

3. General Tensions in the Curriculum Field

The state in which the curricular field currently finds itself is closely related to the complex social framework—economic, political, religious, and ideological—which emerged at the end of the nineteenth century in the United States of America, specifically during the last two decades in which the crystallization of the Industrial Revolution brought about profound transformations in the social fabric and showed the school to be an outdated institution.¹

Such stigmatization would mark the beginning of a combination of profound struggles for the dominion of the knowledge transmitted by the school, as we have already discussed elsewhere², and for control of the social and cultural functions with which the actual school is endowed. In this way, the social tensions which were to emerge by the end of the nineteenth century underwent attempts at consolidation and were shaped by the dynamics inherent to social conflict.

3.1 The Nature of the Conflict

The conflict/consensus dialectic has assumed a predominant position in Functionalism, Weberianism and Marxism³. In fact, the predominance of this debate, which paradoxically presents many areas of relevance/contingency⁴, is recognized in these three great lines of thought. Human societies have been erected, century after century, on the ruins of segregation—social, racial, cultural, economic, religious and political, which have always led to profound, complex and lethal antagonisms. A brief overview of the history of human civilization will suffice to determine how such

¹ In this regard *vide*: Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, pp., 1-25; and yet still Beyer, L. & Liston, D. (1996) *Curriculum in Conflict: Social Visions, Educational Agendas and Progressive School Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 1-28.

² Paraskeva, J. (2001) *As Dinâmicas dos Conflitos Ideológicos e Culturais na Fundamentação do Currículo*. Porto: ASA.

³ In this regard *vide*: Karabel, J. & Halsey, A. (1977). Educational research: A review and an interpretation. In Karabel, J. & Halsey, A (eds.). *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp., 1-85.

⁴ According to Lipset, the Marxist methodological approach is basically functionalist and Marx reveals an interest for the mechanisms which guarantee consensus. *Vide*: Lipset, S. (1985) *Consensus and Conflict*, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

societies have been erected on the basis of cultural genocide. The history of mankind has been written (and for many is still being written) in blood, sweat and tears.

The problematics of this conflict were brought to the fore of curricular discourse when, in 1971, in an article entitled *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of the Conflict*⁵, published in *Interchange*, Michael Apple, strongly motivated by his academic background⁶, denounced the feeble attention paid to the manner in which the dynamics of conflict interfere, not only in the resolution of the curriculum in itself, but also in the maintenance of existing, particular and controversial social truth:

There has been, so far, little examination of how treatment of conflict in the school curriculum can lead to political quiescence and the acceptance by students of a perspective on social and intellectual conflict that acts to maintain the existing distribution of power and rationality in a [given] society⁷.

In this way, the curriculum, whilst a political, ideological, cultural and economic project, must be understood as a document which is determined by the dynamics of conflict and which affords it a cultural capacity. It is mandatory then, in Michael Apple's thinking, to do more than demystify the notion of conflict and to treat it without affectations of any kind, especially since, as is mentioned by Dahrendorf,⁸ the social reality is basically determined by conflict and flux, and not by a closed functional system.

⁵ This article was later (1979) integrated into the work entitled *Ideology and Curriculum*, by Michael Apple.

⁶ It is unpardonable not to identify Michael Apple with the curricular, sociological, analytic-philosophical and phenomenological fields. He has furthermore a solid formation in Sociology of the Sciences, Objectivity, Epistemology, Critical Theory, Ethnomethodology, and Sociology of the problematics of knowledge, of power and of social structure, having participated in translation courses of the works of Habermas, fields which possess as a common denominator the notion of conflict in society and in the sciences.

⁷ Apple, Michael (1971). *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 27

⁸ Dahrendorf, R. (1959) *Class and Class Conflict in an Industrial Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, p., 27.

Moreover, conflicts are the "systematic products of the changing structure of a society and by their very nature tend to lead to progress"⁹. So conflict must be seen as a stimulus¹⁰ because it is a fundamental element within the social transformation framework;¹¹ in other words, conflict—in a Marxist perspective—is a major source of change and innovation for society.¹²

Just as incidental learning contributes "more to the political socialization of a student than certain forms of deliberate teaching of specific value orientations"¹³, so, too conflict must be understood not as a social obstruction but as a dialectic instrument, as a creator of the dynamics of legitimization and of social progress. In fact, there is a violent compromise between the hidden curriculum and conflict, as is documented by Michael Apple.

The hidden curriculum in schools serves to reinforce basic rules surrounding the nature of conflict and its uses. It posits a network of assumptions that when internalized by students, establishes the boundaries of legitimacy.¹⁴

Ultimately, the curriculum may not be analyzed in isolation from the social dynamics, which construct themselves daily around constitutive and preferential rules.¹⁵ The former should be seen as broad parameters in which the action takes place. The latter have to do with the choices one has within the rules of the game.¹⁶ The school, as a social institution, is not insensitive to this dualism and one of its great inherent controversies is related to the choices made within the parameters of implicitly held

⁹ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 35.

¹⁰ Op. cit., p., 36.

¹¹ Lieberman, A.; Darling-Hammond, L & Zuckerman, D. (1991). *Early Lessons in Restructuring Schools*. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching, (NCREST).

¹² Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 35.

¹³ Siegel, R. (1970). (Ed.). *Learning about Politics*. New York: Random House, p., xiii.

¹⁴ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 29.

¹⁵ McLure, H. & Fisher, G. (1969). *Ideology and Opinion Making. General Problems of Analysis*. Unpublished paper. Bureau of Applied Social Research. New York: Columbia University.

¹⁶ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

rules of activity, affording scarce attention to the parameters themselves; in other words, to the mechanisms, which, in the end, territorialize the space [and the time] of the options and determine the hypotheses of choice. The school functions, in this way, as the distributor of a very concrete rationality, which as it is assimilated by the student, empowers him/her to function and to accept the institutional mechanisms and their complex dynamics that contribute to the stability of the interests of an industrialized society.¹⁷

Michael Apple,¹⁸ after upholding social studies and science as the two great areas in which one finds hidden curricular encounters with and tacit teaching of constitutive assumptions about conflict, proposed an alternative vision to these two realities, a wider perspective which must be adopted by educators and curriculumists.

The dominions of science are presented as corpi of knowledge without, however, being analyzed as human constructs. Science must be perceived as a dominion of knowledge achieved by means of specific techniques of discovery or hypothesis-formulation. It reflects a human community, and, as such, it is ruled by norms, values, ambitions, and ideals which translate a historical perspective of struggles and quarrels at the personal and the intellectual level; said conflicts habitually catalyze the emergence of new knowledge paradigms which question formerly unquestionable knowledge conceptions

In essence, the science which is transmitted in the schools is identifiable with the institutionalized patterns of validation: it is transmitted to the students as something which results from empirical verification, which personal and political external interferences cannot penetrate.¹⁹ Students are introduced to a science that lacks conflict in its methodology, its objectives and the foundation of paradigms, the choice of specific criteria to the detriment of others, and this kind of teaching impedes the possibility of determining the conflict and the discord which are the real sources of scientific progress. In the same way, students are introduced to a science in which the

¹⁷ Further insight into this theme may be obtained through the work by Dreeben, R. (1968). *On What is Learned in School*. Massachusetts. Addison-Wesley. According to the author, the way the student assimilates a set of norms, and the way these norms are perpetuated through various forms in his future life is extremely crucial and helps us to comprehend how the school contributes to a continuous social adaptation which is determined by a specific political, social and economic order.

¹⁸ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

¹⁹ Op. Cit.

political compromise that marks the scientific world is silenced. In the majority of schools, conflict, although a propelling mechanism of scientific progress, is an almost non-existent reality for the students.

In this manner, science, which demands behavior shaped by organized skepticism²⁰ cannot be amputated from its own historical dynamics, which have been carried out on the basis of competition between distinct paradigms, and which, although marked by a significant degree of objectivity and neutrality, should not be analyzed without considering concrete social synergies. Science must be regarded and taught as a complex field of argumentation and counter-argumentation based on a theoretical and procedural framework, according to which the conflict between the different paradigms may be legitimized. As described by Manacorda²¹ and Gramsci, science is not an objective notion, but instead an ideology expressing an union between objective facts and formulated hypotheses.

In fact, it is very difficult to determine a divorce between conflict and competition in the field of science especially since, as Hagstrom²² argues, competition over priority and recognition in new discoveries is a characteristic of all established sciences. Another important aspect is the objectivity which emerges to circumscribe the field of science taught at schools and which may lead to a relinquishment *vis-à-vis* a political compromise.²³ As indicated by Gouldner,²⁴ such objectivity may not be as neutral as it is said to be but rather hides moral, intellectual and political conflict.

Just like the scientific field, so too is society portrayed in the school not actually as a space of constant strife and compromise but as a cooperative system. Social studies attempts to legitimize the idea that society is based on happy cooperation, conveying the idea that social conflict is not in itself an essential framework of the constitution and in the maintenance of the social tissue. The school—subject to a conservative perspective—persists in transmitting a notion of society based on the way its elements are interrelated by means of a functional relationship, with each contributing to the

²⁰ Storer, N. (1966). *The Social System of Science*. New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

²¹ Manacorda, M. (1970). *O Princípio Educativo em Gramsci*. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.

²² Hagstrom, W. (1965). *The Scientific Community*. New York: Basic Books.

²³ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

²⁴ Gouldner, A. (1970) *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.

perpetuation of society.²⁵ It is thus relevant that the school transmits an idea of a society which is based on a functional dynamic of consensus (conflict is seen as dysfunctional) although the silence around the conflict remains intriguing, like a valuable picture in the construction and the sedimentation of the social tissue.²⁶

If the social order is legitimized by the regularity of change,²⁷ and if the social tissue is not a static social web, but a realm in which "continuous change in the elements and basic structural form of society is a dominant characteristic"²⁸, then social change and progress emerge propelled by the dynamics of conflict, which must not be dissociated from the curriculum as a mechanism of knowledge construction. Should the opposite occur, as is denounced by Gramsci,²⁹ then there is no union between the school and society.

The school, for Michael Apple,³⁰ sells itself to a system of beliefs, and to the students, very specific pictures are offered, which only serve to legitimize the existent social order since they systematically neglect change and conflict and do not portray humans as creators or recipients of values and institutions. This scenario becomes all the more perilous in an era where, in some countries, education has become obligatory for every child.

Given these omissions and silences, the school as an institution is inadequate in terms of the needs of local communities and for the transformation of the existing social order. The school functions, thus, as a political field of socialization, competing with the family, and assuming compromises, as Sigel³¹ highlights, with the adjustment of students to authority. In this way, it is not controversial to admit that "the public

²⁵ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

²⁶ Op. Cit.

²⁷ Dahrendorf, R. (1959). *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

²⁸ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 35.

²⁹ Gramsci, A. (1971) *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. Smith. New York: International publishers, p., 35.

³⁰ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

³¹ Vide: Sigel, R. (1970) *Learning about Politics*. New York: Random House.

schools are a choice transmission for the traditional rather than the innovative, much less the radical".³²

Michael Apple, after ascertaining certain programmatic considerations in the "sciences"³³, or "social studies",³⁴ adamantly declares that the alternative must be conducted by political activity. To divorce the educational existence of the educator from his political existence is to forget that education, as an act of influence, is inherently a political act.³⁵

The intent of the article is to provide views which are alternatives to the ones which normally have contributed to the legitimization of the process of curriculum development. A close analysis of the nature of conflict allows us to understand the manner in which it enables the students (and we think one should add the additional educational agents) to deal with the political realities and complex power dynamics that are frequently repressive, in such a way as to preserve the institutional modes of interaction.³⁶ To problematize the nature of conflict as an alternative form of conscience, Michael Apple not only questions the knowledge divulged in the subjects, in the history books and in social studies texts, but also upholds the schools as organisms which systematically distort the functions (social, intellectual and political) of the conflict within the communities, functions which are fundamental to their ideological genesis and which serve as an orientation for the individual:

³² Op. Cit., p., 316.

³³ Apple, Michael (1971). *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 37. The author, in the field of sciences, makes some programmatic suggestions, such as the need for a more balanced presentation of some of the values of science, namely organized skepticism, the necessity of interpreting the history of science as a dialectic continuum of controversy and conflict between paradigms, between established truths and the challenges to which they are subject, the necessity of transmitting science as a combination of ephemeral truths, in a process of constant mutation which impedes the crystallization of attitudes.

³⁴ Op. cit. p., 37. In the field of social studies Michael Apple suggests that, for example, a comparative study of the North American, French, Russian and Chinese revolutions would prove extremely pertinent for the study of types of human conditions which cause conflict. He recommends a more realistic approach to the uses of conflict in Black and Native American Human Rights Movements, further upholding an open and broad comparison between the distinct viewpoints and paradigmatic visions of social reality.

³⁵ Apple, Michael (1971). *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

³⁶ Eisinger, P. (1970) *Protest Behavior and the Integration of Urban Political Systems*. Unpublished paper. Institute for Research on Poverty. Madison: University of Wisconsin - Madison.

It has become increasingly evident that history books and social studies texts and materials have over the years, presented a somewhat biased view of the true nature of the amount and possible use of internecine strife in which groups in this country and others have engaged. Our side is good; their side is bad.³⁷

In considering this issue, one finds a combination of concerns which constitute the embryo of one of the great arguments permeating the curricular thinking of Michael Apple—the policy of text-book adoption—and undergirding one of his fundamental works, *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*.³⁸

Supported by Huebner's³⁹ thinking, Michael Apple⁴⁰ adds that "the curriculum field has limited its own forms of consciousness so that the political and ideological assumptions that undergird a good deal of its normal patterns of activity are as hidden as those that students encounter in schools", highlighting the fact that without a broad analysis and comprehension of the dimension of what is at stake here—knowledge—educators will continue to run the risk of being dictated by these institutional values and losing their creative, participative capacity.

A conscious and more realistic approach through teaching the social dialectic of change will award the students with better conceptual tools and politics to deal with the complex social reality.⁴¹

In essence, the crux of this document is the powerful relation (of conflict) that is established between the hidden curriculum and the knowledge relayed in schools. The fact is that, while problematizing the knowledge handed out by the schools, knowledge which is transmitted and influenced/indoctrinated by 'significant others' in the students' lives (parents, teachers, media), Michael Apple retrieves an old question

³⁷ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 27

³⁸ Apple, Michael (1986) *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. New York: Routledge.

³⁹ Huebner, D. (1962) Politics and Curriculum. In H. Passow, (ed.). *Curriculum Crossroads*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp., 87-95

⁴⁰ Apple, Michael (1971). The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 38.

⁴¹ Spencer, H. (1902) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*. London: Williams and Norgate, p., 39.

raised by Spencer, at the end of the last century and which, in fact, was already cause for concern in the classic period of Antiquity and which would prove to be “the most central of all the questions that can be raised about curriculum”⁴²: “What knowledge is of most worth?”⁴³

Herbert Spencer, who was probably the most important popularizer of science and philosopher in the nineteenth century, and who, according to Kliebard,⁴⁴ was the “doyen of the new sociology” and the great demi-god of the social Darwinist doctrine, argued that all life, including education should take essential lessons from the findings of the sciences. For him, only the genuine man of science could know how utterly beyond human knowledge is science, the “Universal Power of which nature, and Life, and Thought are manifestations”⁴⁵. Science, more than evidencing a strong rapport to discipline for intellectual and moral discipline⁴⁶ with religion, Spencer wrote, “we repeat that not science, but neglect of science, is irreligious”⁴⁷, which he claimed was different from the study of languages because of its efficacy, clarity and rigor given that “its truths are not accepted on authority alone”.⁴⁸ Thus the question: “What knowledge is of the most worth?” has, for Spencer, a uniform answer:

Science. This is the verdict on all the counts. For direct self-preservation, or the maintenance of life and health, the all important knowledge is—Science. For that indirect self-preservation which we call gaining a livelihood, the knowledge of greatest value is—Science. For the due discharge of parental functions, the proper guidance is to be found only in—Science. For that interpretation of national life, past and present, without which the citizen cannot rightly regulate his conduct, the indispensable key is—Science. Alike for the most perfect production and present enjoyment of art in all its forms, the needful preparation is still—Science, and for

⁴² Kliebard, H. (1999). *The Liberal Arts Curriculum and its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education*. In M. Esary & K. Rehage (eds). *Issues in Curriculum: a Selection of Chapters from Past NSSE Yearbooks. Ninety-Eight Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Chicago: NSSE., pp., 3-25, p., 5.

⁴³ Spencer, H. (1860) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, pp., 84-85.

⁴⁴ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p. 21

⁴⁵ Spencer, H. (1902) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*. London: Williams and Norgate, p., 47.

⁴⁶ Op. Cit., p., 44.

⁴⁷ Op. Cit., p., 45.

⁴⁸ Op. Cit., p., 44.

the purposes of discipline—intellectual, moral, religious, the most efficient study is, one more—Science⁴⁹.

This problematization, carried out by Spencer is reiterated by Kliebard, who focuses on three fundamentals issues:

In the first place, the humanities, to which the liberal arts curriculum had accorded the central place, were relegated in no uncertain terms to a distinctly inferior position. Secondly, both the sequence and the content of the curriculum could be determined scientifically rather than merely representing a judgment as to the most valuable resources of the culture. A 'natural education' was one that followed the laws that governed the process. And finally, the purposes of the curriculum could no longer be described in such terms as 'liberating the human spirit' or 'initiation into the life of the mind' but were to be seen in terms of the curriculum's contribution to the performance of specific and vital activities⁵⁰.

According to Spencer, the educational program should be judged by the contribution it made to the preservation of the actual human being. This was the supreme criterion on the basis of which the educational phenomenon should be problematized. In this way, "just as survival was the key to evolution, so it became the supreme criterion by which the value of school subjects would be judged."⁵¹ Spencer, who (elaborated a pioneering design for a "functional curriculum" based on "identifying and classifying the human activities that sustain life), proposed a curriculum constructed around five major human activities, namely: "Those directly needed for bodily and self-preservation. Those related to employment and earning a living that indirectly supported self-preservation. Those needed for parenting. Those

⁴⁹ Spencer, H. (1860) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, pp., 84-85.

⁵⁰ Kliebard, H. (1999) The Liberal Arts Curriculum and its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education. In M. Esary & K. Rehage (eds.). *Issues in Curriculum: a Selection of Chapters from Past NSSE Yearbooks. Ninety-Eight Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Chicago: NSSE, pp., 3-25, pp., 9-10.

⁵¹ Kliebard, H. (1988). The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.). *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 21.

needed for political and social life. Those of an aesthetic and recreational nature that related to leisure."⁵²

Spencer's thinking was "to become predominant" in the North American educational scene.⁵³ Consequently, and according to Cremin, it is possible to trace Spencer's influence in some of Eliot's works, namely, in his crusade for the New Education, wherein he upheld the study of the pure sciences, modern European languages and Mathematics, and furthermore, with the Committee of Ten, "parity to the natural sciences in the secondary-school program."⁵⁴

Moreover, the Spencerian conception of a worthwhile curriculum had repercussions for the path that the American curriculum would take by the end of the nineteenth century:

First, there was the elevation of the natural sciences to a more prominent role in programs of general education. (...) Second, there was a notion that the curriculum was not merely to be a selection of the finest elements of the culture (...) but as a reflection of natural laws governing both the course of human history and the development of the individual. And finally, there was the Spencerian conception of the curriculum as instrumental to some purpose beyond itself. In Spencer's case that purpose was self-preservation first and foremost, and this made the development of those functions that would achieve that purpose, rather than those elements that would merely add to the stock of high culture, the most desirable as elements in a program of general education⁵⁵.

⁵² Gutek, G. (1991). *An Historical Introduction to American Education*. Illinois: Waveland Press, INC., pp., 249-250

⁵³ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books. *Vide also*: Kliebard, H. (1999) The Liberal Arts Curriculum and its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education. In M. Esarley & K. Rehage (eds.) *Issues in Curriculum: a Selection of Chapters from Past NSSE Yearbooks. Ninety-Eight Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Chicago: NSSE., pp., 3-25.

⁵⁴ Cremin, L. (1964) *Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, pp., 92-93.

⁵⁵ Kliebard, H. (1999). The liberal arts curriculum and its enemies: The effort to redefine general education. In M. Esarley & K. Rehage (eds.). *Issues in curriculum: A selection of chapters from past NSSE yearbooks. Ninety-Eight Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*, Chicago: NSSE., pp., 3-25, p., 15.

Contrarily to what was subsequently found, especially in the Yale Faculty Report⁵⁶, the study of sciences was valued more highly in relation to the subjects considered as traditionally humanistic. This reformative curricular proposal was praised, not only because it was directed “consciously or unconsciously, to a rising middle class that saw the traditional curriculum as exclusionary and as remote from practical affairs and the interests of a modern industrial society”⁵⁷, but also because the process of curricular development was, itself, seen “as scientific”.⁵⁸

In Gutek's words:

As a constant advocate of science and technology, Spencer was a persistent critic of the inherited curriculum based on theology, speculative philosophy, and the Greek and Latin classics. For Spencer, the curriculum should be changed to emphasize scientific subjects that facilitated the application of memorization and rote learning, Spencer argued that the curriculum should prepare people to master the activities needed to earn a living. As a former engineer, he believed that knowledge should be applied to industry, commerce, government and society⁵⁹.

The character of education is determined not exactly by the knowledge deemed most valuable, but by the knowledge which confers greater social respect and honor and which leads to social positions of prominence.⁶⁰ In other words, there seems to be an overlap of the ornamental over the utilitarian⁶¹ and the major question to be posed of education rests with "how to decide among the conflicting claims of various subjects on our attention".⁶² Above all, Spencer argued that before there could be a

⁵⁶ Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education. In B. Silliman (1829). *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. XV, pp., 297-351.

⁵⁷ Kliebard, H. (1988). The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, pp., 21-22.

⁵⁸ Op. Cit., p., 21,

⁵⁹ Gutek, G. (1991). *An Historical Introduction to American Education*. Illinois: Waveland Press, INC., p., 249.

⁶⁰ Spencer, H. (1902) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*. London: Williams and Norgate.

⁶¹ Op. Cit.

⁶² Op. Cit., p., 6.

rational curriculum, “we must settle which things it most concerns us to know, or (...) we must determine the relative values of knowledges”.⁶³

This argument continued to be debated, and by the end of the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s, the North American curriculum field was inflamed, not only by the works of the so-called romantic critics, such as *Culture Against Man* by Henry⁶⁴, *36 Children*, by Kohl⁶⁵, *Death at an Early Age* by Kozol⁶⁶, among others, but also at a later stage with the works such as *Life in Classrooms* by Jackson⁶⁷ *Schooling in Capitalist America* by Bowles and Gintis⁶⁸, which were related to theories of reproduction and saw the school as one of the key social institutions necessary to reproduce the existing economic relations of a particular society. In accordance with this perspective, the fundamental role of education is directly related to the socialization of the students with the purpose of contributing to the reproduction of existing social relations.

Until then, and as is indicated by Doyle,⁶⁹ the majority of the investigations on teaching and learning were orientated to principles relevant to classrooms in a stricter sense—the act of explaining, reminding and reinforcing, which, contribute, in a more direct way to the learning process and focus more on individual aspects rather than social ones. In this way, the reduction of the dynamics of conflict to the individual eliminates the hypothesis of being able to resolve other problems at the social level.

Jackson⁷⁰ attempts to reveal the interior of the black box that is the schooling institution, affirming the existence of a correspondence between the institutions of production in an industrialized society and in a schooling institution. The author continues by asserting that the school is ruled by inner codes characterized by a strong inequality of power between teachers and students, which facilitate the transformation of the students into the molds imposed by the adults. The students tacitly learn

⁶³ Op. Cit., p., 6.

⁶⁴ Henry, J. (1963) *Culture Against Man*. New York: Random House.

⁶⁵ Kohl, H. (1967) *36 children*. New York: New American Library

⁶⁶ Kozol, J. (1967) *Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Hearts and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

⁶⁷ Jackson, Ph. (1968) *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

⁶⁸ Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America. Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books

⁶⁹ Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom Organization and Management. In M. Wittrock (ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: MacMillan Publishing, pp., 392 - 431.

⁷⁰ Jackson, Ph. (1968) *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

specific social norms which are principally identifiable by confronting the urgencies of the day-to-day and the classroom tasks; these norms serve to structure their future life, which allows us to understand the manner in which the school contributes to the individual adaptation to a (continuous) social order.⁷¹

The school performs its role implicitly by means of activities which are part of the organizational modalities and routines which determine the day-to-day activities in the schools or classrooms.

According to Michael Apple,⁷² one is faced by a picture which Jackson “felicitously labeled the ‘hidden curriculum’⁷³ and which, according to Torres Santomé⁷⁴ establishes a territory with very particular grammatics, wherein learning processes, which constitute fundamental parts to the production chain operation, are processed. The academic demands of the official curriculum are seen as directly related to an adult’s productive life by means of the hidden curriculum.

Years later, Bowles and Gintis’s⁷⁵ analysis would repoliticize the hidden curriculum analysis (since with Jackson this intricate issue was somehow, depoliticized) by conferring to the hidden curriculum a vital political importance. They saw it, especially at the level of the form, as an instrument for the reproduction, cohesion and the stability of the social relations of production and distribution.⁷⁶ Notwithstanding Jackson’s depoliticizing perspective, his approach allows us to discern the meaning of certain practices which hereto had seemed undetected and which are diluted within the daily school routine, namely, the maintenance of order,

⁷¹ Dreeben, R. (1968) *On What is Learned in School*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

⁷² Apple, Michael (1971) The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40, p., 27.

⁷³ According to Torres Santomé, although Jackson is the first to use the term ‘hidden curriculum’, the fact is that previously John Dewey in his work *Experience and Education*, published in 1938, already highlighted the attitudes which were found in the schools and which were seen as fruit of a collateral learning process having as much or more importance than the effects of the explicit curriculum. Vide Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Curriculum Oculto*. Madrid. Morata.

⁷⁴ Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Curriculum Oculto*. Madrid. Morata.

⁷⁵ Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America. Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.

⁷⁶ According to Torres Santomé, Bowles and Gintis believe that if the schools are structured in accordance to certain curriculum and organizationally strategic modalities so as to guarantee the meritocratic hierarchization and distribution of each individual within a specific production territory, all that happens in schooling institutions is subordinate to the economic sphere. None of the authors (Bowles or Gintis) clarifies the manner by which conflict is produced within the ambit of education, what type it is or its possibilities. Vide Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Curriculum Oculto*. Madrid. Morata.

attention-seeking strategies of the teachers and other elements which represent authority, the acceptance of sanctions, the submission to those in power, and evaluation.

We cannot ignore that any analysis of the processes of learning and teaching within schooling institutions should not be limited to the physical space of the institution; we must proceed further, taking into account the economic, social, political and cultural contexts from which the actions and the results acquire a more complete meaning.⁷⁷ Jackson, who agrees with Doyle's⁷⁸ thinking in characterizing the practices in a classroom, describes the process of curriculum development in the classroom by identifying it more with a butterfly than with the trajectory of a bullet.⁷⁹ This particular metaphor of Jackson's gives us more awareness of the depth and of the complexity of the practices at the level of the classroom, especially since they are known to be based on a logic determined by the dominant individualism in the teacher's behavior.

However, as we mentioned before and as Dale⁸⁰ observed, Jackson does not problematize the hidden curriculum in terms of its ideological and political importance in the perpetuation of a particular social stratification. As is revealed by Torres Santomé,⁸¹ the analysis conducted by Jackson and other similar ones reveal themselves to be idealistic inasmuch as they fail to criticize the immense injustice which underlies the data placed on the table, ignoring thus their degree of dependency on the stratified social forms. The manner by which the objectives, the contents, the methodology and the evaluation are involved (and are implicated) with power relations, built on the economic, political and cultural spheres, is ignored.

⁷⁷ Torres Santomé, J. (1990) *La Práctica Refléxiva y la Comprensión de lo que Acontece en las Aulas*. In Ph. Jackson (1990) *La Vida en las Aulas*. Madrid: Morata.

⁷⁸ Cf. Doyle, W (1986). *Classroom Organization and Management*. In M. Wittrock (ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: MacMillan Publishing, pp., 392 - 431. According to the author, there are important elements which are woven in the practices in the classroom. Multidimensionality, (the classroom as an ample space in which a plurality of actions take place), simultaneity (the occurrences simultaneously happen in succession), immediacy (the imposition of a rapid rhythm), unpredictability (crucial events take place that are not predictable), publicity (all that happens is witnessed by more than one student and by one teacher) and history (the accumulation of very unique experiences, of routines, of norms).

⁷⁹ Jackson, Ph. (1968) *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

⁸⁰ Dale, R. (1977). *Implications of the Rediscovery of the Hidden Curriculum for the Sociology of Teaching*. In D. Gleeson (ed.). *Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education*. Driffield: Nafferton Books, pp., 44-54.

⁸¹ Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Currículum Oculto*. Madrid. Morata.

Likewise, and as stressed by Young and Whitty,⁸² the analysis of how the forms of power, distributed in a particular society function in accordance with and in favor of very concrete interests, ideologies and forms of knowledge which, ultimately, contribute to guarantee the economic and political priorities of specific social groups, is marginalized.

Jackson, despite admitting to the possibility of resistance(s) against the established norms, fails to understand that such postures of protest—oftentimes passive—may eventually contribute to the transformation of the practices of dissimulated objectives—reproduction. Jackson minimizes the importance of that which one might designate as the metaphor of the stone, formulated at the beginning of the century by Dewey.⁸³ In terms of Jackson's analysis, the possibilities of emancipation of the daily practices in classrooms are (almost) annulled. As Torres Santomé⁸⁴ stresses, the politics of conflict are ignored by not deepening the possibilities of transformation that both the students and the teachers possess.

As Atkin⁸⁵ insists, Jackson's analysis demonstrates a clear concern with and respect for the practice, but the fact is that only by establishing a relation between what occurs within the classroom and wider and more flexible frameworks, which are sensitive to social, cultural, economic and political contexts, is one able to comprehend and better intervene in the schooling reality.

In the end, Jackson's analysis, (and later, the theory of correspondence traced by Bowles and Gintis)⁸⁶ appears circumscribed, not only by economically-based determinism, but also by a functionalist dimension, which in the words of Torres Santomé,⁸⁷ imposes an acritical vision of day-to-day schooling and ignores the people,

⁸² Young, M. & Whitty, G. (1977) *Society, State and Schooling*. Sussex: The Falmer Press.

⁸³ Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and Education*. New York: MacMillan. According to the author the difference between a human being and a rock is that the rock, when attacked, fragments, whilst the human being resists and reacts.

⁸⁴ Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Currículum Oculito*. Madrid. Morata.

⁸⁵ Atkin, J. (1983) American Graduate Schools of Education: A View from Abroad. *Oxford Review of Education*, 9(1), pp., 62-69.

⁸⁶ It should be highlighted that Michael Apple in his work *Ideology and Curriculum*, notwithstanding the fact that importance is given to the economic manipulation by those in power which proves to be a determining factor for the comprehension of educational problematics, does alert us to the fact that the economic position proposed by Bowles and Gintis is an approach which fails to explain the way results are created in schools, emphasizing that it fails to analyze, profoundly and broadly the mechanisms of dominance and the manner in which they function in day-to-day schooling activities.

⁸⁷ Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Currículum Oculito*. Madrid. Morata.

taking them as passive beings, who are incapable of altering an adverse destiny. These are reductive analyses which ignore the relational and the more encompassing vision of the educational phenomenon and do not accept it to be a producer of the dynamics of transformation or of strategies of resistance.

In this regard, Poulantzas⁸⁸ reiterates that it is increasingly urgent to continue to separate oneself from an economicist-formalist conception, which considers the economy to be composed of invariable elements brought together through the diverse means of production, of an almost Aristotelian nature and essence, being auto-reproducible and auto-regulated by a kind of internal combination.

Fundamentally, notwithstanding the fact that the works which proliferated in that period demonstrated a great advance in the curricular field, none of the said works delved into how knowledge was determined (made socially valid). In other words, there was a reductionism in the study of the teaching and learning behaviors and the processes of the interveners in the educational practice, which limited itself to an exclusive comparison and verification of certain forms of knowledge, ignoring the real and more encompassing value of the curriculum, which continued to remain hidden.⁸⁹ Along these lines, it is mandatory to interpret curricular issues within a wider, more organic dimension, denouncing the school as a mechanism of social segregation and perpetuating the established logics of power.

It is this preoccupation which one finds throughout the whole of Michael Apple's work and which reveals the great influence of Gramsci in the construct of his thinking. According to Gramsci "the traditional school was oligarchic because it was intended for the new generation of the ruling class, destined to rule in its turn"⁹⁰.

The school, springs forth within a dynamic of (constant) crisis, which must be contextualized within a much broader more complex framework of relations.

⁸⁸ Poulantzas, N. (1980). *Estado, poder y socialismo*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

⁸⁹ Torres Santomé, J. (1998) *El Currículum Oculto*. Madrid. Morata.

⁹⁰ Gramsci, A. (1971) *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. Smith. New York: International Publishers, p., 40.

Education, according to a *Gramscian* perspective and, as per Hoare and Smith,⁹¹ must submit to a wider form of analysis:

The crisis of the curriculum and organization of the schools, i.e. of the overall framework of a policy for forming modern intellectual cadres, is to a great extent an aspect and a ramification of the more comprehensive and general organic crisis.⁹²

In his article, Michael Apple⁹³ redresses the preoccupations formulated by Gramsci—and which are still to be found at the epicenter of the educational debate—by considering the relations between education and class and the ideology of education,⁹⁴ as opposed to the economic reductionism of the curricular investigation of the time, conferring a substantive function to both the ideology and the politics as determining mechanisms in the social role of the curriculum. A terrifying void and silence, with regards to the problematics of school-transmitted knowledge, was noted. There was material on the hidden curriculum and on the field of social relations.

Quite naturally *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict* as well as clearly demarcating a critical analysis of education, is indispensable in examining the social structures which explain and condition the life of the substantive educational agents. Michael Apple proposes a curricular alternative to the perception of reality as a permanent construct and disbelief in conflict as the building instrument of knowledge⁹⁵.

⁹¹ With regards to this problematic issue *vide*: Gramsci, A. (1971) *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. Smith. New York: International Publishers, p., 35. The author after making a distinction between "instruction" and "education", says that "the child's conscious is not something 'individual' (still less individuated), it reflects the sector of civil society in which the child participates, and the social relations which are formed within his family, his neighbourhood, his village, etc".

⁹² Op. Cit.

⁹³ Apple, Michael (1971) *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

⁹⁴ Gramsci, A. (1971) *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. Smith. New York: International Publishers.

⁹⁵ Apple, Michael (1971) *The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict*. *Interchange*, 2, (4), pp., 27-40.

Michael Apple questions the basic assumption that conflict between groups is inherent and fundamentally bad and that it should at all costs be eliminated from the core of the established institutional board.⁹⁶ The author does not question the fact that some of the best schools and classrooms are determined through controversy. He furthermore upholds a Marxist standpoint in analyzing the curricular field; in other words, transformation of the world should be pursued without forgetting that, in order for that to occur, the world must be understood in depth and in all its complexity.⁹⁷

The social context in which the school is to be found must be analyzed when what is at stake is the knowledge that the school transmits. The peculiarity of the context in which schools and their agents are to be found must not be ignored. The curriculum serves to construct a web of assumptions which are legitimized once they are constituted and incorporated into an intimate relation with the contexts—social, political, cultural, and ideological—in the socialization practices and knowledge formulation processes.

In this regard Michael Apple reiterates:

Without an analysis and greater understanding of these latent assumptions, educators run the very real risk of continuing to let values work through them. A conscious advocacy of a more realistic outlook on and teaching of the dialectic of social change would, no doubt, contribute to preparing students with the political and conceptual tools necessary to deal with the dense reality they must face.⁹⁸

The nature of the conflict plays out around the formulation and the field of knowledge. Consequently, the dynamics subjacent to the field of the curriculum may not be dissociated from that which Dahrendorf⁹⁹ defines as modern social conflict determined by binominal citizenship and economic growth. In other words, the great social modern conflict (to which the school and the curriculum are not insensitive) plays out between the socio-political developments, on the one hand, and the

⁹⁶ Op. Cit.

⁹⁷ Op. Cit.

⁹⁸ Op. Cit., p., 39.

⁹⁹ Dahrendorf, R. (1993) *Ensaio sobre o Liberalismo*. Lisboa: Editorial Fragmentos.

economic developments, on the other. The future is made up of a plural existence, based on a conflict which is, in itself, an icon of openness and of vigor for societies, especially since the true question is not exactly how conflict might be abolished, but how humanity might learn to live with it and transform into a productive step forward for freedom.

It is on the basis of a particular kind of Marxist perspective on the thematics of the (absence) of conflict in curriculum that Michael Apple initiates his unique and painful journey through the field of education and in this article, published at the beginning of the 1970s, notes what would come to constitute the great analytical vertices that the author proposed for the curricular field, having as its 'córdis' the problematization of knowledge. In an article later published with Weis, Michael Apple¹⁰⁰ argues that each sphere of social life—economy, culture and politics—is constituted and transversed by a combination of class, race and gender dynamics, each with very particular stories.

Having as its epicenter the thematic of conflict, Michael Apple restructures the question formulated by Spencer, complexifying it but also making it more just. For Michael Apple, the question was not *What knowledge is of the most worth* but *Who's knowledge is of the most worth*. In other words, the predominant issue was not based on knowledge itself but on whose knowledge was that same knowledge. Whose vision did it represent? Michael Apple puts his finger on the pulsating wound. If the issue was controversial as far as Spencer was concerned, with Michael Apple, it becomes more profound, although as crucial. The abstraction (the what) of Spencer loses ground while the personification (of whom, whose) of Michael Apple gains ground.

In short, what is at stake (as it always has been) is knowledge (selected, diffused and evaluated), and it is around this framework that the great lines of thought, which already by the end of the nineteenth century burst forth with the metaphor of the mind as a muscle, attempted to steer and to impose a new social order via the curriculum. In fact, for Michael Apple, the nature of conflict is determined by the dynamics—of form and of content—inherent to the way in which (socially valid) knowledge is diffused throughout the schools. We will now turn our attention in the rest of this chapter and in the next chapter to the history of the curriculum field in order to

¹⁰⁰ Apple, Michael & Weis, Lois. (1983) (eds). *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

identify and understand the general tensions, conflicts and compromises within the field over curriculum knowledge. This will help us to understand and situate Michael Apple's political and pedagogical position in the field.

3.2 Mind as Muscle Metaphor

According to Perkinson, "from the beginning [North] Americans depended on their schools"¹⁰¹, adding that one cannot fully understand North American history "without some appreciation of the centrality of education".¹⁰²

Once having achieved independence, the schools assumed a (new) political role¹⁰³, contributing to the preservation of the recently created Republic. Notwithstanding that "the nation's founding fathers knew from classical political theory that the most stable governments combined elements of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy",¹⁰⁴, the fact is that for the North Americans, the solution and the hope were to be found in the foundation of a Republic founded on "popular sovereignty"¹⁰⁵, building "a representative form of government in which the general would be refined and articulated by the best men".¹⁰⁶

Education thus assumed as its principal objective the need "to promote intelligent citizenship",¹⁰⁷ attempting "to convert men into republican machines."¹⁰⁸ The war for a free and open society was waged to "allow men of talent to rise to positions of

¹⁰¹ Perkinson, H. (1968) *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 3.

¹⁰² Perkinson, H. (1968) Preface. In H. Perkinson. *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p., 1.

¹⁰³ Perkinson, H. (1968) *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 7.

¹⁰⁴ Kaestle, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 4.

¹⁰⁵ Perkinson, H. (1968). *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 10.

¹⁰⁶ Kaestle, C. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 4.

¹⁰⁷ Perkinson, H. (1968). *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 7.

¹⁰⁸ Rush, B. (1965) A Plan For the Establishment of Public Schools and the Diffusion of Knowledge in Pennsylvania. In F. Rudolph (ed.). *Essays on Education in the Early Republic*. Cambridge: Mass, pp., 1-40, p., 16.

leadership of their ancestry or their economic status".¹⁰⁹ The school demarcated itself as a political social exercise, guarantor of the establishment of a national aristocracy of talents, assuring, according to Rush¹¹⁰, political conformity and disciplined citizen behavior, both crucial pillars for the inculcation of the Republic.

In a nation of immense fertile territory,¹¹¹ according to Kaestle "a thoroughly American curriculum would help unify the language and culture of the new nation and wean America away from a corrupt Europe"¹¹². The compounded emotion lived (at the time) with regards to Europe is nevertheless curious. On the one hand, the social developments taking place in Europe were noted as the basis for the reform which was intended in America while, on the other hand, there was a kind of repulsion of all that was European and an attempt to implant a very unique social framework which was to become the embryo of what is currently considered *Americanism*.

It should furthermore be added that the increase of population density increased the social tensions as well as stigmatizing the social festering sores, attributing thus to the school the function of inculcating morality in the hope of maintaining social order. Hence, the school was to take on a very profound emphasis in the diffusion of discipline models and behaviors. The school, which already revealed classes of numerous proportions, became, in this way, a regulatory mechanism of social order. As is indicated by Kaestle:

The emphasis on school discipline to influence adult behavior overlooks the purposes of discipline in childhood. There were two compelling reasons for training children to be obedient, punctual, deferential and task-oriented. The first is simply that discipline was needed for the orderly operation as a school. (...) The second reason for encouraging childhood

¹⁰⁹ Perkinson, H. (1968). *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 9.

¹¹⁰ Rush, B. (1965) A Plan For the Establishment of Public Schools and the Diffusion of Knowledge in Pennsylvania. In F. Rudolph (ed.). *Essays on Education in the Early Republic*. Cambridge: Mass, pp., 1-40.

¹¹¹ Verplank, G. (1836) *The Advantages and the Dangers of the American Scholar. A Discourse Delivered on the Day Preceding the Annual Commencement of Union College*. New York: Wiley and Long.

¹¹² Kaestle, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 6.

discipline is that most parents wanted children to behave in a deferential and obedient manner¹¹³.

The school, as regulator of a certain social order, not only would entail the selectivity of the knowledge it translated, but would also mean the diffusion of a (behavioral and cognitive) discipline. Bearing an excessive number of students per class and with a teacher growing increasingly weaker professionally, the school would have as scope a "cultural conformity and educational uniformity"¹¹⁴. For this reason, the textbooks (such as McGuffey's) are probably the "more influential standardization"¹¹⁵ mechanism in school curriculum in the nineteenth century, contributing furthermore to the sedimentation and crystallization of a number of behaviors "demanded by industrialization".¹¹⁶

The more solid the education, the more robust the Republic would be¹¹⁷. According to Jefferson¹¹⁸, the implementation, crystallization and the credibility of the nation and its democratic government would come about through the school. He argued that the "rationale for public schooling in a democratic society", is that it is "to be the site where democratic citizens are empowered"¹¹⁹

Nevertheless, the establishment of a school which "unified"¹²⁰ the North American social project was not easy, and already, by the end of the eighteenth century, schooling conditions were lamentable and there was a call for profound reforms in the educational system.

¹¹³ Op. Cit., p., 69.

¹¹⁴ Op. Cit., p.71.

¹¹⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 2.

¹¹⁶ Perkinson, H. (1968). *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, pp. 110-114

¹¹⁷ Philbrick, J. (1885) *City School Systems in the United States*. U.S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information, n° 1. Washington: D.C.O.

¹¹⁸ Lipscomb, A. (1903). (ed.) *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Vol 2., Charlottesville: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association.

¹¹⁹ Wood, G. (1988) Democracy and Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press., pp., 166-187, p., 167.

¹²⁰ Perkinson, H. (1968). *The Imperfect Panacea: America Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 219. According to the author, North Americans have always perceived the school as a fundamental base for the implementation and sedimentation of the Republic.

It was with this reformatory spirit that on September 11, 1828, at a meeting of the President and Fellows of Yale College, the establishment of a committee to analyze the course of studies at the college was decided upon. In the words of the committee:

We are decidedly of the opinion that our present plan of education admits of improvement. We are aware that the system is imperfect: and we cherish the hope, that some of its effects may ere long be remedied. We believe that changes may, from time to time be made with advantage to meet the varying demands of the community, to accommodate the course of instruction the rapid advance of the country, in population, refinement and opulence. We have no doubt that important improvements may be suggested, by attentive observation to the literary institutions in Europe¹²¹.

The committee¹²², which had as its scope to "inquire into the expediency of so altering a regular course of instruction in [Yale] College, as to leave out of said course the study of the dead languages, substituting other studies therefore; and either requiring a competent knowledge of said languages, as a condition of admittance into the college, or providing instruction in the same, for such as shall choose to study them after admittance"¹²³, elaborated a *Report on Courses of Liberal Education* (also known as the *Yale Faculty Report*), which, according to Silliman, was structured in two parts: "one containing a summary view of the plan of education in the college; the other, an inquiry into the expediency of insisting on the study of the ancient languages"¹²⁴.

The report begins by upholding the crucial necessity of determining the appropriate object of a college. The members of the committee determined that the object of a collegiate course of study should have as its basis the aim to "lay the foundation of a

¹²¹ Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education. In B. Silliman (1829). *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. XV, pp., 297-351, p., 299.

¹²² Op. Cit., According to the author, the committee was made up by His Excellency Governor Tomlinson, Rev. President Day, Rev. Dr. Chaplin, Hon. Noyes Darling and Rev. Abel McEwen, pp., 297 - 298.

¹²³ Op. Cit., p., 298.

¹²⁴ Silliman, B. (1829). Remarks by the editor. In B. Silliman Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education. *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. XV, pp., 297-351, p., 298.

superior education".¹²⁵ In other words, the major object of the college was not actually that the student complete an education, especially since there are very important things which are not learned in college. Similarly, the aim was not to "teach that which is peculiar to any one of the professions" but instead "to lay the foundation which is common to them all".

Quite naturally the defense of a teaching scheme, supported by an (inflexible) mental discipline and by the call to memorization, emerged as indicated by the following report:

The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture are the discipline and the furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge. The former of these is, perhaps, the more important of the two: A commanding object, therefore, in a collegiate course, should be, to call into daily and vigorous exercise the faculties of the student¹²⁶.

In this manner, a very wide study plan, in which all the mental faculties would be duly exercised, was promoted, especially since the (total) perfection of the mind depended on the incessant exercise of its various powers. Thus, the "mental discipline by which mind-as-muscle could be strengthened"¹²⁷, would not actually depend on the isolated study of mathematics (meant to sharpen the intellect, to strengthen the faculty of reason, and to induce a general habit of mind favorable to the discovery of truth and the detection of error), nor on an isolated study of classical languages (familiarity with the Greek and Roman writers was believed to form taste, and to discipline the mind, both in thought and diction, and to induce preference for things elevated, chaste, and simple), but rather on a perfect symbiosis between "the different

¹²⁵ Op. cit. p., 300.

¹²⁶ Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education. In B. Silliman (1829). *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. XV, pp., 297-351, p., 300.

¹²⁷ Beyer, L. & Liston, D. (1996) *Curriculum in Conflict: Social Visions, Educational Agendas and Progressive School Reform*. New York: Teachers College, p., 3.

branches of literature and science, as to form in the student a proper balance of character"¹²⁸.

From the pure mathematics, he learns the art of demonstrative reasoning. In attending to the physical sciences, he becomes familiar with facts, with the process of induction, and the varieties of probable evidence. In ancient literature, he finds some of the most finished models of taste. By English reading he learns the power of the language in which he is to speak and write. By logic and mental philosophy, he is taught the art of thinking; by rhetoric and oratory, the art of speaking. By frequent exercise on written composition, he acquires copiousness and accuracy of expression. By extemporaneous discussion, he becomes prompt, and fluent, and animated.¹²⁹

The great lines of orientation in the *Course of Liberal Education*, were defined as a "course of discipline in the arts and sciences, as is best calculated, at the same time, both to strengthen and enlarge the faculties of the mind, and familiarize it with the leading principles of the great objects of human investigation and knowledge"¹³⁰. In other words, for "an education (...) to be liberal, [it] should have reference to principal branches of knowledge" and because "knowledge varies, education should vary with it"¹³¹.

The concept of Liberal Education besides being sustained by the notion of mind-as-muscle, struggled for uniformity ("the college, by directing its efforts to one uniform course, aims at doing its work with greater precision, and economy of time"¹³²), for totality ("a thorough education ought (...) to be extended to all (...) classes"¹³³), and for the necessary relation between schools and universities ("schools

¹²⁸ Original Papers in Relation to a Course of Liberal Education. In B. Silliman (1829). *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. XV, pp., 297-351, p., 301.

¹²⁹ Op. cit., p., 301-302.

¹³⁰ Op. Cit. According to the report, "a liberal is obviously distinct from professional education. (...) the former is antecedent in time; the latter rests upon the former as its most appropriate foundation. A liberal education is fitted to occupy the mind, while its powers are opening and enlarging; a professional education requires an understanding already cultivated by study, and prepared by exercise for methodical and persevering efforts", p., 324.

¹³¹ Op. Cit., p., 324.

¹³² Op. Cit., p., 319.

¹³³ Op. Cit., p., 323.

and colleges are not rival institutions. The success of each is essential to the prosperity of the other"¹³⁴).

Fundamentally, the Yale Report, completed on September 9, 1828, expressed, above all, the importance of the study of classical languages, which were not to be dissociated from the study of the Sciences, as instruments able to contribute to mental discipline:

The range of classical study extends from the elements of language, to the most difficult questions arising from literary research and criticism. Every faculty of the mind is employed; not only the memory, judgment and reasoning of powers is employed, but the taste and fancy are occupied and improved. (...)The acquaintance with the elements of language and the mythology, as well as the chronology and geography of the ancients, which he derives from their classics, naturally excites in the mind of the student, an ardent desire of knowledge, while his imagination is fired by their poetry and eloquence.¹³⁵

The course of Liberal Education is in essence the path on which Voltaire's pages are compared to those of de Tacitus¹³⁶, an apology to mental discipline, to memorization, to the reinforcing of a particular linguistic structure, by means of which one intends to define the social picture. This is "the most famous document of nineteenth century mental disciplinarianism",¹³⁷ which brings together an apology for a traditional education and for humanistic values with the possible introduction of practical subjects and of the sciences. This perspective would prove predominant and, in the nineteenth century, "the status quo in curriculum matters, at least in most western societies, tended to be associated with a form of liberal arts, which was dominated by classical languages, masterpieces of literature, and elegance of linguistic expression."¹³⁸ Contrary to what was endorsed by Spencer, "the primacy of

¹³⁴ Op. Cit., p., 323.

¹³⁵ Op. Cit., pp., 330-347.

¹³⁶ Op. Cit.

¹³⁷ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 5

¹³⁸ Kliebard, H. (1988) The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 20.

scientific studies over the more traditional humanistic ones"¹³⁹, the Yale Faculty Report or the Report on a Course of Liberal Studies, defended classical languages as the guarantors of mental exercise, dictating rigor and discipline by means of recitation and memorization.

Consequently one is confronted with a study plan that is not only uniform - "the goal of a uniform system of education had long been a dream of [north]American educators, although ideas about the precise purpose and structure of schooling differed in successive periods"¹⁴⁰ -, but also strong on classical languages and literature, mathematics, and philosophy or religion (...) with some science but no modern literature, no modern languages and no modern history¹⁴¹. In other words, in accordance to Beyer and Liston, one is faced by a curriculum whose "lineage could be traced in some respects to the classical university of the Middle Ages"¹⁴² with an accentuated emphasis on the artes liberales and sermonicales¹⁴³ "engaged in the dissemination of sanctioned forms of knowledge,¹⁴⁴ counting with the input, as much from the teacher, as from the textbooks.

3.3 Social Changes in the Late XIX Century

In the first half of the nineteenth century, schools favored the sedimentation of a particular social project in which acculturation assumed a substantive role, while in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the curriculum reinforced mental discipline. In conformity to Noble,¹⁴⁵ John Locke's theory, based on "the development of memory, reason, will, judgment and other mental faculties through strenuous application to the study of the classics and mathematics"¹⁴⁶ was very well-known, but "the last half of the [nineteenth] century may be regarded as the golden age of mental

¹³⁹ Op. Cit., p., 21.

¹⁴⁰ Tyack, D. (1974). *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p., 41.

¹⁴¹ Muelder, H. (1984) *Missionaries and Muckrakers: the First Hundred Years of Knox College*. Urbana. University of Illinois Press.

¹⁴² Beyer, L. & Liston, D. (1996) *Curriculum in Conflict: Social Visions, Educational Agendas and Progressive School Reform*. New York: Teachers College, p., 3.

¹⁴³ For more detailed information about this issue vide: Paraskeva, J. (2001) *As Dinâmicas dos Conflitos Ideológicos e Culturais na Fundamentação do Currículo*. Porto: ASA.

¹⁴⁴ Op cit. p., 3.

¹⁴⁵ Noble, S. (1938). *A History of American Education*. New York: Rinehart and Company INC.

¹⁴⁶ Op. Cit., p., 339

discipline".¹⁴⁷ Nonetheless, Noble continues by stating that the transition from a social motif based upon culture to a disciplinary motif did not pose great difficulty and that the "discipline came to be referred to as mental culture"¹⁴⁸. In fact, with the rapid growth of an immigrant population (from almost all over the world), it was impossible to maintain the mental disciplinarian philosophy, and teaching (both theory and practice) was radically altered.

In the nineteenth century, the teacher considered himself/herself as the primary force in the teaching-learning process, determining its rhythms, its compasses and times, but this notion lost its power with the passing of time. According to Kliebard:

At the heart of America's educational system in the nineteenth century was the teacher. It was the teacher, ill-trained, harassed and underpaid, often immature, who was expected to embody the standard virtues and community values and, all the same ripe, to mete out stern discipline to the unruly and dull-witted.¹⁴⁹

This notion is also corroborated by Beyer and Liston, who agree that "the preparation provided early common school teachers was rather limited (...) with teachers often only marginally older and with barely more years of schooling than their charges"¹⁵⁰ and with a very rudimentary professional preparation.

Nonetheless, the great social transformations that were to be witnessed by the end of the nineteenth century, and which were, in some way, manifested with the enormous expansion in the 1830s of the cotton industry and in the implementation of an inter-regional transport network, with consequent great development and a profound economic transformation in all regions¹⁵¹, were to provoke profound

¹⁴⁷ Op. Cit., p. 339.

¹⁴⁸ In this regard *vide*: Op. Cit., p., 340.

¹⁴⁹ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 1.

¹⁵⁰ Beyer, L. & Liston, D. (1996). *Curriculum in Conflict: Social Visions, Educational Agendas and Progressive School Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press , p., 2.

¹⁵¹ Kaestle, C. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang. The author furthermore adds that "along new canals and railways, southern cotton and western foodstuffs came to the Northeast, the manufacturer and exporter of America's raw materials. (...) After a depression from 1837 to the early 1840s, expansion resumed. By the late 1840s,

alterations in the role of schooling. The school, as a specific political social project, demonstrated its weakness by showing that it was impotent in meeting the new challenges imposed by society, which was controlled by the rhythms and the compasses of industry and technology.

One is brought face to face with a historical era, in which, according to Kliebard, one bears witness to a “tremendous growth in popular journalism (..) including magazines and newspapers”¹⁵², to a violent social transformation created by the “the rapid advance of railroads as means of relatively cheap and reliable transportation”¹⁵³, and to a “continued growth of cities”¹⁵⁴. In this way, an attempt at perfecting a system was made (or better still, a school, since, with exception made of larger cities, America had schools but lacked schools systems¹⁵⁵) which was increasingly attached to economic and social objectives.¹⁵⁶

In the words of Kaestle, certain aspects of economic development would affect schooling in a multiplicity of ways:

By fostering commerce, geographical mobility and communication, capitalism encouraged schooling for literacy, mathematics, and other intellectual skills. By creating more wage labor, capitalism contributed to the demand for work discipline although other factors also account for school discipline. By creating more tightly coordinated productive hierarchies, such as in factories, industrialization promoted the values of punctuality, subordination, and regimentation that came also to characterize schools (...)¹⁵⁷.

the Northeast had become unmistakably a manufacturing region, with steadily increasing productivity and commodity output. (...) The acceleration of social change in the 1830s and 1840s is still clearly evident”, p., 63.

¹⁵² Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 2.

¹⁵³ Op. Cit., p., 2.

¹⁵⁴ Op. Cit., p., 2.

¹⁵⁵ Kaestle, C. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang.

¹⁵⁶ Tyack, D. (1974). *One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

¹⁵⁷ Kaestle, C. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 63.

These transformations which coursed through the North American society were to multiply and profoundly alter the social fabric, and by around the 1890s, "the signs of change were unmistakable"¹⁵⁸, with obvious economic change. In the words of Urban and Wagoner Jr, it was an era that can be described as one of "high industrialization"¹⁵⁹, in which "two alterations in the living conditions and economy". (...) were felt. "The first of them was urbanization. (...). The other was an "emergence of visible extremes of wealth and poverty"¹⁶⁰. Naturally, the "population density in large cities increased tensions and made social problems more visible."¹⁶¹

In essence, a profoundly conscious awareness of change became rampant, stimulated by both newspapers and magazines, as well as by the rail network development, which eliminated the isolation to which many of the remote zones of the nation, had, until then been subjected.¹⁶²

The social development that was established by the dynamics of industrialization, economic provisos, and the need to control immigration, would affect the social fabric in multiple ways, provoking profound ruptures, be it in the function and the predominance of the family, the manner in which education was thought of, or in the way education would seek for adequate answers to increasingly complex social challenges. Industrialization did indeed "interfere" with the nation as a whole, in such a way, that "no single term quite does justice to the complexity of social development"¹⁶³. Similarly noted is a turn in the field of education, whereby

¹⁵⁸ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 4.

¹⁵⁹ Urban, W. & Wagoner Jr, J. (1996) *American Education, a History*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, INC., pp., 159-160. According to the authors "from 1860 to the turn of the twentieth century, the proportion of city dwellers in the United States doubled. By the end of nineteenth century, the nation's urban population was approaching 50 percent.(...) Much of this urbanization was accomplished through domestic migration from farm to city. Mechanization in agriculture forced more and more farm families to seek their fortunes in the nation's burgeoning cities. This relocation process put great stress on traditional family structures, which, in turn, had a direct impact on the nation's school legislation".

¹⁶⁰ Op. Cit., pp., 159-160.

¹⁶¹ Kaestle, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 70.

¹⁶² Kliebard, H. (1988) The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33. Vide also: Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, (1st chapter).

¹⁶³ Kaestle, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 64.

responsibility was shifted from the family to the schools, which, in turn, adopted a much more complex role. As Kliebard puts it:

With the change in the social role of the school came a change in the educational center of gravity; it shifted from the tangible presence of teacher to the remote knowledge and values incarnate in the curriculum¹⁶⁴.

The curriculum, until then decided by traditional dynamics, no longer offered adequate answers for the needs of society, and entered a period of crisis. In other words, the major transformations in North American society would entail the development of new and rich market spaces, changes in attitudes, which would problematize the great objective of social institutions, an arena in which the school is no exception. The school was shaped to meet the needs of industry, by valuing 'virtues' such as "hriift, perseverance, punctuality, loyalty, and obedience"¹⁶⁵

Just as in the early period of the formation of the nation, the school was summoned to perform a predominant role in the consolidation of a common social project. Naturally, and as stated by Kliebard, "by 1890 visible cracks were noticed in mental discipline"¹⁶⁶. He adds,

With a society in such a rapid state of flux, it should not be surprising that the matter of what we teach our children in school should also come under scrutiny. (...) With the reevaluation of America's social institutions in the air, it was no wonder that the doctrine [mental discipline] that had become identified with existing conditions in the public schools should come under scrutiny. (...) The question emerging in many people's minds was whether a curriculum that

¹⁶⁴ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p. 1.

¹⁶⁵ Perkinson, H. (1968) *The Imperfect Panacea: America's Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p. 111.

¹⁶⁶ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p. 3.

had its origins in the courtly life of Renaissance Europe was appropriate to the demands of the new industrial society¹⁶⁷.

Fundamentally, the collapse of mental discipline "as a theory of curriculum"¹⁶⁸ was due to the transformation in the existing social order which brought on the new problematization of knowledge. The development which surrounded the nation dictated the rupture from traditional conceptions of education and inaugurated a new and much more complex era. In fact, in "1860 the United States lagged behind England, France and Germany in its industrial output [but by] 1894 it led the world and produced almost as much in value as those three nations combined".¹⁶⁹

3.4 The Struggle over Knowledge Control

The social transformations that were evident by the end of the nineteenth century, were propelled by the industrial and technological development, which created the opportunity for the emergence of an increasingly stronger North American "proletariat class"¹⁷⁰, and by the demographic crescendo of approximately 14 million immigrants, in the last four decades of the century, which led to large increases in admissions to secondary school¹⁷¹. This also led to a redefinition of the essence of the school itself, which, in the meantime, had become an increasingly complex institution¹⁷² and also a redefinition of the function of schooling as the forum for knowledge diffusion.

In this sense, the problematization of the knowledge reflected in the curriculum, a pressing preoccupation that had already existed in the age of classical antiquity and

¹⁶⁷Op. Cit., 4-6.

¹⁶⁸ Op. Cit., p. 6.

¹⁶⁹ Tyack, D. (1974) *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press., p., 29.

¹⁷⁰ Kaestle, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang, p., 66.

¹⁷¹ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge.

¹⁷² Tyack, D. (1974) *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

which was part of *Aristotelian* thought¹⁷³, would come to be an extremely complex question, especially, in a society in which the true notion of community was being re-considered with the advent of a notable economic increment¹⁷⁴, the growth of journalism, the development of the railway¹⁷⁵, and the "massive new influx of students into secondary schools"¹⁷⁶. The changes became more apparent around 1890, in part because of the American common school which emerged in the 1850s and 1860s and which had created a school population that was apt to enter secondary school, but also in part because of the demands imposed by technology. In the absence of technological skills among the young, they were left no other alternative, but to proceed with their studies in secondary school.¹⁷⁷

These factors lead to a profoundly heterogeneous and complex social picture, in which the trajectory between knowledge and the social values and their incorporation in the curriculum increasingly became a more complex task, particularly since "different segments in any society will emphasize different forms of knowledge as most valuable for that society"¹⁷⁸. A set of social trends began to emerge with regards to education, in general and to curriculum, in particular, led by various interest groups, with the purpose of controlling the knowledge disclosed in the curriculum, each representing "a force for a different selection of knowledge and values from the culture and hence a kind of lobby for a different curriculum"¹⁷⁹.

Thus, the rupture with the curricular premises prescribed in the Yale Faculty Report, which had, in the interim, revealed themselves incapable of meeting the challenges of an increasingly culturally polychromatic society, inaugurated a new era in the cannibalization for the control of knowledge in schools, and in 1892, the National Education Association's Committee of Ten emerged. This committee would

¹⁷³ Aristotele (1945) *Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

¹⁷⁴ Kaestle, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic, Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*, New York: Hill and Wang.

¹⁷⁵ Kliebard, H. (1998) The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.). *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 22.

¹⁷⁶ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p. 7.

¹⁷⁷ Troen, S. (1976) The Discovery of the Adolescent by American Educational Reformers, 1900-1920: an Economic Perspective. In L. Stone (ed.). *Schooling and Society: Studies in the History of Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp., 239-251.

¹⁷⁸ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p. 7.

¹⁷⁹ Op. Cit., p. 7.

territorialize the curricular problems around the standardization of the secondary school and the admission of students to college with the defense that education for life is education for college¹⁸⁰, aiming for the transformation of the existing educational order¹⁸¹.

3.4.1 Fitting for Life is Fitting for College

The Committee of Ten¹⁸², appointed at the meeting of the National Educational Association at Saratoga, on the 9th of July 1892, was composed of representatives of leading colleges and secondary schools in different parts of the country¹⁸³, having as Chairman Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University¹⁸⁴. This nomination, according to Kliebard, recognised “the great influence [Eliot] had exercised not only in higher education but in elementary and secondary schools as well”¹⁸⁵, and which led to foregrounding “the humanist interest group which, though largely unseen by professional educators in later periods, continued to exercise a strong measure of control over the American curriculum”¹⁸⁶.

¹⁸⁰ National Education Association (1893) *Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

¹⁸¹ The Report of Committee of Ten was unanimously approved through resolutions in the seventeenth annual meeting of the members of the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teacher's Association, who argued for effective cooperation between the teachers of preparatory and high schools and the faculties of colleges [vide: Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, pp., 1-17]. This concern was raised by the National Education Association, "in particular the National Council of Education's Report of the Committee on Secondary Studies in 1891" [vide: Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 74]. It is important to note that, according to Eliot, the Committee of Ten itself also intended to establish a close rapport between secondary schools and colleges. [Eliot, C. (1894) The report of the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Volume VII, 105-110, p. 109].

¹⁸² *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (1894) National Education Association. New York. American Book Company.

¹⁸³ The remaining members who made up the Committee of Ten were: William Harris, Commissioner of Education; James Angel, President of the University of Michigan; John Tetlow, Head Master of the girls High School and the Girl's Latin School in Boston; James Taylor, President of Vassar College; Oscar Robinson, Principal of the High School, Albany; James Baker, President of the University of Colorado; Richard Jesse, President of the University of Missouri; James Mackenzie, Head Master of the Lawrenceville School; and Henry King, Professor in Oberlin College. With regards to this matter, vide: *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies*. (1894) National Education Association. Chicago: The American Book Company.

¹⁸⁴ *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (1894) National Education Association. New York. American Book Company.

¹⁸⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, p. 9.

¹⁸⁶ Op. Cit., p. 9.

A more in-depth understanding of the foundations of the structure of the Committee of Ten forces us, as is suggested by Michael Apple, to effect a contextualization with the social, intellectual and educational reality of the times.¹⁸⁷ In this way, it will be useful to mention that in the 1880s and 1890s, secondary school was an institution with parameters which were very different from the ones of the present. There were few secondary schools outside the urban centers and, in comparison with the present figures, the attendance was definitely inferior. As indicated by Eliot, "no State in the American Union possesses anything which can be properly called a system of secondary education"¹⁸⁸, adding that "between the elementary schools and the colleges is a wide gap very imperfectly bridged by a few public high schools, endowed academies, college preparatory departments and private schools"¹⁸⁹ which were not subject to common standards and which did not portray a uniform matrix.

Furthermore, and as was mentioned previously, "on an intellectual level subtle shifts were occurring in widely held beliefs among educators about mental discipline"¹⁹⁰. As is documented by Michael Apple, the period of time in which the Committee Report was situated was one in which "the reliance on faculty psychology, with its concomitant emphasis upon classical languages such as Latin as the training subject par excellence, was gradually giving way"¹⁹¹, and there began to emerge a "more modern concept of mental discipline, which was concerned with developing the mind as a whole"¹⁹², thereby resulting in a wider perspective of curriculum.

On the other hand, the socio-educational climate gave vent to visible instability. The economic crisis of 1893, which motivated the growing disbelief in obsolete social institutions (among which the school was no exception) accelerated people's awareness of the imminence of a new world, the newly-assigned role being given to

¹⁸⁷ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 75.

¹⁸⁸ Eliot, C. (1905) The Gap Between Common Schools and Colleges. In C. Eliot (ed.) *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Century Company, pp. 197--219, p. 197.

¹⁸⁹ Op. Cit., p. 197.

¹⁹⁰ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 75.

¹⁹¹ Op. Cit., p. 76.

¹⁹² Kolesnik, W. (1979) *Mental Discipline in Modern Education*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, p. 23.

the school, and a completely revitalized curriculum.¹⁹³ Furthermore, the unrelenting development of industrial capitalism led to new and constant demands for knowledge and the complex and conflicting problematization of the social institutions¹⁹⁴, thereby announcing a turning point in schooling.¹⁹⁵

Immersed in this context, the Committee of Ten searched for uniformity in both “secondary school programs and in college admission prerequisites”¹⁹⁶. At the end of the nineteenth century, the chaos in secondary schooling was an unquestioned reality¹⁹⁷ and inherent to the improvement to secondary schools, were not only the creation of new schools, but also the implementation of common and more elevated standards for existing ones so that colleges might find “in the school courses a firm, broad, and reasonably homogeneous foundation for their higher work”.¹⁹⁸ The problematics of uniformity, for Eliot, was already an ancient desire. In the inaugural speech offered as President of the University of Harvard, he declared that “a single common course of studies, tolerably well selected to meet the average needs, seems to most Americans a very proper and natural thing”.¹⁹⁹ Uniformity was, thus, the path for American schools to follow²⁰⁰, although Eliot was a fervent supporter of the system of elective studies in which “the choice offered to the student does not lie between liberal studies and professional or utilitarian studies” since “all the studies which are open to [the student] are liberal and disciplinary, not narrow or special”²⁰¹, a system which was, in fact, followed at the University of Harvard for more than 40 years.

¹⁹³ Kliebard, H. (1998) The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 25.

¹⁹⁴ Kliebard, H. (1982) Education at the Turn of the Century: A Crucible for Curriculum Change. *Educational Researcher*, 11, pp., 16-24.

¹⁹⁵ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

¹⁹⁶ Eliot, C. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Volume VII, pp., 105-110, p., 107; *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary Studies*. National Education Association. Chicago: American Book Company, p. 1.

¹⁹⁷ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

¹⁹⁸ Eliot, C. (1905) The Gap Between Common Schools and Colleges. In C. Eliot (ed.) *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Century Company, pp., 197 - 219, p., 202.

¹⁹⁹ Eliot, C. (1905) Inaugural Address as President of Harvard College. In C. Eliot. (ed.) *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Century Company, pp. 1-38, p. 11.

²⁰⁰ Eliot, C. (1892) *Shortening and Enriching the Grammar School Course*. National Education Association.

²⁰¹ Eliot, C. (1905) Inaugural Address as President of Harvard College. In C. Eliot (ed.) *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Century Company, pp. 1-38, p. 13.

The Committee, after having carefully observed the "subjects taught in forty leading secondary schools in the United States and the total number of recitations, or exercises, allotted to each subject"²⁰², and after a preliminary discussion on the 9th of November, decided to organize on the following day nine conferences related to the following subjects: (1) Latin; (2) Greek; (3) English; (4) Other modern languages; (5) Mathematics; (6) Physics, Astronomy and Chemistry; (7) Natural History (Biology, including Botany, Zoölogy, and Physiology); (8) History, Civil Government and Political Economy; and (9) Geography (Physical Geography, Geology, and Meteorology).²⁰³ The Committee also adopted a list of eleven questions, which were to be discussed at the said conferences, from which, for its relevance, the seventh is highlighted: "Should the subject be treated differently for pupils who are going to college, for those who are going to a scientific school, and for those who, presumably, are going to neither?"²⁰⁴

In 1893, the Report published, in an extensive volume of 250 pages²⁰⁵, the conclusions obtained at the nine conferences. It contained reference to how "both the conferences and the Committee of Ten arrived at remarkable degree of unanimity in their conclusions".²⁰⁶ Unlike Germany, which had "different schools for different social classes, such as the Volks, the Bürger, the Höhere Töchter schools and the Gymnasia"²⁰⁷, the American people could not "sacrifice one of the dearest principles of social and political equality—the birthright of every boy and girl in the land—for any poor mess of pedagogical pottage".²⁰⁸ Thus, the Committee of Ten, after a project of coordination and correlation of the recommendations assembled from the various

²⁰² *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (1894) National Education Association. New York. American Book Company, p., 4.

²⁰³ *Op. Cit.*, p., 5.

²⁰⁴ *Op. Cit.*, p., 7.

²⁰⁵ The great size of the document led Eliot to outline a strategy for its diffusion and implementation that entailed a multiplicity of resources ranging from the free distribution of thirty thousand copies to strategic schools and colleges, thanks to the support obtained from the Secretary of the Interior, Hoke Smith, to the sizeable publication of articles with the support of Butler, then the editor of "Educational Review", or the effort made by Eliot himself so that the colleges endorsed the document, a task that was not easy since Eliot, in his own University of Harvard, was confronting strong resistance to the adoption of the master outlines disseminated in the Report, or still through the participation in meetings of teachers with the intent of broadly discussing the document and ensuring its adoption. With regard to this, *vide*: Sizer, T. (1964) *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

²⁰⁶ Eliot, C. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 105-110, p., 109.

²⁰⁷ De Garmo, C. (1894) Report of the Committee of Ten. From the Point of View of Educational Theory. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 275-280, p., 276.

²⁰⁸ *Op. Cit.*, p., 276.

conferences²⁰⁹, and after a very complex combination of negotiated and renegotiated compromises at various levels, proposed a curricular matrix for secondary schooling based on four programs or courses of study separately designated as Classical, Latin-Scientific, Modern Languages and English²¹⁰, concluding that all students regardless of destination were entitled to the best ways of teaching the various subjects²¹¹. It was assumed that education for life is education for college²¹², since they concluded that "all students should be uniformly given the opportunity for an education for *life*"²¹³. One should not however forget that very few students went to high school.

This is a document, which provoked a wide range of reactions in the midst of the socio-educational community,²¹⁴ especially since it contained a number of proposals of social importance²¹⁵, which, in turn, led to the implementation of a series of strategies in order to achieve their dissemination²¹⁶. To some the Report was "fully worthy of careful, prolonged investigation, thought, and discussion"²¹⁷, because it could demonstrate that "the present weakness of our schools is owing to the fact that there is very little substantial recognition of the sciences of education"²¹⁸, that it was

²⁰⁹ Eliot, C. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 105-110, p., 107.

²¹⁰ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

²¹¹ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge

²¹² *Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies*. (1894) National Education Association. Chicago: The American Book Company.

²¹³ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p., 78.

²¹⁴ Sizer, T. (1964) *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

²¹⁵ Sachs, J. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. From the Point of View of the College Preparatory School. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 75-83, p. 75.

²¹⁶ *Vide*: Sizer, T. (1964) *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp., 196-198. Fundamentally, we are faced by a document, which independent of the criticism is able to have an impact on the educational community. In Sizer's words, agreement with the recommendations made in the Report of the Committee of Ten was due to a number of factors, carefully and strategically delineated: in the first place, the Report "came at the very time when such an authoritative document was badly needed"; in the second place, "the Committee had been wisely selected with just such an effect in mind"; in the third place, there was "a carefully planned distribution"; in the fourth place, "its members adhered to the tradition of mental discipline, but saw that the new academic subjects might well provide this discipline as adequately as the classics and mathematics did"; in the fifth place, the Report was moderate in tone, in other words, "it went to neither extreme—the old time Latin School nor the manual training school—but it made concessions to each camp"; lastly, ironically but strategically, the Report carefully avoided mentioning the causes for the chaos in secondary education.

²¹⁷ Parker, F. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. Its Use for the Improvement of Teachers now at Work in the Schools. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 479-491, p. 479.

²¹⁸ *Op. Cit.*, p. 490.

the best illustration of the "progressive spirit in American education"²¹⁹, that it was "the first classic in American pedagogical literature"²²⁰, or even that it was a document which disseminated a praiseworthy educational theory which attempted to create greater complicity between the secondary school system and colleges²²¹. But to others, as is documented by Krug, "practically everything about the Committee of Ten has been controversial"²²², especially since there was something very strange about the unanimity of the conclusions presented by the Report.²²³

Hence, and as proposed by Kasson, the Report not only revealed a conspiracy on the part of the colleges, but it also revealed itself as a rather too conservative document,²²⁴ ignoring thus "the art either as an historical inheritance or as a spirit-inspiring individual expression"²²⁵. For Schurman, the Committee of Ten and some of the conferences were victims of a well spent popular psychology which defined education merely as a preparation for the faculties of the mind.²²⁶ Greenwood, on the other hand, perceived the Report as a criticism of teachers, believing the "teachers to be the silent majority" of said document.²²⁷ Moreover the American Philological Association raised its voice against the Report of the Committee of Ten, forming the Committee of Twelve under the chairmanship of Wilson Goodwin, professor of Greek Language at Harvard. According to this Committee, if the Report of the Committee of Ten were to be put into practice standards would drop, on the basis that secondary schools and colleges should oppose a scheme that threatened their own degradation.²²⁸ Small, to whom the curricular matrix proposed by the Committee resembled a pedantic abstract of a completely disorganized process, stressed that the Report of the Committee of Ten "presents a classified catalogue of subjects good for study, but there is no apparent conception of the cosmos of which these subjects are abstracted

²¹⁹ Bradley, J. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. From the Point of View of the Smaller Colleges. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 370-373, p., 370.

²²⁰ National Education Association. (1894) *Proceedings*, p., 142.

²²¹ Eliot, C. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 105-110.

²²² Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 35.

²²³ Sachs, J. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. From the Point of View of the College Preparatory School. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 75-83, p. 75

²²⁴ Kasson, F. (1893-1894) Editorial. *Education*, XIII-XIV, pp., 432-433.

²²⁵ Clark, J. (1894) Art in Secondary Education – An Omission by the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 374-381, p., 376.

²²⁶ Schurman, J. (1894) The Report of Secondary School Studies. *School Review*, 2, pp., 83-97.

²²⁷ Greenwood, J. (1894) The Report of the Committee of Ten. Its Use for the Improvement of Teachers now at Work in Schools. *National Education Association Proceedings*, p., 454.

²²⁸ Sizer, T. (1964) *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

phases and elements”²²⁹, further adding that “education is not an affair of perception, reflection and judgment alone”²³⁰ which implies that “education connotes the evolution of the whole personality, not merely of intelligence”²³¹. He emphasized his opposition by noting that:

The proper educator is reality, not conventionalized abstractions from reality. (...) Our business as teachers is primarily, therefore, not to train particular mental powers, but to select points of contact between learning minds and the reality that is to be learned. (...) Our business as teachers is to bring these perceptive contacts of pupil’s minds with points of objective reality into true association with all the remainder of objective reality, i. e., we should help pupils, first, to see things, and second, to see things together as they actually exist in reality²³².

Ultimately, if, on the one hand, the Report of the Committee of Ten manifested a profound belief in the creation of a standardized educational process and the necessity to institute the one best system²³³, on the other, it endeavored to guarantee, at all cost, the perpetuation of certain values, which were beginning to be threatened by an increasingly multicultural community.

For a better understanding of this problematic issue, one needs to consider the critical understanding of Michael Apple in relation to the Report of the Committee of Ten, which lends an interesting contribution to the discussion and which has been organized in the following manner. In the first place, the Committee of Ten is merely composed of men "though a large portion of the students and teachers these men ‘represented’ were women”²³⁴. In the second place, the nine conferences, which territorialized the field of action for the Committee of Ten, represented "the residual power of the classics and the emerging power of newer academic subjects”²³⁵.

²²⁹ Small, A. (1896) Demands of Sociology upon Pedagogy. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Thirty Fifth Annual Meeting of the National Education Association*, 3 (10), pp., 174-184, p., 175.

²³⁰ Op. Cit., p., 175.

²³¹ Op Cit., p., 175.

²³² Op. Cit., pp., 176-178

²³³ Marble, A. (1894) City School Administration. *Educational Review*, 8, pp., 154-168.

²³⁴ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 74.

²³⁵ Op. Cit., p. 77.

In the third place, the four proposed programs for the curricular matrix—Classical, Latin-Scientific, Modern Languages and English²³⁶—not only completely silenced "manual or vocational training, business and other 'practical' subjects, as well as art and music"²³⁷, but also pointed to "the cultural capital of two particular segments of the dominant group within the academy and within the gentry itself"²³⁸. On the one hand, there were "those whose cultural background, visions of 'civilization' and affiliation were with the older classical subjects"²³⁹ and, on the other hand, there were "those 'moderate reformers' who wished to expand the definitions of high-status curricular knowledge somewhat to include a wider array of more 'modern' academic subjects"²⁴⁰. In order to better justify the insatiable appetite for control of knowledge in the curriculum, Michael Apple, recalls Young's rationale, to whom, "those in positions of power will attempt to define what is to be taken as knowledge, how accessible to different groups any knowledge is, and what are the accepted relationships between different knowledge areas and between those who have access to them and make them available".²⁴¹

Lastly, given the complexity of the task undertaken by the Committee of Ten, and given the natural internal divergences between its members, the Report provided a combination of (inevitable) compromises and concessions centered around the older classical subjects and around the modern academic subjects, around a necessary focus on mental discipline, around the elective system fervently defended by Eliot, and even around the actual concept of uniformity. Although "the Committee of Ten began out of political, organizational, and curricular tension", created to deal with the "mundane problem of uniform college entrance"²⁴², its work and its recommendations would come to affect society as a whole.

²³⁶ Vide: Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, pp., 61-62.

²³⁷ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 77

²³⁸ Op. Cit., p. 77

²³⁹ Op. Cit., p. 77

²⁴⁰ Op. Cit., p. 77

²⁴¹ Young, M. F. D. (1971) An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organized Knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (ed.) *Knowledge and Control, New Directions for the Sociology of Education*. London: Collier - MacMillan Publishers, pp., 19 - 46, p., 32.

²⁴² Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 8.

In essence, Michael Apple, in his critical analysis of the recommendations proposed by the Committee of Ten, denounced the dynamics of gender, power, cultural segregation and differentiation which are found in the discourse which structures the report. In the text, which indicates the major intentions of the Committee of Ten, profound conflicts between the various social factions circulate around that which is promulgated as "legitimate culture"²⁴³. It is a document in which the extremely complex dynamics of power and of culture crisscross, which manifest themselves through the search for uniformity (partially achieved²⁴⁴), through the primacy conferred to the curricular form in detriment of the content, through the profusion of a broader knowledge accepted as legitimate and directed towards mental discipline, and through the systematic attempt to develop the powers of rationality in students—which nevertheless militate against each other "on the terrain of specific definitions of cultural status". Thus, quite naturally, "the kind of subject matter that was to be taught and many of the methods of teaching subject matter remained relatively limited to the cultural resources of dominant groups"²⁴⁵.

The Report of the Committee of Ten is a strategic political document, which tries to perfect the existing social order rather than reforming it. It is testimony of the reorganization of cultural capital, of a redefinition of what is understood to be legitimate culture, and of a transformation of the curriculum, which has inevitably brought about compromises and concessions. Fundamentally, there is, in the recommendations of the Report the clear intention to reconquer the curricular form, something which immediately attests to the impact the document had on a social level.

As is indicated by Krug (according to Michael Apple "one of the wisest interpreters of the [said] report"²⁴⁶), "from 1894 to 1905 almost every treatment of matters educational was referred to, compared with, or distinguished from the report of the Committee of Ten"²⁴⁷. In accordance with Sisson, there was no school in the United States that was not affected by said document.²⁴⁸ It was a document which was

²⁴³ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p., 76.

²⁴⁴ Op. Cit., p., 79.

²⁴⁵ Op. Cit., pp., 78-79.

²⁴⁶ Op. Cit., p. 79.

²⁴⁷ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 66.

²⁴⁸ Sisson, E. (1910) An educational emergency. *Atlantic Monthly*, 106.

widely read and discussed, provoking significant reactions and changes to the educational fabric²⁴⁹. Eliot, who for a period of time assumed leadership for the Humanist movement, had the reputation of a reformer. He upheld that the major objective of a truly democratic school, which was "to lift the whole population to a higher plane of intelligence, conduct, and happiness"²⁵⁰, had not yet been attained in the United States of America. For Eliot, the "function of education in a democracy should be the firm planting in every child's mind of certain great truths which lie at the foundation of the democratic social theory".²⁵¹ While arguing for mental discipline, he was not exactly a defender of the established social order. In that regard, Kliebard commented as follows:

Eliot, essentially, was the champion of the systematic development of reasoning power as the central function of schools, and he recognized that much of what transpired in schools was simply unrelated to that function. (...) Eliot differed from the most mental disciplinarians in that he thought that any subject, so long as it were capable of being studied over a sustained period, was potentially a disciplinary subject. (...) Although [he] did not emphasize education for the purpose of direct social reform, he remained optimistic with respect to human capabilities. The right selection of subjects along with the right way of teaching them could develop citizens of all classes endowed in accordance with the humanistic ideal²⁵².

Despite his influence, Eliot ended up by having to concede and compromise, especially in terms of substantive strategic options such as with the system of electives in which he staunchly believed. For Eliot, "the elective system fosters scholarship, because it gives free play to natural preferences and inborn aptitudes, makes possible enthusiasm for a chosen work, relieves the professor and the ardent disciple of the presence of a body of students who are compelled to an unwelcome task, and enlarges instruction by substituting many and various lessons given to small, lively classes, for a few lessons many times repeated to different sections of a

²⁴⁹ Sizer, T. (1964) *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

²⁵⁰ Eliot, C. (1905) The Function of Education in Democratic Society. In C. Eliot (ed.) *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Century Company, pp. 401-417, p. 403.

²⁵¹ Op. Cit., p. 413.

²⁵² Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 10.

numerous class"²⁵³. In this regard, Eliot "had to settle for a choice of four different courses of study in the high school rather than the system of electives"²⁵⁴. The Report of the Committee of Ten is a declaration of principles which preside over a number of negotiations and renegotiations at various levels, of advances and retreats, in which, according to Eliot, the great objective was much deeper than uniformity of programs for the students. The great aim was the search for uniformity of "topics, methods, and standards of attainment for any subjects that might be offered or taken"²⁵⁵, an objective that, according to Baker, ended up by "lay[ing] comparatively too much emphasis on facts and too little upon ideals"²⁵⁶.

3.4.2 Five Windows of the Soul

As the criticism grew in terms of the recommendations relayed by the Report of the Committee of Ten, so did its credibility drop. Its obsession with uniformity would lead, although Eliot denies it, to giving minimal attention to substantive issues, which required much greater thought—such as issues related to elementary schools. For example, "the high school did not live unto itself. Its fortunes and destiny were linked not only to college but also to the elementary school. Moreover, whereas only a small fraction of the pupils in high school went to college, practically all of them came from the grade schools"²⁵⁷. But the elementary schools, according to Krug, possessed their own preoccupations and difficulties, and were targets of repeated criticism, namely, the problem of waste: "too long a period of time was said to be taken to accomplish too little [and] the length of time for elementary schooling, [the] nature of curriculum, [the] shockingly large number of children who left elementary school without completing the course"²⁵⁸, problems that had been ignored by the National Education Association in Krug's view. Furthermore, he noted that the "elementary school people

²⁵³ Eliot, C. (1905) Inaugural Address as President of Harvard College. In C. Eliot (ed.) *Educational Reform, Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Century Company, pp. 1-38, p. 15.

²⁵⁴ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 10.

²⁵⁵ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 46.

²⁵⁶ Baker, Apud, Clark, J. (1894) Art in Secondary Education – An Omission by the Committee of Ten. *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, pp., 374-381, p., 375.

²⁵⁷ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 93.

²⁵⁸ Op. Cit., pp. 95-96.

felt they were hampered by domination from the high schools"²⁵⁹, that they "were indeed the overworked and oppressed proletariat of the pedagogical enterprise"²⁶⁰ and, quite naturally, there developed an awareness of the need for a "special project of their own, comparable to the Committee of Ten in scope and especially in the possession of a substantial expense account".²⁶¹

It is in this context, and approximately seven months after the creation of the Committee of Ten, on February 22, 1893, that the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education, whose general chairman Superintendent William Maxwell of Brooklyn "was authorized to divide the members of the committee into three sub-committees—one on the training of teachers, one on the correlation of studies in elementary education, and one on the organization of city school systems"²⁶². From among these three sub-committees the one that would attain greater prominence was the second one, linked with the correlation of studies in elementary education²⁶³, and which was composed by the Superintendent of the Committee of Fifteen himself, Maxwell, along with "Greenwood, Gilbert, Jones and, as chairman, Harris"²⁶⁴, "America's leading Hegelian, the powerful and articulate United States Commissioner of Education"²⁶⁵, who would be "wearing the mantle of the humanist position"²⁶⁶.

Although Harris had belonged to the Committee of Ten, the fact is that soon he dissociated himself from the doctrine of mental discipline which, in the meantime, was in decline, defending instead an approach centered on a "new rationale for a humanistic curriculum". Harris proved to be more sensitive than Eliot to the social transformations which determined the rhythms and the steps of the society of his day. However, and despite having "embraced certain reform causes such as women's access to higher education", and arguing that the major function of "education in the

²⁵⁹ Op. Cit., p. 94.

²⁶⁰ Op. Cit., p. 96.

²⁶¹ Op. Cit., p. 97.

²⁶² Maxwell, W. (1895) Introduction. In *Report of the Committee of the Fifteen on Elementary Education*. National Education Association. New York: The American Book Company, pp., 7-18. p., 8.

²⁶³ Marble, A. (1895) Dr. Harris and his Critics. *Journal of Education*, Volume XLI (15), pp., 247-248.

²⁶⁴ Maxwell, W. (1895) Introduction. In *Report of the Committee of the Fifteen on Elementary Education*. National Education Association. New York: The American Book Company, pp., 7-18. p., 9.

²⁶⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 14.

²⁶⁶ Op. Cit., p., 14.

course of its progress should broaden and deepen the intellect"²⁶⁷, the fact is that Harris gained a name in the educational field as a great conservative. As is highlighted by Kliebard, his "lukewarm reaction to manual training, [his] deep reservations about the virtues of child-study as a basis for determining what to teach, [his clear opposition to vocational education, and his staunch support for a] curriculum constructed around the finest resources of Western civilization"²⁶⁸ confer on Harris the image of a man who would mark the educational field as the great defender of Humanist studies, and mistrust the predominance that the Natural Sciences were beginning to enjoy.

In order to implement his approach, Harris stressed that "school education should open five windows of the soul, and let it look out upon the two departments of nature and the three departments of mind"²⁶⁹, namely, that independently of the transformation that education was portrayed as bringing to North American social institutions, the five windows of the soul would remain as the means by means of which the culture would be propagated and perpetuated to the majority of citizens²⁷⁰. In the words of Harris, the five windows of the soul are as follows:

Arithmetic gives the first glimpse of inorganic nature, for it reveals the nature of quantity, and quantity gives the law to time and space, and to all bodies. Then in geography a glimpse is given of organic nature as related to the inorganic on the one hand, and as related to man on the other—a very educative study indeed! Then there is grammar, which looks into the logical structure of the intellect as revealed in language; history, which reveals the human will; literature in the school readers, showing how the great geniuses of the language have revealed the aspirations of the people in impassioned prose and poetry²⁷¹.

²⁶⁷ Harris, W. (1896) How the Will Combines With the Intellect in the Higher Orders of Knowing. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*. National Education Association, pp., 440-446, p., 440.

²⁶⁸ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 15.

²⁶⁹ Harris, W. (1889) The Intellectual Value of Tool-Work. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*. National Education Association, pp., 92-98, p., 96.

²⁷⁰ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge.

²⁷¹ Harris, W. (1889) The Intellectual Value of Tool-Work. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*. National Education Association, pp., 92-98, p., 97.

It is in this sense that Harris argues that the course of studies for schools and colleges should have two functions: "It must furnish the best range of studies for discipline—or the subjective training of the powers of the mind, and it must present the objective world of nature and humanity in outlines complete enough to give to the youth a general survey of his relations to both aspects of the world"²⁷², further adding that if a course of study focused only on developing and limbering up the intellect and the will while ignoring the strong rapport that these establish with reality, the child will wither up, since it only promotes a formal development of the child and not a substantial one. Curiously, the convenient association that Harris established between formal and substantial development contributed to the antagonism and consequent estrangement/dissociation vis-à-vis the doctrine of mental discipline, proposed by Eliot, as well as to the reservations he expresses with regards to Eliot's desired elective system. The five windows of the soul are also identified as the five substantive provinces for adequate human learning from primary school up to college. In his own words, Harris notes:

So great is the task of the school, and its two provinces—the will and the intellect—lead into provinces so crowded with details that there is perpetual danger of dissipation of energies. (...) To avoid this danger it is necessary for the educator to consider carefully the relation of each branch of study in the program to its scope and contents, and secure a proper representation of all the substantial phases of human life in and by means of these studies²⁷³.

In this extremely prudent way, Harris analyzes the problems surrounding elective systems, which had the objective of making studies more practical. According to Harris, "as long as these electives are so arranged that the symmetry of the course of study is preserved, and each department is represented in a proper manner, there is no great injury to the pupil"²⁷⁴. For Harris, "it was the content of the subjects rather than their form that was crucial in determining their value" and by emphasizing the virtue of an effective cynosure on "content of what was learned, instead of disciplinary value,

²⁷² Harris, W. (1880) *Equivalents in a Liberal Course of Study. Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*. National Education Association, pp., 167-175, p., 167.

²⁷³ *Op. Cit.*, p., 170.

²⁷⁴ *Op. Cit.*, p., 173.

Harris, was reconstructing the justification for a curriculum that would preserve the humanistic ideal"²⁷⁵. His apology of ancient languages, namely Greek and Latin, differed in its "rationale from that of the typical mental disciplinarian"²⁷⁶, since its fundamental justification rested on the fact that "Greece and Rome were seminal to Western civilization"²⁷⁷ and that the comprehension of modern society would be incomplete without this historical legacy. Thus, the ancient languages emerge as an important piece in the construction and sedimentation of the symmetry of the course of study.

By 1895, in Cleveland, the *Committee of Fifteen* was "ready to report on elementary school curriculum"²⁷⁸, having already incurred violent reactions (principally, with regards to the Report emanating from one of the sub-committees, "The Correlation of studies in elementary education") especially, from a group of North American educators, who, in 1892 founded the National Herbart Society²⁷⁹, at the same meeting at the National Education Association in Saratoga Springs in which the Committee of Ten had been founded. Among the notables mentioned there was "a 35-year old professor from the University of Chicago named John Dewey"²⁸⁰, a person who is extremely hard to classify²⁸¹, who failed to "choose sides easily"²⁸², who, by association with names like Charles de Garmo, Frank and Charles McMurry, Elmer Brown (who later would succeed Harris as the Commissioner of Education),

²⁷⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 34.

²⁷⁶ Op. Cit., p., 35.

²⁷⁷ Op. Cit., p., 36.

²⁷⁸ Op. Cit., p., 14.

²⁷⁹ With regard to this, *vide*: Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 99. "The name of Herbartians was assumed by or applied to a relatively small group of American educators, mostly with interests in elementary school, affected through several degrees of relationship by German philosopher Johan Friedrich Herbart, who died in 1841. Some of them had studied in Germany. Herbart himself had not been strictly or solely a philosopher of education, but his general philosophy was applicable to that field. Two of his disciples, Stoy and Ziller, developed these educational implications, which were carried still further by one of their students, William Rein, who succeeded Stoy at Jena in 1885. It was probably Rein who was best known by the American Herbartians, including those who had themselves studied in Germany.

²⁸⁰ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 107.

²⁸¹ Op. Cit., p., 113.

²⁸² Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 26.

Nicholas Butler and Joseph Rice, affiliated himself with an intellectual movement which "had undertaken to challenge the existing order in American education".²⁸³

Just like the other two sub-committees, the sub-committee, on "The correlation of studies in elementary education", headed by Harris, acted on the basis of a string of questions which had been submitted by educators "throughout the country whose opinions might be considered as of value"²⁸⁴. From among the seventeen questions submitted, the fifth (as they appear in numerical order in the referred Report) alluded explicitly to the correlation of the studies: "What should be the purpose of attempting a close correlation of studies? a) to prevent duplication, eliminate non-essentials, and save time and effort? b) to develop the apperceiving power of the mind? c) to develop character—a purely ethical purpose?"²⁸⁵. In this manner, the sub-committee began to trace the concept of correlation, which was anchored in four great sections, namely; "logical order of topics and branches; symmetrical whole of studies in the world of human learning; psychological symmetry—the whole mind; and correlation of a pupil's course of study with the world in which he lives—his spiritual and natural environment"²⁸⁶. In essence, and just as Kliebard stresses, Harris used the terms correlation—"a pivotal point in Herbartian curriculum theory"—and concentration, but not in the sense proposed by the Herbartians.

The latter correlation was an umbrella concept which would promote the "interrelationship among the subjects themselves", and not, as mentioned by Harris, an instrument of "correlating the pupil with his spiritual and natural environment"²⁸⁷. Similarly with regards to the concept of concentration, Harris related it to his five windows of soul; in other words, the course of study in the elementary school should be concentrated around its five provinces. So for the Herbartians, the concept of concentration was in fact related to "a particular subject, such as history or literature,

²⁸³ Kliebard, H. (1999). Dewey and the Herbartians: The Genesis of a Theory of Curriculum. In W. Pinar (Ed.). *Contemporary Curriculum Discourses, Twenty Years of Journal of Curriculum Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, pp., 68-81, p., 69.

²⁸⁴ Maxwell, W. (1895) Introduction. In *The Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education*. National Education Association. New York: The American Book Company, pp., 7-18, p., 9.

²⁸⁵ Op. Cit., p., 11.

²⁸⁶ Report of the Sub-committee on the Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education. In *The Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education*. National Education Association. New York: The American Book Company, pp., 40-41

²⁸⁷ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 16.

as a focal point for all subjects"²⁸⁸ achieving in this way a certain unity in the curriculum that they had conceptualized. The obvious adulteration of the meaning of these two Herbartian concepts—correlation and concentration—forced the Herbartian movement to react against the Report of the sub-committee on "The correlation of studies in elementary education", headed by De Garmo, the then-President of the National Herbart Society.

The Journal of Education on March 7, 1895, published a discussion centered around the Harris Report, having as its principal issue the concept of correlation. For Frank McMurry²⁸⁹, the Harris Report warned of the dangers of "studies closely tied together"²⁹⁰, and he contended that the members of the sub-committee did not understand that "the chief fault of our present studies is that they do not support each other"²⁹¹, further adding that the Report "is opposed from principle to this kind of correlation"²⁹². On the other hand, the McMurry²⁹³ (and the irony and sarcasm is obvious in his references to the Report) observed that "they have four points in their definition of correlation"²⁹⁴, stressing that the fourth still allies/consigns itself to the "old idea of study, in which, from the adult standpoint, we decide that what the child will use as a man shall constitute his course"²⁹⁵. To conclude McMurry, for whom the Harris Report was not "in sympathy with the child"²⁹⁶, stated that "the new education is based on child study, apperception, and interest"²⁹⁷ and accentuated that "knowledge is not primarily for the sake of knowledge, but for use, and the only condition under which the ideas will be active is that they shall appeal to the child and

²⁸⁸ Op. Cit., p., 16

²⁸⁹ McMurry, F. (1895) Discussion on Report of Dr. Harris. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (21), pp., 165-167, p., 165.

²⁹⁰ Op. Cit., p., 165.

²⁹¹ Op. Cit., p., 165.

²⁹² Op. Cit., p., 165.

²⁹³ Op. Cit.

²⁹⁴ Op. Cit. "Your committee understands by correlation the selection and arrangement in order of sequence of such objects of study as shall give the child an insight into the world that he lives in, and a command over his resources such as is obtained by helpful cooperation with one's fellows. In a word, the chief consideration to which all others are to be subordinated, in the opinion of your committee, is this requirement of the civilization into which the child is born as determining what he shall study in school", p., 165.

²⁹⁵ Op. Cit., p., 165.

²⁹⁶ Op. Cit., p., 165.

²⁹⁷ Op. Cit., p., 165.

shall fit his nature. Child study, interest and apperception demand that the chief factor shall be the nature of the child"²⁹⁸.

Similarly, Parker did not dispute the fact that the members of Harris' sub-committee conducted "the most careful study of the doctrine of Herbart and his disciples—Ziller, Stoy and Rein"²⁹⁹. However, for Parker "the failure of this report is that they haven't even given us the fundamental doctrine of Herbart"³⁰⁰; in other words, "there is no doubt that the Herbartian doctrine and all other doctrines of concentration are ignored in their fundamental essentials. That is what this committee has left out—it is the old story, the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out, or to put it a little more mildly, Hamlet kicked out"³⁰¹. De Garmo, believed the Report to be "an estimate of education values"³⁰² and that "as a critique of educational values the report is a very important one"³⁰³. Notwithstanding this, he argued that "the report presents a very different idea of the correlation of studies"³⁰⁴, adding further that the adulteration and the perversion of the concept are clear:

It is true that this committee have, at the beginning, laid down a principle of correlation which would make a correlation. The text is here, but the discussion is lacking. So far as I have read, I have not found one word in the report which shows what the sequence of studies should be³⁰⁵.

De Garmo was of the opinion that "it is possible to relate one subject to the other so that when it is dark the child, even if he has not the sun to lighten his eyes, can at least have some stars of hope above him"³⁰⁶. Harris reacted to these interventions by reiterating that "to make Herbart of use in pedagogy, we must ignore his

²⁹⁸ Op. Cit., p., 165.

²⁹⁹ Parker, F. (1895) Discussion on Report of Dr. Harris. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (21), pp., 165-167, p., 165.

³⁰⁰ Op. Cit., p., 165.

³⁰¹ Op. Cit., p., 165.

³⁰² De Garmo, C. (1895) Discussion on Report of Dr. Harris. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (21), pp., 165-167, p., 165.

³⁰³ Op. Cit., p., 165.

³⁰⁴ Op. Cit., p., 165.

³⁰⁵ Op. Cit., p., 165.

³⁰⁶ Op. Cit., p., 165.

philosophy"³⁰⁷. He posed the following question: "without educational values, what are you going to do with all your studies?"³⁰⁸ and aligning with Parker's stance, he commented, "I am amazed to think that in appointing this committee there was any such notion as Parker's. Correlation has no business to mean what they make it to mean"³⁰⁹. Harris had great difficulty with the fact that five dictionaries contain the synonym of correlation upheld by the Herbartians.

Charles McMurry in response to Harris, mentioned that there is no dictionary which offers an alternative synonym of correlation ("The analysis and isolation of subjects of study"³¹⁰) since there is no one better than Herbart who could have expressed his educational principles. McMurry believed "that a thoughtful study of this report [would] convince anyone who is interested in children that is formal, and is a production of this old idea, based upon language as the foundation of all education"³¹¹.

Dewey, too, expressed his attitude when faced by this contention. He was interested in theories, such as the ones Harris defends, which attempt to find a certain principle or philosophy in the various subjects of the curriculum. However, he contended the five windows of the soul proposed by Harris did not present any principle of cohesion between them³¹². In other words, the symmetry that was so ardently defended by Harris—a study course which might mention the whole human experience—did not exist and, according to Dewey, it was extremely important for the curriculum to represent and to present, with some degree of symmetry, all the intrinsic factors of the human experience³¹³. For Dewey, the major objection to the Harris Report was not specifically rooted in the clear appeal to the foregrounding of Western civilization, but in the fact that such a concept did not reveal itself to be sensitive to the way a child perceives his world and the role he performs in it. Even in terms of a curriculum sensitive to the culture-epoch, Dewey did not appear convinced

³⁰⁷ Harris, W. (1895) Discussion on Report of Dr. Harris. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (21), pp., 165-167, p., 166.

³⁰⁸ Op. Cit., p., 166.

³⁰⁹ Op. Cit., p., 166.

³¹⁰ McMurry, C. (1895) Discussion on Report of Dr. Harris. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (21), pp., 165-167, p., 166.

³¹¹ Op. Cit., p., 166.

³¹² Dewey, J. (1899) *The School and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

³¹³ Op. Cit.

as to its viability although the argument of the culture-epoch was interesting for him since it attempted to create a symbiosis between the child and the subjects.

For Dewey, the major problem facing education resided in the difficulty of reconciliation between psychological and social factors.³¹⁴ Resorting to the notions of people like Eliot, Small, Harris and Hall, he tried to conceptualize his great objective. The Laboratory School, according to him, was one of the viable and safe avenues for the divorce between the psychological and the social. In truth, one of the ways of achieving an effective coordination between the dynamics of the psychological and the social factors is through the transformation of the school into a miniature of the community, in which the child is called upon to participate and to contribute to, so that a construct is erected that is directly related to the present life of the child and not only as the preparation for a future life.³¹⁵ In fact, just as for Small, for Dewey, the social meaning of the curriculum is related to it being a social instrument.

Notwithstanding the criticism directed at the Report of the sub-committee on *The Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education*, Harris, who "more or less, succeeded Eliot as the central figure among those forces that sought to preserve the humanistic ideal by incorporating into curriculum the finest elements of Western civilization even in the face of the rapidly increasing population of students then enrolling in American schools"³¹⁶, reiterated that his study had a scientific dimension which allowed him to claim that "child study is not the only thing"³¹⁷. In doing so, he challenged greatly concerned with the problematics of correlation "to find what there is to be correlated, and then correlate it"³¹⁸. One is confronted by a document which, contrary to the *Report of the Committee of Ten* and the *Report of the Fifteen* was "vigorous, conscientious, brilliant (...), aggressive, courageous, and philosophical; a work of genius, and epoch-making utterance. (...) [It] established a battle line (...) It is an

³¹⁴ Dewey, J. (1895) Plan of Organization of the University Primary School. In J. Boydston (ed.). *The Early Works of John Dewey, 1895-1898: Early Essays*, Vol. 5. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, pp., 223-243.

³¹⁵ Op. Cit, pp., 223-243.

³¹⁶ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 30

³¹⁷ Harris, W. (1895) Discussion on Report of Dr. Harris. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (21), pp., 165-167, p., 167.

³¹⁸ Op. Cit., p., 167.

American idea against the world"³¹⁹. For Winship, it was the masterpiece of North American education:

Dr. Harris has launched the educational masterpiece for which America has been waiting for a quarter of a century. He has not only given us a great philosophical ideal, but it is a high-water mark of technical perfection in the modern educational literature of this and other lands. For the first time American school men have an ideal of art in the treatment of an educational theme³²⁰.

In essence, a large part of the incisive criticism that the Report of the Committee of Fifteen faced, (or, at least, that which gained more publicity) was proffered by the members of the Herbartian movement. Despite the fact that Herbartianism had a "short-lived heyday, beginning to decline in 1905", the Herbartian ideas and the reactions vis-à-vis such ideals continued to "exercise profound influence on the American curriculum long after the movement itself faded from existence as a distinct entity"³²¹.

However, and as is declared by Krug, "Herbatianism was not the only evangelical movement at this time. One representing far greater numbers of people was the child study³²² movement, and with "Herbartianism losing its early potency as a reform movement"³²³, it was the child study movement that soon posed the most direct threat to the principles defended by Harris and by Eliot.

³¹⁹ Winship, A. (1895) Dr. Harris Masterpiece. *Journal of Education*, Vol. XLI (8), pp., 128-129, p., 128

³²⁰ Op. Cit, p., 128

³²¹ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 16.

³²² Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, pp., 107-108.

³²³ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 35.

3.4.3 The Great Army of Incapables

In the frontline of criticism directed at the recommendations disseminated by the *Report of the Committee of Ten* one could find Hall, "a person who had early on assumed unquestioned leadership of the child study movement in the United States"³²⁴ and that would come to reveal himself to be a "pivotal figure in the second of the four interest groups seeking to influence the curriculum at the end of the century, the *developmentalists*"³²⁵. Their ideology rested on the recognition of a natural order of child development, which they believed should serve as the scientific platform for the determination of what should be taught. However, and as is stressed by Krug, although "Hall seems to be identified as the leader of a movement"³²⁶ whose motto had its expression in the cult of adolescence, the fact is that at the beginning, he was not greatly identified with the movement. Furthermore, his initial (always incisive) criticisms of the Report of the Committee of Ten "did not involve adolescence or any aspect of child study, but were based on his admiration of secondary schools in Germany and France"³²⁷.

As a scientific study, the child study movement dates from 1870, a time when Adams had already reiterated the necessity of paying careful attention to the mental habits of children as the means of bringing science to light in pedagogy.³²⁸ It had "attracted enough attention by 1880 to become the major topic of the education section in the meeting that year of the American Social Science Association",³²⁹ upholding an approach which consisted "to a large extent, of research that involved the careful observation and recording of children's behavior at various stages of

³²⁴ Op. Cit., p., 11.

³²⁵ Op. Cit., p., 11. Author's italic.

³²⁶ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. According to the author, "One of the first to proclaim the discovery of adolescence was Professor James Earl Russel, of the University of Colorado, later dean of Columbia's Teachers College", p. 116.

³²⁷ Op. Cit., p. 116.

³²⁸ Adams, C. (1879) *The New Departure in the Common Schools of Quincy and other Papers on Educational Topics*. Boston: Estes & Lauriat.

³²⁹ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 108.

development"³³⁰. Although the projects developed by Burnham at Clark University, for whom the problems of secondary schools and colleges were rooted in an oversight in the interpretation and knowledge of adolescence and not actually in the less-than-happy choice of the subjects in the curriculum³³¹, had, according to Krug, stimulated Hall, the fact is that it was in 1880, when Hall returned from Germany that the developmentalists "found the champion that would make them a potent force in America education"³³². In fact, it was in this meeting of the American Social Science Association, which also took place in 1880 and in which Harris also participated,³³³ that Hall³³⁴ "took up the new cause and made himself its leader",³³⁵ while Harris "regressed toward conservatism".³³⁶

According to Hall, for whom the struggle for the survival of the individual should have "given away to the higher struggle for the survival of others"³³⁷, the child study movement rested on three great pillars: firstly, it benefited the teacher by educating, stimulating, refreshing and reinvigorating him; secondly, the child study movement had the child as its referent, and it enabled teachers to adapt their methods to the children in order to create positively felt alterations in the course of the teaching-learning process; thirdly, the child study movement was an added value for science, since it entailed contact between the best current science and the best education of the time³³⁸. Furthermore, according to Hall, human development "followed the general psychonomic law which stated [that] ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny"³³⁹.

³³⁰ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 11.

³³¹ Burnham, W. (1897) Suggestions from the Psychology of Adolescence. *School Review*, 5, pp., 652-665, p. 664.

³³² Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 36.

³³³ Harris, W. (1882) The Education of the Family, and the Education of the School. *Journal of Social Science*, XV, pp., 1-5.

³³⁴ Hall, S. (1882) The Moral and Religious Training of Children. *Journal of Social Science*, XV, pp., 56-76.

³³⁵ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 108.

³³⁶ Op. Cit., p. 108.

³³⁷ Hall, S. (1894) Child Study. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association*. National Education Association, pp., 173-179, p., 179.

³³⁸ Op. Cit.

³³⁹ Perkinson, H. (1968) Preface. In H. Perkinson. *The Imperfect Panacea: America's Faith in Education: 1865-1965*. New York: Random House, p., 188.

In his first great investigation—for many a "kind of model for scientific pedagogy"³⁴⁰—Hall³⁴¹ maintained that the systematized inventory of the contents located in the minds of children would enable us to also determine, in a more systematized fashion, that which should be taught at schools. In 1890, "the child study movement was [already] in full blast, enrolling thousands of disciples among teachers and others interested in education"³⁴². It consolidated in 1894, at which point Hall announced at the annual meeting of National Education Association that "unto you is born a new Department of Child Study"³⁴³. Gradually, Hall would come to dilute the evangelical stance of the child study movement (it was not a movement to restrict its debates to public schools), introducing a much broader social dimension to it, while promoting a pedagogical system based on scientific principles. Hall believed that "sooner or later everything pertaining to education, from the site of buildings to the contents of every text book, and the methods of each branch of study must be scrutinized with all the care and detail as to the command of scientific pedagogy and judged from the standpoint of health"³⁴⁴.

As is proposed to us by Kliebard, with Hall at the forefront, not only did "the cause of child study became identified with scientific and hence valid ways of addressing the great educational issues of the day", but also the "efforts of the humanists to preserve in the curriculum the great accomplishments of Western culture were increasingly being regarded as speculative and old-fashioned".³⁴⁵ Hall opposed the Report of the Committee of Ten, notwithstanding the fact that it portrayed a number of strategically achieved compromises and concessions, proposing instead "the scientific study of students' minds"³⁴⁶. Hall criticized the Committee for the increase in the Latin enrollments and for the decline in physics enrollments.³⁴⁷ Fundamentally,

³⁴⁰ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 37.

³⁴¹ Hall, S. (1883) The Contents of Children's Minds. *Princeton Review* (11), pp., 249-272.

³⁴² Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 110.

³⁴³ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 37.

³⁴⁴ Hall, S. (1892) Editorial. In S. Hall (ed.). *The Pedagogical Seminary*. Vol. II. Worcester: J. H. Orpha, p., 8.

³⁴⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 37.

³⁴⁶ Apple, Michael (1999) *Power, Meaning and Identity. Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 80.

³⁴⁷ Hall, S. (1901). How Far is the Present High-School and Early College Training Adapted to the Nature and Needs of Adolescents? *School Review*, 9, pp., 649-651.

according to Kliebard, Hall's criticism of the Committee of Ten "was perceived by many as the voice of science and progress directed against an entrenched establishment barely courageous enough to put forward moderate reforms in the face of monumental challenge of the efficacy of the existing curriculum"³⁴⁸.

According to Hall, several committees of the National Education Association, that of the Ten included, fell into the error of attempting to measure all that is educational in the attempt at constructing a certain uniformity, which diminished the spontaneity and normal development of both the child and the teaching and learning process:

Everything must count (...) for herein lies its educational value (...). There is no more wild, free, vigorous growth of the forest, but everything is in pots or rows like a rococo garden. (...) The pupil is in the age of spontaneous variation which at no period of life is so great. He does not want a standardized, overpeptonized mental diet. It palls on his appetite³⁴⁹.

In conformity with this, Hall³⁵⁰ accused the Report of the Committee of Ten of being constructed on the basis of three screaming fallacies. With regards to the first fallacy—all students should learn the same way and for the same period of time independently of their hypothetical destiny—Hall made a 'spicy' attack on the increasingly polemical Report of the Committee of Ten, decrying it as a masterpiece of College policy, and as was highlighted by Kliebard, arguing that "the school population, presumably, was so variable as to native endowment that a common curriculum was simply unworkable"³⁵¹. Hall placed his finger on the eternal fallacy of uniformity (unfortunately, one of the many touchstones of contemporary educational

³⁴⁸ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 13.

³⁴⁹ Hall, S. (1904) *Adolescence: Its Psychology and its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education*. Vol. 2. New York: D. Appleton, p., 509.

³⁵⁰ Op. Cit.

³⁵¹ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 12.

politics), noting that there is a "great army of incapables, shading down to those who should be in schools for the dullards or subnormal children"³⁵².

The second fallacy supports itself on the assumption that all the subjects are of equal importance and, therefore, should be taught in the same manner, which implies an overlapping priority of form over content. In other words, and as denounced by Hall, for the members of the Committee of Ten, who were great defenders of mental discipline, it was the form which gave value to the subject since the content was, purely, the furnishings. Hall could not accept the assumption that preparation for college is essentially the same as preparation for life, not only because the differentiation was an unavoidable reality, but also because such a recommendation in the Report was purely "part of the strategy that the Committee had used to impose college domination on the high school curriculum".³⁵³ In Hall's opinion, the established educational order should be inverted:

The college depends on the high school, and *not vice versa*. The latter should declare its independence, and proceed to solve its own problems in its own way; it should strive to fit for life those whose education stops here, and should bring the college to meet its own demands. It should ask again how best to feed the interests and capacities peculiar [to a child's age]; how to fill and develop mind, heart, will, and body, rather than how to distill a budget of prepared knowledge decreed by professors who know no more of the needs of a [child's particular age].³⁵⁴

For Hall, "science represented the culmination of the process of evolution"³⁵⁵, stressing "the development of reason as the chief goal of education [and it] was a

³⁵² Hall, S. (1904) *Adolescence: Its Psychology and its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education*. Vol. 2. New York: D. Appleton.

³⁵³ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 13.

³⁵⁴ Hall, S. (1901). *The Ideal School as Based on Child Study*. National Education Association, pp., 474-488, p., 487. Parentheses mine.

³⁵⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 37.

product of a prescientific era, and to attempt to realize that goal in elementary and secondary schools would serve only to sap energy and impair health"³⁵⁶.

It was not long before Eliot's reaction was felt and in a paper read at the meeting of the American Institute of Instruction, in Portland, Eliot reacted to Hall's accusations reiterating that even taking into account the limitations presented by the Report of the Committee of Ten, its recommendations "far from being fallacies, are sound and permanent educational principles, on which alone a truly democratic school system can be based".³⁵⁷ After a minute explanation of the origin, the first steps taken, and the scope of the investigation and the methodology traced by the Committee of Ten, Eliot dissected, one by one, all of Hall's accusations.

Thus, Eliot argued that all students should learn the same way and for the same amount of time independently of their hypothetical destiny, and he stressed that, among the various issues which were included in the agenda to be discussed by the different conferences, one was the following: "Should the subject be treated differently for pupils who are going to college, for those who are going to a scientific school, and for those who, presumably, are going to neither?"³⁵⁸. This issue was subjected to the same treatment as all the others by "ninety-nine honest and intelligent teachers, intimately concerned either with the actual work of American secondary schools or with the results of that work as they appear in students who go to college, and fairly representing the profession in the United States". These teachers unanimously declared the following:

every subject which is taught at all in the secondary schools should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease³⁵⁹.

³⁵⁶ Op. Cit., p., 43.

³⁵⁷ Eliot, C. (1905) The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten (1893). *Educational Review*, Vol. 30 (4), pp., 325-343, p., 326.

³⁵⁸ With Regards the 11 issues upon which the 9 Conferences should address, *vide* : *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (1894) National Education Association. New York. American Book Company, p., 7.

³⁵⁹ Eliot, C. (1905) The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten (1893). *Educational Review*, Vol. 30 (4), pp., 325-343, p., 328.

According to Eliot, Hall could not, given such categorical evidence, gratuitously proceed with the notion of his extraordinary fallacy. It was easy, the author added, to speak about differentiated teaching as Hall does; however, "every superintendent and principal of the least experience knows that every secondary school must have a program or programs, and that most of the instruction must be addressed to classes and not to individual pupils"³⁶⁰. For Eliot, a differentiated curriculum would certainly have a wider effect in the determination of the social and occupational destinies of the students and would not be able to reveal the innate capacities of the students³⁶¹.

With regards to the second fallacy pointed out by Hall in the Report of the Committee of Ten—the assumption that all the subjects are of equal importance, if they are taught in the same manner—Eliot counterattacked by stating that "this dogma is nowhere explicitly stated in the Report of the Committee of Ten, [rather it was] implied in some of the opinions expressed by the several Conferences and by the Committee".³⁶² Furthermore, and as per Kliebard, "Eliot reiterated his optimism in the power of human intelligence and reason", rejecting the "notion that there 'was a great army of incapables' invading the schools of the 1890's [and highlighting that] the actual number of 'incapables' was but 'an insignificant proportion' of the school population"³⁶³. Finally and in what concerns the third fallacy pointed out by Hall on the recommendations proposed by the Committee—the assumption that fitting for college is essentially the same as fitting for life—Eliot also reiterated that "this doctrine is nowhere laid down in the Report of the Committee of Ten, or in the reports made by the several Conferences to the Committee". It is nothing "but an inference from the unanimously adopted recommendation that every subject which is taught at all in the secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it"³⁶⁴.

In essence, and in opposition to the virulent attacks perpetrated by Hall against the Committee of Ten—especially against volumes I and II on Adolescence, Eliot

³⁶⁰ Op. Cit., p., 328.

³⁶¹ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge.

³⁶² Eliot, C. (1905) The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten (1893). *Educational Review*, Vol. 30 (4), pp., 325-343, p., 333.

³⁶³ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 13.

³⁶⁴ Eliot, C. (1905) The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten (1893). *Educational Review*, Vol. 30 (4), pp., 325-343, p., 336.

repeated his repugnance for Hall's proposals, which he saw as based in a psychological pedagogy in which the development of the child emerges in very distinct stages, so that a rift seems to be carved between childhood and adolescence, rather than the image of child development as a continuous form of growth, with extremely minute transitions, in the domain of his development.³⁶⁵

Hall was the target of much criticism from a wide range of authors, distributed among many sectors in the field of education. Dewey's criticism stands out; for him, the child study movement had created great expectations for its capacity to significantly transform curricular practice.³⁶⁶, and does Judd's criticism, for whom there was "so much mythology in Dr. Hall's books that one can hardly wonder at the reluctance of high-school teachers to read or follow their teachings"³⁶⁷, and that of Harris, for whom the child study movement exposed itself to the dangers of arrested development; namely, the children lost too much time with something they had already learned³⁶⁸. Fundamentally the major divergence between Harris and the child study movement was the fact that the latter defended a curriculum arises from the nature of the actual child, while Hall interpreted the child study movement as a means in the teaching of a curriculum determined on other grounds; in other words, Harris was more worried about "the content of studies in relation to human experience and wisdom"³⁶⁹. However, for some people like Shorey, Hall was responsible for "logical aberrations"³⁷⁰, someone who "created many enemies"³⁷¹, but for others, he was an individual who earned the admiration of thousands of teachers, and whose work *Adolescence*, would come to exert influence, like no other, in the field of education.³⁷²

Paradoxically, although Hall "had covered himself in the armor of science, it is significant that his curriculum ideas were drawn, not so much from the scientific data so diligently collected by him and his fellow psychologists, as from his metaphysical,

³⁶⁵ Op. Cit.

³⁶⁶ Dewey, J. (1897) *Criticisms Wise and Otherwise on Modern Child Study*. National Education Association.

³⁶⁷ Judd, C. (1909) Editorial Notes. *School Review*, 17, pp., 570-571, p., 570.

³⁶⁸ Harris, W. (1900) The Study of Arrested Development in Children as Produced by Injudicious School Methods. *Education*, XX, pp., 453-466, p., 455.

³⁶⁹ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 112.

³⁷⁰ Shorey, P. (1909) Hippias Paidagogos. *School Review*, XVII (1), pp., 1-9, p., 9.

³⁷¹ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 107.

³⁷² Lancaster, E. (1905) *President's Address*. National Education Association.

even mystical, assumptions about the alleged relationship between the stages in individual development and the history of the human race³⁷³. Actually, and according to Selden's diligent research, one can perceive how the power of eugenics interfered quite dynamically within the typology of mainstream curriculum. Drawing from Hollingworth, a psychologist and eugenics scholar, Selden stresses how eugenics dominated the field from its embryonic stage. As Selden argues, "the writings of Hollingworth offer an example of mainstream academic knowledge as a source for an ethnic and racially stratified society"³⁷⁴.

Hall believed "that the child recapitulates in his or her development the stages that the whole human race traversed throughout the course of history"³⁷⁵. We find this in his own words:

The principle that the child and the early history of human race are each keys to unlock the nature of the other applies to almost everything in feeling, will, and intellect. To understand either the child or the race we must constantly refer to the other. This simple principle applies also to all spontaneous activities. Thus in seeking the true principle of motor education we must not only study the plays, games and interests of the child today, but also try to compare these with the characteristic activities of early man³⁷⁶.

In essence, the issues addressed by Hall also swirled around the attempt to control the knowledge that should be divulged via the curriculum. That is to say, the problem of what should be taught in schools could not be reduced to mere speculation and to a vague philosophical argument, but rather this should be determined according to natural laws in the same way that Darwin had discovered the laws of natural

³⁷³ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 38.

³⁷⁴ Selden, S. (2000) Eugenics and the Social Construction of Merit, Race and Disability. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32 (2), pp., 235-252, p., 245.

³⁷⁵ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 38.

³⁷⁶ Hall, S. (1904) The Natural Activities of Children as Determining the Industries in Early Education. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Forty-Third Annual Meeting of the National Education Association*, p. 443.

selection"³⁷⁷. Hall thus created the forum for the "study of the stages of child development", attempting in this way to legitimize a practical program for the child study movement, supported by an educational pyramid which was divided into four major stages³⁷⁸, and fighting for a teacher who ought to teach more and know more, one who "must be a living fountain, not a stagnant pool"³⁷⁹.

The child study movement saw the beginning of its end given its obvious impotence in significantly altering schooling practices. Hence, at the end of the penultimate decade and at the beginning of the last decade of the nineteenth century, both *Herbartianism* as well as the child study movement "had lost their driving force"³⁸⁰.

For Hall, the loss of vitality in the ideas of his movement was not seen as a foregone issue and he continued to stress that the child study movement had awoken the conscience of each one, that "the school is for the child and not the child for the school", and that the child is the "consummate flower of the cosmic process"³⁸¹. However, due to the loss of credibility of Humanist perspectives defended by Eliot and Harris, and the absence of sharpness in terms of an effective alteration in schooling practices, there developed an increasingly stronger belief in the need for educational reform, having as background the efficiency and efficacy of the school system. Heading this (new) approach, was a "young New York pediatrician whose interest in prophylaxis had led him to some searching questions about the city schools"³⁸² and who had witnessed the memorable meeting at Cleveland, in which the confrontation between Harris and the *Herbertians* took place: his name was Rice.

³⁷⁷ Kliebard, H. (1988). The effort to reconstruct the modern American curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 28.

³⁷⁸ With Regards this issue *vide*: Hall, S. (1901). *The Ideal School as Based on Child Study*. National Education Association, pp., 474-488. According to the author, there were four levels in the educational pyramid, each one representing well-delimited stages of child development: "the kindergarten age", from 2 or 3 until 6 or 7 years old; "the age of about seven or eight is a transition period of the greatest interest for science"; from 8 or 9 until 12 or 13 years old; and finally the adolescence, "beginning about thirteen with girls and a year later with boys and lasting about ten years", pp., 476-483.

³⁷⁹ Hall, S. (1901). *The Ideal School as Based on Child Study*. National Education Association, pp., 474-488, p., 487.

³⁸⁰ Krug, E. (1969) *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, p. 115.

³⁸¹ Hall, S. (1908) *Recent Advances in Child-study*. National Education Association, p., 952.

³⁸² Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 3.

3.4.4 The Scientific Razor Blade

Already in 1892, Rice had abandoned the practice of medicine, becoming instead an educational reformer. In 1888, he left for Jena and Leipzig in Germany, but keeping contact with some school systems in United States. He returned in 1890, having been approached to undertake "a survey of American elementary education". This undertaking was initiated on the 7th of January and concluded on the 26th of June of 1892, and was "sponsored by the influential journal, *The Forum*"³⁸³. His survey was later published in the journal in a series of articles from October of 1892 to June of 1893, and later as a book entitled *The Public School Systems of the United States*³⁸⁴. In the words of Cremin, it was an exhausting project:

(...) Rice was to prepare a first hand appraisal of American public education. From Boston to Washington, from New York to St. Louis, he has to visit classrooms, talk with teachers, attend school board meetings, and interview parents. He was to place 'no reliance whatever' on reports by school officials; his goal was to render an objective assessment for the public³⁸⁵.

From state to state, from city to city, Rice noted that "public apathy, political interference, corruption and incompetence were conspiring to ruin the schools"³⁸⁶. According to Rice, if there were schools that revealed reasonably laudable progressive practices, others were absolute nightmares, be it for the teachers or for the students, as the following example attests:

After entering the room containing the youngest pupils, the principal said to the teacher: "Begin with the mouth movements and go right straight through". Complying with the request

³⁸³ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 17

³⁸⁴ Op. Cit., p., 18.

³⁸⁵ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 4.

³⁸⁶ Op. Cit., p., 4.

of the principal, the teacher directed their attention to the class and said, "Now let us see how nicely you can make the mouth movements". About fifty pupils now began in concert to give utterance to the sounds of a (as in car), e, and oo, varying their order, thus: a, e, oo, a, e, oo; e, a, oo, e, a, oo; oo, a, e, oo, a, e; oo, e, a, oo, e, a; etc.

The mouth movements made by the pupils while uttering these sounds were exaggerated as the mouths would permit³⁸⁷.

According to Rice³⁸⁸, four elements exerted a profound influence on the conditions of schools: "the public at large (...) it must unfortunately be said that in the large majority of instances the people take absolutely no active interest in their schools"; "the boards of education" since they "are elected according to whims"; "the superintendent and his staff" who "may be regarded as the central figure"; and "the teachers" who are "after all, the great problem". In this way, Rice would come to direct his criticism not only at the superintendents of the schools—accusing them of "lack of knowledge of pedagogy"³⁸⁹ and of giving only superficial attention to the practices in the classrooms, but also at the school boards which were made up of people without qualifications, usually politically nominated³⁹⁰. Thus was it manifested that corruption and lack of expertise in school management was the basis for the crisis in schools³⁹¹. At the same time, for Rice "it was the quality of teaching that seemed to (...) be most responsible for the catastrophic state of American education"³⁹², given that many teachers, "whose incompetence was undoubtedly proved, still continued teaching"³⁹³.

The criticism directed at the first series of nine articles by Rice, published in the journal *The Forum*, were soon forthcoming, especially from the "professional press—

³⁸⁷ Rice, J. (1969) The Public Schools of Chicago and St. Paul. In J. Rice (ed.) *The Public School Systems of the United States*. New York: Arno Press, pp., 166-192, p., 176.

³⁸⁸ Rice, J. (1969) Introduction. In J. Rice (ed.) *The Public School Systems of the United States*. New York: Arno Press, pp., 166-192, p., 176.

³⁸⁹ Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 19.

³⁹⁰ Op. Cit.

³⁹¹ Tyack, D. (1974) *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

³⁹² Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 19.

³⁹³ Op. Cit, p., 19.

a reaction that ranged from chilling disdain to near-hysteria"³⁹⁴. Some argued that Rice was not an authority since he lacked any experience of the classroom³⁹⁵, while others accused him of being a snobbish intellectual who, by means of radical analyses of university quality, had entirely foregone the notion of North American public education³⁹⁶. It is while involved in this criticism that Rice embarked on his next investigations, "seeking comparative data" for the reason why certain schools were able to achieve significant levels of success but others were not able to do so, which would lead to a shift in the range of his investigation. According to Kliebard, when in 1912, the book *Scientific Management in Education* was published, Rice's intentions became crystal-clear:

Although there were still vestiges of Rice's work for the child in the school environs, the major thrust of Rice's work had shifted from the monotony and mindlessness of school life to the themes of standardization and efficiency in the curriculum. Rice's genuine dismay and disgust on what was going on in America schools in 1890s had evolved into a grim determination that teachers and administrators must be made to do the right thing³⁹⁷.

The book, as was acknowledged by Rice, "consists of a collection of twelve articles bearing upon causes of success and failure in the teaching of the so-called essential branches in the elementary schools"³⁹⁸ and describes a task ["which as the reader may well imagine, was not a simple one"] which consisted of having "to learn whether or not it was possible to extend the curriculum so as to include the subjects demanded by the new school of education without detriment of the three R's". Having defined the cancers of the system with 'relative' facility', Rice stressed that the crisis that the educational system had reached forced the imposition of a "scientific system

³⁹⁴ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 8.

³⁹⁵ Schneider, H. (1893) Dr. Rice and American Public Schools. *Education*, V. XIII, pp., 357-357.

³⁹⁶ *Vide, Education*, (1892) V. XIII, p., 245.

³⁹⁷ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 20.

³⁹⁸ Rice, J. (1912) Introduction. In J. Rice. (ed.) *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, pp., v - xx, p., v

of pedagogical management" which "would demand fundamentally the measurement of results in the light of fixed standards"³⁹⁹. He argued:

The school has but a single purpose, which is that of educating children. Consequently, in the strict sense, scientific management in education can only be defined as a system of management specifically directed toward the elimination of waste in teaching, so that the children attending the schools may be duly rewarded for the expenditure of their time and effort⁴⁰⁰.

Still, Rice continued, "results alone do not tell us the whole story"⁴⁰¹, adding that "the child's capital is represented by time" and, "whether certain results are to be lauded or condemned depends upon the amount of time expended in obtaining them"⁴⁰². According to Rice, there is a direct proportionality between time and results which never should be belittled. Such proportionality would prove to be a polemical issue, since, as stated by Rice, the educators did not reach a consensus on the two questions which dominating schooling practice: "How much time shall be devoted to a subject? and What result should be accomplished?"⁴⁰³.

Rice proceeded with his crusade, screaming at the top of his voice for scientific management marked by criteria of efficiency and efficacy and calling attention to the difficulties permeating rational educational reform. In one of the articles published in *The Forum*, in 1896, "Obstacles to rational educational reform", which would later emerge as the second chapter of the book *Scientific Management in Education*, Rice refined his analysis. For Rice, "politics in school boards, incompetent supervision, insufficient preparation on the part of teachers"⁴⁰⁴ were not exactly "the ultimate cause"⁴⁰⁵ of public indifference and obstacles to educational progress, they merely

³⁹⁹ Op. Cit., p., xv.

⁴⁰⁰ Op. Cit., p., viii.

⁴⁰¹ Rice, J. (1912) Scientific Management in Education. In J. Rice (ed.) *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, pp., 1-19. p., 9

⁴⁰² Op. Cit., pp., 9-10

⁴⁰³ Op. Cit., p., 5.

⁴⁰⁴ Rice, J. (1912) Obstacles to Rational Educational Reform. In J. Rice (ed.) *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, pp., 20-36, p., 20.

⁴⁰⁵ Op. Cit., p., 20.

constituted "the symptoms of a much more deeply hidden disease which permits all sorts of havoc to be played with the schools"⁴⁰⁶.

Consequently, for Rice, the fundamental problem lay in the fact that educators did not reach an agreement about which transformations—if any—were desirable or viable. In other words, the true cause for the impediments created around the issue of educational reform "may be traced (...) beyond the province of general public, into the professional circle itself"⁴⁰⁷. It is in this context that he proposed, as a remedy for the disease of American education, "adequate professional preparation for teachers"⁴⁰⁸.

Rice, for whom in education "everything is speculative: nothing is positive", argued that for the good of society, the educational system should be structured in accordance to the demands of scientific rationality:

Thus, the pedagogical system, as a unit, may be looked upon as a series of five elements placed one above the other; being, from below upward, the child, the teacher, the principal, the superintendent, and the top. In practice, things are so arranged that the child is instructed and supervised by the teacher, the teacher by the principal, and the principal in turn by the superintendent. This arrangement is theoretically justified on the ground that, in pedagogical sense, the teacher is supposed to be wiser than the child, the principal than the teacher, and the superintendent than the principal⁴⁰⁹.

Notwithstanding the knowledge that not all principals are pedagogically wiser than their teachers, Rice advanced this management proposal, repeating with conviction that the incompetence which permeated the teaching professional was malignant:

The office of a teacher in the average American schools is perhaps the only one in the world that can be retained indefinitely in spite of the grossest negligence and incompetence. It is in

⁴⁰⁶ Op. Cit., p., 20.

⁴⁰⁷ Op. Cit., p., 21.

⁴⁰⁸ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 169.

⁴⁰⁹ Rice, J. (1912) Introduction. In J. Rice (ed.) *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, pp., v - xx, p., xii.

the appointment and discharge of superintendents and teachers that politics plays the greatest mischief in our schools⁴¹⁰.

For Rice, in the option between unscientific and scientific management of the educational apparatus lies the key to the success for obtaining positive results in schools. The first "indicates that it is the intention of the department to direct its activities upon the basis of the best that is known"⁴¹¹, while for the latter "the one at the top is a law unto himself". We are faced by two distinct views of education, one more restrained, but both representative, according to Rice, of the old education and the new education and which expressed two very distinctive types of school.

A school subjected to unscientific or mechanical management means that it assumes as its principal function the practice of "crowding into the memory of the child a certain number of cut-and-dried facts—that is, that the school exists simply for the purpose of giving the child a certain amount of information"⁴¹². In well marked contrast, the schools led by scientific principles follow other patterns. Consequently, "while the aim of the old education is mainly to give the child a certain amount of information, the aim of the new education is 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"⁴¹³.

Rice⁴¹⁴ highlighted three general principles which underlie his theory of scientific management, namely: "the school system must be absolutely divorced from politics in every sense of the word", so that all the elements of the board of education do not feel obligated to and coerced into giving opinions about what they think best for the school; "the supervision of the schools must be properly directed and thorough", translated into "increas(ing) the professional strength of the teachers"; and teachers

⁴¹⁰ Rice, J. (1969) Introduction. In J. Rice, (ed). *The Public School Systems of the United States*. New York: Arno Press & New York Times, pp., 1-27, p., 15.

⁴¹¹ Rice, J. (1912) Introduction. In J. Rice (ed.) *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, pp., v - xx, p., xvi-xvii.

⁴¹² Rice, J. (1969) Introduction. In J. Rice. (ed). *The Public School Systems of the United States*. New York: Arno Press & New York Times, pp., 1-27, p., 20.

⁴¹³ Op. Cit., p., 21.

⁴¹⁴ Op. Cit., pp., 17-18.

must constantly endeavor to grow both in professional and in general intellectual strength".

Fundamentally, Rice⁴¹⁵ fought against that which he understood as a *laissez-faire* system, in which "the material for instruction is selected largely on the principle of filling out time", and "matters are poured into the mind without regard to its assimilative powers". Rice, despite being associated with Herbartianism, and because of that diverged from the perspectives disseminated by Eliot, as well as by Harris, also progressively distanced himself from Hall. As is suggested by Kliebard, "almost against his will" he became the leader of the "third of the major curriculum interest groups that was to appear just before the turn of the century, the social efficiency educators"⁴¹⁶, a doctrine which by its intention to de-politicize the educational system, seemed to cast common shadows with the notion of the survival of the fittest, a *leitmotiv* of social Darwinism.

3.4.5 The Denizens of Slums [Versus] the Graduates of Harvard

As we have come to gather, the last decade of the nineteenth century was highly significant for the development of North American education. It was a historical epoch in which both society in general, and individuals, in particular, were constantly bombarded with new concepts, new theories, new perspectives, new ways of thinking, which consequently would affect the field of pedagogy. It was an epoch in which the field of pedagogy witnessed the emergence of various profoundly significant works, namely, *Principles of Psychology* by James, *Talks on Pedagogics* by Parker, *Animal Intelligence*, by Thorndike and *The School and Society* by Dewey which, ultimately, expressed the many faces of an era which strove to construct a large theoretical field for increasingly urgent pedagogical transformation, and which had, in the thinking of Spencer, one of its great motivators, if not the principal one.

⁴¹⁵ Rice, J. (1912) Economy in Time and Teaching. In J. Rice (ed.) *Scientific Management in Education*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, pp., 53-64, pp., 56-58.

⁴¹⁶ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 20.

We cannot forget that Spencer's thinking infuses the *Report of the Committee of Ten*, by which Eliot resorted to *Spencerian* postulates in order to argue that the child should obtain in his study of sciences, "training in the power to observe accurately, describe correctly and reason justly"⁴¹⁷. This document which, as we previously discussed, marked the educational debate in such a profound manner that it was taken as a point of reference, by opposition or by association. Spencer, as we previously indicated, served as the demigod of what would become known as Social Darwinism⁴¹⁸. The message of this movement was relayed to the whole country, with the help of its disciples. Spencer and his followers were convinced that "the laws that Darwin had enunciated in terms of descent of the species could be applied to ethics, economics, sociology, and education"⁴¹⁹, arguing, in this way that "the laws that Darwin had enunciated in terms of natural selection had their parallel in the social realm"⁴²⁰. Fundamentally, Spencer, came forward with the concept of the survival of the fittest, amplifying its significance, conferring it a link to human civilization. This civilization was interpreted by Spencer as, "part of nature, all of a piece with the development of the embryo or the unfolding of a flower"⁴²¹. Kliebard mentions the following concerning this notion:

Survival of the fittest, in other words, was a law, not only of the jungle, but of civilization, and the unequal distribution of wealth and power was simply the evidence of that law's validity⁴²².

For Ward, civilization and progress were not synonyms. He added that if "the only final end of human effort is human happiness"⁴²³ there could be no progress without achieving this same objective. Hence, he proceeded, "progress is the increase of

⁴¹⁷ Eliot, C. (1892) Wherein Popular Education has Failed. *The Forum*, 14, pp., 411-428, p., 421.

⁴¹⁸ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books

⁴¹⁹ Kliebard, H. (1988). The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 23,

⁴²⁰ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 21.

⁴²¹ Spencer, H. (1969) *Social Statics*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, p., 65.

⁴²² Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 21.

⁴²³ Ward, L. (1893) *The Psychic Factors of Civilization*. Boston: Guin and Company, p., 285.

human happiness, or, negatively considered, the reduction of human suffering". Thus, Ward defined civilization as "the product of many men at work with their inventive brains, each seeking to compel the forces of nature to do something for himself".

Sumner, who in the meantime had become "the commanding figure of the new field of sociology"⁴²⁴ embarked with vigor on a *Spencerian* reformist crusade against the established power of the "classical languages, and literary and other humanistic studies"⁴²⁵. According to Cremin, like Spencer, Sumner not only "combined a vigorous laissez-faire individualism with an unshakable belief that true scientific progress could only come through the inexorable natural workings of the evolutionary process"⁴²⁶, but he also "assumed that those who held power had gained it by being 'fittest', that their survival in the competition of society was the most eloquent testimony to their suitability for leadership"⁴²⁷.

Eleven years after Sumner accepted his position at Yale, there emerged a publication in two volumes entitled *Dynamic Sociology* on the authorship of a government botanist and geologist, who although highly influenced by the Darwinist theory, would end up adopting a diametrically opposite stance. This man, Lester F. Ward, was an auto-didactic individual. Notwithstanding the fact that he "earned three degrees in George Washington University, then known as Columbia College, his real learning came from voracious reading and from the tireless observation of natural phenomena. He was abreast of nearly all of the great scientific treatises of his day, and he made himself thoroughly familiar with Spencer's works as they appeared"⁴²⁸.

For Ward "the laissez-faire position that the social Darwinists had advocated was, in Ward's view, a corruption of Darwinian theory because human beings had to develop the power to intervene intelligently, in whatever were blind forces of nature, and in that power lay the course of social progress"⁴²⁹. For Ward, and according to

⁴²⁴ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 94.

⁴²⁵ Kliebard, H. (1988). The Effort to Reconstruct the Modern American Curriculum. In Landon Beyer & Michael Apple (eds.) *The Curriculum, Problems, Politics and Possibilities*. New York: Stae University of New York Press, pp., 21-33, p., 23,

⁴²⁶ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 94.

⁴²⁷ Op. Cit., p., 94.

⁴²⁸ Op. Cit., p., 96.

⁴²⁹ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 21.

Cremin, Spencer and Sumner had, consequently, ignored “the crucial fact that with the emergence of mind the very character of evolution changes”⁴³⁰, since “the mind is *telic*”, [it] has purposes, [it] can plan [in other words, it is able to supplant] the relatively static phase of genetic evolution with a new dynamic phase”⁴³¹.

It is in this sense that Ward⁴³² maintained that civilization could not be achieved “by letting cosmic natural forces take their course, but by the power of intelligent action to change things for the better”; in other words, moral progress would largely depend on the “intellectual direction of the forces of human nature into channels of human advantage”. Contrarily to Spencer, and to Sumner, who would transform his theory of knowledge evolution into a principle of curriculum⁴³³ in which “the genesis of knowledge in the individual must follow the same course as the genesis of knowledge in the race”⁴³⁴, Ward, not only saw education as the great panacea for all social ulcers⁴³⁵, in which social progress would be achieved by means of a just and adequate construction of an educational system⁴³⁶, but also, he maintained that social inequality was merely a reflex of the misdistribution of the social inheritance⁴³⁷.

Another issue that distanced Spencer (and Sumner) from Ward was his analysis in terms of private schooling. While Spencer was an “adamant proponent of private schooling, contending that state education could only undermine parental freedom and corrupt the body politic with the poison of public welfare”⁴³⁸, perceiving public education as an eroder of parental responsibility, Ward saw state education as the “only feasible device for turning evolution to the larger social good”⁴³⁹. For him, the

⁴³⁰ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 96.

⁴³¹ Op. Cit., p., 96.

⁴³² Ward, L. (1883). *Dynamics Sociology, or Applied Social Science as Based upon Statistical Sociology and the less Complete Sciences*, Vol. 2. New York: D. Appleton, p., 216.

⁴³³ Kliebard, H. (1999). The Liberal Arts Curriculum and its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education. In M. Early & K. Rehage (eds.). *Issues in Curriculum: A Selection of Chapters from Past NSSE Yearbooks. Ninety-Eight Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 3-25, p., 6

⁴³⁴ Op. Cit., p., 6

⁴³⁵ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books.

⁴³⁶ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge.

⁴³⁷ Ward, L. (1883). *Dynamic sociology, or Applied Social Science as Based upon Statical Sociology and the Less Complete Sciences*, Vol. 2. New York: D. Appleton.

⁴³⁸ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 94.

⁴³⁹ Op. Cit., p., 98.

larger issue in terms of governmental intervention in education rested on the fact that the government was “controlled by the wrong groups”⁴⁴⁰ and that the solution consisted in eliminating the influences of “partisan pressure groups”⁴⁴¹ and advancing with “practical and humanitarian approaches to social problems”⁴⁴², as, in fact, “it is not impossible to reform government”⁴⁴³.

Ward, by understanding education as a powerful instrument of social transformation, similarly distanced himself in general from the Humanist movement and, most particularly, from Eliot, however, it is important to note that, just like Eliot, Ward demonstrated an unwavering belief in the power of human intelligence, affirming “without equivocation that native endowment was equally distributed across social class lines as well as gender, and whatever the differences that could be observed in the human condition, they were directly attributed”⁴⁴⁴ to the misdistribution of the social inheritance. As well as denoting the non-existence of class variations in the intellect, Ward, characterized himself as a paladin of egalitarianism, fervently defending education as an instrument of diffusion and consolidation of social harmony. In one of his best-known works⁴⁴⁵, Ward strongly criticized the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. For Ward, the “denizens of slums are not inferior in talent to the graduates of Harvard College”⁴⁴⁶. According to Kliebard, Ward proved to be not only the “prophet of the welfare state in the Twentieth century” but also “the principal forerunner of the fourth and last of the major interest groups that were struggling for control of the curriculum in decades ahead, the social meliorists”⁴⁴⁷. Ward and Small earn credit for having transformed “the harsh Spencerian doctrine of social Darwinism into a full-fledged philosophy of meliorism”⁴⁴⁸. In the words of Ward, in social meliorism was the salvation for the increasingly more acute social dilemmas, which could not be explained as mere

⁴⁴⁰ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 22.

⁴⁴¹ Op. Cit., p., 22.

⁴⁴² Op. Cit., p., 22.

⁴⁴³ Ward, L. (1893) *The Psychic Factors of Civilization*. Boston: Guin and Company, p., 284.

⁴⁴⁴ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 22.

⁴⁴⁵ Ward, L. (1893) *The Psychic Factors of Civilization*. Boston: Guin and Company, p., 290.

⁴⁴⁶ Op. Cit., p., 290.

⁴⁴⁷ Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 - 1958*. New York: Routledge, p., 23

⁴⁴⁸ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 99.

ethical or moral conflicts, but instead needed to be explained as resulting from the profound and complex frictions at the level of the social fabric:

These problems have nothing to do with ethics. They are not moral questions, although upon their solution more than upon anything else depends the moral progress of the world. They are purely social problems and can only be properly considered in the dry light of science. The proper name for this science is *meliorism*, the science of the improvement or amelioration of the human social state⁴⁴⁹.

By opposition to Spencer, “the prophet of science”⁴⁵⁰, Ward attacked the discourse of segregation, the generator of social injustice, which was an increasingly complex challenge, given the strength and acceptance that the *Spencerian* doctrine seemed to enjoy. However, and according to Cremin, the impact of Spencer’s thinking and work was due to Albion Small, who, in 1892 found himself heading the first Department of Sociology of the United States at the University of Chicago. He noticed Ward’s work, entitled *Dynamic Sociology*. Cremin notes:

Ward’s was marked by a brilliance quite comparable to Spencer’s and Sumner’s; and in moving education to the forefront of human affairs, he gave ‘scientific’ expression to a theme that had flowed as part of American mainstream from Jefferson through Mann and Harris to the generation of the eighties. But while Spencer and Sumner were widely read and discussed, Ward was massively ignored, known at best as a sociologist’s sociologist. Had it not been for the eager discipleship of Albion Small at the University of Chicago, a whole generation of educators might well have missed his work⁴⁵¹.

⁴⁴⁹ Ward, L. (1893) *The Psychic Factors of Civilization*. Boston: Guin and Company, p., 290.

⁴⁵⁰ Kliebard, H. (1999). The Liberal Arts Curriculum and its Enemies: The Effort to Redefine General Education. In M. Early & K. Rehage (eds.). *Issues in Curriculum: A Selection of Chapters from Past NSSE Yearbooks. Ninety-Eight Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp., 3-25, p., 10.

⁴⁵¹ Cremin, L. (1964) *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage Books, p., 98.

Despite having revealed a somewhat conservative bent early on, this perspective of Small's would be dissipated at the National Education Association conference held in Buffalo, which was titled "The demands of sociology upon pedagogy". Small re-approached issues previously dealt with in a work co-authored George Vincent, "An introduction to the study of society", in which the school is conferred a dynamic and active role, leading to social transformation.

Small, who was Dewey's colleague at the University of Chicago, like Ward perceived education as an instrument of vanguardism for social amelioration, ensuring that it should place the forthcoming generation in contact with three main realities: interdependence—the conviction that in industrial society nobody survives alone; cooperation—correlated with interdependence; and progress—the awareness that new people and new events require new social approaches:

The teacher who realizes his social function will not be satisfied with passing children to the next grade. He will read his success only in the record of men and woman who go from the school eager to explore wider and deeper these social relations, and zealous to do their part in making a better future. We are dupes of faulty analysis if we imagine that schools can do much to promote social progress until they are motivated by this insight and temper⁴⁵².

In essence, Small upheld a broad perspective of education in which "the rational center is the student himself"⁴⁵³ and pedagogy was seen as the science that would assist the children to organize their contacts with reality. Consequently, the teacher was perceived not as a leader of children but instead as a maker of society⁴⁵⁴. Small, despite ultimately revealing a kind of distance with regards to Ward, nonetheless expressed his recognition of Ward's influence, when he declared that he would prefer to have written "*Dynamic Sociology* [more] than any other book ever published in America"⁴⁵⁵.

⁴⁵² Small, A. (1896) Demands of Sociology upon Pedagogy. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the National Education Association*, pp., 174-184, p., 184

⁴⁵³ Op. Cit., p., 178.

⁴⁵⁴ Op. Cit.

⁴⁵⁵ Commager, H. (1967) *Lester Ward and the Welfare State*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merill. p., xxvii.

Fundamentally, for Ward, a new corrosive truth began to crystallize, a truth that is perhaps as basic as the actual concept of formal education's social segregation. "Intellectually considered, social differentiation has always been far in advance of social integration"⁴⁵⁶. By striving arduously for a curriculum which could lead to social transformation, creating the necessary equilibrium and social harmony, Ward assumed a borderline position in the curricular debate at the end of the nineteenth century. This debate would ultimately attempt to dilute the predominance of the individualistic doctrines which support mental training. For Ward the most important issue was knowledge, in particular knowledge as a direct and profound social objective. He stressed that in the distribution of knowledge there rests all social reform, and that this reform should be an inherent function of the state⁴⁵⁷.

In considering the general tensions within the curriculum field since the end of nineteenth century, we have highlighted the role of specific curriculum pioneers—Elliott, Harris, Hall, Rice, and Ward among others—and the conflicts engaged in by them. It is our aim now to see how these particular embryonic tensions expanded, disseminated, and influenced the field throughout the twentieth century. In so doing, we will undertake another deep exegesis of the impact of Bobbitt Charter and Snedden's curriculum scientific fever, the utter importance of the Civil Rights Movement and the Romantic Critics within the struggle for the U.S. curriculum, the emergence of Tyler, and subsequent developments challenging Tyler's dominant tradition. In so doing, we will carry on building our case in contextually situating Michael Apple's work within the curriculum field.

⁴⁵⁶ Ward, L. (1883). *Dynamic Sociology, or Applied Social Science as Based upon Statistical Sociology and the less Complete Sciences*, Vol. 2. New York: D. Appleton, p., 397

⁴⁵⁷ Op. Cit.