MOVING BEYOND REFORM

Albert Shanker

> The public school has done its best for us foreigners and for the country, when it has made us into good Americans. I am glad it is mine to tell how the miracle was wrought in one case. You should be glad to hear of it, you born Americans; for it is the story of the growth of your country; of the flocking of your brothers and sisters from the far ends of the earth to the flag you love; of the recruiting of your armies of workers, thinkers, and leaders. And you will be glad to hear of it, my comrades in adoption; for it is a rehearsal of your own experience, the thrill and wonder of which your own hearts have felt.
>
> Mary Antin, The Promised Land[1]

When A Nation at Risk first appeared, most of us in public education began underlining passages and writing marginal notes. It was a landmark report that served as the catalyst for an education reform movement that has affected school systems from coast to coast. Many more reports soon followed, and we were eager to prepare our rebuttals because there were many inaccuracies in them and, more important, limited perspectives that needed broadening.

But a number of us paused before we went out to do battle. Exactly what was the state of public education in 1983? Did

these reports offer accurate and constructive criticism of our schools, or were they simply attacks on public education?

We took an honest look back at American public education in the 1970s and early 1980s and saw that it was in a pretty desperate state. Any reasonable person had ample grounds for feeling despondent. There were too many students who were automatically promoted and allowed to graduate from high school after taking all kinds of electives and Mickey Mouse courses and without ever meeting serious requirements. And there were too many teachers who were hired without any real effort to determine their qualifications.

All this had a predictable effect on public opinion. The Gallup Polls each year showed that a higher and higher percentage of the American public thought that the public schools were doing a poor job. More and more people were coming to the conclusion that it would be good policy to offer public funds for vouchers or tuition tax credits for private schools because they believed that parents ought to be given the option of providing alternative schooling for their children.

In addition, a smaller and smaller percentage of the adult population had children in the public schools. Back in the 1960s, 57 percent had children in public schools. By the early 1980s we were down to about 23 percent. People were having fewer children, and the population was aging. Therefore, the

pressure to support public schools became less compelling for politicians. The issue of what to do for retirees and the aged became more of a priority than what to do for children.

At the same time that public education was losing political support, other major issues emerged on the national agenda: economic competitiveness, rebuilding the infrastructure, and strengthening the military. Agreement on these priorities, particularly in a time of economic decline, had clear and ominous implications for education funding.

The outlook for public education was therefore not promising. Yet in spite of the criticisms they leveled, the reports essentially represented a vote of confidence for public education. Not one of the many groups of businessmen, educators, and political leaders across the country that had debated the issues and issued the reports concluded that we ought to support tuition tax credits or vouchers. Every one of the commissions essentially endorsed public education. What we needed, they argued, was not an alternative system, but an education reform movement to make public schooling an effective system.

These reports did indeed inspire reform initiatives throughout the country. California is instructive because it was where Proposition 13 was approved by the electorate so sentiment against public spending was high. But a group representing the

eighty largest corporations in the state, the Business Roundtable, not only got together and decided to help reform education, they did a thorough study of the issues, proposed a piece of legislation that was one hundred and fifty pages long and, attached to that legislation, was a proposed increase in aid to education of $2.6 billion over two years.

A coalition of businessmen, politicians, and educators also appeared in Texas, where H. Ross Perot became chairman of the special education commission appointed by Governor Mark White, and in Florida, where Governor Graham circulated bumper stickers and buttons proclaiming: "Education means business." And in Tennessee, Governor Lamar Alexander made education reform a key factor in the state's effort to influence General Motors to locate its Saturn Project in his state.

The wave of reform generated by the reports also brought with it a wave of increased regulation, which was ironic since the administration in Washington had successfully promoted the idea that excessive regulation stifles initiative and creates bloated and costly bureaucracies. As a result we have gone through a period of deregulation in the private sector--but not in education. Instead, states have passed tomes of reform legislation, mandating curriculum, texts, uniform examinations, and attendance requirements, and much more.

In effect, what was being abolished in the business world as

overregulation was being implemented with a vengeance in the schools in the name of reform. The clear implication was that local education authorities were not doing a good job in providing quality education, which convinced some central authorities that they had to step in and impose some order and control.

When the reform movement began, many people warned me not to get too excited. "Periodically," they said, "the American people get very interested in this sort of thing. Proposals will be made and ideas will be tossed around. The fuss will last a few weeks or a month or two, but this sort of thing never lasts very long. It's all television and newspaper headlines and editorials. It's politicians and the next election."

Fortunately, this has not been the case. Education is still a major agenda item of practically every legislature in the country, of governors, business groups, and foundations. Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of the reform movement has been the sustained interest of so many people in improving our public schools.

However, the issues of reform have implications that go far beyond what happens in our classrooms. They are tied in with what holds our nation together, to the preservation of democracy and democratic values. And I believe that our reform agenda will succeed only if we initiate a revolution that goes well

beyond the current reform agenda.

The present school reform movement is, in effect, a last opportunity to turn things around. We are at a point in time that is similar to where the auto and steel industries were ten years ago. Ten years ago managers in auto and steel knew what was happening in places like Japan and Korea. They visited foreign plants and saw that other countries were producing better and cheaper steel and automobiles than we were. At some point they must have had meetings where they addressed the problem of how to meet this competition. And they may have concluded that they had to restructure their entire production process and redesign the work place and improve labor-management relations. But what happened? They decided that real change was too difficult. Management simply could not make the adjustments. So the plants continued as before, except people often were worked harder and longer. And management also fell back on some wishful thinking. After all, maybe no one would really buy those crazy little automobiles with foreign names. Or there was always Congress to help with import duties or other protectionist measures. But, whatever happened, changes in the way they did things were out of the question.

That has turned around some, but it may be too late. We do not know if there will continue to be an automobile or steel industry in this country.

In education we face a similar situation. The signs of dissatisfaction are all there. A poll taken several years ago asked parents it they would put their children into private schools if they were given some sort of government subsidy for that purpose. The results indicated that the current percentage of students in the private schools, now about 11 percent, would increase to about 33 percent, at least if parents were able to find places after they got the money for their children.

This would represent a tremendous shift. As of now, of course, private schools do not have enough seats for all the prospective students. So, someone running a private school would be in the enviable position of being able to choose from among a long line of applicants waiting to get in. There is little doubt that in such a situation the better students would be "creamed-off" and the problem children and the less gifted would be relegated to the public schools, all of which would lead to a rapid decline in the whole system.

This would also lead to an erosion of political support. A loss of 10 percent of the student body over a short period of time from the public to private schools would result in a major and possibly permanent shift of support away from public education toward the private sector.

Therefore, the reports, the proposals, the whole reform movement represent an effort to preserve public education in

this country. The system will always survive in some form, but the question is whether it is going to continue to be the primary delivery system, or whether it will become the system for those kids who are kicked out of private schools or who are not accepted in the first place. That is, will public schools be the public "clinic" for those who cannot make it anywhere else, or will public schools continue to be the main educational delivery system of this country?

Is that important? In my view it is a key issue for the country. Our nation is made up of different religious, racial, and national groups. We continue to take in more immigrants than all the other countries in the world combined. We have a school system which attempts to educate all of our children and plays an important national role, what we used to call "Americanization," but what I prefer to call instilling democratic values. In fact, our public school system has been and continues to be essential to building and perpetuating a pluralistic democracy.

The alternative in the future might be a series of private schools--Catholic, Protestant, Jewish schools, Communist schools, Spanish-language schools, Vietnamese schools, Ku Klux Klan schools, and anything else that anyone would want. Unlikely? Not at all. There are countries where children go off to schools like that. And this variety invariably promotes the fragmentation of society. Merely witness the multitude of

tragedies around the world caused by racial, ethnic, and religious differences. It is suicidal to encourage division at the expense of cohesion.

The idea that the public school is central to our national unity is hardly new. The tradition goes back a long way. In 1880, for example, Henry Ward Beecher, speaking in New York, called the public school "the most democratic institution ever invented . . . the one universal institution underlying society in America." He went on to warn his audience that "sectarianism is in our way."

What is interesting is that most of Beecher's remarks strike a modern note. He too was talking about reform, about the need to make public schools so effective that they would stand against all competition, about the need to turn teaching into a true profession that would recruit and retain a fair share of the best and brightest. In his mind, the struggle to turn the public schools around was identical with the struggle to enhance democracy. The classroom that Americanized swarms of immigrants was our great defense against a descent into the turmoil of Europe. The ideal was (and is) that the door is always open through education even for the most downtrodden to acquire a political voice and to gain economic advancement.

That is why our dropout rate is unacceptable. Over 40 percent of urban youth fail to finish high school. But other industrial

democracies have school systems which are designed to "weed out" the vast majority of students. Recently, a visiting British educator, when told of the "horrifying" 41 percent dropout rate in New York, commented, ". . . any English city retaining 59 percent of its eighteen year-olds in full-time education would receive the Society of Education Officers' Gold Medal." And, in an article in the London Times Educational Supplement, the director of the British Manpower Services Commission wrote, ". . . seven out of ten of the [current] work force left school at the minimum age--many of them at fourteen . . . ." But we expect something quite different from our schools.

The current education reform movement has made it clear that we are once again "a nation at risk." In an already much-quoted passage, the Carnegie report, A Nation Prepared, defines what is at stake: "If our standard of living is to be maintained, if the growth of a permanent underclass is to be averted, if democracy is to function effectively into the next century, our schools must graduate the vast majority of their students with achievement levels long thought possible for only the privileged few." Once again, we see our public schools as the main instrument for realizing our national ideal of offering everyone the chance for full participation in our political and economic life. It is simply unacceptable for us to have a school system that shuts out 70 percent of the students from the possibility of further advancement before they reach their teens.

But the crucial question is whether or not the reforms currently on the table can save the public schools. I have already said that what is right with them is that they represent a commitment on the part of the business and political communities of the country to support public education as the major delivery system. And for the most part what they proposed was positive.

There should be licensing exams for teachers, just as lawyers go to law school and have to take a bar exam, and doctors go to medical school and have to take examinations, and accountants and actuaries and others have to be examined. The results of teacher testing in Florida, California, and other places showed that about 35 percent of prospective teachers could not pass a basic arithmetic and language usage test. This indicates not only that we need examinations, but that the level of most teacher examinations at the present time is much too low.

We also needed the stimulus of the reform reports to upgrade school curricula, to say that students must take a solid core of academic subjects: English, science, and mathematics, for example. We needed to get away from the notion that students should determine what the curriculum is on the basis of their immediate pleasures and desires.

But the problem that we face today is how to carry out constructive reforms in the face of an impending critical

demographic problem. This country has 2.2 million public school teachers. One half of those teachers will leave within the next seven years. One might say, "So what? Teachers have always been leaving." Every place I go people say to me, "Hi, Al, I used to be a teacher." Ex-teachers are legion. Our schools have somehow always managed to cope with large turnovers.

However, we are faced with an entirely new situation with regard to teacher recruitment. One of the best things that happened to public education in recent memory was the Great Depression of the 1930s. There was a large number of unemployed, and teaching was a job. Many people who would ordinarily have gone into other fields went into teaching, and the schools had a windfall of high quality personnel, most of whom are now gone.

Later we had a large number of men who were subject to military conscription from the end of World War II until the end of the Vietnam War, who preferred to struggle in some of our schools rather than fight overseas. Conscription is over now so no one comes into our schools because it is a way to avoid military service.

The largest group of people who are no longer available to us are women. If you look at law schools, medical schools, dental schools, business administration programs, for example, and if you look at the percentage of degrees awarded in those fields to

women in 1973 and 1983, you will see that, in each case, the figures have moved from 3 percent, 5 percent, 9 percent to 45 percent, 38 percent, 53 percent, and so on. Huge numbers of women have moved into other professions as a result of the removal of barriers. In the past, most would have become teachers.

Therefore, one might accurately view teaching as a field that never really attracted many people on a positive basis, but which always got refugees who were fleeing the Depression, the draft, or discrimination. Now that conditions have changed, the refugees are no longer there.

Some relatively simple arithmetic shows the magnitude of our problem. In 1973, 24 percent of all the undergraduate students in this country said that they were going to become teachers. That was the baby-boom generation. But in the 1983 baby-bust generation, only 4.5 percent of all undergraduates said that they wanted to become teachers. We need an estimated two hundred forty thousand new teachers a year. The colleges are producing one hundred ten thousand. And many studies show that prospective teachers are among the poorest performers on achievement tests.

Nationally, we have invested a great deal of money in education. Texas has spent almost $3 billion in two years. California has put up $2.6 billion. Teachers' salaries have

gone up 7 percent in each of the last two years, though they are now only at the level they were in the 1970s. Taxpayers have been overwhelmingly supportive of reform initiatives, but they will soon lose patience if they see that increased expenditures do not lead to improved educational outcomes.

Yet for the first time in our history, at least in so pronounced a way, education must face the realities of the marketplace. If you cannot get enough teachers, you have to increase salaries and improve working conditions. For example, there are usually too many students in our classes. Theodore Sizer makes the point in Horace's Compromise that if you are a good teacher, you do not want to give just multiple choice examinations to your students. You want to be able to get them to think. But if you want to do this, you have to get them to organize their thoughts, to argue, and to persuade, which means frequent writing and rewriting.

But if a teacher has five classes a day and thirty pupils in a class, that would mean one hundred and fifty papers to read and grade for each writing assignment. Five minutes spent marking each paper and five minutes meeting each student would add up to twenty-five hours of work--for one assignment! Even a 20 percent reduction in class size would leave the teacher with an impossible burden.

That is not all. If you reduce class size by 20 percent, you

need 20 percent more teachers. And, as I said, we are about to hire poorer and poorer teachers because there are not enough qualified candidates to go around. So if you want to hire more teachers, you can only get them by digging down deeper into the academic barrel. Therefore, the irony is that making an improvement in working conditions which might attract more people actually helps create a system in which the standard deteriorates.

Another aspect of the recruiting problem is that teachers need time with their colleagues, some sort of stimulating collegial relationship. One of the reasons that people do not want to be teachers is that it is a very isolated profession in which an adult finds himself locked in a room with children for his or her entire working life. This means that teachers should not be teaching five periods a day but should have a period when they can talk to colleagues and renew themselves professionally. But, again, to cut teaching loads, you need more teachers, and you are back again digging deeper and lower.

What all this means is that the traditional slogans still widely used about recruiting teachers, about improving salaries and working conditions to meet our staffing crisis, are largely unrealistic. Even if the personnel were there and school authorities could find them, the cost of a package of minimally competitive salary increases would come to about $75 billion across the nation. In addition, if we were to set a reasonable

standard for new teachers, the profession would need to recruit one quarter of all the college graduates for the next ten years.

So if you do not take the bottom quartile because they are not bright enough and if you do not take the next quartile because they are still in the bottom half of their class, you are left with the job of trying to recruit half of the top half of all the college graduates in the country. What chance is there that the United States can afford to take that amount of talent and put it into our nation's classrooms, given the fact that we need doctors, dentists, lawyers, engineers, and all sorts of other professionals? Slogans are very appealing, but unless they take into account demographic and economic realities, they are meaningless.

Another problem in staffing our schools stems from the changing perception of the nature of work. As vice-president of the AFL/CIO, I served as a member of the Commission on the Future of Work, which tried to find out why the labor movement is not only losing members, but finds itself representing a smaller and smaller percentage of people in the overall work force.

Of course, at first we did the easy things. We said we have an antilabor administration in Washington, laws are not being administered fairly, lots of jobs are going overseas, and there are a lot of antilabor consultants advising management on ways

to undercut union strength. All that was true.

But then we went on to ask if there were things that we were doing that resulted in people not joining unions or leaving unions. We looked at the results of various polls, and we commissioned some surveys of our own because the assumption of most unions is that workers do not like their jobs or their bosses. So the conventional wisdom is that the way to organize them is to tell them how awful their work is and how terrible the employer is and how they are being exploited and tell them that if they want to change the dismal picture, they ought to join the union.

The results of the polls were fascinating, especially in the light of my own experience. I remember growing up in New York City in the 1930s, and, at one point, I asked my parents why they worked. I got very fast answers. "You want to eat, don't you?" they said. "You want a roof over your head?" It was all very simple. My parents hated the work they were doing. The only reason they did it was for bread and shelter. I can remember my parents at the age of thirty or thirty-five fantasizing about the day they would be sixty-five so they could stop working and get social security. Imagine people who are thirty wanting to press a button and give up thirty-five years of their lives because life is so terrible, as it was for many workers in those days.

But that is not the way workers think about their jobs today. Seven out of ten workers who were asked why they worked did not say, "Because I have to eat." Instead they said, "I have special abilities. I want to use my talent on my job. I get great satisfaction from it. I don't want to be told exactly how to do my work. I want discretion, and, if I am able to do it my way, I will do it better. And I want recognition for my effort."

This, of course, does not mean that people would want to work if they were not getting paid. They are being paid, but they are not insecure enough to feel that they have to exchange sweat for dollars. They expect fulfillment and satisfaction from their jobs.

Now what relationship do these findings have to teaching today? The interesting thing is that we are living in a period in which the auto industry and the steel industry are trying to change the nature of jobs so that workers are happier and more involved and not treated like mere hired hands. This approach is like the Japanese management philosophy where workers are, in a sense, also inspectors and thinkers and providers of ideas. But we still do not have a philosophy of this sort in our schools.

What effect does the current wave of reform legislation have on a bright college student? He might begin by seriously

considering teaching as a career because he sees that the state legislature has increased salaries and is genuinely interested in improving education. But then he is likely to stop and say, "Now wait a minute. They just put into law this one hundred and fifty page book of regulations telling me what to do as a teacher, how many minutes to teach English, what text book to use, what the appropriate test is. They must think we are a bunch of idiots. I don't want to go into a field that everyone thinks is only for people who are not too bright or who can't make it anywhere else."

If we do not do anything differently in our schools, we are headed for a downward spiral in which we will bring in more and more people who are not fit and drive out the competent people that we have. The end result will be that the American people will likely give up on the reform movement and shift their support from the public to the private sector, which will be the end of public education as a serious force in our country and an end to the kind of open society that we want to have.

Therefore, the real question is: How do we bring people of some quality into the teaching profession? And the revolution that we need that goes beyond the reforms is for us to do for education what we have done for other professions, for lawyers, doctors, engineers, and actuaries, for just about every other professional field.

We have to say to people in teaching that they are no longer going to be viewed as hired factory workers under someone else's supervision. Decisions affecting teaching and learning will have to be turned over to the staff. In addition, we must have a very high standard of entry as we do in other professions, which have people who are board certified, who are specialists, who are recognized as experts in their fields. We are going to have to develop similar systems within our schools. Not everyone will be on the same salary schedule. Some people will be able to earn $70,000 or $90,000 a year. Very few institutions in our society are staffed completely by top-notch people. The basis for excellence in any institution is to get a fair share of outstanding people and to organize the institution in such a way so that the top people have enough communication and enough of an organizational relationship with all the other people to improve the whole operation.

So what is needed is a move toward the professionalization of teaching, starting with entry-level standards and then developing teachers who are the equivalent of the top professionals in other fields, with a national profession-controlled system of examinations--a board certification process--and with schools run essentially in the same way as, for example, a legal firm, with senior partners and junior members. Then teaching will no longer be viewed as a job in which you are just a hired hand.

This means that the schools of the future will look quite different from those that we have today. There is no single model, but rather many exciting possibilities that need to be explored.

But what I think is clear is that if we were to start our education system from scratch today, it is unlikely that we would create the schools that we have today. Suppose that we had not had schools before, and we were faced with the task of developing a way to educate our children, and somebody said, "We will build a building called a school, and we will put thirty-five seats in a room, and we will put kids in there at 8:45, and they will sit there and listen to the teacher until three o'clock."

Such a proposal would give rise to all sorts of objections--about the possibility of children learning by sitting still for a whole day, about the willingness of any sensible adult to be in a room with children under those conditions, about the ability of a large group of children to learn the same material at exactly the same pace. When the smoke cleared, the odds are that the Education Committee would not have opted for the kind of system that we now have.

All of us have been to school so we have an idea what education should be like. If you do not have a blackboard and chalk and a teacher standing in front of the room, homework and

textbooks, you do not have a school. We find it difficult to think in other terms.

I would like to offer another model, not as the ideal model, but just to show that there are other ways of educating children.

Consider the boy scouts and girl scouts. Both of these organizations have a series of examinations and tasks that scouts have to pass and master. But there is never a time that the scoutmaster stands in front of the troop and says, "Today, scouts, we are going to learn ten knots, and I am going to lecture on the subject." Instead, everyone has a sheet of paper which says, "Here are the twelve things you have to do before you go on to the next rank." And each time a scout masters one of them, someone signs the sheet to acknowledge his achievement.

The job of the scoutmaster is to connect each scout with some activity that will help that scout to master the task. The scout might be given a book and a piece of rope and told, "Go over there and see if you can learn these knots. This is difficult, but some scouts manage to do it." Ten minutes later, the leader sees that Johnny is having difficulty, so he goes over and says, "I'm sorry you're having trouble. I told you it was hard. Now I'm going to take out this board that has real knots on it, pull them off, take them apart, and put them together. Watch me, and see if you can learn it that way." If

Johnny continues to have trouble, the leader might try some peer tutoring and tell him to sit down with Jack who is a whiz at knot tying.

In the kind of school that I envision, the curriculum would be established by adults, but the students would be able to advance individually. A certain number of faculty members would be outstanding, board-certified teachers. A lot of the students' time would be spent with video cassettes or at computer terminals because imparting information on how Eskimos live in Alaska or on the wildlife of Tierra del Fuego can be presented by electronic media more effectively than by what 98 percent of all teachers are trying to do on their own.

The classroom as most of us knew it in our school days would no longer exist. Since students would be spending a good deal of their time with peer tutors, with teacher interns, or with other individualized learning or study material, teachers would have sufficient time for professional relationships, evaluating and preparing learning material, and for individual coaching of students, developing the higher level writing and thinking skills that they do not have time for in today's schools.

Where staff shortages persisted in key areas like math and science, a variety of new recruitment methods might be tried. For example, one possible solution is that, in addition to a permanent corps of professional teachers, we will develop a

large cadre of teachers who will teach for four or five years as a form of public service that would be recognized for salary credit or seniority by IBM or General Motors or by the federal government. This would be extremely important for IBM, for example, to be able to say to people, "We want you on our staff, but we also want to make sure that we have adequate personnel in the future who know math and science, and if you immediately come to IBM, we probably won't have the teachers to produce the next generation's mathematicians and scientists. Therefore, if you teach for five years, when you come to IBM, we are going to treat you as though you were a war veteran and count your teaching as a form of service to IBM and to the country, and we will take that into consideration in your status and salary." Conversations with business leaders around the country have convinced me of the feasibility of such a plan.

The education reforms that we have had up to now are the equivalent of those reforms that tried to save the automobile industry by changing the color of the paint and putting a better stereo into the dashboard. They did not work.

If we finally manage to put a better automobile on the road, it will be because we will have redesigned the workplace, changed the role of workers, put in new forms of quality control, and done things that are revolutionary compared to the way the industry did things in the past.

Admittedly, the reforms which thus far have been proposed and implemented in our schools are important because it is better to have a system in which solid requirements are spelled out for students and in which illiterate prospective teachers are weeded out. But, in themselves, these minimal improvements do not create the kind of school system that we need for the emerging high-tech world.

What we need to do is address the questions of how to get students actively involved in their own learning; of how to get intelligent adults to devote a lifetime of service to our schools; of how to change the structure of schools to make careers rewarding, both financially and intellectually.

We simply cannot do it if we lock our teachers in a room with thirty or more children for their entire working lives at a low salary with stifling work conditions. But we might do it if we make teachers full partners in the education enterprise, with a competitive salary and with authority to choose materials, hire and train new staff, and exercise the kind of decision-making power that is an intrinsic part of any other professional's working life.

We have to move beyond the area of minor improvements with working conditions or textbooks or course requirements and into fundamental structural change in American public education. We need to do this because even if we succeed with the reforms that

are now being proposed, we will only have recreated the schools that we had in 1952. Back then, we did not automatically promote students. We tested teachers. We required students to take certain subjects. But with all this, we still had a dropout rate far beyond what we have today.

In effect, what we are doing now is attempting to go back to a model which, based on past performance, would have the effect of institutionalizing a social division, separating an educated minority from a mass ill-equipped to cope with a high-tech world.

At least one other demographic specter haunts our society. When the first workers retired on their social security benefits, there were seventeen people in the work force contributing to the payments. But current trends point to a future where there will be only three workers to support each retiree and one of those will be black or Hispanic. Unless our schools succeed with far more of our students than they do now, we may well face a future in which one employed person will be asked to support, not only his or her family, but someone receiving retirement benefits and another receiving public assistance. Our democratic principles may well crumble under such a crushing burden.

A continuation of the present structure, even with the reforms now on the table, will inevitably result in unqualified teachers

coming into the schools, with greater disappointment on the part of the general public that reform is not working, all of which will result in a continued movement toward a privatization of education and an ever-increasing separatism of every religious, racial, and ethnic group. Such a process will inevitably have a disastrous impact on our democratic ideals and institutions.

[1]Mary Antin, The Promised Land (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924), 222.