. *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America*. New York: Crown, 2005.

LeCompte, Margaret. "Some Notes on Power, Agenda and Voice: A Researcher's Personal Evolution toward Critical Research." In *Critical Theory and Educational Research,* Eds. Peter L McLaren and James M. Giarelli, 91-112. New York: SUNY Press, 1995.

Lemann, Nicholas. *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux: 1999.

Leistyna, Pepi. "Facing Oppression." In *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*, ed. Kenneth J. Saltman and David A. Gabbard. New York: Routledge Falmer, 2003.

Lewison, Mitzi, et al. "Taking on Critical Literacy: The Journey of Newcomers and Novices." *Language Arts* 79, no. 5 (May 2002): 382-392.

Lipset, Seymour and Asoke Basu. "The Roles of the Intellectual and Political Roles." In *The Intelligentsia and the Intellectuals: Theory, Method and Case Study*, ed. Aleksander Gella. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications Inc., 1976.

Manzo, Kathleen. "Ga. History Plan Stirs Civil War Fuss." *Education Week*, 18 February 2004. Accessed 9/17/2005 from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/02/18/-23civil.h23.html?querystring=ga%20history%20plan%20stirs%20civil%20war%20fuss.

Marker, Perry. "Old Wine in a New Bottle: Twentieth-Century Social Studies in a Twenty-First-Century World." In *Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century*, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Martin, Jane. "Becoming Educated: A Journey of Alienation or Integration?" In *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in a Globalizing World*, 3rd ed., ed. H. Svi Shapiro and David E. Purpel, 197-210. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.

Martin, Jay. *The Education of John Dewey*. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Marx, Karl. "Theses on Feuerbach." In *The Marx-Engels Reader* 2nd ed., ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1978.

Mathison, Sandra. "The Accumulation of Disadvantage: The Role of Educational Testing in the School Career of Minority Children." *Workplace* 5(2). Accessed 12/31/05 from http://www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue5p2/mathison.html.

Mattson, Kevin. *Creating a Democratic Public: The Struggle for Urban Participatory Democracy During the Progressive Era*. University Park: Penn State U. Press, 1998.

McColl, Ann. "Tough Call: Is No Child Left Behind Constitutional?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 86, no. 8 (April 2005): 604-610.

McLaren, Peter and James Giarelli, "Introduction." In *Critical Theory and Educational Research,* ed. Peter L McLaren and James M. Giarelli, 1-22. New York: SUNY Press, 1995.

McLaren, Peter. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*, 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

McLean, Bethany and Peter Elkind, *The Smartest Guys in the Room: The Amazing Rise and Scandalous Fall of Enron*. New York: Portfolio Press, 2003.

McNair, Brian. *An Introduction to Political Communication*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2003.

McNeil, Linda. *Contradictions of Reform: The Educational Costs of Standardized Testing*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Meier, Deborah. "Educating a Democracy." In *Will Standards Save Public Education?*, ed. Deborah Meier. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.

Mensh, Elaine and Harry. *The IQ Mythology: Class, Race, Gender and Inequality*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Michael, John. *Anxious Intellectuals*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.

Miller, Barbara. "Testing Companies Mine for Gold." *Rethinking Schools* 19, no. 2 (Winter 2004/2005). Accessed 12/30/2005 from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/19_02/test192.shtml.

Mills, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mitchell, Gordon. "Public Argument, Action Research and the Learning Curve of New Social Movements." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 40, (Spring 2004): 209-225.

Moe, Terry. "Politics, Control, and the Future of School Accountability." In *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West. Washington: Brookings, 2003.

Molnar, Alex. *School Commercialism: From Democratic Ideal to Market Commodity*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Mooney, Chris. *The Republican War on Science*. New York: Basic Books, 2005.

Nathan, Linda. "Habits of Mind." In *Will Standards Save Public Education?*, ed. Deborah Meier, 50-56. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.

National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. *The Waltons and Wal-Mart: Self-Interested Philanthropy*. D.C.: NCRP Press, 2005. Available for purchase online from http://www.ncrp.org.

Neill, Monty, et al. *Failing Our Children: How "No Child Left Behind" Undermines Quality and Equity in Education*. Cambridge: Fair Test, 2004.

Newman, Frank, Lara Couturier, and Jamie Scurry. *The Future of Higher Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and the Risks of the Market.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Newman, Joseph. *America's Teachers: An Introduction to Education*, 4th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2005.

Nieto, Sonia, ed. *Why We Teach*. Columbia: Teachers College Press, 2005.

Noddings, Nel. *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education* 2nd ed. New York: Teacher's College Press, 2005.

Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Ogbu, John. "Class Stratification, Racial Stratification, and Schooling." In *Class, Race, & Gender in American Education,* ed. Lois Weis. Albany: SUNY Press, 1988.

Olssen, Mark. "Neoliberalism, Globalisation, Democracy: Challenges for Education." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 2, no. 2 (July 2004): 231-275.

Orfield, Gary and Chungmei Lee. *Why Segregation Matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality*. Cambridge: Harvard Civil Right's Project, 2005. Accessed 05/19/06 from http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/deseg/-Why_Segreg_Matters.pdf.

Pang, Valerie and Evangelina Bustamante Jones, "Caring Centered Multicultural Education: Addressing the Academic and Writing Needs of English Learners." In *Defending Public Schools: Teaching for a Democratic Society*, ed. Kathleen R. Kesson and E Wayne Ross, vol. 2. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Pedulla, Joseph, et al., *Perceived Effects of State Mandated Testing Programs on Teaching and Learning: Findings from a National Survey of Teachers*. Boston: National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy, March 2003. Accessed 12/30/05 from www.bc.edu/research/nbetpp/statements/nbr2.pdf.

People for the American Way. *The Voucher Veneer: The Deeper Agenda to Privatize Public Education*. D.C.: People for the American Way, 2004. Report accessed 12/30/05 from http://www.pfaw.org/pfaw/general/default.aspx?oid=11371.

Phi Delta Kappan. "The 37th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 1 (Sep 2005): 41-57.

Posner, Richard. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Powell, Lewis. "Attack on American Free Enterprise System." Memo from Lewis Powell to Eugene Sydnor, Jr., 23 August 1971. Last accessed 6/08/06 from: http://www.mediatransparency.org/story.php?storyID=22.

Rich, Andrew. "War of Ideas: Why Mainstream and Liberal Foundation and the Think Tanks They Support are Losing in the War of Ideas in American Politics," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Spring 2005): 18-25.

Rich, Andrew. *Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Robinson, Gerard. *Survey of School Choice Research*. Milwaukee: Institute for the Transformation of Learning, 2005. Accessed 12/30/05from http://www.itlmuonline.com/content.asp?cat=2&id=60.

Robelen, Eric. "40 Years After ESEA, Federal Role in Schools is Broader Than Ever." *Education Week* 24, no. 31 (April 2005): 1-2.

Rorty, Richard. *Achieving Our Country: Leftist Though in Twentieth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Ross, Wayne, et al. "Saving Public Education—Saving Democracy." *Public Resistance* 1, no. 1 (May 2005). Pdf accessed 12/31/06 from www.publicresistance.org.

Rothstein, Richard. *Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.

Rudalevige, Andrew. "Forging a Congressional Compromise." In *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, ed. Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West. Washington: Brookings Institution, 2003.

Ryan, James. "The Perverse Incentives of The No Child Left Behind Act." *New York University Law Review* 79 (June 2004): 932-990.

Ryan, Kevin and James Cooper. *Those Who Can, Teach,* 10th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004.

Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon, 1994.

Said, Edward. "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community." *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 1 (1982): 1-26.

Saltman, Kenneth. *The Edison Schools: Corporate Schooling and the Assault on Public Education*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Saltman, Kenneth. "Introduction." In *Education As Enforcement*, ed. Kenneth Saltman & David Gabbard, 1-33. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003.

Saltman, Kenneth. *Collateral Damage: Corporatizing Public Schools—A Threat to Democracy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

Salamun, Kurt. "Liberal Education in the Face of Antidemocracy." In *Educating For Democracy: Paideia in an Age of Uncertainty*, ed. Alan M. Olson, David M. Steiner, and Irina S. Tulli. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.

Saul, John. *The Doubters Companion: A Dictionary of Aggressive Common Sense*. Toronto: Viking, 1994.

Sehr, David. *Education for Public Democracy*. New York: SUNY Press, 1997.

Shea, Christine. "Critical and Constructive Postmodernism: The Transformative Power of Holistic Education." In *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Transformation in a Postmodern World*, 2nd ed., ed. H. Svi Shapiro, David E. Purple, 337-354. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.

Shapiro, Svi. "Public School Reform: The Mismeasure of Education." In *Critical Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in a Globalizing World,* 3rd ed., ed. H. Svi. Shapiro and David E. Purpel, 287-296. Mahwah: Lawrence Earlbaum, 2005.

Siebold, Tom. "A Brief Framework for Understanding the Anti-Public School Movement." Essay accessed 12/30/05 from Susan Ohanian at http://susanohanian.org/show_commentary.php?id=294.

Simon, William. *A Time for Truth*. New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1978.

Sizer, Theodore. "Preamble: A Reminder for Americans." In *Many Children Left Behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act is Damaging Our Children and our Schools*, ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood, xvii-xxi. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Smith, Mary Lee, et al. *Political Spectacle and the Fate of American Schools*. New York: Routledge/Falmer, 2003.

Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, *Unfulfilled Promise: Ensuring High Quality Teacher for Our Nation's Students*. Chapel Hill: Southeast Center for Teaching Quality, 2004. Accessed 12/30/05 from http://www.teachingquality.org./-publications/reports.htm

Spring, Jeol. *American Education*, 12th ed. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006.

Spring, Joel. *Political Agendas For Education: From the Christian Coalition to the Religious Right*, 2nd ed. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.

St. Pierre, Elizabeth and Wanda S. Pillow. "Introduction." In *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*, ed. Elizabeth A. St. Pierre and Wanda S. Pillow, 1-24. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Stanley, William. "Schooling and Curriculum for Social Transformation: Reconsidering the Status of a Contentious Idea." In *Defending Public Schools: Curriculum Continuity and Change in the 21st Century*, ed. Kevin D. Vinson and E. Wayne Ross, vol. 3. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Strine, Mary. "Critical Theory and 'Organic' Intellectuals: Reframing the Work of Cultural Critique." *Communication Monographs* 58, (June 1991): 195-201.

Stone, Deborah. "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas." *Political Science Quarterly* 104, no. 2 (1989): 281-300.

Stotsky, Sandra. *Losing Our Language: How Multiculturalism Undermines Our Children's Ability to Read, Write and Reason*. New York: Encounter Books, 2002.

Sunderman, Gail and Jimmy Kim. *Teacher Quality: Equalizing Educational Outcomes and Opportunities*. Cambridge: Harvard Civil Right's Project, 2005. Accessed 7/18/06 from http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/esea/-Teacher_Quality.pdf

The Black Commentator. "Bush Funds Black Voucher Front Group: Your Tax Dollars Pay for Propaganda Blitz." *The Black Commentator* 16 (Nov. 14, 2002). Available online at http://www.blackcommentator.com/16_thw.html. Last accessed 12/30/05.

The Black Commentator. "Voucher Tricksters: The Hard Right Enters Through the Schoolhouse Door." *The Black Commentator* 7 (July 11, 2002). Accessed 12/30/05 from http://www.blackcommentator.com/7_voucher_tricksters.html.

The Carnegie Corporation and The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. *The Civic Mission of Schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 2003. Accessed 04/27/06 from http://downloads.ncss.org/-legislative/CivicMissionofSchools.pdf.

Turtel, Joel. *Public Schools, Public Menace: How Public Schools Lie To Parents and Betray Our Children.* New York: Liberty Books, 2004-2005.

Tyack, David and Larry Cuban. *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Urban, Wayne and Jennings Wagoner. *American Education: A History*, 3rd ed. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2003.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and the Workforce. *New Report Debunks NEA-MoveOn.org Excuses for Poor School Performance; Proves High Standards are Key to Closing Achievement Gaps in Education.* 108th Cong., 2nd sess., 9 September 2004. Press release accessed 5/18/06 from http://edworkforce.house.gov/press/press108/second/09sept/nclb090904.htm

U.S. Department of Education. "Education Department, BAEO Form Partnership to Reach Parents About Landmark No Child Left Behind Act." Press release made available 15 October 2002 from http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/-2002/10/10152002a.html. Accessed 12/30/05.

Vinson, Kevin, Gibson, Rich, and E. Wayne Ross. "Pursing Authentic Teaching in an Age of Standardization." In *Defending Public Schools: Teaching for a Democratic Society*, ed. Kathleen R. Kesson and E Wayne Ross, vol. 2. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Von Zastrow, Claus. *Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools*. D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 2004. Accessed 12/31/05 from http://downloads.ncss.org/legislative/AcademicAtrophy.pdf.

Weiner, Lois. "Neoliberalism, Teacher Unionism, and the Future of Public Education." *New Politics* 10, no. 2 (Winter 2005). Accessed 12/30/2005 from http://www.wpunj.edu/~newpol/issue38/weiner38.htm.

Westbrook, Robert. *John Dewey and American Democracy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Williams, Joe. *Cheating Our Kids: How Politics and Greed Ruin Education.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Wink, Joan. *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the Real World*, 3rd ed. Boston: Pearson, 2005.

West, Cornel. *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight Against Imperialism*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2004.

West, Cornel. *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Wood, George. "Introduction." In *Many Children Left Behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act is Damaging Our Children and our Schools*, ed. Deborah Meier and George Wood, vii-xvi. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Wood, Gordon. "Founding Fathers and Creation of Public Opinion." *The Public Intellectual: Between Philosophy and Politics*, ed. Arthur Melzer, Jerry Weinberger, and M. Zinman. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.

Yalof, David and Kenneth Dautrich. *The Future of the First Amendment*. Miami: The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, 2004. Accessed 05/18/06 from http://firstamendment.jideas.org/findings/findings.php.

Zinn, Howard and Donaldo Macedo. *Howard Zinn On Democratic Education*. Boulder: Paradigm, 2005.

Zinn, Howard. *Disobedience and Democracy: Nine Fallacies on Law and Order*. New York: Vintage, 1968.