DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 738 SO 008 016

AUTHOR Warren, Donald R.
TITLE Public School as Political Idea.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented to the American Educational Studies Association, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights; Democracy; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; *Equal Education; Institutional Role; Political Socialization; *Public Schools; *School Role; Socialization; *United States History; Universal Education

ABSTRACT

The American public school is a political idea, as well as an educational institution, that is still awaiting full realization. Public schools fail to deliver the promised indiscriminate availability of educational goods and services. Discussions of that failure frequently revolve around the school's educational agenda and questions of pedagogy and curriculum. It can also be understood as an historical disagreement over the political implications of the equal opportunity objective. Early leaders articulated the idea of education to prepare citizens to use political power intelligently and to transcend the accidents of birth and geography in acquiring economic powers. Those who followed through on the idea saw it as a means for homogenizing society and for imposing on it "needed" education. At the root of these measures was a fear of the political implication of equal education. Although our schools today are not truly great, the idea, clouded with ambivalence, still has the potential of an uncompleted dream. (JH)

Public School as Political Idea*

Donald R. Warren
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Americans typically regard their public school as an educational institution, and perhaps it is. But it is also a political idea still awaiting full realization. Reflecting a public policy commitment to equalize access to education, the public school has been given the task of disseminating learning resources and programs without regard to sex, social class, race, and religion. That assignment has kept the school near the storm's eye of struggles over the distribution of wealth, status, training, and opportunity. Although the controversies frequently have revolved around the school's educational agenda and questions of pedagogy and curriculum, they can be understood too, and perhaps more fundamentally, as disagreements over the political implications of the equal opportunity objective.

Well before antebellum schoolmen got hold of it, the idea of public school articulated by early national leaders such as Benjamin Rush, Noah Webster, and Thomas Jefferson was as much a political as an educational construct. Horace Mann and his generation of reformers made the connection explicit: the common school would prepare citizens to use political power intelligently and enable them to transcend the accidents of birth and geography in acquiring economic power.[1] They envisioned a new system of what Jonathan Messerli has termed "enabling institutions" to supplant the enculturating web of church-family-community-work which functioned in small-town and rural America.[2] That web appeared to be disintegrating in the Jackson and antebellum years, at least in the northeast, and in any case had never functioned effectively amid pluralistic urban populations. More to the point, that socializing nexus, tied as it was to local conditions, could not promote the commonality of value and self understanding which the reformers deemed necessary as a basis for national community.

---

*Presented originally at the 1973 meeting of the American Educational Studies Association.

The importance of the school's projected political role was particularly evident in antebellum schoolmen's opposition to private and philanthropic modes of delivering educational services. The former could not be trusted to adhere to public policy commitments and the latter left the education of low-income children to the vagaries of local good-will and wealth. In the schoolmen's view, both promoted social class segregation in schools. They wanted, instead, inclusive learning opportunities available to rich and poor alike. Children of working class and immigrant families constituted a target population. Schools could arm them with literacy, skills, and the manner and morals thought necessary for membership in the national community, and in the process equalize enabling opportunity, only if the institutions worked their magic on rich and poor, Yankee and immigrant alike. The objective required inclusive, i.e., common, schools and widespread public support. The taint of philanthropy, public schools aimed at poor and foreign children only, was to be avoided. Thus, financing the schools was also envisioned as a common concern and activity. One paid a share whether or not one delivered his or her children to private schools or even whether or not one had any children at all. Public education, as idealized by antebellum schoolmen, was not a donation from the haves to the have-nots but a gift everyone gave to each other.

In interpreting the early nineteenth century public school idea, subsequent generations must be careful not to be misled by the schoolmen's hyperbolic excesses. To put it gently, they overstated their case. Some of them apparently enjoyed exaggeration. But even those must have found their proclivities taxed by the effort to sell systematized common education to the local elites and disparate social class, religious, and cultural groups which at the time were not accustomed to acting in concert on much of anything. Rather than a

description of actual practices and schooling outcomes, the hyperbole may represent little more than a salesman's attempt to render his product shiny, new, and irresistible.

In recent years the American public school has been the object of a fresh wave of criticism, perhaps the most thorough of the cycles of dissatisfaction which have regularly engulfed it over the past one and one half centuries. Some of the critics point to the school's failure to meet the learning needs of low income and minority culture children. Others note that its public character places it in the service of dominant power elites, thus rendering it incapable of promoting social change and equality. Decrying its effectiveness in teaching obedience and passivity, still others urge a dismantling of the public school establishment to the point of deschooling the society. Christopher Jencks claims to have documented the school's failure to equalize wealth and income. Yet, in many respects, the public school as institution has proven to be effective. For one, it bestows credentials which employers require in screening job applicants and which are positively correlated with status and income. Jencks's conclusions notwithstanding, apparently his data show a considerable schooling impact on income.[3] For good or for ill, the school is widely utilized in sorting people into jobs and established social class strata. Finally, one should remember that Ivan Illich and other advocates of deschooling fault the school not for failing but for succeeding too well as a socializing agent.

In terms of the equal opportunity ideal, however, the public school has failed. The point is not that it has failed to realize or promote effectively political and economic equality. The evidence on that score is at best ambiguous and at worst doubtful. The point, rather, is that American public schools have

not delivered the promised indiscriminate availability of educational goods and services. Before they are dismantled and/or released from the equal opportunity objective, it might be well to explore some of the reasons why.

The Lure of Homogeneity

One of the reasons may stem from the way early nineteenth century school people translated the equal opportunity imperative. The public school movement gained momentum during the 1830s and 1840s amid its adherents' despair over the fragmented, unevenly supported, and often dreary learning opportunities available through district schools. In terms of curriculum, textbooks, teacher competence, length of the school term, and facilities, public education varied from community to community and in many cases was non-existent. Changing social conditions heightened the reformers' concern for achieving educational commonality. Unprecedented urban growth, working class dissatisfaction, crime, extension of the franchise, an unstable economy, foreign immigration, drunkenness and other immoralities -- plagued by such worries the new nation seemed on the verge of coming unglued. "All the elements of society are in commotion," warned Elipha White at the 1837 meeting of the American Institute of Instruction. "The civil, moral, and religious institutions of ages are crumbling....Moral revolution -- moral chaos seems approaching.[4]

School reformers saw, on one hand, an unfinished nation and, on the other, an increasingly pluralistic population which seemed in danger of dissolving amid fratricidal squabbles. Bringing the country together, they insisted, required enabling its citizens to develop their abilities and acquire the understandings, skills, and attitudes they needed to play productive roles in society. If they were poor, in jail, fragmented by sectarian and geographical loyalties, or barred

by race or social class from chances to participate in the life of the nation, they could not be expected to contribute positively to nation-building. Needed were guarantees of a basic cultural homogeneity to bind the country together.

Put in its best light, the lure of homogeneity promised the equalization of learning opportunity through public schools of comparable quality. No child was to be deprived of a chance for education through accidents of birth or geography. Common schools scattered throughout the country represented one of the reformers' most cherished dreams. That realizing the objective amounted to an imperative became clear in the mid-century drive for compulsory school attendance. All of the youth, not merely some of them, must be educated.

But the effort revealed sinister aspects as well. Although exceptions appeared among them, particularly later in the century, public school advocates tended to fear cultural diversity, to see it as a cause of social malaise. People who were different clearly needed to be amended. "The foreigners who settle on our soil should cease to be Europeans and become Americans," announced Calvin Stowe to Ohio educators in 1837. "We must become one nation; and it must be our /the schoolmen's/ great endeavor to effect this object so desireable and so necessary to our American welfare."[5] Frequently expressed among public school advocates in the Jackson and antebellum years, such observations rested, perhaps innocently, on the assumptions that plurality implied disunion and civil conflict suggested disloyalty. An added implication of the schoolmen's prescription was that social change ran the risk of revolution. Schools became for many of them the way to control and direct change. Concluded

Elipha White: "By making men patriots and Christians, loyal and obedient subjects of civil authority and moral government, education effects an entire change, and restores order complete."[6]

Not all of what proceeded in schools from such rationales was outrageous but a great deal of it was. Federally sponsored schools for American Indians and the native peoples in Alaska adhered to a white man's burden rationale and deliberately assaulted rich indigenous cultures. Apache children learned that George Washington fathered their country, a lesson vividly fictionalized in Edwin Corle's novel Fig Tree John.[7] White school marms and masters introduced their Aleut and Eskimo charges to the mysteries of an alien morality and tongue, while in Chicago Italian youngsters were encouraged to practice sitting on their hands.[8] The objective, as William T. Harris put it early in the twentieth century, was to bring civilization to primitive peoples who "have not yet reached the Anglo-Saxon frame of mind."[9] He was referring specifically to the U.S. Bureau of Education's Alaska program, but his remark applied with equal force to the public education of immigrant children. Despite whatever good intentions and hopes characterized those who followed it, the lure of homogeneity promoted school-based acculturation, an alienating attempt at culture imposition.

Reform by External Pressure: the People as Enemy

Complementing and reinforcing the drive for acculturation through the agency of common, comparable, and homogeneously tailored public schools was another school reform strategy with equally ambiguous origins and objectives.

Confronted with the task of selling public education to somewhat reluctant, disinterested, and contentious citizenries, public school advocates devised what they termed the law of external pressure. Thaddeus Stevens affirmed it before the Pennsylvania legislature in 1835: "Every new improvement...has required the most strenuous, and often perilous exertions of the wise and good.... It is the duty of faithful legislators to create and sustain such laws and institutions as shall teach us our wants, foster our cravings after knowledge, and urge us forward in the march of intellect."[10] Maryland Congressman William Cost Johnson phrased it more cryptically two years later: "The inappetance of a people for education is in exact ratio of its ignorance."[11] In 1864 the president of the Cincinnati school board complained to the Ohio General Assembly, "The truth is, and it is just as well to say it in plain terms, that deeply and vitally as it concerns the State, the great majority of people care very little about education."[12] Addressing the first meeting of the National Association of School Superintendents in 1866, Emerson E. White, Ohio's commissioner of common schools, cautioned his audience to remember a "fundamental law running through the entire history of educational progress... An ignorant community has no inward impulse to educate itself. Just where education is most needed, there it is always least appreciated and valued... The demand for education is always awakened by external influences and agencies."[13]

Not all schoolpeople and public education advocates shared commitment to the law of external pressure. Nevertheless, its growing acceptance informed two related thrusts which characterized American public school organization and policy in the nineteenth century. One was the tendency toward centralization which encouraged the evolution of school bureaucratization at local, state,

and, with the founding of the U.S. Office of Education in 1867, at federal levels. The other can be seen in the move to marshall effective school control in the hands of educational professionals.

Centralization reflected the reformers' concern with devising efficient and effective public learning programs. They wanted not merely more schools, but systems of schools sharing common goals, curricula, and policies which would be able to realize economies of scale in delivering educational services. To promote equality of opportunity, the schoolmen argued, system, uniformity, rationality, and quality comparable with that of private schools must be imposed upon public education. In 1853 James Thornwell warned the governor of South Carolina:

> It is obvious...there is no system at all; the schools are detached and independent, they have no common life, and the state knows nothing of the influences which may be exerted within them.[14]

The state, Thornwell advised, must intervene "because this is the only way by which consistency and coherence can be secured..." South Carolina needed, according to Thornwell, "a common center of impulse and of action," a recommendation which Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and other northern school reformers would have applied to all states. Thornwell continued:

> There must be one presiding spirit, one head, one heart. Education will become a disjointed and fragmentary process if it is left to individuals, to private corporations and religious sects. Each will have his tongue and his psalm, and we shall have as many crotchets and experiments as there are controlling bodies.

Centralization must proceed gradually, not "abruptly and violently." Popular enthusiasm, suggested Thornwell, must be awakened by "addresses and disputations," forays among the people.

By the end of the century, school centralization had taken a significant, but not surprising, turn. Particularly in large cities, bureaucracy became the prevalent mode of school management and organization. Decision-making devolved into the hands of hierarchically arranged staffs with specialized assignments and limited familiarity with the system's total operation. Effective control rested with the senior officer. At the time, public school advocates viewed the development as a needed improvement. Boston's superintendent of schools John Philbrick concluded in 1885:

> The history of city systems of schools makes it evident that in the matter of administration the tendency is towards a greater centralization and permanency of authority and that this tendency is in the direction of progress and improvement. No doubt excessive decentralization of administration has been one of the chief obstacles to improvement in every department of our free school system.[15]

The move toward centralization and bureaucracy, combined with schoolpeople's attachment to the lure of homogeneity, promoted also a public school increasingly alienated from and unaccountable to its intended beneficiaries. For Margaret Haley, the outspoken leader of the Chicago Teacher's Federation around the turn of the century, the tendency toward "factorying education" threatened to dehumanize not merely the teaching profession but also schools themselves. Complained Haley, "our city school systems shall become great machines, in which one superintendent 'presses the button' and all the teachers

move absolutely as he directs."[16]

Rule by experts became a key item on the school reform agenda of progressives during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Joseph M. Rice, a New York City pediatrician whose muckraking articles focused critical attention on the state of American public schools in the early 1890s, added his voice to those demanding that the schools be cleansed of political graft, amateurism, and unbusinesslike practices. Too many schools, in Rice's view, delivered misery rather than joy in learning: rigid curricula and inflexible teaching methods enforced uniformly on all students; little evidence of interest by school personnel in individual differences among students; a heavy emphasis on rote memorization at the expense of students' learning to think; in sum, a tendency to forget that "the school exists for the benefit of the child, and not for the benefit of boards of education, superintendents, or teachers." To remedy the evils, Rice urged that three principles or laws be followed in the management of school systems: 1) divorce the schools from politics, 2) establish properly directed and thorough supervision, and 3) promote intellectual and professional self improvement endeavors by teachers. For Rice, the superintendent held the key to school reform. He must be "competent to undertake the task and sufficiently energetic to do all that is required of him, provided, however, that he is given a sufficient amount of independent power to enable him to improve the schools in any manner that may to him seem fit." Given competent, professional superintendents, the old, "unscientific" form of education, characterized by drilling facts into children's heads and eliciting from them rotely memorized lessons, will pass away. In its place, schools conducted on "scientific" principles will arise. The aim of

this "new" education, in Rice's view, was "to lead the child to observe, to reason, and to acquire manual dexterity as well as to memorize facts -- in a word, to develop the child naturally in all his faculties, intellectual, moral, and physical."[17]

Rice expressed little fear that his proposed reforms might be accompanied by unexpected, even undesired, outcomes. However, before the end of the decade, voices of caution could be heard warning of possible dangers from removing school management too far from the people. One of these was the Chicago Educational Commission which submitted its school reform proposals to Mayor Carter Harrison in 1898:

> There is a marked tendency in American cities to make the school system more and more a matter of expert control.... It is not, however, to be accepted without safeguards from the people. When larger powers are placed in the hands of the superintendent, whose judgment is modified only by his assistants, and these in turn have been imbued in a great measure with his own ideas of instruction and management, there is a distinct danger that the schools will fail to respond fairly to the ideas of the people. If the system of public instruction is not readily affected by public opinion, a feeling of dissatisfaction naturally arises that may lead to radical changes through the appointment of new members to the board of education, and such changes... are in general prejudicial to the interest of public education.[18]

"It is safe to say," the report continued, "that any educational system controlled wholly by the teaching force will be too conservative. The larger questions of educational policy must be left to the whole community from which representatives should be chosen to consider questions of public instruction and make recommendations to the proper authorities."

The commission's warning should not be misread. Composed of prominent citizens, including William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, who served as chairman, the commission resembled the blue-ribbon,

typically ad hoc, panels which blossomed across the country during the progressive era to marshall the forces of urban reform. In general, its members endorsed the sort of educational improvements popular among progressives at the time: cleansing the schools of political taint, appointing school board members by the mayor rather than electing them, and managing the schools by appointed professionals. The Commission feared, however, that if the reforms were carried to extremes, an alienated public might agitate for a reversal of improvements already gained. Citizen representation in school policymaking, the commission thought, not only kept the schools close to the public, a proximity not possible for board members appointed at large, it also kept the public close to the schools, thus increasing the likelihood of citizen loyalty to the schools and popular support for intended reforms.

What Rice and other reformers who shared his views did not, perhaps could not, see was the extent to which professionalism could promote a sterility in school operations as damaging for children as the conditions which progressives intended to correct. Rice's well-placed concern for children notwithstanding, his advocacy of expert and scientific management of schools promoted also an ideology of school control which effectively immunized school administrators against citizen and teacher demands for significant roles in education policymaking. The strategy of school reform by external pressure contained an internal contradiction which may explain one of the public school's more ironic features. School reformers from Horace Mann, Emerson White, and Henry Barnard to late nineteenth century progressives insisted upon an a-political public education, unsullied by partisan ideology and the shenanigans

of ward committeemen. What evolved instead (in part but not completely by design) was a deeply politicized institutional system controlled by professionals and, as school board members, representatives of the upper classes operating in concert under a cloak of objectivity and noblesse oblige.[19] Public education was promoted because the state and society in general were said to require it not because a pluralistic people with differing learning needs, capabilities, and aspirations especially wanted it. The organization and control of education were imposed externally; they were not processes in which ordinary citizens participated substantially. Reform by external pressure encouraged a jarring and singularly political development: the public school movement had identified the people as enemy.

Ambivalence and Exhaustion

Scanning the past 150 years, one can find considerable evidence that those who controlled American public schools went to some lengths to maintain that control and to hedge on the delivery of educational opportunity precisely because they feared or were ambivalent about the possible political consequences of equalization. From the start, therefore, American public education has exhibited a curious doublemindedness. It has offered, on one hand, a splendid and liberating vision of a nation sustained by enlightened citizens and leaders. On the other, it has promised fearsome control of change, non-conformity, and cultural diversity. With untroubled certainty, Daniel Webster regarded public education "as a wise and liberal system of police, by which property, and life, and the peace of society are secured..."

"By general instruction," he concluded, "we seek, as far as possible, to purify the whole moral atmosphere..."[20]

At the root of this ambivalence has rested an abiding discomfort over the political implications of education itself. Nowhere in the nineteenth century was this fear and fascination with learning more evident than in attitudes toward the education of black people.

> "This class of people," suggested a southerner writing in 1856, "do not require any place in the educational system of the State. Nay, more; their habits, capabilities, and natures are such, that the only and best education which they are capable of receiving, is just that which their labor itself furnishes -- namely, an education of character, rather than an education of the mind....where the master's eye directs the work and watches the morals of his people -- where the great and simple truths of Christianity are freely but orally taught to the slaves, (and for simple minds oral instruction is the best and wisest) -- where, in a word, slavery is the institution, and not merely an investment -- there the whole discipline of his condition develops in the slave the highest moral life of which he is capable, and his education is perfected by industry, obedience, and loyal affection to his master."[21]

In short, the state must be careful how far and for whom it promotes public education. Southern legislatures provided an equally telling, if left-handed, affirmation of education's power when they forbade the instruction of slaves following a series of revolts in the 1830s.

The evidence that schools can effect social reforms is at best uneven, but for a good many years Americans have seen evidence that some of their

number have feared an inestimable disaster accruing from the indiscriminate equalization of educational opportunity. Black people, in particular, have suffered exclusionary public school policies, but so have countless other racial, cultural, sexual, and religious groups. Exclusion has taken a variety of de jure and de facto forms, from outright expulsion, as in the cases of "colored" minorities and pregnant students, to mention two examples, to the blatant anti-Catholic bias of teachers and textbooks encountered by Irish children in the early nineteenth century. On occasion, exclusion has been barely visible, even to those who experienced it. Women, for example, once admitted to the public school ladder, a consequence achieved after a long and difficult struggle, experienced a subtle socialization toward social roles and careers deemed suitable for the "weaker sex."

One does not have to return to the nineteenth century to grasp the extent to which public school is a political idea. Less than a decade ago, Americans witnessed an unprecedented resurgence of their educational dream. For reasons lofty and base, Lyndon Johnson resurrected an old faith and with it familiar hyperbole. He signed the precedent-setting Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) on April 11, 1965 in the front yard of a school he once attended as a child near Johnson City, Texas. "As a son of a tenant farmer," he explained, "I know that education is the only valid passport from poverty."[22] The bill provided massive infusions of federal funds for school districts serving low income populations in urban and rural areas. "By passing this bill," the president said, "we bridge the gap between helplessness and hope for more than 5 million educationally deprived children.... And we rekindle the revolution -- the revolution of the spirit against the tyranny of

ignorance." Two days later at a White House reception for members of Congress, he returned to the theme of education's healing potential. "Better build schoolrooms for 'the boys,'" he concluded, recalling an often quoted aphorism, "than cells and gibbets for 'the man.'"

> I know those of you who sat in on the hearings have heard this many, many times, but I hope the people of America can realize that we now spend about $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in the detention home; we spend $2,500 for a family on relief, we spend $3,500 for a criminal in a State prison -- 1,800, 2,500, 3,500 -- but we only spend $450 a year per child in our public schools.
>
> Well, we are going to change that....
>
> Health is important. So is beautification, civil rights, agriculture, defense posture, but all of these are nothing if we do not have education.
>
> I will never do anything in my entire life, now or in the future, that excites me more, or benefits the Nation I serve more, or makes the land and all of its people better and wiser and stronger, or anything that I think means more to freedom and justice in the world than what we have done with this education bill.

Five months later, after signing the bill providing funds for ESEA programs, the president voiced again his belief in education's double-edged utility:

> We have always believed that our people can stand on no higher ground than the schoolground, or can enter any more hopeful room than the classroom. We blend time and faith and knowledge in our schools -- not only to create educated citizens, but also to shape the destiny of this great Republic.

Those words and the programs they preceded now seem to belong to a distant past. The school reform incentives of the mid 1960s were in part efforts to avoid and defuse more direct assaults on inequality and injustice in American life.[23] They were also half-hearted affairs. If learning programs such as Headstart and those generated by the Office of Economic Opportunity failed, and the evidence is far from conclusive that they did, the reasons are not

difficult to find.[24] Rounded off by the lure of homogeneity, stripped of vitality by delivery mechanisms that assumed the efficacy of reform instituted bureaucratically from the top down, and undermined by a fearful ambivalence that change might actually occur, the programs were barely underway when the process of demantling them began.

A disquieting exhaustion followed. Scholars and educationists returned to their research and with Richard Nixon on their side convinced Congress to establish a National Institute of Education, intended, in the President's words, to uncover the "new knowledge needed to make education truly equal."[25] The unspoken assumption was that ignorance alone explained the racism, social class bias, and bureaucratic starkness haunting the policies and programs of American public schools. In the context of the still unmet educational needs and aspirations of low income and minority culture students, Ivan Illich's deschooling proposal suggested a near-complete depletion of spirit and a singular loss of nerve.

Maxine Greene's insight into the education paradox provides a helpful perspective within which to view this cycle of action and exhaustion which has characterized American public school development over the years.[26] Education, she reminds us, both shapes and liberates. It entices us into the unknown, into adventure, as Alfred North Whitehead put it, and at the same time threatens us into reactionary flight. Education will always have enemies. It takes particular "contours," but is never wholly captured by institutional shapes, which, as Greene observes, necessarily remain ragged and insufficient. Educational institutions exist therefore in constant need of reform. The education paradox alerts every generation that it has a school reform agenda,

whether it wants one or not.

Americans in the 1970s have grounds aplenty for dissatisfaction with their public schools. Those institutions do not require defense. By any number of available measures, they have rarely achieved greatness. But if we are exercised about what public schools can and cannot accomplish, we ought at least to be candid about what we have tried to have them do and where we lost our nerve or, worse, failed to report truthfully what we intended them to do. Jonathan Kozol insists that the public school by definition is enlisted in maintaining established distributions of political and economic power.[27] The evidence on that point is still coming in. More certain is the fact that we do not know whether public schools can equalize educational opportunity. To date, at best timid and ambivalent efforts have pursued that objective.

Despite the failures of the public school as institution and those who have promoted and controlled it, the idea of public school as it has evolved in the United States, including its educational and political implications, remains worth salvaging. Like the institution, it too is clouded with ambivalence, suggesting if only distantly a peoples' commitment to themselves to guarantee chances for learning indiscriminately. The idea is great, if the school itself is not, but it is truly an uncompleted dream.

Notes

1. Donald R. Warren, To Enforce Education: A History of the Founding Years of the United States Office of Education (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1974), pp. 3-7.

2. Jonathan Messerli, Horace Mann: A Biography (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), p. xii.

3. See Christopher Jencks et al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972), pp. 253-65; and Patricia Cayo Sexton, "The Inequality Affair: A Critique of Jencks," Social Policy, 4, No. 2: 53-61.

4. Elipha White,"Introductory Discourse," American Institute of Instruction. Lectures and Proceedings, 8 (1837): 3.

5. Quoted in Allen Oscar Hansen, Early Educational Leadership in the Ohio Valley (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1923), p. 31.

6. Elipha White, American Institute of Instruction, 8 (1837): 3.

7. Edwin Corle, Fig Tree John (New York: Pocket Books, 1935).

8. See Darrell H. Smith, The Bureau of Education (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1923), pp. 47-55, 79-93.

9. William T. Harris to Julia Ward Howe, January 22, 1901, Bureau of Education Letters Sent, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

10. Quoted in Edgar W. Knight and Clifton L. Hall, eds., Readings in American Educational History (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. 353.

11. U.S., Register of Debates in Congress, 25th Cong., 2d Sess., 1837, 13:49.

12. Quoted in Ohio Educational Monthly, 13 (1864): 287.

13. Emerson E. White, "National Bureau of Education," American Journal of Education, 16 (1866): 184-85.

14. James H. Thornwell, "On Public Education in South Carolina (1853)," in Rena L. Vassar, ed., Social History of American Education (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), Vol. I, p. 258.

15. John D. Philbrick, City School Systems in the United States, U.S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information, No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1885), p. 19.

16. Quoted in Joseph M. Cronin, The Control of Urban Schools (New York: The Free Press, 1973), pp. 58-59.

17. Joseph M. Rice, The Public School System of the United States (New York: The Century Co., 1893), pp. 9-27.

18. Chicago Educational Commission, Report (Chicago: Lakeside Press, 1899), pp. 139-140/

19. See George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1927), pp. 82-97.

20. Quoted in David B. Tyack, ed., Turning Points in American Educational History (Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967), p. 96.

21. Quoted in Rush Welter, ed., American Writings on Popular Education: the Nineteenth Century (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1971), p. 204.

22. Public Papers of the Presidents (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), I: 413-14.

23. See Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, The Political Web of American Schools (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972), pp. 153-57.

24. Ibid., pp. 159-170.

25. Richard M. Nixon, "Education Reform," Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, March 9, 1970, p. 304.

26. Maxine Greene, "Identities and Contours: An Approach to Educational History," Division F Vice Presidential Address, American Educational Research Association, 1973.

27. Jonathan Kozol, "Look, This System Is Not Working," Harold W. Sobel and Arthur E. Salz, eds., The Radical Papers (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), pp. 50-51.

Vitae

Donald R. Warren is Head of the Department of Policy Studies, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. He is president of the American Educational Studies Association and secretary of Division F (History) of the American Educational Research Association. His publications include To Enforce Education: A History of the Founding Years of the United States Office of Education (Wayne State University Press, 1973) and articles in School Review, Intellect, Phi Delta Kappan, Education and Urban Society, Illinois Journal of Education, New York Teacher, and Midwest History of Education Journal. He is currently completing a book entitled Schools for People: Policy Issues in the History of American Education.