

Great Britain Philosophy of Education Society (GBPES)  
2010 Conference in Oxford

**"Educational Implications for  
Democracies-Always-in-the-Making"**

Barbara J. Thayer-Bacon,  
University of Tennessee  
Cultural Studies of Education  
1126 Volunteer Blvd, Claxton-420  
Knoxville, TN 37996-3456  
Fax: 865-974-8103  
Email: [bthayer@utk.edu](mailto:bthayer@utk.edu)  
Telephone: 865-974-9505

**GBPES SUBMISSION*****Educational Implications for Democracies-Always-in-the-Making****The C.A.R.E. Project*

I am working on a project that aims to not only develop a relational, pluralistic social political theory that moves beyond liberal democracy, but also to consider how such a theory translates into our public school settings. As a pragmatist and a scholar in cultural studies, I believe it is vital that my theory writing be informed by practice in order to keep my theory grounded in the historical, local, contingent, everyday world. Consequently, when I began working on this project, prior to trying to write any philosophical political theory that moves us beyond liberal democracy, I sought to immerse myself in particular school cultures and communities, relying on a phenomenological methodology.

In order to help me address my own cultural limitations and better understand tough questions and issues a relational, pluralistic political theory must face in our public schools, I designed a study that required me to spend time in USA schools where the majority of the students historically have been disenfranchised from the USA's "democracy" as well as spend time in schools where the students are considered part of a "model minority." I began what I called "The CARE Project" (Culturally aware, Anti-racist, Relationally focused, Educational communities) in 2001 by focusing on the Mexican culture and spending time in a Mexican school as well as a USA elementary school where Mexican American children are the vast majority. In 2002 I focused on

African Americans in southern USA and traveled to a small village in Ghana, West Africa, as my country of origin for African American cultural roots. In 2003 I was on the Navajo Reservation observing schools and in an urban Native American high school in the plains area of USA. In 2004 I observed Japanese Americans in Saturday school, Japanese high school students in a USA boarding school, and Japanese elementary students in Japan. In 2005 I went to Chinese Sunday School with Chinese American children, traveled to San Francisco to study a Chinese American majority elementary school, and then went to Guangzhou, China for the country of origin part of my research.

In *Beyond Liberal Democracy in Schools: The Power of Pluralism*, I share my observations and experiences as antidotal stories, using a narrative style of philosophical argumentation, as impressionistic accounts of practices that illuminate the relational and pluralistic democratic theory I am developing.<sup>1</sup> I also use the stories to help me translate my sociopolitical theory into educational theory and recommendations for school reform in USA public schools. This project has the potential for implications beyond the boundaries of the USA, as classical liberalism has been imposed or embraced by the educational systems of all countries colonized by England, France, and more recently the USA. Students from community-based cultural backgrounds, which include the majority of indigenous people, have struggled to succeed in individualized classrooms worldwide. Thus, I seek to reach a wider audience through conferences such as this one. It is my hope to contribute a relational, pluralistic educational theory that will help all students have a chance of actively participating in a democratic society-always-in-the-making.

---

*Public Education vs Private Education*

Amy Gutmann discusses at length in her *Democratic Education* an educational issue that I want to argue is vital to the possibilities of democracies someday, the issue of free, good quality, public education for all future citizens.<sup>2</sup> This is where I must begin a serious discussion with the educational implications of the C.A.R.E project I am working on, and what it has to teach us for schools in democracies-always-in-the-making. My focus here will be a macro level view of education as a social institution embedded within a larger society.

In the schools I have visited the value of an education is never doubted. What is doubted is if the students will have enough resources to be able to stay in school and their schools will continue to have the resources needed to stay open and pay their teachers. In the schools I visited in Ghana, Mexico, and the Native American schools in the USA, the students are fighting hard, against great odds, to stay in school and learn all they can. The Japanese boarding school I visited in the USA has since closed its doors. It is important to remind ourselves that having schools to go to is a basic human need we cannot neglect. Democracies depend on educated citizens to exist. My visits to schools in other countries have reminded me as well that it does not take a lot of resources to offer children an education, but it does take some. We live in a world where we have enough resources to offer all children a chance to go to school and learn the basic skills they need to be able to contribute as educated citizens to the development of democracies-always-in-the-making. But, my question is, are we willing to share the resources we have?

---

The poorest schools in America are richer than many if not most schools in other countries; we have a great deal of resources in terms of learning materials and basic supplies. It is striking when I compare the pictures I have of classrooms I visited in other countries versus the US, the schools I visited were in the Southeast and the Southwest, where states are struggling to pay their bills yet those classrooms are still so full of learning materials in comparison. US schools are also wealthy in terms of the level of education our teachers have received prior to becoming teachers, and they continue to earn as teachers, as well as the number of teachers we have per student. Yet, even within the US there is a wide range of wealth and a large gap between what our wealthy private and suburban schools have to offer students and what our much poorer inner city and rural public schools have to offer. In other countries like Japan and China, efforts to equalize resources have been more successful, but even there differences exist, in China between rural and urban schools as well as with key schools in the cities, and in Japan with particular elite high schools a select few students are able to attend, as well as through the *juku* system of after-school programs to further students educations that only parents with some means can afford for their children. Not only do our children need access to schools to help them become educated, but we need to make a strong commitment to share our resources and equalize the quality of conditions in our schools so that all of our children have the chances they need to become contributing citizens to democracies-in-the-making.

In *Democratic Education*, Gutmann considers the debate between private schools vs public schools for democratic societies. Is a democratic society dependent on the offering of a free, good quality education for all of its future citizens or is it more

important to offer its citizens choices in where they send their children to school?

Americans, as good representatives of classical liberalist values, consistently opt for what they think offers them the most freedom and choices for their education, so it should come as no surprise that they have historically fought for the option of privately educating or home schooling their own children, and only begrudgingly, in the later half of the 1800's, agreed to the utilitarian argument made by intellectuals such as Horace Mann, that it benefits all of us to have our citizens educated and healthy and able to work and contribute to our society. The case was made for government sponsored public education for those who could not afford to pay to educate their own children, but in the USA the citizens have never agreed that the government should insure that all children in America receive a free and equal education, that all our children should receive the same, high quality education. Those are values expressed in countries with collective values such as Japan and China (and other countries with more socialistic values such as Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Canada), where the vast majority (>97%) of students attend state-run schools and the children are exposed to the same, state-run curriculum (for consistency and quality control, to help insure equality, cooperation, and a sharing of resources).

Americans have only agreed that it is important to "minimally educate" all children in the USA, that we have an obligation to supply an "adequate education," to insure children are not "absolutely deprived." The private school business thrives today in America, for those who have the means to pay for their children to be educated, as the US continues to refuse to guarantee its economically poor children anything more than a minimally sufficient education, however we define that.<sup>3</sup> Americans maintain a strong,

classical liberal belief in the right to choose a private education over a public education, to choose to educate one's child in a Catholic or Jewish school, for example, instead of a public school that is legally bound to not teach a particular religious view, given its representation of the state in a country that seeks to separate the institutions of church and state. The US has never succeeded in separating the social institutions of church and state (the boundaries are porous and leaky, and they are artificially, socially constructed). Protestant Christian beliefs prevail in American public schools, even though they are softer and less noticeable than they were one hundred years ago, which is why Catholic, Jewish, and now Muslim schools, as well as non-sectarian schools have developed in contrast to the public schools.

Gutmann argues in *Democratic Education* in favor of a constrained voucher system, using her two principals of nonrepression and nondiscrimination to protect parents' options and choices and at the same time address limits on choices due to lack of material resources.<sup>4</sup> She proposes offering both public and private schools within a well developed welfare state that federally guarantees students will be able to reach their thresholds, while leaving it up to states and parents to decide how to get students over their thresholds. Gutmann wants to preserve American's right to choose what type of school they send their children too, and also make it possible for all parents and students to have this choice. I agree with what Gutmann wants to preserve, but since America is not a well-developed welfare state that does what she asks, her solution will not work.<sup>5</sup>

At the time of Gutmann's writing of *Democratic Education*, the voucher system was being proposed by conservative politicians such as George W. Bush, then governor

of Texas. Voucher proposals seem to have dissipated today, although it is still in the news. For my purposes, the issue serves as an important one for us to consider because of what it illustrates for democratic theory. The general argument made by those proposing a voucher system is based on classical liberal values, making the case for parents to be able to choose what school their child attends, and insisting that the way to solve the inadequacies of a public school system is to make them accountable through a capitalist approach of market competition. The general idea is that if public schools have to compete with private schools for student enrollment, they will have to improve the quality of their schools. As public schools are currently designed, there is no market incentive to encourage their improvement. Everyone agrees, including critical theorists such as Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, that the public schools are failing.<sup>6</sup> However, critical theorists are seeking to improve conditions in American public schools and make them more equal, so there is not such a strong class divide between the haves and the have-nots, or racial divide between White students and students of color. Conservative politicians are making the case that because our public schools are failing, we need to try something else.<sup>7</sup>

The voucher system was proposed as a way of offering people choices and forcing schools to compete for student enrollment. Vouchers are a form of credit, that give people a way to take the money they pay through their taxes for public school education, and use it to pay for a private school tuition instead, if that is what they choose to do. It is an idea that threatens to do away with public schooling and privatize all schools. Critical theorists argue that a voucher system does not offer a real choice for lower income families, unless the government supplies people with the means of

transportation to get their children to other schools, insists that schools open their doors to all who apply, and the government caps all school tuition rates so that schools cannot raise their tuition rates above what the voucher amount is, for parents who cannot pay more than the value of their vouchers. These safety measures would result in essentially making all schools public. No classical liberal will agree to such terms, as the terms remove the incentives the vouchers were meant to create, market competition. However, without making the playing field level, lower income families and parents who have children with special needs, for example, cannot avail themselves of the choices the voucher system supposedly offers.

The general idea of vouchers seems to have died down today due to lack of public support, although it does seem to resurface as an issue periodically, especially during election years. As a result of the solid critique of our public school systems developed during the 1980's and beyond, the general feeling we have in America today is a loss of faith in our public schools, and there is a general exodus from public schools for families that can afford to send their children to private schools or home school them.<sup>8</sup> We do not have only lower income children left in the public schools, which was the prediction if a voucher system was adopted in the USA, but we have close to that in parts of our country. California and the East Coast (e.g. Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York City) serve as vivid examples of what I am describing, but they are not the only states experiencing this issue. In Jonathan Kozol's *Shame of the Nation*, he describes current conditions in urban school districts across America that strongly supports my description of our public schools as full of mainly working class children.<sup>9</sup> What we have in the USA is not an education system that can lead to democracies-someday; it is a

system that continues to lead to greater and greater discrepancies between the haves and the have-nots, which are predominantly people of color in a nation with a long history of racism. The issue of public schools versus private schools through the debate over a voucher system stands today as a vivid example of my argument that classical liberalism and the assumptions upon which it is based will not, cannot support democratic theory. Classical liberalism undermines the possibilities of a democracy for its logic is based on a view of individual needs in competition with each other, where others are always positioned as a hindrance, taking away from and getting in the way of individual needs.

The schools I visited in Japan and China offer us good examples of educational institutions that are based on collective values of fraternity, equality, and cooperation. (I think Ghana may offer a good example too, but I am hesitant to say so due to my own lack of more extensive exposure.) In general, the schools in China and Japan are remarkably similar, within their country, in terms of their basic structures and designs, as well as in terms of the amount of their resources such as materials, and in terms of the teacher/student ratio. They are also very similar in terms of their basic curriculum within the schools. In general it does not matter so much where one's family lives, in terms of what school their child will attend; there are measures taken, such as the rotation of teachers in Japan, to help insure that the schools will be equally good, and funding is distributed to the schools at a national level so that no poorer district will be punished for not generating as much resources through local taxation as wealthier districts are able to raise, as we do in the US. There is much the US can learn from

other collective and more social democratic countries about how to share resources and achieve more equitable schools for our future citizens.<sup>10</sup>

These same countries stand as good counter-examples of the view that if we make our schools equal in terms of resources they will end up being equally bad. They can end up being equally good. In general, the schools in Japan in particular are held in high regard and their test scores document that they are succeeding in maintaining an equally high quality, and China's school system is rising significantly in quality too and becoming very competitive with Japan. It is very important to consider how our schools are funded and how we can assure that the funding is fairly distributed. Japan has taken care of this issue by distributing funds at a national level and having a Ministry of Education that oversees the quality of schools throughout the country. I am not in favor of a nationally driven curriculum, for reasons I will discuss below, but I do think it is vital for a democratic society to insure that its future citizens have access to equally good schools and the only way we can assure resources are evenly distributed is to distribute them at a state and national level. This distribution responsibility does not entitle the government to dictate what will be taught in our schools, it is a supply service only.

### *Democracies Always-in-the-Making*

What does a transactional view of democracies-always-in-the-making offer us as a way out of these either/or positions regarding public schools versus private schools, and equality versus choice? What does a relational, pluralistic democratic theory have to say in answer to the question, is a democratic society dependent on the offering of a free education for all of its future citizens or is it more important to offer its citizens

choices in where they send their children to school? Yes, a democratic society is dependent on offering all of its future citizens free access to an education, but it is important that this free education strive to be equally good in quality for all its children. In order to achieve good quality education for all its future citizens, we need our governments to help us gather our resources and serve as the place of deposit and distribution, making sure everyone gets their fair share and no one takes more than they should, thus avoiding depleting resources for others.

Americans have never made the level of commitment to their public schools that I am calling for, one that insists on equally high quality public education that is available and free (paid for by our taxes) for all of its future citizens. They have only been willing to commit to minimum standards. Occasionally we act in such a way that seems to value equally good schools for all, as when we made it against the law to segregate children in our schools by race (in the 1950's), when we started pre-school programs for children of lower incomes (Head Start, in the 1960's), and when we insisted that children with special needs also deserve access to a free education (*PL 94-142*, in the 1970's).<sup>11</sup> A more current example is the previous Congress and past President Bush's passing of a policy that appears to be a commitment for equally high standards, "No Child Left Behind." However, from a transactional democratic perspective, these policies are doomed to failure if they address the issue of equal education as if schools are autonomous institutions, separate from other social institutions such as economic and familial institutions. A transactional view reminds us that schools are one social institution among many (family, work, church, community, government), and their boundaries are not nearly as solid as we like to think. These social institutions,

constructed by us, are artificial, not natural, and do not exist in isolation; they influence each other and continually affect and change each other.

In response to the second half of my question, is it more important to offer citizens choices in where they send their children to school, the answer is no, it is not more important to offer our citizens choices, but yes, it is as important as offering them free, good quality education. A democratic society needs to offer its citizens' choices in what schools their children attend, to help maintain and support the growth of diversity within the citizenry. A democracy-in-the-making will only get closer to achieving that ideal by embracing the value of diversity. However, the choices we offer need to be fair, in terms of open accessibility, affordability, as well as in terms of high quality. I believe that the only way we can assure that all our future citizens have choices in what schools their children attend is to have the state/nation pay for them through fair redistribution of the taxes we pay, as well as oversee them in terms of accessibility and quality control, acting as referee, based on the agreed upon standards set by us, the communities, teachers, and parents in consultation.

Beyond the role of referee, it is important that the states/nation stays out of the education business so that schools can develop in their own unique ways, based on local cultural expressions. Charter schools are a current model that offers this kind of possibility, for charter schools are public schools, supported by state/national funds and subject to federal guidelines for open enrollment, and yet they are able to design their own missions and develop their schools in a variety of ways. They enjoy local control. There are charter schools in the US that address particular cultural needs, as well as represent varying pedagogical styles and differing curriculum focuses. Some of these

schools are doing very well and some are not, their success rate depends on many factors. I do think they offer us an example of a way to support diverse educational approaches and meet the needs of a pluralistic citizenry and yet insist on all of our children having access to free, high quality education.<sup>12</sup>

Are we prepared to offer various religious focuses for publicly funded schools? I think we have to be willing to do so, in order to address the varying needs of our diverse populations. In the US, we have never succeeded in separating church from state, we just succeeded in giving Protestant Christian values and beliefs hegemonic power over other spiritual beliefs, and let them become the norm against which all other spiritual beliefs had to be measured. Protestant, Christian values can be seen in obvious ways in our public schools, such as the school calendar and holidays scheduled around Christmas and Easter, but also in more subtle ways, such as the belief in original sin leading us to feel that children must be supervised and closely watched at all times, and kept busy, for "Idle hands are the devil's workshop." A transactional view of democracy argues that it is not possible for the social institutions of church and state to maintain a strict separation, anymore than it is possible for people to leave their spiritual values behind when they walk into a classroom to teach and learn. Those boundaries and borders are artificially drawn and are again leaky and porous indeed. I am suggesting the use of public funds to support a variety of schools with differing spiritual beliefs will offer minorities such as Indigenous peoples ways to break the hegemonic power Christian values hold over public schools in America.

Some worry that if we fund public schools in a way that allows people to choose from among a diverse array of schools, our children will not be exposed to the same

level of diversity they are exposed to by all going to the same schools. Parents will choose to enroll their children in schools with others like them, and instead of our children learning how to communicate and relate to each other across cultural differences, helping them to enlarge their perspectives, they will insulate themselves and limit their growth potential by associating only with others like themselves. Of course, as long as the US has offered parents options between private and public schools, the situation has existed that parents already have been able to choose to enroll their children in schools with others like them, as least parents with the resources to make that kind of choice. Also, as long as parents have the freedom to choose where they want to live, this choice offers them another way to enroll their children in schools with others like them, as we saw when White families fled to the suburbs after schools were desegregated in the 1960's, and we can see with Native Americans today choosing to live on their Reservations so their children can go to school with others like them. We can only assure that our children all go to school together by making public schools mandatory and outlawing private schools, as China did under Chairman Mao's leadership, and by controlling where people live. Then we have a situation where we do not have the possibility of a democracy-in-the-making, but instead a strong, authoritarian form of government, not something I want to embrace.

I seek to describe a model of relational, pluralistic democracy where people deeply value the richness of cultural diversities and willingly embrace the value of their children learning how to work together and become friends with each other, across their differences. It is true, it is not even possible for our children to go to school with all the rich diversity of this world. And, it is also important to recognize that children need to

grow up nurtured and cared for by others like them, to help them develop a healthy sense of self, and a shared cultural identity. I learned in my project how important the issue of shared identity is from research on and by Native Americans.<sup>13</sup> We do not need a government to force us to be together by limiting our choices of free association with each other, that is a police state. We need our government to serve as a facilitator and resource and guide to help us find ways to work with each other across our differences.

We need what Young calls “coalitions across differences” where people can come together in public forums and work on issues and problems with which they share concerns.<sup>14</sup> Highlander Folk School in Tennessee serves as an example of such a public forum for adults seeking a place to discuss their social problems.<sup>15</sup> I want to recommend that our schools for our children need to serve this same purpose, they need to be places where our diverse children can come together voluntarily and learn how to work together to solve their problems. Our children need to be exposed to differences and begin to develop the habits of mind and heart they will need as future citizens in a democracy-someday, such as: self-reflection, patience, generosity, curiosity, and caring for others who are different from them. I am pointing to micro level concerns in terms of ideas of what we can do within our openly accessible, publicly funded, high quality, diverse, locally run public schools. That is a topic for another time.

### *Conclusion*

I want to argue, as an outcome of the C.A.R.E. study, that governments in democracies-always-in-the-making should serve roles very similar to the kinds of roles I

describe teachers serving in school classrooms, roles of facilitator and resource, guide and mentor, advocate and supporter, translator and referee when needed.

Our government, church and business leaders, our teachers, community members, and parents all share a responsibility to help our children develop into adults who will be able to participate in a democratic society always-in-the-making. We need the adults in our children's lives to create and nurture fertile ground for the children to grow by making sure their basic needs are taken care of (such as: a place to sleep, food to eat, clothing and shelter, protection from harm, loving arms to hold them). This means we need our governments to address universal issues such as health care, job opportunities, retirement benefits, and access to quality schooling to make sure the resources we have are shared so that no child goes without their basic needs being met. When laws such as "No Child Left Behind" are passed that do not address social issues that affect children's basic needs then they are empty promises. It is easier for legislatures to blame teachers for lowered expectations and order children to take more tests than it is to actually try to address difficult social issues such as lack of health care, unemployment rates, and the rising cost of living that put so much stress on families that they reach breaking points.

We need our government to help us find ways to work together and solve our problems, not by solving them for us but by serving as facilitators, giving us forums for discussing and airing our various issues and concerns, and avenues for sharing our various views with others beyond the reach of any particular forum. We need our governments to serve as resources and help us find information we need to solve our problems, including putting us in touch with human resources, those who are experts

and know much about particular issues and concerns. We need our governments to serve as mentors and guides to help people develop their knowledge so they can become experts in particular problems in need of solving. We need our governments to advocate for us when our rights are violated, and support us in our efforts to grow and develop. We need our governments to serve as translators and help us understand each other, and find ways to work together, to help us overcome our flaws and limitations, appreciate and value our differences, and recover from our mistakes and misunderstandings. All of these tasks for the government of a democracy-always-in-the-making are similar to the roles Myles Horton's Highlander played and continues to play for people who come there to learn how to organize and solve their problems.

We need our governments to help us gather together our resources and serve as the place of deposit and distribution, like storage closets that hold the supplies for us that we will need access to for working on problems and issues, including the cleaning supplies we need to clean up after ourselves. We need them to keep an inventory and inform us of the need to replenish supplies that are running low. We need our governments to make sure we all have equal access to the supplies and that we don't use more than our fair share, or forget to put what we use back on the shelf in the closet for others to use. As referees, we need our governments to make sure we play fairly and follow the rules we agree upon, and blow the whistle on us when we don't. If we find we do not like the rules we have created to live by, we need our governments to again offer us a forum for discussing and deciding how we want to change the rules.

I have argued that classical liberalism has spread its values of individual freedom, choice, and autonomy far and wide, due to colonization of other parts of the

world by Euro-western nations that embraced these values, nations such as England and France, and more recently the United States. These values have acted like a poison to indigenous cultures and are having the same affect on other collective cultures today. I offer a transactional view of individuals-in-relation-to-others as a powerful antidote to classical liberalism. I do not think classical liberalism will ever lead us to democracies, the exclusionary either/or logic of liberalism in fact contradicts the very idea of 'democracy,' which is inclusive and welcoming of others not like us. It is my great hope that the transactional view I offer here gives us ways to imagine that we can work toward a democracy that is welcoming of all our children.

---

*Notes:*

1. author, *Beyond Liberal Democracy in Schools: The Power of Pluralism* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2008).
2. Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987).
3. Jonathan Kozol, *Savage Inequalities* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1991).
4. The principle of nonrepression assures "the freedom to deliberate rationally among differing ways of life" (p. 44) and the principle of nondiscrimination assures that "all educable children must be educated" (p. 45).
5. I do want to note that Amy Gutmann became the 8<sup>th</sup> president of the University of Pennsylvania in 2004 and she has been a leading advocate for financial aid based on need to promote socioeconomic diversity in higher education. Gutmann made Penn one of a handful of universities in the country that substitute grants for loans for students from economically disadvantaged families. By fall 2009, all undergraduate

students eligible for financial aid were receiving loan-free aid packages so they can graduate debt-free. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amy\\_Gutmman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amy_Gutmman), accessed 1/15/09.

6. Henry Giroux, *Ideology, Culture and the Process of School* (Barcombe, England: Falmer Press, 1981); Henry Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1983); Henry Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1988); Peter McLaren, *Life in Schools* (4th edition) (Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc., 1989/2003); Peter McLaren, *Schooling as a Ritual Performance* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 1986/1999).
7. For example, Milton Friedman, and Rose D. Friedman, *Free to Choose* (NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980).
8. National Center for Educational Statistics, "Student Achievement in Private Schools," *The Nation's Report Card* (U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 2006).
9. Jonathan Kozol, *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America* (New York: Crown Publishers, 2005).
10. See for example: I. Epstein, (Ed.), *Chinese Education: Problems, Policies, and Prospects* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1991); J. Fallows, *Japanese Education: What Can it Teach American Schools?* (Educational Research Service, 1990).
11. Joel Spring, *American Education, 11th edition* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004, 1978).

12. See for example: Kathleen Knight Abowitz, "Charter Schooling and Social Justice" *Educational Theory*, 51, no. 2 (2001, Spring): 151-170; Harry Brighouse, "A Modest Defence of School Choice. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36, no. 4 (November 2002): 653-659; Harry Brighouse, "What's Wrong with Privatizing Schools? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 38, no. 4 (2004): 617-631; S. Smith, *The Democratic Potential of Charter Schools* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001).

13. Eduardo Duran and Bonnie Duran, *Native American Postcolonial Psychology* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995); Deborah Davis Jackson, "'This Hole in our Heart' The Urban-raised Generation and the Legacy of Silence," in Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters (Eds.), *American Indians and the Urban Experience*, pp. 189-206. (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2001); Richard Morris, "Educating Savages," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 152-171; Jon Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian Students* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992).

14. Iris Marion Young, *Inclusion and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

15. Myles Horton, *The Long Haul: An Autobiography*, Herbert and Judith Kohl (Eds.) (New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1990).

[word count= 5,914, PESGB word count = 3-6,000]

---