DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 421 SP 035 788

AUTHOR Brosio, Richard
TITLE The Battle for Social Foundations of Education: A Report from the Middletown Front.
PUB DATE 10 Nov 94
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association (November 9, 1994). For related paper, see SP 035 787.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; College Faculty; Department Heads; Education Courses; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foundations of Education; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; *Politics of Education; Power Structure; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; Social Structure; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Middletown; *Social Foundations of Education

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the interdepartmental and university-wide struggle over the status of the social foundations of education discipline at a midwest university. Opening sections of the paper describe the location and status of social foundations courses and faculty members during the 1960s and 1970s as the institution developed from a teachers college into a multipurpose university. Next the paper describes a later secessionist movement attempting to establish a Social Foundations of Education Department at the institution. This includes a detailed account of meetings, sub-groups of the faculty, and developments, communications, and discussions with administration as well as the failed attempt to establish a separate department. A subsequent section describes how the ideas behind the succession movement continued at the university in various political and administrative struggles. A final section describes this local struggle as part of a larger battle against what is seen as a generally reactionary period of national history. This section argues that the opponents of social foundations knew enough about the critical and even subversive potential of foundational inquiry to fear and resist its effects. The paper closes with a broader discussion of teacher education and its purposes. (Contains 49 references.) (JB)

ED 380 421

The Battle For Social Foundations of Education:

A Report From The Middletown Front

Richard Brosio

AESA 1994

Background

The Battle For Social Foundations of Education (SFE) had to be fought because of what did—and did not—occur historically on the Middletown Front. Some of the problems may have been endemic to institutions that evolved from normal schools to colleges of education and finally into multipurpose universities; however, there were also more specific and unique reasons that made the struggle for SFE so intense and enduring at this institution. If SFE can be described as interpretive, normative and critical studies of education, then it is understandable that nontheoretical, conservative, former normal school personnel would not eagerly support this field of study; however, some sister institutions do have Foundations departments and/or histories of support and respect for foundational study, scholarship and courses. It could be argued that specific—if not unique—reasons for the historic erosion, neglect and hostility toward SFE at this institution can be explained best in terms of the individual and group actors who were able to bring their views of teacher education to institutional fruition compared to those who were not. Had there been more politically effective, committed and tireless Foundations advocates during the 1960s when Middletown became a university, they may have been successful in convincing or forcing the organization and leadership to have allowed SFE to play a key role in teacher education programs instead of the marginal part that it was condemned to play. Because there was a lack of politically sagacious, brave and resolute Foundations faculty when Teachers College emerged as just one college within the multipurpose university in the 1960s, some SFE courses were housed in a department that didn't include SFE in its title, others in the associate dean's office, as well as foundational content being dispersed throughout various departments around the college. Of the two undergraduate Foundations courses in the professional core requirement, one had a secondary education prefix (ED SEC 420), while the other had an elementary one. Furthermore, the secondary SFE course was only a three hour course under the old quarter system whereas most of the other required core courses were four quarter hours. The graduate courses had Foundations

prefixes but were officially controlled by the associate dean's office; however, in practice the chair of the Secondary Education Department (a department that over the years had various other names in the title after secondary) provided the overwhelming number of faculty to teach these courses. Not all of the choices represented qualified Foundations faculty members. The assignment of poorly qualified and nonqualified persons to teach the undergrad core SFE (carrying a secondary education prefix) courses occurred as well.

What has just been described became apparent to me soon after becoming a member of the Secondary Education Department in 1972. In spite of this realization it was not obvious how to improve the situation. The SFE professors in the department were few, not evenly committed to the cause of overall improvement, not uniformly active in the field and lacking in solidarity as well as political skills. The departmental leadership was quite effective at pursuing its goals during the 1970s, although the improvement of conditions for effective SFE instruction was not one of its priorities. One could be identified with Foundations and even have most and/or all teaching assignments in Foundations courses but there were limits to one's advocacy. The litmus test was met and failed if one argued for the undergraduate Foundations course to be changed from ED SEC 420 to ED FON 420. Relatedly, it was verboten to suggest that an ED FON 420 course be used to teach all of the students in the college, i.e., the elementary students as well. This idea threatened the turf separation between elementary and secondary; moreover, the ED FON prefix change would threaten to prevent nonFoundations professors from being assigned to Foundations courses in both departments.

In the early 1980s there occurred an opportunity that at the time seemed to promise a workable solution to the problem of SFE's status at Middletown. I had become convinced through long experience and reflection that the hegemony exercised by those who were opposed to focusing attention and resources upon the improvement of SFE in the department and college would prevent the necessary changes from being made; therefore, a secessionist attempt appeared to be necessary. The university had initiated a merit pay plan

under the direction of a new president and provost. The Teachers College had a new dean as well. It appeared that scholarly productivity was going to become important in terms of promotion, tenure and salary increase. At the same time as these important changes were being made, the long-time chairman of the Secondary Education Department received a no-confidence vote by the other chairs in Teachers College. The new provost was in the process of looking critically at various departments; therefore, an external committee was organized by his office to conduct an inquiry into Secondary Education. The subsequent report was not supportive of the status quo. Rumor had it that the department—which consisted of a very heterogeneous mix of those interested in secondary education, supervision, methods, higher education, multicultural education and SFE—was a prime candidate for reorganization.

Instead of waiting for reorganization—which seemed to include separation of some components from the old unit—a small group of Foundations faculty and those who were teaching and/or interested in Multicultural Education began negotiating with the college dean to see if these two areas of study could comprise a new unit if the rumored reorganization were to occur. The nominal director of Multicultural Education and I (sometimes having the title of Foundations Coordinator but without any influence or power to serve as an official advocate of the field) were both mentioned favorably by the external review process established by the provost. The two of us made clear that we had no personal quarrels with members of the department that had been severely criticized by the external committee report; however, we maintained that our two areas comprised a logical intellectual unit—moreover, the classes taught were related as well. The external evaluation had recommended that SFE be moved to another unit; therefore, we secessionists thought that a good case could be made for an amicable splitting off from a department whose rump might still undergo more division and reorganization. Because some secessionists thought that our unit would be too small and vulnerable in terms of college and university politics, an attempt was made to bring the (hopefully) autonomous SFE and Multicultural units into

an already existing Center for Lifelong Education which consisted of curriculum, adult and community education. This department consisted of faculty who had once been included in a huge Secondary, Adult and Community Education Department. When curriculum, adult and community education successfully seceded, the Secondary Education Department added Higher and Foundations of Education to its title. This meant that the chairman of Sec., High. and Foundations of Education came to control, in a official way, the assignment of instructors to graduate Foundations claims, viz., Philosophy of Education, History of Education and Sociology of Education—including seminars in each of these disciplines. I thought at the time of our attempted secession that a new and separate department of Foundations and Multiculturists faculty would be better for Foundations; however, some of my secessionist colleagues persuaded me that our autonomy would be respected within the hoped-for new, larger arrangement. The chairman of the Center for Lifelong Education interviewed those of us who sought to join his unit, he declared his support as did the dean of Teachers College. It appeared that the provost and even his hierarchical superiors supported our attempted secession and reorganization.

The leadership of Sec., High. and Foundations of Education was not supportive. In fact, under the leadership of the chair the most intense pressure was brought to bear upon the five of us who sought to leave. Many faculty members in the department who were not trained in SFE or Multicultural Education and did not study in these fields would lose the opportunity to teach the courses should the secession succeed. They did not look favorably upon this possibility. They argued that if one taught the courses, he (there were no women involved in this claim) was automatically certified to be included in the SFE and/or Multicultural subfaculties. We argued that one had to have a record of academic preparation and of subsequent work in the fields in order to qualify. Our argument was made difficult by the fact that, because Multicultural Education was in its infancy as an area of inquiry and teaching, most of the faculty who taught it had not studied it at university; therefore, they had degrees in other areas. Two of our Multicultural faculty had not been

prepared in SFE, therefore making it more difficult to argue personnel-wise that we were an organic unit. The opponents of our secession focused on the fact that the required undergraduate Foundations and Multicultural courses had Secondary Education (ED SEC) prefixes; therefore, if we left, the courses would remain in the old unit. We argued that because the ED SEC prefix was a result of political power and not of intellectual academic reality, a prefix change for the undergraduate SFE course to Foundations (ED FON) would bring official description into congruence with reality. It was not certain how comfortable the multiculturalists were with prefix changes. The required undergraduate multicultural education course had a SEC prefix, whereas some others had ED GEN prefixes. (As this analysis is being written (1994), there is a push by multiculturalists to change all of the multicultural courses to an ED MUL prefix!)

The following is a quote from the secessionists' "Report on Foundations of Education and Multicultural Education," which was written in May 1982. It was the document that was intended to provide the intellectual academic, pedagogical and organizational justification for autonomy within the Center for Lifelong Education. The dean of Teachers College had given us the green light to write the explanatory report seeking to justify the secessionary attempt. The introduction of the report reads:

> Included herein is a response to External Evaluation Committee's recommendation that the Foundations of Education be moved to another unit. The Provost has stated that the results of departmental and administrative deliberations of the External Evaluation Committee report will be discussed by the Dean of Teachers College, the President [of the University], and himself in order to arrive at some decision. The information that follows considers the areas of Foundations of Education and Multicultural Education and discusses the rationale for their future together. It proposes the moving of these two areas to the Center for Lifelong Education, where they would operate under the umbrella of the Center organization in much the same manner as the areas of Adult and Community Education and Curriculum. A rationale for such a merger is provided ... justifying the action with the belief that each of the involved areas will be strengthened by the cooperative efforts made possible by the merger.[1]

In spite of the logic and academic rationale articulated in the report, the secession did not occur. The main reason for the failure was lack of political power within the institution. Although the Foundations and Multicultural professors were seemingly given a green light by the dean and upper administration, that support mysteriously ceased without explanation; therefore, the attempt to secede and join another unit failed. As might be expected, the consequences were not good for those of us who had attempted to leave. Only two members of the secessionists were full professors and one person had not yet achieved tenure.

Although it was not possible to ascertain with certainty why and how the failure occurred, it is necessary to forward a careful conjectural explanation—one that is based on information and facts, although not of the type that allows for convincing/definitive argumentation. First of all, the changes the University and Teachers College were undergoing—in the direction of more accountability, emphasis on merit and respect for disciplines, etc.—were only in the beginning stages of that trajectory. The dean and upper administration may not have been as secure or powerful as they needed to be in terms of securing the move we had proposed. One could speculate that resolve, courage and even honesty were in short supply as well. It is true that the leadership of the department we were attempting to leave mounted a fierce, broad front, sometimes personal counterattack on those who sought change. Relatedly, the secessionists were not of one accord. The personal acquaintanceships among us were not for the most part cemented by deep friendships; moreover, there were serious differences among the group with regard to how best to conduct one's professional-academic career. At the heart of the disagreement among the secessionists lay the different conceptions of the necessity to be engaged in scholarship on a continuing basis. Only one member of the secessionist group was engaged on a regular basis in scholarship that could be judged by one's peers in a field of study. It appears, in retrospect, that some members of the secessionist group shared many of the underlying assumptions about how to conduct oneself professionally with those they

sought to leave: specifically, a more generalist mode of operation, interest in grant writing, consultantships and comfortableness with "practical" rather than theoretical issues. The careers made by the original secessionists after the failure of 1982 make clear what only seemed to be the case at the time of the attempted flight. So, in addition to a lack of deep friendships and loyalty to one another, there was a lack of agreement on what it meant to be a teacher, scholar and service provider within the profession. It must be made clear that I am not arguing for only one model of how to be a "good" professor; nor is it being claimed that each and every secessionist had the same amount of maneuverability with regard to career lines/choices and institutional reward systems, pressures and realities. Those in the department who successfully prevented the secession from occurring had no such problems—they were united in their reactionary counterattack.

The Battle Continues After The Secession Fails

There were some things gained despite the failure to secure SFE and Multicultural Education in a new unit. The most important one being the idea that there would be separate, somewhat official, subfaculties within the department. The three Foundations professors all had degrees in the field and had taught the courses; although, the degree of involvement within the academic and professional work in the field was very uneven. In spite of that unevenness, there was the fact of semiofficial recognition, by the dean's office, that those whose main interest was in methods and supervision were not to teach Foundations courses. The prohibition against nonqualified persons teaching the Multicultural courses was never well established because of the difficulties involved with demonstrating that the area was a field in the same way that SFE is; obviously, the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation's (CASA) booklet called *Standards For Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies* (1978) provided a useful tool in the ongoing battle

that the multiculturalists lacked. Another opening in an otherwise bleak scene was the fact that "Foundations" was in the title of the department. I had personally learned that although the struggle for SFE was difficult, the terrain upon which to conduct the battles was not entirely impossible or hostile. Most of the other members of the original secessionist group learned different lessons. Before the attempted secession it was virtually unheard of for junior members of our department to enter into negotiations with the dean; however, this was no longer to be the case after the first battle had been fought—although it had not been successful. The fact that the leadership of the department in which we were now forced to remain was seriously out of sync with where the college and university seemed to be headed made it possible to forward certain arguments that could eventually (hopefully) lead to improved conditions for SFE professors and for students who were required to, or chose to, take Foundations classes. The erstwhile allies of 1982 did not share my strategic insight that the dean's office could be compared to the central government, whereas the departments were the various states. It seemed possible to encourage the central government to become interventionist in order to ensure that departments which were resisting progressive change would feel pressure from the dean's office. This strategy made even more sense when one realized that the university was basically promoting the direction in which the dean's policies were leading us. Soon after the abortive secession, a new dean came to office in Teachers College. This proved to be a change of great importance in the attrition battle for Foundations on the Middletown front.

In addition to having a change in leadership in the dean's office, the department also had "new" leadership. The external committee report helped make it impossible for the former chairman of our department to continue in power. He was succeeded by a person who basically shared the views of the former chair, although their personalities and *modus operandi* were significantly different. Although I was not hopeful, my strategy was to attempt dialogue with the new chairman in order to forward the project of improving and securing the role of SFE within a heterogeneous department whose commitment was

primarily to supervision, methods, technology and other nonFoundational concerns. In fact, SFE was treated as a "conquered province" ever since (and before) I began working at Middletown in 1972. The "province" provided work for many nonFoundations professors, but they did not work in the field as scholars, service providers—and in most cases, not even in terms of attending SFE conferences or reading the literature. Granted it is difficult to "prove" what someone reads; however, there were many empirically verifiable signs pointing to the lack of reading the literature.

There were many issues I wanted to pursue: chief among them was ensuring that only SFE faculty teach the courses; however, there were integrally related issues because of the neglect—and even hostility—the departmental leadership had visited upon SFE. For one thing, there were only three Foundations professors; therefore, we could not handle all of the courses. It was apparent that more Foundations professors needed to be hired. None were hired between the time I came in 1972 and when radically altered conditions in 1994 allowed the hiring of a bona fide Foundations colleague. The undergrad SFE course (ED SEC 420) still had the secondary prefix, plus it still was a three hour course while all of the other required professional core courses were four hour ones—except for the Elementary Education (EL ED) course that was supposed to be foundational. The advising that was needed to support enrollment in graduate SFE courses was woefully inadequate; although, it was now rare that patently obvious nonqualified colleagues taught the graduate courses. The departmental leadership reacted to the modest gain in proper faculty assignment to SFE graduate courses by failing to use its proper authority and strength on the advisement front, as well as neglecting to use departmental resources to prevent the removal of these courses from some important program requirements. It would be accurate to say that, although I had a clear priority list upon which to resume the battle for SFE, this was not always possible because of my lack of power *and* the continuous actions of the department leadership to jeopardize the status of SFE in our department and college. My role in the battle was primarily defense/reactive, although once involved, certain offensive

tactics became possible. My intention is to organize this section around certain key fights for which documentary evidence is available. The framework within which these skirmishes occurred is based upon the university's decision to change from the quarter to semester system. The politics of this transition period proved to be dangerous for those of us who were advocates of SFE, but with relatively little power to protect and promote the field and its courses.

As plans for transition from a quarter to semester system began, I wrote to the chairman, on October 13, 1986, about the rumor that he planned to reduce the graduate History of Education class to two hours in response to the impending change. This cut would be incongruous with the three hour format of courses considered to be important ones under the proposed semester system. My tone in the letter is amicable although I was shocked, angered and worried in the face of how SFE might be further weakened during a transition to semesters with no one who would/could argue for our field during the crucial negotiations.[2] It is my view that the chairman and others who represented the department during the transition to the semester system were driven by credit hour convenience as well as their values—ones which assigned a comparatively low value to Philosophy, History and Sociology of Education, as well as SFE as a field of study and teaching. In addition to the damage that would be done to the intrinsic nature of the course itself by reducing credit hours for a SFE graduate course, the reduction could necessitate that a Foundations professors teach *five* courses per semester, while those whose course's did not suffer in the transition would teach "only" four.[3] Unfortunately, a reduction to a two hour course format under the new semester system did occur in the case of the undergraduate Foundations course, but not in terms of the graduate ones. As it became apparent that the negotiations over transition to the semester format was being forwarded by some who were consciously or inadvertently committed to and/or comfortable with "making history behind the backs" of many who would be vitally affected by the decisions, I sought support from CASA. My specific worry was that the 420 SFE course—which had just been increased to

a four hour course under the outgoing quarter system—would be endangered during the transition to semesters. Dr. Alan Jones in his capacity as Secretary-Treasurer of the Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE) and a CASA network volunteer wrote to one of the members of the departmental negotiators on April 17, 1986 reminding him of CASA standards.[4] In fact, as the document for footnote number five demonstrates, Jones sent a copy of the *Standards For Academic and Professional Instruction* booklet to this member—one who had been a SFE person in the secessionist group. The person to whom the letter was sent assured me in writing that he had recommended a 420 SFE course as a three hour offering under the coming semester system. In spite of the reassurance, the hour was lost and the erstwhile ally did not fight effectively to prevent that surgery.

It is necessary to go back chronologically in order to understand the irony involved in the threatened loss of one hour during the transition to semesters. After struggling for a very long time to increase the 420 SFE course to a four hour course under the quarter system, this goal was finally achieved in the spring of 1986—as was alluded to in the preceding paragraph. On the very day that I began teaching the 420 SFE course with the extra hour the chairman announced to me, in what I considered to be a flippant manner, that the hour had been traded away during the transition negotiations, but that an attempt would be made to regain it as the whole process played itself out. It was at that point in December of 1986 that I knew there would be no fair play for SFE within the department under the chairman and his allies. Neither the population nor culture had changed within the department since the abortive attempt to secede. Furthermore, it became increasingly apparent that except for personal style the new chairman represented the very same interests as the person he had succeeded in power. The erstwhile alliance of SFE and Multicultural professors was no longer intact; therefore, there was no formal organized opposition to the leadership's policies and *modus operandi*.

As the storm clouds gathered over the contested terrain of the undergraduate 420 SFE course, it became obvious that CASA-AESA, the "central government" of the dean's

office, as well as the larger university were the most likely and effective allies (although one SFE member of the original secessionist group acted bravely and somewhat effectively as my sole internal ally during the battle over the lost hour). My developing argument sought to establish that department chairs did not have the power to violate national standards, such as our CASA and CLSE ones. I appealed to the "central government" to protect the "constitution" during a period of partisan—and I argued, irresponsible—attacks upon standards/"constitution" during the transition period. In a memorandum to the dean and associate dean on July 23, 1986, I alerted them to an incredible, rumored proposal from the department that the 420 SFE course could be collapsed into student teaching. Not only would the one Foundations course be diffused and truncated temporally but, that "most of us who are best prepared to teach Foundations courses have not been, or are not presently, supervising student teachers. I fear that if 420 is offered in rump form before or after student teaching it will be staffed along the lines of load convenience instead of criteria based upon the best qualified faculty members ... I hope, and trust, that those members of my department who are privileged to have a voice in the transitional process are aware of the need to do Foundations over the whole length of the semester—and that they have spoken convincingly of their awareness to you and to other transition policy makers."[5]

This memorandum was followed by a letter from Alan Jones, who continued to serve as Secretary-Treasurer of CLSE and now as President-Elect of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA), to the dean, associate dean and department chairman on January 23, 1987. Jones opened with: "It is with great concern that we at the Council of Learned Societies in Education have recently learned that the basic required undergraduate course in the foundations of education at ... [Middletown] (ED SEC 420) has been reduced from four credit hours [under the last period of the quarter system], thus placing it in an apparently lower priority position than the other required courses in your institution's teacher education program... I hope that steps will quickly be taken ... to restore parity in credit hours ... It is our understanding that a movement in that direction is

already underway ... If we at the [CLSE] can provide any additional information or assistance ... please do not hesitate to call upon us."[6] It is clear to me that outside support from persons like Jones and organizations such as CLSE, AESA-CASA were of great importance to our deans because they were supportive of Foundational studies as well as committed to a Teachers College that followed policies which were publicly answerable and congruent with national standards.

I wrote a memorandum to the chairman on September 15, 1987 in my capacity as State coordinator of CASA and as a member of the SFE faculty. In addition to the problem of the lost hour for 420, I reminded the chairman that there was erosion of integrity of Foundations graduate courses because of their not being offered and/or being staffed (on occasion) by nonFoundations professors—in one case the chairman himself taught Philosophy of Education off-campus in a three week workshop format. I returned to the most grievous problem in the memorandum: "My greatest ... worry is about the 420 class and its present hours allocation. We struggled for a long time to increase this crucially important course offering to four hours under the quarter system. On the very day when we began teaching it as a four hour course (first day of Winter Quarter 1986) I learned that it had been reduced to two hour status [under the impending transition to semesters] ... I am convinced that it is imperative our Department, and Dean's Office, see to it that ... 420 ... be [increased to] a three hour course ..."[7] On October 26, 1987 I wrote again to the chairman and said how concerned I was about the 420 hour loss: "You have verbally assured me that you think we can get the hour back. I am not as confident ... My position is—and has been—that it never should have been traded away in the first place. Foundations is integral to teacher education, and is even part of our Department's title—but still the hour was cut ... I believe that ... [this would not have occurred] had I been able to represent and defend the course."[8]

It was of crucial importance to keep alert to each and every act—or lack of action—that injured, and/or did not provide proper support to SFE. However, this was difficult to

do for a variety of reasons. First of all, things were occurring at a rapid pace during the transition to semesters; there were many committees and processes that were involved but I was not a member of any of them; furthermore, there was officially no colleague involved who could be trusted to forward the project of improvement that I and CASA favored. There was one person who was involved formally in the transition process and had a SFE background as well as regularly teaching the 420 SFE course, but who did not work in the field in the sense of attending any of the main SFE organizations—let alone providing service to the field or contributing to the literature. Although this insider wanted 420 to gain the hour for obvious reasons, first among them making load credit come out right without having to teach an overload in order to meet the required twelve semester hours, he did not argue effectively against the chair and the others in department leadership positions when the hour was traded away. The chairman looked to this insider to claim SFE was represented in the transition process. This was a clever strategy on his part—at least for the short run. I tried to point out that being a bona fide Foundations person could not be earned simply through having a degree and teaching a course; instead, one had to participate in the professional and academic life of the field. The deans of our college agreed with my argument; however, they could not spend all of their energies on one department or particular battle. It was difficult for one person, and only one staunch ally (a colleague who was not involved as an insider during the transition process) on the 420 hour battle to be alert to all the attacks on SFE: e.g., as we focused on regaining the hour, the practices of nonsupport for SFE graduate course enrollment continued, nonFoundations professors were assigned to the 420 SFE courses, too few Foundations courses were offered during summer sessions, our courses hardly ever enjoyed the luxury of being taught when they were slightly under-enrolled whereas media, discipline, "research" courses, etc., were granted this benefit. As an example of the atmosphere of steady attacks on SFE, I offer the following excerpts from a letter written to the chairman on July 15, 1988 in reference to the the 1988–89 academic year. "I do not want to teach an already

truncated 420 class during a shortened period of time ... I fear that some 420 sections will be run on a less than whole semester basis. As you know, I was always in favor of stretching an academic study of education course out over [a long period of] time [viz., from quarters to semesters] so that there is [more] time for reflection and digestion."[9] The departmental leadership came up with a scheme which was driven by convenience and choice for student teachers. Some student teachers elected to student teach for shorter periods of time than the whole semester. This incredible plan came from those who consistently voiced commitment to the student teaching experience as the most important in the teacher education program! For those students who chose to student teach for fewer weeks (there were two choices representing less than the whole semester) the obvious problem was the need to have something to fill the time left by the shorter format. The leadership's invention was to offer an already truncated, poorly staffed 420 SFE class in two versions of a "workshop" format: five weeks and/or three weeks.

In an attempt to enter into the transition process it was necessary to have assistance from outside the department. On July 29, 1988 I wrote a letter to the university provost informing him that the Teacher Education Council (TEC) had established an AD HOC committee to study curricular/course offerings in teacher education. The TEC would decide ultimately if the hour would be restored to 420. A moratorium had been imposed on the transition process: this meant a cessation of activities aimed at further altering courses and hour allocations until a future date. The final negotiations would be worked through the formal process. In the meantime the 420 SFE course was being taught without the third semester hour. My letter explained that "I was called to the AD HOC by ... [the associate dean of Teachers College] to speak about 420. We weren't supposed to be discussing hours per se; instead, the AD HOC committee's charge is to look for overlap, duplication, proper boundaries—and finally proper time allocations. Hopefully, the TEC will look at the courses fairly, and then change some things when the moratorium is lifted. Because this issue is so important to my professional life and to our students, I am keeping you

informed."[10] As has been pointed out earlier, I encouraged the dean's and provost's offices to see their role of guarantors of certain standards and practices that were protected by professional organizations—in this case AESA-CASA—so that the wild and sometimes selfish politics of transition would not simply do away with courses, hours, etc., that merited "constitutional" protection against irresponsible leadership and even "democracy." The brief I presented to the TEC on July 28, 1988 exemplifies the strategy I pursued.[11] An outline of my argument presented can be characterized as follows: (1) the 420 SFE course is broad and deep therefore necessitating three hours; (2) this fact was recognized by the TEC in May of 1986 when the decision was made to increase 420 by one hour under the quarter system; (3) 420 is the only SFE course in the professional sequence of required undergraduate courses; (4) CASA standards require that Foundational study consist of least one-sixth of the sequence; (5) the SFE should not be taught in a time-compressed workshop form. I concluded by stating that "this unique, and critically important, course can best serve our professional sequence and students by being restored to a proper share of that sequence—and by being taught over the whole of the semester time frame."[12] I was not aware at the time that the colleague who claimed to be a SFE professor and who had been included in on the formal politics of transition by the department leadership was not a foe of the "workshopification" of 420.

I wrote to Alan Jones on September 7, 1988, who was President of AESA at the time, and explained to him that, although the department curriculum committee was on record as wishing to restore the hour to 420 when the moratorium was over, it was far from certain that the department leadership would fight for the restoration unless the other things they desired within a pork-laden package were granted as well. This fear was based upon the fact that SFE concerns were always given the lowest priority by the departmental leadership throughout the unit's history. The following passage from the letter will give the interested reader the essence of my report to President Jones. "I have argued that the added hour ... should be a separate issue; however, I *don't have the power to make that*

happen [emphasized for this text] ... As you know, most of my colleagues [in a heterogeneous department] have primary allegiance to laboratory experiences ... [but, on the positive side the] Dean ... and Provost ... 'pledge' their support to the restoration."[13]

I asked Jones to write to the dean and provost to strengthen the idea that there was, in fact, an AESA and CASA out there and that I was not merely representing myself. "The letter must come across as a document which further empowers the Dean and Provost to act decisively for what is right with regard to national professional criteria ... [The] Associate Dean is in agreement with ... [the Dean's] position and ... [they are both] members of TEC."[14] Perhaps the following part of my letter to the AESA president will help the reader understand the kind of departmental leadership that was being battled against upon this complex terrain. "Chairman ... is officially for the restored hour but is not in a leadership role in trying to get it back. There occurred a temporary lifting of the moratorium last May, and ... [the chairman] tried to get a proposal through TEC which did not include the restored hour for Foundations. I vetoed [demurred] it. Then it was learned that demurrals from within departments weren't valid. It went to a vote before TEC and lost. I am convinced that had it won, we could not have been successful coming back ... [and] asking for more."[15]

In order to further clarify these complex events and chronology, it is necessary to look at the demurral process more closely. A memorandum dated May 9, 1988 from the associate dean to the department chair read as follows: "A demurrer was received on the proposed senior high, junior high and middle school education license on May 5, 1988. As has been our procedure, please meet with the person who has demurred the posted program—in this instance ... Richard Brosio."[16] I argued in the formal demurral letter to the dean that I was taking "this official action because ... [the New Program Posting] is not congruent with the action taken by our Departmental Curriculum Committee—action which was approved by the Department. More specifically, my demurrer is based upon my belief that if there is to be any proposal from our Department during this lifting of the

moratorium [on alterations during the transition to semester], the Social Foundations of Education (ED SEC 420) should be restored to three semester hours. ... [The chairman's] proposed new ... course would mean a fourth methods course ... while the only Foundations course would remain at two semester hours."[17] I continued to keep the provost informed about what was occurring. Interestingly enough, the deciding vote against the department leadership proposal before TEC was cast by a student representative chosen by the leadership. This brave person was a former student of mine.

There is no question that within the specific context of the Battle for SFE on the Middletown front the fact that the undergraduate course was not protected by a department and its leadership was the most dangerous liability. The reasons for this lack of support are many and varied; however, be that as it may, the conclusions I drew from these unfortunate events and battles were that SFE as an area would be better served by having its own department/unit—even if the unit were only autonomous within a federated organization of collegiate governance.

Because the department chairman's proposal (which did not include the restored hour) failed, the opportunity to pass an inclusive proposal became greater. On September 12, 1988 I wrote to the provost that the AD HOC subcommittee that was headed by the associate dean of Teachers College recommended a program that included the restored hour. The recommendation had to pass through TEC, Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC) and finally, University Senate. I alerted him about a potential roadblock: "Apparently there is some concern that the Ed Psych [Educational Psychology] course [which was part of the AD HOC recommendation] may be contested at UEC ... I hope that the Social Foundations of Education increase will not become a hostage in that possible war ... Do you think that the best strategy is to let the process work its will?"[18] The provost answered the question in the affirmative. I informed the provost on December 12, 1988 that the TEC passed the newly proposed (by the AD HOC Committee) "Senior High, Junior High/Middle School Education Program."[19]

Although the document being relied on to make the next point is somewhat out of chronological sequence, it helps to explain the multifaceted complexity of this particular phase (credit hour reduction during transition to semesters) of the Battle for SFE. The first paragraph of my June 15, 1988 letter to the provost provides a review of events already described in the work before you; however, it is important to add another dimension. I related to the provost the fact of my meeting with our dean, associate dean and department chairman on May 6, 1988. The dean assured me that the persons at the meeting "pledged" their support to the restoration of the lost hour for 420. The chairman "did not verbally join in but did agree that the Department Curriculum Committee was already on record—with departmental approval—to offer a proposal to the TEC that includes the restored hour ... The plan I demurred [unsuccessfully] in May of 1988 did not include the hour. So ... [the chairman] seemed to be admitting that we would revert back to the plan approved earlier—one that went properly through channels."[20]

Again, it is necessary to present material out of chronological sequence in order to help explain and hopefully clarify how the battle for the lost hour was conducted on the Middletown front. The groundwork for the progress being described was prepared in a very important way at a February 3, 1988 meeting with the dean, associate dean and chairman. I prepared an eight page "Position Paper on Social Foundations of Education" and the four of us were to conduct our discussion within the paper's context. This was an important recognition of Foundation's importance, and represented support from the dean who called the meeting. In this Position Paper I went from an introductory paragraph about the present crisis involved with the 420 hour that the department leadership had traded away to a history of how SFE had been treated in the department.

I began with pointing out that all of the bona fide Foundations professors believed that the field was poorly served by being housed in the department. Three Foundations colleagues who left long before 1988 were brought back on the historical stage and especially one who warned presciently that the turning over of the Foundations graduate

courses to the department (as has been pointed out, they had been controlled formerly by the former associate dean) would be a mistake because of the department leadership's refusal to recognize the integrity and importance of SFE. Next came a reminder that in the early 1980s "the faculty members who are [at that time and still are] closest to Foundations in the Department all sought to leave the unit ... The issues were always the same, viz., that the Departmental leadership *always* put Social Foundations interests at the bottom of the priority list."[21] The Position Paper touched briefly upon the fact that the current dean and his predecessor both supported me in terms of having only the most qualified faculty members to teach the graduate Foundations courses, although constant vigilance on my part was necessary. The next point made was a recapitulation of how the present crisis in 420 developed; especially how the nonFoundations leadership and followers used their political muscle to keep it one hour short for most of the time, and how the SEC prefix allowed almost all members of the department to teach it. A highlighting of how the chairman did not inevitably have to trade the 420 hour away was accomplished as the narrative made clear "in his frame of reference ... his priorities/beliefs caused him to apply the knife to 420."[22]

The "Position Paper on Social Foundations of Education" made clear that the author believed he should have been consulted in the transition process in order to represent the field and courses. It was of great importance to demonstrate to the deans that the chairman's choice as Foundational spokesperson was made because this person had only a peripheral involvement/commitment to the field; consequently, the leadership could count on his cooperation in most instances. At the end of the "Position Paper's" first part, I rearticulated the necessity of keeping power separate from right. "I believe that even though the Department leadership obviously had the *power* to reduce the ... [SFE] course to two hours ... they didn't have the *right* to do so ... [Furthermore,] Foundations is in the title of our Department."[23] The fact that Foundations was in the title was of great advantage to me in the battle for Foundations. People in the university outside of the

department always thought it was indefensible that a department's leader would fail to support, neglect and even harm an area that the leadership was supposed to represent. I found that arguments I advocated for the treatment of SFE usually found a receptive audience except from among the chair and his followers in the department. It seems as though what SFE offers is thought to be of worth by many people in higher education and especially teacher education colleges/programs; however, the case must be made resolutely and consistently. Even those who fail to see the value of this field are not comfortable in most instances publicly declaring their opposition to Philosophy, History and Sociology of Education. Comparative education can be integral to Foundational studies also. Obviously, there are disagreements with regard to what SFE's constitutive parts consist of; however, many nonFoundations colleagues understand the tripartite division when SFE is brought to their attention. Policy studies needs more explanation. Educational administration/leadership professors, among others, can be expected to become defensive over policy study turf.

In the second part of the "Position Paper"—the document upon which the February 3, 1988 meeting was based, I spoke of CASA network colleagues and their institutions' compliance with the one-sixth percent devoted to Foundational study in the required professional core. I focused on institutions in the same State and athletic conference. It was also pointed out that NCATE had backed CASA standards, including the one-sixth formula, as well as requiring assignments being made based on input by authentic Foundations faculty when SFE issues/courses/interests are at stake. The conclusion of part two ended with an indictment: "The historical leadership of this Department has always maintained that they were supporters of Foundations! Those of us who are committed to the crucially important role Foundations should play in Teacher Education have never agreed that they were supportive, except in a perfunctory minimal way—and when no other Department interest was at stake."[24] The indictment provided fresh evidence: "After the hour had been lost, traded, or given away ... I was not appointed to the Department

Curriculum Committee, where the action to restore the hour would have to begin. Nor were any other regular 420 instructors appointed ... Perhaps it was and oversight."[25]

In the third and last section of the "Position Paper" I reminded the readers that the hour's restoration should be considered and accomplished independent of any other plans involving more hours for other courses that had been contrived by the departmental leadership. I suggested that the "Position Paper's" arguments be shared with the provost so that he would be informed. It was communicated to the readers of part three that Alan Jones, the AESA president (1988) and Christine Shea, the head of CASA, were following the Battle for SFE closely; furthermore, they stood ready to render assistance. The "Position Paper" ended with a request[26] that was not granted. The argument offered by the dean was that a Social Foundations coordinator would be unnecessary if the department were led responsibly. As we shall see, the dean was instrumental in securing new leadership for the department; however, that happy event did not occur until 1993.

By way of review, with all the groundwork having been prepared in terms of: getting the department to act on recommending that the 420 SFE course be increased to three hours; keeping pressure on the departmental leadership to commit to working with the associate dean's AD HOC committee that included the restored hour but not the pork which weighted down the chairman's proposal to get more for the nonFoundations areas of the department (the proposal that lost by one vote); working closely with the dean's and provost's offices; bringing AESA-CASA pressure to bear; and trying to gain support of colleagues in the college and university, the hour was restored finally by the Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC) on April 1[ ] 1989. In fact, as I told the provost, "the proposal passed UEC ... without ... opposition."[27] I wrote a thank you letter to the chairman of the UEC with a sigh of relief.[28]

Situating the Battle on a Bigger Conceptual Map

At this point in the narrative about the Battle for SFE on the Middletown front I would like to explain how it was important for me to see the local struggle as part of a

larger one. Although it is difficult and/or even impossible to conjecture accurately about the many factors that motivate people to act—or not act—as they do, especially when they are unwilling or unable to explain the reasons for their behavior, it is possible to assess and evaluate public records upon larger maps of contestation during the historical period within which they occur. The relationships between ideas and power are of crucial importance to consider when one seeks to analyze larger and deeper meanings of actors' actions in battles fought on higher education sites where ideas, organization and timing replace the weapons used by military combatants. The Battle for SFE on the Middletown front was fought during one of the most reactionary periods in our recent history. In spite of not knowing for certain how the opponents of the SFE project I favored lined up on the great political, economic, cultural, educational, etc., issues that transcended the intrainstitutional fight, it is possible to argue plausibly that these opponents aided the hegemony being defended and advanced during the most recent offensive by the Right, capital and various "conservative" allies.

Michael Apple draws from Louis Wirth's preface to Karl Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* (1936):" 'The most important things ... we can know about a man [sic] is what he takes for granted ... [Furthermore,] the most important facts about a society are those that are ... generally regarded as settled.' That is, to ... understand, the activity of men and women of a specific historical period, one must start out by questioning what to them is unquestionable. As Marx would say, one does not accept the ... participants' own commonsense appraisals of their intellectual and programmatic activities (though these are important ...); rather, the investigators must *situate* these activities in a larger arena of economic, ideological, and social conflict ... [Unfortunately,] if one were to point to one of the most neglected areas of educational scholarship, it would be ... the critical study of the relationship between ideologies and educational thought and practice, the study of the range of seemingly commonsense assumptions that guide our overly [trying to be] technically minded field. Such critical scholarship would lay bare the political, social, ethical, and

economic interests and commitments that are uncritically accepted [by all too many] as 'the way life really is' ..."[29] I would argue that one reason the opponents of SFE in the department were foes is that they knew enough about the critical and even subversive (of unexamined assumptions) reality/potential of Foundational inquiry.[30] Perhaps this fear was based upon their implicit acceptance of the societal and educational status quo as good enough. If it were good enough, then their roles as teacher educators could consist mainly of preparing teacher candidates to understand their prospective tasks in terms of selecting and sorting K-12 students according to "scientific" criteria so that those who are deserving would score well on the various vertical rank order scales used by educators. Of course, it is difficult to establish motives to those who never produced a corpus of writing that permits an understanding of their underlying assumptions; however, their (uncritical) methods emphases, nontheoretical stance and commitment to focusing on the nuts-and-bolts of teaching tasks does signify their apparent lack of interest—and/or awareness—of the socioeconomic, political, ethical scaffolding and ramifications of particular educational configurations, processes, etc.

Drawing on Philip Wexler's work, Apple argues that social and educational research is importantly a political act, because it insists that we direct our attention to "the knowledge and symbols schools and other cultural institutions overtly and covertly give legitimacy to ... [Moreover, this research] calls for an understanding of how the kinds of symbols schools organize and select are dialectically related to how particular types of students are organized and selected, and ultimately stratified economically and socially [racially, ethnically, and according to gender]. And all of this is encompassed by a concern for power. Who has it? Do certain aspects of schooling—the organization and selection of culture and people ...—contribute to a more equitable distributi of power and economic resources or do they preserve existing inequalities?"[31] Relying on Pierre Bourdieu, Apple pursues his interrogation of the relationships between education and power. Schools help to recreate the social and economic hierarchies of the larger capitalist-dominated society

"through what is seemingly a neutral process of selection and instruction. They take the cultural capital ... of the middle class as natural and employ it as if all children have had equal access to it ... Just as our dominant economic institutions are structured so that those who inherit or already have economic capital do better, so too does cultural capital act in the same way. Cultural capital ('good taste,' certain kinds of prior knowledge, abilities and language forms) is unequally distributed throughout society and this is dependent in large part on the division of labor and power in the society. 'By selecting for such properties, schools serve to reproduce the distribution of power within society,' "[32] It is obvious that insights such as these are more readily produced in Philosophy, Sociology and History of Education—as well as their parent disciplines—than in the courses favored by the opponents of SFE on the Middletown front. This is not to claim that the opponents were openly or even consciously opposed to the necessary steps that are needed in order to reconstruct the school and society along more authentically democratic lines, as well as upon a scaffolding consisting of a good deal more equity and social and economic justice.

Speaking of the alliance between capital and its agents with the middle class (or petit bourgeoisie) during the Rightist reaction—especially during the 1980s—Svi Shapiro explains that distinct but reinforcing concerns came together. The first was the attempt by capital to cause a radical redistribution of the national product through a reallocation of government spending. This was aimed primarily at increasing profits as well as strengthening U.S. capital's position vis-à-vis increasingly competitive rivals. The second was the insistence by the middle class to reestablish education on the basis of petit-bourgeois values of the so-called "Protestant ethic," "real" achievement, persistence, discipline, hard work, return to a "basic" curriculum, etc. However, "while these arguments have ... been loudly articulated by ... the Right, such appeals to traditional ideology do not tell the whole story. The class interests underpinning the demands for change in educational policies cannot, primarily, be found in the concern with traditional values ..."[33] Shapiro grounds educational argument, and especially Rightists ones during

the 1980s, in the volatile political economy and upon social class. "Present educational demands stem far more from middle-class perceptions of the erosion of its relatively privileged position ... [Furthermore,] the distinctions that emanate from the division of labor endow the middle class with experience of its separateness and superiority over the working class."[34] Shapiro argues that class distinctions, based upon the division of labor, were thought by its beneficiaries to have been dangerously eroded—to their peril. Teachers and professors are not immune to such class-status anxieties. In the view of some, the educational policies of the liberal State are thought to have "compromised the school's role in the process of intellectual selection (hence upsetting the 'natural' balance between those capable or not of engaging in mental labor). Such ... [policies] have made school 'too easy' ... so that it no longer functions to adequately restrict or select out the 'wrong' or 'incapable' students (that is to say, working-class, black, or other minority students ... The result is a serious erosion of the status, opportunity, and market position of the American middle class."[35]

It is a fact that with very few exceptions—those being some multicultural teachers—there was no analysis of the kind Shapiro represents carried on by the nonFoundations professors in the department during the battle being described in this work. The support for "Tech Prep" currently demonstrated by some of those in the department who have not done or supported SFE work is a good example of their failure to have grappled with the reproductive function of K-12 schooling.[36] The state of Indiana's current attempt to have students decide in junior high school if they intend to pursue a "Tech Prep" curriculum in order to be prepared for (alleged) high tech jobs is indicative of the strategies pursued by those who do not recognize, or admit, that it is not the skill and training of the worker that determines the job he/she gets, but rather the job that determines the amount and kind. Most of the professors who opposed the well-being, integrity and growth of Foundational study and teaching lack records of publications and/or other publicly verifiable statements/actions that demonstrate having opposed the reactionary

decrease in political, economic, social and educational support for institutions and procedures that had supported former, mitigating accommodations between democratic ideas and the stark realities of the radical stratification within the capitalist-dominated economy.

Continuing the analysis of how the intrainstitutional battle being described is better understood if seen within the context of the Rightist reaction that may have been strongest during the 1980s, let us turn to the work of Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux. Writing of the educational "reforms" of the 1980s, they argue that many of them "appear to reduce teachers to the status of low-level employees ... whose main function is to implement reforms decided by experts in the upper levels of state and educational bureaucracies. Furthermore, such reforms embrace technological solutions ..."[37] Aronowitz and Giroux warn that teachers' intellectual roles are being further reduced, ones that the authors maintain are central to the nature of critical pedagogy and education for democratic citizenship. It could be argued plausibly that the main actors in the Foundations battle who were opponents of the programs, courses and practices favored by the proponents of SFE could be said to be sympathetic to the following vision/reality of K-12 school practice. Aronowitz and Giroux charge that "schools [in the 1980s] increasingly adopt[ed] forms of pedagogy that routinize and standardize classroom instruction. This is evident in the proliferation of instructional-based curriculum and management schemes, competency-based learning systems [etc., which are] ... basically management pedagogies ..."[38] Many members of the leadership group in the department were trained in supervision. This is not to claim that everyone in educational administration and/or educational leadership is unaware of critical theory; in fact, many are respectful of the depth and breadth analyses potential inherent to SFE study. Aronowitz and Giroux would have teachers view educational theory not "as merely the application of [so-called] objective scientific principles to the ... study of schooling ... Instead, it ... [must be] seen as ... political discourse that emerges from and characterizes ... struggle over what forms of authority,

orders of representation, forms of moral regulation, and versions of the past and future should be legitimated and passed on ... [Moreover,] educational theories and discourse are ideologies that have an intimate relation to questions of power."[39]

Aronowitz and Giroux provide an explanatory framework within which to place intellectual workers, one that owes much to Antonio Gramsci and Karl Mannheim. I offer this framework as a useful, generalized map upon which to situate persons who participated in the battle for Foundations; however, there is no claim that the categories offered can provide exact, definitive places within which to locate these complex persons. The (1) transformative intellectual is one who sees schooling as part of a fundamental and larger social project aimed at liberatory political praxis. For Gramsci, this meant working (but not in the schools) to overcome social class injustices characteristic of capitalism. Although not every SFE professor would qualify as a transformative intellectual, I maintain that the discussions and studies about such roles are more likely to occur among Foundations teachers-scholars than anywhere else in teacher education. It might be clear to the reader that my colleagues in the department who had some claim to SFE status were hardly transformative intellectuals. The (2) critical intellectual is, in fact, critical in keeping with his/her status as an intellectual worker; however, "in most cases, the posture of critical intellectuals is self-consciously apolitical, and they try to define their relationship to the rest of the society as free-floating."[40] I must point out that Gramsci did not intend to use the term intellectual as one who operates for the most part in the realm of ideas, but instead, a person who deals with ideas for various reasons: administrative, bureaucratic, instrumental, etc. This second kind of intellectual is descriptive of some SFE actors in the Middletown Battle. There seemed to be an abyss between their professional work and citizen, existential and overall lived experiences. The (3) accommodating intellectual supports the dominant society even though he/she may not be aware of his/her usefulness to the status quo. This person can be said to mediate unreflectively the ideas and practices of a nondemocratic and unjust system. Both the critical and accommodating intellectuals

use the idea of objective reason vis-à-vis a realist concept of epistemology in order to claim professional status and neutrality. It cold be said, with warranted assertibility, that many of the opponents of SFE in the battle fell into this third category. Because these opponents did not fight primarily—if at all—on the terrain of ideas/ideology, it would be inaccurate to place them into the fourth group, viz., hegemonic intellectuals. As Aronowitz and Giroux inform us, these hegemonists "self-consciously define themselves through the forms of moral and intellectual leadership they provide for dominant groups and classes."[41] Few of the opponents spoke of their, or family, class status; subscribing (implicitly for the most part), instead, to a conservative-liberal mainstream American view of this society's classlessness.

The struggle was conducted for the most part by actors who did not articulate the battle in terms of references to larger issues. The obstinacy met by those who sought to forward a SFE project that would make it possible for students to participate in bona fide Foundational inquiry, as well as create spaces for Foundations professors to have room for professional growth and a modicum of security, was a stubbornness rooted in parochial conceptions of professionalism, questions of power, turf and monetary considerations. Obviously, those who obstinately opposed our project would not admit to my description of what drove them to struggle against change. A different kind of study would be necessary in order to attempt to get at their stated motivation.

It is difficult to grapple with opponents who do not acknowledge—or are not aware of—how their part in a particular skirmish or tactical battle is related to a larger and deeper set of convictions. The tendency to assume that one's unarticulated positions constitute the norm in particular social-work contexts and/or in the larger society is characteristic of many during this time of the alleged end of ideology—except for the ideological Rightists who have declared class war on ordinary persons from above. This propensity is characteristic of many who work in teacher education, and was the case with regard to those who sought to keep SFE marginalized and exploitable in the department. This frame of mind can and

does often lead to teacher education programs, courses and experiences for students that can make it difficult for them to get beyond a rather narrow/superficial version of professionalism.

I intend to provide a plausible picture of teacher education in order to demonstrate the limitations and weaknesses of the approach seemingly favored (acknowledged/articulated, or not) by those who sought to keep SFE a "conquered province"—i.e., to be exploited but not invested in. I provide this picture with proper diffidence because of the complexity of the situation and its players; however, I trust that the picture coincides with many readers' experiences and perspectives. G. Max Wingo has written that:

> Those who are responsible for the educational world are doers ... It is their business to make decisions and to act, and they usually have little time for speculation and disinterested analysis ... Typically, the really important matters so far as teachers are concerned are teaching method (including ... discipline), curriculum, and instructional materials. To administrative personnel, the important matters are curriculum, personnel, finance, and public relations. All of these areas are practical ... It is not unusual for the practical educator to harbor deep-seated feelings of suspicion toward those who are theorists of educational activity ... Typically, the courses students like best are those in which they can see most clearly the relation between what is done in college classes and the specific work they will have to do as teachers ... Teachers in preparation, as well as those already practicing, find little difficulty in enumerating the things they ... want to know about. They want a good mastery of the subject matter ... [to] know about good methods ... They are interested in materials to use ... There is universal concern ... about ... control of students. All teachers want to know in general what is expected of them ... how their work will be evaluated by the administration and ultimately by the community.[42]

Although one must exercise caution when generalizing about educational workers, it is warranted to argue that very few K-12 public (and private) school teachers in this country have been educated with theoretical power as an important goal. It seems obvious that

most teacher candidates have not demanded such empowerment possibilities as part of their college experience. As I have written elsewhere:

> Teacher candidates who have not been raised in families that are aware of their position on the social, political, economic, racial, ethnic and gender maps do not typically enter teacher education with an alertness to capitalism and its power. Because teacher education is characteristically "practical" and "how-to" in its orientation, the theoretical insight necessary to understand how teaching and education relate to the larger worlds of power—or lack of it—is not usually learned effectively. The domination of teacher education by "how-to-ism" is supplemented by a psychological orientation that seldom allows calling the whole system into question; instead, the emphasis is upon fitting the student into the system ... The weakness of Social Foundations of Education in most teacher education programs is well known. As a result, the theoretically empowering potential from the study of philosophy of education, history of education, sociology of education, comparative education and critical policy studies is not very significant in the educational experience of undergraduate students in most teacher training institutions.[43]

Those who opposed the strengthening of SFE in the department were motivated, by many reasons, to keep insignificant what I have described as theoretically empowering.

The status quo that was being defended by the department leadership during the battle for Foundations was in many ways similar to Joe Kincheloe's description of teacher education.

> Students often enter the college of education with a set of conservative expectations and predispositions. They want to become teachers like the ones they've had or known and they expect to teach students just like the ones who were their friends ... in school. More often than students in other fields, they attend colleges close to their homes and desire to teach in their home states. Because of these and other factors, their acculturation into the profession marks little break with their pasts ... Thus teacher education students tend not to be seekers of alternative ways of seeing ... Instead they walk into class searching for recipes for information delivery and class room discipline. Questions of purpose, context, and power are alien, [and considered] irrelevant.[44]

Kincheloe, like Wingo, points out how social theory is viewed as having little relevance to teacher education. However, in Kincheloe's words, "without the ... perspective provided by such theory, teachers remain unequipped to analyze the deep structures that shape their professional training and the schools in which they will teach."[45] In the absence of more data it is impossible to know the many and exact reasons why the opponents of the SFE project in the department took such an oppositional position. One could conjecture, based on hearing some or all of them talking informally over the years, that their view of the world could be described as conservative. Conservatism does not automatically mean one distrusts radical (to the root) inquiry; however, it is not surprising to find many conservatives in the U.S. viewing with suspicion courses and discourses that have the potential for such inquiry. A detailed analysis of social class, racial/ethnic, gender and other realities of identity would have to be undertaken in order to discern reasons why the upholders of the departmental status quo and the opponents of SFE came to adopt these positions. Although it is easy to understand why those not trained in SFE, and not having vitae that reflected involvement in Foundational activities after earning the doctorate, would oppose the progressive project's insistence that only bona fide Foundations teachers-scholars should teach the courses. Perhaps the opponents were principled generalists.

I can say with certainty that some department members who were in attendance at a faculty lecture I gave in 1975—including some who subsequently became secessionists in the SFE-multicultural project—were not enthusiastic about, or in agreement with, the main theses I forwarded. This did not bode well for a politics based on shared views and solidarity. The following passage represents the heart of what many of them disliked.

> Teacher education must not allow itself to operate outside the perennial concerns of Western civilization [I did not mean to imply that the "West is best."] Teacher colleagues must not lose sight of the larger concerns confronting the historical culture of which they are a part. Granted, the schools of education cannot and must not become a slavish replica of the colleges of literature, science, and the arts, but it is within the liberal arts colleges where the central concerns of ... [our society] have been studied; therefore, teachers colleges will

> separate themselves from this mainstream at their peril... Every profession is tempted by the use of jargon, "expertise," and inhouse parochiality instead of [the search for] wisdom. We must realize that a beginning teacher who possesses a great deal of technique but who is not grounded in the big books of the West [obviously these books, plays, pieces of music, cinema, oral traditions, etc., must be selected by a participatory democracy based on social class, racial/ethnic and gender justice] may be as dangerous as a debater who is willing to argue any side of the issue [in sophist fashion].[46]

I am aware that the liberal arts tradition has served the rich and powerful throughout history; nevertheless, my argument concerning the radical potential of that tradition still holds. It has been within the conversations characteristic of the historic subject matters where the opportunities existed, and still exist, to make actual their radical potential so that the arts, letters and music come to portray, speak of and musically celebrate a society based upon more socioeconomic, political, cultural, racial, ethnic and gender justice.

An in-depth discussion of the need for and possibilities of profound changes in teacher education are beyond the scope of this analysis; however, my view is that hoped-for change is dependent importantly on the political realities in the larger society. Relatedly, as long as a frightened and reactionary middle class—including some privileged members of the working class—continues to make common cause with their richer and more powerful allies and patrons, American politics will continue to be dominated by a near majority of those who side not only with capital but with patriarchy, racism, militarism, neocolonialism and with religionists who seek to make their views dominant even within formerly secular sites. There must occur a massive broadening of those who participate in the political process in order to change the direction toward authentic participatory democracy, socioeconomic justice, equity, fair play and other progressive necessities. Teacher education reform will not fare well within the context of politics being increasingly dominated by the Right(s). In fact, the far Right has been successful in pushing the "mainstream" political discussion significantly rightward.[47]

Meanwhile let us return to the verbal picture of teacher education being sketched herein. Many, if not most, teacher candidates come from families whose primary source of income derives from small farms, factory jobs, the trades, retail, small business ownership, lower-to-middle-level corporate work, teaching—and more than likely, two parental incomes. There are and have been notable exceptions, especially in the case of women who suffered from limited career opportunities. While certainly not speaking pejoratively of these family backgrounds (my father was a skilled tradesman), it is plausible to argue that it has not been from these segments of the population that the bulk of the intellectually or politically inquisitive—let alone iconoclastic or radical—young people have come. In fact, many teacher candidates do not even maintain solidarity with labor unions that played important parts in their parents' relative economic well-being. Those who defended the departmental status quo seemed to be unaware of this problem; moreover, nothing was done to counter and/or improve it within the contexts of teacher education they controlled. As we know, the comparative lack of family wealth among many teacher candidates contributes to their having to make their education pay dividends quickly. This often contributes to a lack of intellectual or social concern inherent to studying issues in-depth and to root causes. Many of the how-to courses do not challenge or force the students to go beyond concentration on narrow vocationalism or unimaginative professionalism. However, "as understandable as this phenomenon is in terms of social class position and family historical experience ... hostility to theoretical empowerment among many teacher candidates and teachers [including some school of education professors] allows the status quo to continue—and even become undone [in reactionary fashion] by ... recent successes of the capitalist imperative."[48] It was my position throughout the battle for SFE that a strong Foundations department would represent one of the best opportunities for professors to challenge the limited range of consciousness and interest among all too many students. This kind of Foundations contribution would help develop a more intellectually muscular and critical emphasis in the methods and other how-

to courses offered by the department. This hoped-for contribution is beginning to happen in the department because of new colleagues and leadership, as well as some victories for SFE; however, this is a happy story for the work's conclusion.

A number of things must occur, and/or be accentuated, if K-12 school teachers are to play more effective roles in terms of education that enables their students to understand and be committed to democracy, equity, diversity, a society based upon a moral economy and a polity in which it is safe to act altruistically. It seems obvious that teachers will have to be in touch with the caring and nurturing parts of their character. They will need to insist upon having a general and teacher education experience that provides the necessary and commensurate theoretical empowerment to guide and match their emotional commitment. Moreover, this education must be radical, in the sense of getting to the root of things. This theoretical education must be linked to, and informative of, the best kind of caring and critical pedagogy. Field experiences, sometimes called laboratory experiences, must be undergirded by nonpositivist scientific data collection as well as enlightened by sound theory. Perhaps, "most important of all, teachers must see themselves as workers who are part of the vast majority of citizens in advanced capitalist societies who are, in fact, classed workers ... This class-consciousness must be seen as part of the complexity that makes up other ... [identities] such as race, ethnicity ... and ... gender. It is as class-conscious workers that teachers [educators] should enter into broad umbrella-coalitions with *other class-conscious workers*. This [change and] strategy will provide the best chance to alter the teeter-totter of conflicting imperatives [of capitalism and democracy] in favor of ... [the later], equity, peace, multicultural tolerance and celebration. Public K-12 schools can become sites where the democratic imperative prevails [but] only when synchronized action takes place in schools, other sites and especially in the capitalist-dominated economy and State."[49]

I dare say that it was difficult for discussion, analysis and/or even critique of ideas such as mine to occur within the practices of teacher education favored by those who

attempted to keep SFE marginalized and weak in the department. Because of career choices not to publish, it is nearly impossible to learn if department members—including the original secessionists—engaged in questioning a socioeconomic, political and educational system that considered interrogation of its privileges and power unfair and unwarranted. It is clear that such questioning never manifested itself at department meetings, curricular discussions or elsewhere within the public places of our work-site; although, this was not true of the Teachers College of which the unit was/is a part.

To be continued.

NOTES

[1]"A Report On Foundations Of Education And Multicultural Education" May 1982, p. 1. Also see Appendix for the whole Report.

[2]Letter to chair, October 13, 1986.

[3]Load reduction could be had in the department at the time if one's research proposal was approved of by a departmental committee, chair and dean.

[4]Alan Jones' letter to colleague, April 17, 1986.

[5]Memorandum to deans, July 23, 1986.

[6]Alan Jones' letter to deans and chair, January 23, 1987.

[7]My memorandum to chair, September 15, 1987.

[8]My letter to chair, October 26, 1987.

[9]My letter to chair, July 15, 1988.

[10]My letter to provost, July 29, 1988.

[11]My "brief" to Teacher Education Council (TEC), July 28, 1988.

[12]Same source as no. 12, p. 2.

[13]My letter to Alan Jones, September 7, 1988.

[14]Same source as no. 14, p. 1. The associate dean at that time became the dean of Teachers College in 1993.

[15]Same source as no. 14, p. 2.

[16]Letter to chair from associate dean, May 9, 1988 and new Program Posting.

[17]Letter to dean May 5, 1988.

[18]My letter to provost of September 12, 1988. TEC passed our program.

[19]My letter to provost, December 12, 1988

[20]My letter to provost, June 15, 1988.

[21]"Position Paper on Social Foundations of Education," February 3, 1988, p. 1.

[22]Same source as no. 22, p. 2.

[23]Same source as no. 22, p. 3.

[24]Same source as no. 22, pp. 6–7.

[25]Same source as no. 22, p. 7.

[26]Same source as no. 22, p. 8.

[27]My letter to provost, April 11, 1989.

[28]My letter to chair of Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC), April 11, 1989.

[29]Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979), 13–14.

[30]For an interesting analysis of the term foundations as a metaphor for the SFE field see, Jeanne Pietig, "Celebrating Twenty-five Years of AESA: From Foundations to Scaffolding and Beyond (AESA Presidential Address—1993)," *Educational Studies* 25, 1 (Spring 1994): 1–23. See especially the subsection called: Reasons for keeping foundations (as a descriptive metaphor).

[31]Ibid., 15.

[32]Ibid., 33.

[33]Svi Shapiro, *Between Capitalism And Democracy: Educational Policy And The Crisis Of The Welfare State* (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1990), 122.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid., 123.

[36]For a description of "Tech Prep" see, James E. Green and Roy A. Weaver, *Tech Prep: A Strategy for School Reform* (Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1994). This PDK Fastback does not provide a critical analysis of the phenomenon described; furthermore, such an analysis was not the authors' intent.

[37]Stanley Aronowitz and Henry A. Giroux, *Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate Over Schooling* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc., 1985), 23.

[38]Ibid., 28.

[39]Ibid., 32.

[40]Ibid., 37.

[41]Ibid., 39.

[42]G. Max Wingo, *Philosophies of Education: An Introduction* (Lexington, MA. D. C. Heath and Company, 1974), 4–5.

[43]Richard A. Brosio, *A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 1994), 323–24.

[44]Joe L. Kincheloe, *Toward A Critical Politics of Teacher Thinking: Mapping the Postmodern* (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 1993), 14.

[45]Ibid., 203.

[46]Richard Brosio, *Professors, Students, and Some Enduring Concerns in the West* (Muncie, IN: Ball State University Lecture Series, 1975), 14–15. I focused on the West because it is the civilization and culture I knew best. There was no intention of minimizing the importance of other peoples' histories. In the context of the teacher education I experienced at the time, the call to consider something as big as the West was radical enough. Those who considered it inappropriate at the time have not distinguished themselves, for the most part, in the struggle for multicultural awareness. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. sums up my thinking on Western civilization and canons: "Unfortunately, as history has taught us, an Anglo-American regional culture has too often masked itself as universal, passing itself off as our 'common culture,' and depicting different cultural traditions as ... 'parochial.' So it's only when we're free to explore the complexities of our hyphenated American culture that we can discover what a genuinely common American culture might ... look like." *Loose Canons: Notes On The Culture Wars* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 176–77. I would argue that similarities exist between American cultural definition and some of those that define the West. With Harvey J. Kaye, I agree that there should not occur a "wholesale rejection of Western

civilization as the more nihilistic currents of post-modernism suggest. If fact, as [Antonio] Gramsci recognized: 'In the accumulation of ideas transmitted to us by a millennium of work and thought there are elements which have eternal value, which cannot and must not perish. The loss of consciousness of these values is one of the most serious signs of degradation brought about by the bourgeois regime; to them everything becomes an object of trade and weapon of war.' The challenge for critical historians is, therefore, that 'of taking them up ... [and] making them glow with new light.' " *Powers of the Past: Reflections On The Crisis and Promise of History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 166.

[47]See, Chip Berlet, "The Right Rides High," *The Progressive* 58, no. 10 (October 1994): 22–29, for an analysis of the Right(s)' success in moving the so-called mainstream of U.S. Politics hard to the right. Berlet writes: "If the left of the current political spectrum is liberal [in a neolaissez-faire sense] corporatism and the right is neofascism, then the center is likely to be conservative authoritarianism ... That there is no organized Left to offer an alternative vision to regimented soulless liberal capitalism is one of the tragic ironies of our time ... Unless progressives unite to fight the rightward drift, we will be stuck with a choice between the nonparticipatory system crafted by the corporate elites who dominate the Republican and Democratic parties and the stampeding social movements of the Right, motivated by cynical leaders willing to blame the real problems of our society on such scapegoats as welfare mothers, immigrants, gays and lesbians, and people of color." p. 29.

[48]Brosio, *A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education*, 325.

[49]Ibid., 326.