



Brosio, Richard, A. (2009). Authentic Bona fide Democrats Must Go Beyond Liberalism, Capitalism, and Imperialism: A Review of *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform*. *Workplace*, 16, 95-107.

Authentic Bona fide Democrats Must Go Beyond Liberalism, Capitalism, and Imperialism: A Review of *Dewey's Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform* by Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy, and John Puckett (Temple University Press, 2007)

Richard A Brosio

As I read the book under review, my concerns were what the three authors' view of "democracy" actually were and why they were so hostile to John Dewey's ideas and actions – and/or lack of the latter. Dewey's work has been central to my scholarship and teaching since writing a doctoral thesis at the University of Michigan: namely, *The Relationship of Dewey's Pedagogy to His Concept of Community*, (1972). It seems that the three authors are angry with Dewey because his theoretical work was not translated into action. These authors' presentation of Dewey's theory is somewhat troubling; therefore, resulting in difficulties with their complaints about the failure to convert theory into practice. Returning to how "democracy" is portrayed in *Dewey's Dream*, I will focus on this and also provide a critique of what I think is an overall weak series of arguments in the book.

In the book's **preface** the reader learns the authors' intent is to lay out a "democratic manifesto" that could help develop Dewey's "utopian vision of a worldwide, organic, 'Great Community' composed of truly participatory, democratic, collaborative, and independent societies" (p. ix). The **introduction** addresses "Dewey's Lifelong Crusade for Participatory Democracy." Although this may not be of great importance to some, the word "crusade" does not signify authentic democracy for me, and arguably to many others. My nervousness is heightened by the authors' view of the globalization that has occurred in the last thirty years – a movement basically driven by the neo-liberals who considered Milton Friedman as a brilliant theorist with regard to solving the so-called "accumulation crisis (the alleged lack of enough profit)." This solution required the U.S. military and its allies to overcome resistance by many third world nations. The three authors ask: "what *specifically is to be done beyond theoretical advocacy to transform American society and over developed societies into participatory democracies capable of helping to transform the world into a 'Great Community?'* " (p. xiii). Again, these kinds of passages can be interpreted in many ways within a diverse global population. The

NATO treatment of the “Balkan Problem” in the 1990s may seem “Great Community” to some; however, others can make plausible arguments that it really was the extension of American imperial power – with a little help from “our” friends.” Was Iraq brutally conquered to make its people eligible for inclusion in the “Great Community”? What of the U.S. war in Afghanistan and Pakistan? And let us remember the U. S. hand in Central America, Chile, Argentina, and other Monroe Doctrine places in this hemisphere. Naomi Klein’s *The Shock Doctrine* (2007) provides a vivid and explanatory analysis of what Benson et al. should consider when they propose what is to be done for what ails America! The dust cover of Klein’s book includes the following: “Disaster capitalism – the rapid-fire corporate re-engineering of societies...did not begin with 9/11/01.” Given what is actually occurring in the twenty-first century around the world, it seems naïve that the authors of *Dewey’s Dream* seem to think that “university-assisted community schools” backed by national and international organizations are the best way to achieve Dewey’s utopian vision as a global, organic “Great Community.”

Because the term “civil society” is included in the book under review, I believe it is best to address what this term means and has meant in the past. The abstract of my “Civil Society: Concepts and Critique, from a Radical Democratic Perspective”¹ reads as follows (pp. 1-2) – although not verbatim.

My intention is to present an initial/introductory framework for further study on how and why civil society and arguments about it are important for educators and their allies who favor schooling-education for: democratic empowerment, social and economic justice, respect for diversity, and the possibilities for developing further the opportunities to act altruistically – if not ‘caringly’ – in schools and society. It is necessary to place the above in contexts of “wars on terrorism”, neo-liberal globalization, the plight of labor, surveillance, empire and capitalism itself. It is important to inquire whether – or not – spaces exist within contemporary U.S. society for radical democratic, anti-capitalist, and compatible politics of identity strategies and struggles to occur and succeed. Liberals, conservatives, et al. have seen capitalism and democracy as compatible, therefore being able to deny that global capitalism is now a total system – not just a part of civil society. They view capitalism as just another part of an increasingly complex and diversified civil society. The results of these interpretive claims makes capitalism’s great nemesis, socialism, and especially Marxist socialism, unnecessary and even impossible. The liberal/bourgeois concept of civil society allegedly consists of spaces between the central state and the capitalist economy. However, Marx and many Marxists view civil society as a place that has been historically constructed by the triumphant bourgeoisie. I argue that the democratic Left(s) must conduct a sober and rigorous reassessment of the problems and possibilities that are connected to civil society issues – including the schooling-education ones within its confines.

I have presented this passage to build upon my critique of how naïve – or how stuck – the authors are in the very not radical liberalism that is unable to accomplish what they claim.

The authors' first chapter is called "**Michigan Beginnings, 1884-94.**" They focus on Dewey's essay called "The Ethics of Democracy" (1888) in which he argued against anti-democrats who prevailed at that time. Dewey theorized that only participatory democracy provided the "uncoerced, truly harmonious organic society most conducive to both the common good and to individual self development" (p. 4). Dewey realized that authentic democracy had to include: political, civil, and "industrial" (also called economic) conditions. The three authors praise the 1888 essay but are disappointed because Dewey did not go beyond theory. They wanted the young Dewey to explain how his theories could deal with the realities in the country, so that difficult questions could be addressed. The authors write also about the alleged failure Dewey encountered as he tried to get beyond academic theory when he worked with Franklin Ford. Ford thought that communication was the key to spreading democratic ideas and suggestions for action. He and Dewey came up with a newspaper called *Thought News* (a journal of inquiry and record of fact) but it never materialized. I am critical of the authors' claim that Dewey had to do the whole job – theory and practice. How could a bourgeois intellectual in a university philosophy department achieve both? He was not connected to organized groups, labor unions, and political parties as were Marx and Gramsci. Those of us who have studied Dewey's work can and do use the best and most useful of it in order to make connections to other theorists, activists, and revolutionaries.

Chapter 2, "**Dewey at the University of Chicago, 1894-1904,**" features claims that Dewey did his best work there, and lived off of it for the rest of his life. It was at Chicago that Dewey addressed problems of pedagogy and schools. He was the head of the Department of Pedagogy, as well as the combined Department of Philosophy and Psychology. President William Rainey Harper was involved in attempts to "radically" change public education in the city. Given that Harper worked with rich and powerful persons in this campaign it is difficult to imagine that "radical" meant the same thing as what intellectuals and activists who were working with the proletariat proposed and demanded. Harper was a student of the Old Testament, because he believed that they told the stories of God attempting to raise humans to a possible "higher" life. He was considered a leading biblical authority in the U.S. Harper saw the university as a, or, the Messiah. How could Dewey become a genuine radical democrat within this milieu? The secular Dewey does not rely on the Old Testament. Therefore, how radical could Dewey be in hammering out a humanistic democratic praxis at Chicago? A critical reader of *Dewey's Dream* may want to know what its authors mean by "radical."² Harper's idea that the university should take responsibility for providing elementary and secondary teachers is admirable; however, because very few colleges and universities were "progressive" then and now, it is not surprising that all too many schools of education graduates are not overall progressive, let alone radical. Dewey believed that all philosophy was or should be the philosophy of education. Without claiming that all philosophers are or should be progressive **or** radical, it could be argued that schools of education might be better were they to move beyond mostly "how -to" instruction.

The three authors claim that Dewey failed to understand that the universities, especially the national urban ones, should be seen as the key institutions for a school and society network. The authors turn to what was called the Dewey School and/or the Laboratory

School. Dewey's experiences at the School were made public via *The School and Society* (1900) helping him to become a world figure. Our authors claim that the Laboratory School did not help to achieve the kind of reforms that were necessary at that time. More specifically, they tell us that in contrast to that School "community schools explicitly based themselves on the real-world household and community problem-solving" (p. 29). Claiming that Dewey was influenced by Wilhelm Wundt, who founded psychology as a separate discipline,

we can see more clearly that Dewey's ... School was ... conceived as a scientific laboratory to test and develop educational theories. ... [Therefore] we can better appreciate why the students ... could not benefit from the real-world problem solving that Dewey brilliantly theorized was the best way to engage their intense, sustained interest and develop their capacity for reflective critical inquiry and collaborative practical action (p. 29).

The three authors claim that the Dewey School was an "artificial *university laboratory school* isolated from American life" (p. 31). The problems to be solved were make-believe and disconnected from the real world. This is understandable when we know that the working masses of Chicago were unlikely to be students. They claim it was a "stimulated pseudo-community" that did/could not connect school and community. Perhaps the middle and upper class students would disagree. The university was in the great White City part of Chicago! The authors admit that if appropriately applied, Dewey's "general" ideas can be used practically. I contend that school can hardly ever replicate real life. I do not want to appear glib; however, in a "practical" non-scientism way: it could be argued that at Michigan Dewey became interested in going beyond educational essentialism. As he thought through this as a school inspector in and around Ann Arbor, he began to see how the "scientific method" could and should replace the philosophy and practice based on alleged certainty. He brought this to Chicago. However, he learns that the country is not ready for more Laboratory Schools – especially if they were based on science rather than scientism – or revealed religion. So, on to Columbia to figure out how he might help develop a somewhat more democratic society and governments (federal, state, city, town), so that the public schools – at least – could be supported by these more powerful allies. It is heartening to know that during the 1920's Dewey understood that the capitalism of his time was a main enemy of authentic deep democracy. He did not wait for the 1929 crash to figure out that some kinds of socialism would have to replace the actually existing capitalist system. I continue to be surprised that the three authors expect Dewey to do exactly what they think is best. I argue that their project is nowhere close to "real" radicalism. For example, they never address in depth socioeconomic class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation issues - and never at all, U.S. imperialism!

I want to reiterate my concern that the authors are not consistent with what they write about Dewey. An example is their complaints that he was not very interested in what America looked like outside the university and the Laboratory School. However the reader is then told that Dewey's friendship with Jane Addams at Hull House did in fact allow him to experience what the other Chicago was like. The authors also complain that

Dewey did not take seriously the conversion of theory into practice, but, Dewey's pragmatist philosophy embraces this conversion – it is inherent to the procedure. Along with Charles Sanders Peirce and William James, Dewey was an important contributor to this scientific (not scientism) based method of inquiry.³ Dewey's interpretation of science is well known. He endorsed it as the most efficacious way to inquire into problematic situations through rigorous theory construction, and then to see how the theoretical plans worked as they acted upon in the more concrete world. This is why Dewey can be valuable to those who were beyond the liberalism of his time and place.

What more does the authorial trio want from poor Dewey when they cite what the latter presented at the National Educational Society in 1902 namely: “The School as Social Centre”? Dewey said:

I do not feel that the philosophic aspect of the matter is the urgent or important one. *The pressing ... significant thing, is really to make the school a social centre; that is a matter of practice, not of theory* [authors' emphasis added]. Just what to do in order to make the schoolhouse a centre of full and adequate social service to bring it completely into the current of social life, such are the matters, I am sure, which really deserves the attention of the public and that occupy your own minds (p. 34).

Dewey's experiences at Hull House assisted him to understand better how public schools must be more than places for academic growth, but for the education of the whole student. A slogan might read: “Every neighborhood public school a neighborhood settlement house!”

The trio wants Dewey to have been more involved in making his ideas concrete reality. Therefore his verbal commitment in 1902 was apparently not enough. Relatedly, they constantly insist that the “great” national, urban universities, such as Chicago, Penn, Columbia – and perhaps Michigan – should assist school of education students, classroom teachers, and community workers to figure out how they can push theory into actuality. The goal is to provide the best education for each and every student. They also argue that the universities should operate as centers for educating teachers to work in the neighborhood public schools. They do realize that Dewey understood what the “free market” private enterprise economy and its governmental allies – enablers – were doing to block these hopes and plans. The authors believe that the public school system, if it were as Dewey and they wished it to be, could help ordinary working people figure out what to do, given what the powers that be were doing in the early twentieth-century and now in the twenty-first. The civil society they wished to build would be able to rein in governmental and corporate power, wrongdoing, and crime. I have argued in this review, and elsewhere⁴, that the liberal dream was not reality. The weaknesses of social liberal reform were and are the inability to recognize that predatory, totalistic capitalism and its imperial partner would have to be confronted right on.⁵ Another prominent liberal who lived recently in Chicago – President Obama – will have to take the struggle to those who make the dream impossible at this time. Stay tuned!

Chapter 3 addresses “**Dewey Leaves the University of Chicago for Columbia University.**” After leaving in 1904, Dewey allegedly “essentially abandoned any attempt to *develop schooling theory by testing and integrating it with schooling practice* (pp.46-7). Robert Westbrook weighs in: “ ‘He gave up leadership of the collaborative “real school” of philosophy ... and he abandoned the elementary school that was the only practical expression of his philosophy of education’ ” (p. 47). Westbrook also is disappointed that with Dewey’s abandonment others had a field day in interpreting what Dewey said and wanted. Furthermore, those who understood and admired Dewey did not always speak out against those who misunderstood and/or engaged in distortion. However, this is not just specific to Dewey, in fact every important theorist and public intellectual has experienced this misfortune.⁶

Harold Rugg is said to have expressed his disappointment that Dewey abandoned educational reconstruction for reconstruction of philosophy. I can easily understand why Dewey “retreated” to philosophy. It was not very possible to reconstruct the schools in America during his long professional life. I do not criticize what Dewey “lacked”, but believe that if he had understood Marx and the best Marxists better, he could have developed a concept of politics that might have helped Americans understand better what they were – and are still – up against. Dewey never spent any time in jail! He never had to become a refugee! Perhaps he did all that was possible – for him? Ivan Illich and Paul Goodman might connect with Dewey when he wrote that “ ‘As societies become more complex ... the need of formal or intentional teaching and learning increases. [But] ... there is a danger of creating an undesirable split between the experience gained in more direct associations and what is acquired in school’ ” (p. 50). My understanding of this passage is that the institutional school may not ever be the same as the society itself. Perhaps it is better to study the bigger system – or big picture – in order to suggest what schools (really their teachers and administrators) can or should become! Many postmodernists will retort that there is no “big picture,” just small ones. I have addressed this disagreement in many publications, suggesting that a series of small pictures can become a larger mural.

The authors explain that the 1920’s was a decade dominated by the rich and very rich. The Great War had caused many intelligent people to become pessimistic about their power to progressively change politics and economics. “Self-labeled ‘realists’ such as Walter Lippmann and Joseph Schumpeter argued in this vein that democratic theory must be reconstructed along the lines of what later came to be known as ‘elitist democracy’ ” (p. 52). In other words, the oxymoronic elitist democracy meant that ordinary citizens could vote only for elite candidates/blocs – for their “betters.” Some would argue that American “democracy” was never more than this – including in 2009! The three authors are correct to present Dewey as a counter-weight to this authoritarian position. In his *Public and Its Problems* (1927) Dewey attempted to reiterate what he had already written about democracy, but perhaps even going further in the late 1920’s. *Dewey’s Dream* presents passages that get to the “physics” of his commitment to a very radical democracy – if only it could have been achieved by ordinary Americans - from (close to) the bottom up. This is not to claim that Dewey had contacts with working people who would make possible this *rising of the masses*.

However, in that decade the industrial proletariat was always on the defensive. The rise of the *masses* during the 1930's was made possible for many reasons. The 1929 crash and subsequent Great Depression were the most important causes. However, there were many intellectuals and informed wage earner workers who recognized the impending crisis during the "Roaring Twenties." C. A. Bowers explains that during the 1920's Dewey, Thorstein Veblen, and Charles A. Beard came to the conclusion that "laissez-faire capitalism was incompatible with democracy and that the historic clash between the interests of property and democratic forces would end only after centralized planning was adopted" (Bowers 1969, p. 78). This is a socialist point of view! Bowers also informs the reader that a discussion group was formed at Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1927. – and lasted until 1939. Harold Rugg, George Counts, William Kilpatrick, John L. Childs, Bruce Raup, et al. discussed the role of education between the conflicting imperatives of capitalism and democracy. Bowers tells us that Dewey was frequently in attendance.

The fear that America, and other Western "democracies" would become "mass" societies really needs to be seen in the context that the "mass" which conservatives and many liberals feared were in fact most significantly Marx's proletariat. The *masses* needed to be controlled so that red revolutions would not occur. In Italy, Germany, Spain and elsewhere the fascists took care of the "mass" problem!

In the last sentence of chapter 3, the authors write it is ironic that "shortly after 1927, his [Dewey] ideas about schools functioning as fundamentally strategic community school centers were implemented in real-world practice by his former student and continuing protégé, Elsie Clapp" (p. 61). Here is a person who gets it! Not everyone can do everything well. I do not know if Elsie was angry with her mentor for not moving from New York to Jefferson, KY (Ballard School), and/or later Arthurdale, WV (still a Clapp school). My guess is that Clapp did not expect Dewey to do it all. This contradicts the three authors' expectations, and even demands.

Chapter 4 is called: "**Elsie Clapp's Contributions to Community Schools.**" The authors begin with a quote from Clapp [*Community Schools in Action (1939)*]:

The work which is here described is itself a tribute to John Dewey, whose philosophy and whose vision of the school as a social institution prompted our efforts to create a community school and to participate in community education. Although he was in no way responsible for what was done, everything that we have learned from our experiences in this attempt we learned in a special sense from him (p. 63).

In my view, this passage from Clapp undermines most of what this slim volume under review intends to argue and establish. It is interesting to know what the authors' titles are – at least when they wrote the book under review. Benson is Emeritus Professor of History, University of Pennsylvania Graduate School; Harkavy is Associate Vice

President and Director of the Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania; and Puckett is Associate Professor in the Policy, Management, and Evaluation Division of the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. The job titles do not sound like these authors are “in the field,” at the “frontlines,” or in the thick of the battles going on in these United States, where one has to put their careers and even safety on the line. I do not know what positions the authors’ had prior to the 2007 book. My doctoral mentor at the University of Michigan, G. Max Wingo, wrote in his *Philosophies of Education: An Introduction* (1974): “To Mary [his wife], who spends her days in the schools doing the things her husband mostly talks about.” An honest person! The “talking” and writing he offered helped me to think about school and society issues. Moreover this “helped” get me into “trouble,” based on the comparison between what Wingo thought was good schooling and education and what the high schools in which I labored were like.

How powerful do the authors think Dewey was? They claim that “unwittingly, by using his great prestige to ... channel progressive educational programs and energies into rural schools ... Dewey significantly contributed to the post-World War II debacle of American schools and ... cities” (p. 67). Perhaps the authors lacked the space to go beyond this simplistic causal conclusion. My view is that the authors think that they represent “radical” democracy for school and society, even though almost everything they include in this book is about elite universities, foundations’ help, full professors, higher education, educational leadership and so forth. Many manual (blue, pink and even low paid white collar) workers might label them as the “suits.” Furthermore, there is much evidence that colleges and universities are moving incessantly toward privileging big science, technology, sophisticated “vocational” education, business colleges, and perhaps increasing liaisons with the governmental entities that deal with unending wars.

The America that Dewey lived in did not provide many opportunities for him to be a theorist **and** activist - certainly not the kind of activist who risked prison or worse. Dewey was an Anglo-American who was convinced that he also needed to appeal to the powerful people in the corporations and governments. He worked in Ann Arbor, Chicago, New York – places where it was easier to be recognized. Allegedly, he had a son who was a stockbroker. From Columbia to Wall Street is not very far. The authors appear to be members of that crowd – not necessarily ethnic, but with regard to university positions. Dewey hardly ever called capitalism by its name – if at all – and neither do the authors. Dewey brushed Marx’s importance aside. Perhaps if he would have had access to the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844 written by the young Marx, Dewey may have understood more about “authentic radicalism” going beyond Anglo-American liberalism?⁷ I write this with the realization that Dewey did go beyond many of the borders that a person like himself may not have thought of, or had the bravery to confront.

Part II

I chose not to write very much about this section that includes four chapters. This is because I think those readers who may find them of great interest are few and specialized. They will be treated to the nuts and bolts of what the three authors have done with regard to their project centered at the University of Pennsylvania. Chapter 5 is called “**Penn and the Third Revolution in American Higher Education**,” followed by 6, “**The Center for Community Partnerships**,” 7 “**The University Civic Responsibility Idea Becomes an International Movement**,” and finally, 8, “**John Dewey, the Coalition for Community Schools, and Developing a Participatory Democratic American Society**.” What I want to address is my concern about the authors’ beliefs with regard to what they and their allies have allegedly accomplished. Given the book’s copyright date, 2007, it is difficult not to be skeptical with regard to the authors’ optimism. Their use of terms such as “radical,” and “revolutionary,” within contexts of programs supported by foundations and elite universities causes this reviewer to ask: which world are the authors living in? For example, their use of the word “democracy” in America and other so-called “capitalist democracies” needs explanation. These problems in Part II are joined by excessive repetition and unclear chronology.

The authors write of the great progress they and their allies have made, only to then admit that there is so much more to do. Here is an example:

We emphasize that we view the ‘third revolution’ as still in its early - very early – stages.... But things are changing in the right direction. One indicator ... is the accelerating number of universities and colleges ... that now publicly proclaim their desire to collaborate actively with their neighboring public schools and local communities. Predictably to date, public proclamations of collaboration far surpass tangible, interactive, mutually respectful and beneficial collaboration, but progress is being made (p. 79).

The authors do not mention the conservative and religious successful drive to privatize K4-12 schools! And then they mention John Gardner’s view that corporations have been trying to decentralize their businesses; moreover, Gardner praises the governments for following the corporate lead. This does not sound like a “radical revolution” in progress – not even radical.” When Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House in the 1990’s his reactionary “Reaganesque” plan blew up in his face because most Americans were frightened by right-wing “radicalism.” The authors cannot be blamed for the lack of anticipating the 2008, and onto 2009, economic crash in the U.S.; however, one might think that these ambitiously “radical” scholars would have understood that the drive to let capitalists regulate themselves could lead to events that John Dewey would not have liked.

The “neo-Deweyan strategy” the authors present is better than the continuing essentialist and conservative grip on so many K4-12 schools, both public and private. However, because of the way they present the reading material it appears that all these meetings, committees, foundations, successes and failures suggest a bit of “little to do about not too much”! The authors might be surprised what the articles published in the journal called

Rethinking Schools have to offer. This journal provides a more accurate picture of what our schools are like, as well as what can and/or **should** be done. *Dewey's Dream* lacks addressing the need for broad, solidaristic agency in order to overcome the mountains of anti-democratic institutions and practices. Where are the mass actions required to seriously and effectively combat capitalism, imperialism, and liberalism itself – in its American dominant form?⁸ Their criticism of Dewey and his alleged failures to battle for change on the ground looks very shaky and perhaps even unfair. The authors are not radical community street organizers as were labor unionists in the 1930s – and even now. They pose little, if any, threat to the still existing far right dispensations that control the U.S. and all too many of its “capitalist democracy” allies.

I agree with the authors' view on how public schools are situated in American society and how crucial this is with regard to their quasi-Deweyan project. They reiterate that public means belonging to all the members of a community and that means the schools should serve all its members.

More than any other institution, public schools are particularly well suited, therefore, to function as neighborhood ‘hubs’ or ‘centers,’ around which local partnerships can be generated and developed. When they play that innovative role, schools function as community institutions *par excellence*. They then provide a decentralized, democratic community-based response to rapidly changing community problems. In the process, they help young people learn better, at increasingly higher levels, through action-oriented, collaborative, real-world problem solving (p. 85).

They are aware that there are other public places wherein education for all can and does occur, libraries and museums are examples.

Going beyond the authors I bring the following passage from Svi Shapiro's idea of the “welfare educational state.”

Receiving its impetus from progressive notions of the ‘whole child,’ the assertion that the ability to learn is inseparable from the satisfaction of an individual's physical and emotional needs has permeated the popular consciousness. Successful schooling is understood as necessarily linked to the provision of a much broader set of social services: adequate health care and access to preventive treatment; the availability of adequate food and nutritional resources; the opportunity to alleviate emotional and mental distress; and the provision of an adequate home and physical environment. In short, [public] school has become a major focus of, and the ideology of education of the whole child a major justification for, the extension of social rights and the provisions of the welfare state (Shapiro 1990, pp. 143-4).

My chapter contribution to *Education and Hope in Troubled Times* is called: “Capitalism's Continuing Attempts to Dominate Civil Society, Culture and Schools: What Should Be Done.” I argue that Shapiro's logic takes us beyond: “educational

rights... and are used to demand adequate jobs and income for the student's parents. He understands that this democratic project is capable of pressuring the capital state (central and subsidiary) because the state and its schools are situated between the imperatives of capitalism and democracy" (Shapiro 2009, p. 118). The book under review does not provide, in Section II, the breadth and depth that its authors need in order to make a convincing case for their mostly optimistic presentation of the community schools and university collaborators' successes. As I write this what comes to mind is: no wonder that Dewey did not want to work with some of those who call themselves the "carry-out of theory" people! In conclusion and repetition: not many people can be a John Dewey. So let us honor him for what he has contributed and use the tools (resources of rationality) he introduced to us.

References

- Bowers, C.A. (1969). *The Progressive Educator and the Depression: The Radical Years*. New York: Random House.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Shapiro, H. S. (1990). *Between Capitalism and Democracy: Educational Policy and the Crises of the Welfare State*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Shapiro, H. S. (Ed.) (2009). *Education and Hope in Troubled Times: Visions of Change for Our Children's World*. New York and London: Routledge.

Notes

¹ This article can be found in: *Notes & Abstracts in American and International Education*, 98 (Fall 2004), 1-22); and on-line in: *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 2 (September 2004).

² I have argued in many of my publications that Dewey makes the cut as a bona fide radical educator and political thinker. His grasp of what was wrong with capitalism – especially as early as the 1920s – allows him to be considered as one who sees economics as central to radical democracy. Here are three examples of my work. *The Relationship of Dewey's Pedagogy to His Concept of Community*. University of Michigan Social Foundations of Education Monograph Series number 4 (1972); *A Radical Democratic Critique of Capitalist Education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing (1994); *Philosophical Scaffolding for the Construction of Critical Democratic Education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing (2000). Professor S. D'Urso thought that Dewey should have been the schoolmaster of Marx's radical democracy!

³ See G. Max Wingo, *Philosophies of Education: An Introduction* (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 1974). Specifically, chapter 7, "American Pragmatism and the Liberal Protest."

⁴ "Marxist Thought: Still *Primus Inter Pares* for Understanding and Opposing the Capitalist System," *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (May 2008), www.jceps.com/?page_ID=article&articleID=113. 2. Marxism, Still the Best

Hunter of the Predatory, Capitalism: A Review of *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Education, Workplace* 6.1, Feb. 2004,
www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue6pl/brosio.html

⁵ Jonathan Freedland informs readers that Diego Garcia, the largest island in the Indian Ocean's Chagos archipelago, has become part of the U.S. global imperial military bases. Britain turned over its base to the U.S. and, the Anglo-American project resulted in a removal of the native population. Supporters of American imperialism tirelessly tell us that it does not operate as earlier European colonial powers did, namely their flag flying over the native people. Freedland praises David Vine, and his book: *Island of Shame: The Secret History of the US Military Base on Diego Garcia*, as follows: "Above all, it serves as a case study for the way contemporary empire operates, exploding the myth that the US differs from its British, Spanish, and Roman predecessors by eschewing both the brute conquest of land and the dispossession of those unfortunate enough to get in the way" (2009). *The New York Review of Books*, 56 (May, 28), 25-27. The passage above is from p. 27. Noam Chomsky, Michael Parenti, David Harvey, Ellen Meiksins Wood, Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, et al. are writers and public intellectuals who understand well the Diego Garcia empire project.

⁶ I have included Westbrook in my *Philosophical Scaffolding for the Construction of Critical Democratic Education*. **Chapter 4** is called: "Saved by a Method: Science, Dewey, the Progressive Protest – And a Whiff of Reconstruction." I agree with Westbrook (p. 152) where he writes that Dewey lacked a political strategy for achieving what he thought (not too systematically) should be done. He had no powerful forces behind him. Said differently, he lacked the politics to carry forward his good ideas. Given who Dewey was, is this surprising? He was not enlisted in the more red politics of the 1930s, for example the CIO. He was not a communist. I consider him a liberal who was moving at least to some form of socialism. See p. 152: "I contend that neither educational theorists nor practitioners have, in any important way, gone beyond the impressive analysis constructed by Dewey and the progressives with regard to educating the whole person for participation in the civic affairs of society." I continue to be angry with Benson, et al. for the kind of critique they have made of Dewey and what he should have done! This especially because I do not believe their book takes us any further than a dressed up liberalism for the early part of this century. Their project is no threat to the powers that be in the US and the world today.

⁷ See: Richard A. Brosio, "One Marx, and the Centrality of the Historical Actor(s)" *Educational Theory*, 35 (Winter 1985), 73-83.

⁸ Immanuel Wallerstein argues in (*After Liberalism* (New York: The New Press, 1995) that historical liberalism has been non- and even anti-bona fide deep democracy. In his chapter 14 – "The Agonies of Liberalism" he provides the following. Liberalism "was not fundamentally antistatist, since its real priority was rational reformism. [However] liberalism was fundamentally antidemocratic. Liberalism was always an aristocratic doctrine; it preached the 'rule of the best.' Liberals did not define 'best' primarily by birth status; they defined it rather by educational achievement. But the best was always a group smaller than the whole. Democracy was the objective of the radicals, not the liberals It was to prevent this group [radicals] from prevailing that liberalism was put forward as an ideology. And when liberals spoke to those of

conservative bent who were resistant to proposed reforms, the liberals always asserted that only rational reformism could bar the coming of democracy....” (p. 257). George Scialabba provides a somewhat more generous view of liberalism in his article, “Only Words” *The Nation* 288 (May 11, 2009): 32-5). “Liberalism has always stood, at least in theory, for government accountability and citizen participation, for broadly based prosperity and the absence of class hierarchy, for social solidarity and against exploitation, domestic or international. It has always been proto-socialist. [However] it needs to affirm those values far more explicitly and emphatically” (p. 35).

Other Works Considered

Brosio, R. A. (1998). Citizenship Education Democracy (review of David T. Sehr’s *Education for Public Democracy*). *Educational Studies*, 29, 303-307.

Cooper, K. & White, R. (2006). *The Practical Critical Educator*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Johnston, J. S. (2004). Authority, Inquiry, and Education: A Response to Dewey’s Critics. *Educational Studies*, 35, 230-247.

Margonis, F. (1995). John Dewey: Organic Intellectual of the Middle Class. *Philosophy of Education 1994*, 302-305.

All of the authors. (2004). Critiques of John Dewey. *Journal of Thought* 39 3, 3-150.