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THE UNIVERSITY AS PROPHET, SCIENCE AS ITS MESSENGER, AND DEMOCRACY AS ITS REVELATION

John Dewey, University of Chicago President William Rainey Harper, and Colonel Francis Parker

INTRODUCTION

I started this essay by thinking that Dewey’s departure from University of Chicago in 1904 would illuminate the conflict about the social purposes of the university and science that was a “hot” topic as the U.S. welfare state formed at the turn of the twentieth century in what is called Progressivism. The reform movements were sharply debated as to what paths to engage American enlightenment hopes of freedom, liberty, and progress in the new industrialism and conditions of the city. Biographically the seemingly authoritarian style of the president of the University of Chicago, William Rainey Harper, in university governance, the incorporation of Colonel Francis Parker’s Chicago Institute of Education and laboratory school into the University through a large donation, and the failure of President Harper to install Alice Dewey as the school principal had all the titillating marks from which to write an exposé as Dewey abruptly left Chicago for New York City’s Columbia University.

Biographical notes and personalities play as an academic voyeurism that is something like visiting the Playboy website. Living vicariously through someone else’s troubles was, however, why I decided against psychology as my undergraduate major and went to the study of history! My biographical charge dissipated, and I ended with something less erotic than the voyeurism. I thought of Dewey, Harper, and Parker as conceptual personae rather than as particular creative authors (see, e.g., Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994). Their writings presented themselves as enunciating particular solutions and plans for action that went beyond the philosophical ideas of any of the three individuals. The conjunction of three authors gives focus to the mission of the nation as a republic through a particular language of science and redemption. The new “modern” university, to borrow phrases from the three protagonists, is to perform as prophet of society, science as the messenger, democracy as the revelation, and schooling as the site for delivering the message of salvation. The university’s mission, I will argue, intersected with those of the reform movements of U.S. Progressivism (circa 1880-1920).

The initial reading of Harper, Dewey, and Parker as biographical narratives at the University of Chicago organizes the first section. The second section refocuses
on the notion of conceptual personae to think about the rules and standards of reason (systems of reason) that give intelligibility to the mission undertaken. The third section textually analyzes the texts as they link enlightenment beliefs in philosophy and science to the new university expertise that serves the reform movements of progressivism. The university, to use Harper’s word, is “the priest” that provides the knowledge of social change. The secular mission of the university combined Christian ethics and science in providing the “revelations”, to use Dewey’s phrase, that enable democratic modes of living. The fourth section explores the intersection of the practices of science and Protestant salvation themes as they are inscribed in narratives of the nation and its promise of progress and universal progress. The New Psychology and the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools provide concrete technologies that are to serve to change society by having more efficient theories and techniques. The final and fifth section examines the reason about change and science as simultaneous enlightenment hopes and fears of the threats to the envisioned future.

The argument is a cartography of the making of “the modern self” that circulated in American Progressivism and particularly pragmatism. In a sense, I play with the title of Dewey’s (1910) book, How We Think, by asking about the grid of practices through which the “reason” about philosophy, science and psychology, and democracy are ordered historically as principles of “thought” and action. To talk about Dewey, Harper, and Parker, then, is to think about what historically travels through their writing as the subject of history.

AN EXCURSUS INTO WHY I ASK WHAT I ASK

My interest is historically in the system of reason that orders and classifies what is known and knowable in the works of Dewey, Harper, and Parker. The idea of reason as historical and as an object of study is easily grasped, I think, if we look at the notions of reason in Ancient Greece. Reason was tied to a cyclical history, with no notion of cause or development. The past was the most truthful for giving guidance to the present, as its wisdom came from the gods. Looking to the “future” was to engage in hubris as people sought something that only the gods could give. The Medieval Church placed “reason” in finding God. History was universal and outside the province of humans, as God owned time. People who sought to control development were engaging in heresy. Looking at the East, Chinese reason, in contrast, embodied narratives and images of things in motion and of relations in which people had no privileged position, no conceptions of metaphysics or representation so dear to Western philosophy. In a provocative and insightful analysis, Jullien (2000/2007) asks why Western art has nude paintings but in Chinese art nude paintings are not found. His answer is that Chinese communication and ethical questions are generated through an indirectness and detours that give attention to the renewal of things and its regulations. This is in contrast to Western analytics, which is direct in approaching reality. That directness assumes the ontological givenness of object of the representations and its essences.3
Why this excursus in order to arrive at Dewey, Harper, and Parker? The “answer” requires going back to the notion of conceptual personae. These words are not merely there for educators to “grasp” some reality to act on and, to use a common phrase, “to get desired outcomes.” The words about reform and change appear in a grid of historically formed rules and standards that shape and fashion what is said, thought, and acted on. Circulating in the writings of Dewey, Harper, and Parker is an assemblage of different historical practices about the American enlightenment, the cosmopolitan citizen, and the ordering of life through rationalizing and taming of uncertainty. Further, the practices described (re)vision Calvinist interests in rescuing the “soul” for a moral and ethical life. Interrogating the threesome brings to the surface particular qualities and characteristics of planning and ordering “modern” life and its individuality that can provide a way to think about American Progressive reform movements.  

As a historical project, two further comments are needed. The different principles are assembled, connected, and disconnected in particular historical practices that have no single origin. Further, whereas I focus on texts, my agreement will help to dispel the fashionable differentiation between text and context, ideas and the real, certainty/uncertainty, and rationality from the sublime. The legacy of these distinctions end up upon after all is said and done not very “real” or practical, as it denies the dialogic logic between ideas as “things” and “things.” Texts are not only texts, as they are inscriptions that shape and fashion cultural theses about modes of life.

WHO ARE AND HOW DO THESE PEOPLE INTERSECT IN THE HISTORY TO BE TOLD?

The following briefly discusses the connection of Harper, Dewey, and Parker in the University of Chicago. My intent is to contextualize biography and institution as a prelude to the following sections that speak to the particular solutions and plans for action through which the missions of their projects intersected with progressivism.

William Rainey Harper: University of Chicago President (1891-1906)

The current University of Chicago was established in 1891 through the initiation of the Baptist Education Society and grants primarily from John D. Rockefeller. That Society sought to resuscitate the original university founded in 1857 but which had closed down a few years earlier for financial reasons (Menand, 2001, p. 285).

Serving as president of the new university from 1891 to 1906 was William Rainey Harper. Harper was born in Ohio in 1856 and was a leading biblical scholar. He attended Hyde Park Baptist Church and was considered “faithful and zealous” (Goodspeed, 1928, p. 171). Harper was also a member of the Chicago Board of Education for two years, and chair of the Education Commission of the City (Goodspeed, 1928, p. 173).

Harper wanted to establish a great western university in Chicago that would be as important as those on the East Coast. He initially had trouble recruiting and had to provide higher salaries ($7,000 late in 1891; chairs of department at $15,000).
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Harper recruited faculty from Clark University, where there was strong dissatisfaction with its president, G. Stanley Hall. The faculty included nine women (Goodspeed, 1928, pp. 120-129).

Harper was considered to be authoritarian in his running of the university. The faculty thought that Harper was duplicitous; partly because he was autocratic, partly because he was worried about the benefactor John D. Rockefeller, and partly because he wanted to experiment and did not always accept his faculty’s judgments and programs (Ryan, 1995, p. 121).

Two of Harper’s legacies as president of the University were the establishment of the first department of sociology in the United States, the University of Chicago Press, and the first extension service for students to attend classes that could not otherwise because of their work schedules.

_Dewey, Head of Philosophy and Pedagogy Departments, University of Chicago (1893-1904)._ Dewey came to the Department of Philosophy in the 1893-1894 year, as the university was planning for graduate studies. Dewey was the fourth choice for the position and had a low salary of $4,000 (Ryan, 1995, p. 123; also see Martin, 2002, p. 139). In 1894-1895, Dewey had a joint appointment in philosophy and as professor and head of the new department of pedagogy, later called the department of education. The university catalogue listed both departments under the same number. The education department was “to train competent specialists for the broad and scientific treatment of educational problems” (Storr, 1966, p. 297). That training was considered as a type of graduate work and a higher quality of training than found in normal schools where teacher education typically occurred (Storr, 1966, pp. 297-298).

In 1896, an elementary school opened as an adjunct to Dewey’s department. Dewey became the director of a professional school in 1902. Its purpose was to train leaders in education. The Laboratory School was to modify the educational atmosphere and prepare for change.

Harper and Dewey thought of the school as a scientific laboratory. Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, one of the founders of the University and member of its board of trustees, wrote that Harper considered the establishment of the School of Education with Dewey at its head as constituting “one of the great triumphs of President Harper’s administration” (Goodspeed, 1928, pp. 183-184). Harper asserted that the work in the elementary school was as important as any laboratory in the university through the contribution it made to the public school system (Storr, 1966, p. 299). Harper, for example, reported the assessment of Dr. B. A. Hinsdale of the University of Michigan, who was a pioneer in the academic study of education. Hinsdale’s assessment of the Laboratory School was “more eyes were fixed upon the school than upon any other elementary school in the country” (Storr, 1966, p. 298).

The school was a constant source of financial anxiety for Dewey, as it had no endowment and only a small amount from the university. Dewey did receive a small amount of support from Anita Emmons Blaine, heiress of the McCormick
agricultural machinery (Ryan, 1995, p.120-121). When Dewey suggested to Harper that the trustees should give more money to the school, Harper told Dewey that the trustees would probably disband it, if the request went to them (Storr, 1966, p. 299).  

Conflict between Harper and Dewey occurred in the governance of the university. Harper wanted control of the university’s programs, which Dewey resented as interference by the benefactors and an administration that he considered dictatorial (Storr, 1966, p. 339). Dewey warned about conformity under a bureaucratic government and its threats to the development of a democratic university (Storr, 1966, pp. 338-341). When Harper sought approval of a policy to divide the faculty of arts, literature, and science into separate schools, for example, Dewey felt that the reforms were to partition power. He thought of it as the method of ward politicians to bottle up faculty into different pockets that Harper could control. Power, he thought, should be held in the faculty senate (Storr, 1966, p. 336).

Colonel Francis Parker, “Father of Progressive Education” and Teacher Educator, University of Chicago-Almost (1902)

Colonel Francis Parker was brought to Quincy, Massachusetts, by Charles Francis Adams and instituted what became known as the Quincy Plan. Adams argued that schools should prepare graduates for modern life and not through a curriculum devoted to Greek or Latin. He had the Quincy school board conduct an annual school examination and found that students knew grammar but could not write letters, could read from textbooks but not read from unfamiliar sources, and they spelled correctly but their handwriting was illegible (Cremin, 1962, p. 129).

Parker’s reform produced a synthesis that marked a transition from early American transcendentalism to a scientific pedagogy, and from a dependence on European formulations to a more indigenous effort (Cremin, 1962, p. 134). The twin goals of the reform for Parker were to improve teaching and to check expenses.

Parker emphasized the social qualities of teaching, as did Dewey. Parker believed that schools should be organized as “a model home, a complete community and embryonic democracy” (cited in Zilversmit, 1993, p. 3). Parker argued that the foundation of teachers’ practice should be the child’s natural curiosity and eagerness. He drew on European Romantic education notions as he adapted the works of Froebel and Pestalozzi into an education of “complete living” whose “methods draw on mother-play, as its ideal” (Parker, 1899/1902, p. 762). The teacher was a coworker with children, starting from the child’s experiences, leading and extending understandings and sensitivities.

The pedagogy was child-centered. Using the Committee of Ten Report of the reorganization of the high school, Parker argued that the school should be a common one in which there should be no class distinctions (Krug, 1989, p. 68). He emphasized the importance of starting with the interests of the child. Teaching emphasized a hands-on approach through the use of manipulates and learning from “things” (Parker, 1886). The children created their own “Reading Leaflets” that
reflected their first-hand knowledge of, for example, the surrounding countryside. Reading Leaflets replaced primers and textbooks, with children creating their own stories from their field trips and laboratory investigations as science (Cremin, 1962, pp. 132-133).

Parker came to Chicago to head the Cook County Normal School and then directed the Chicago Institute of Education. An important innovation was the teacher training class, where the new teacher combined observation, practice teaching, and instruction, an innovation that today is called student teaching and practicums.

Dewey hailed Parker as the father of progressive education (Krug, 1989, p. 9). Colonel Francis Parker and Dewey met in Boston. Dewey sent his children to Parker’s Cook County Normal School and generally supported the work of Parker (West, 1989, p. 84). Dewey adopted Parker’s view that school should be set up as a miniature community of existing social life. The key to this community was for children to learn a mode of living. The principles of participation were to constitute a simplified democratic community. The child was to participate in the cooperative activities and problem solving. Dewey rejected the sentimentalism about childhood innocence that Parker had; nor did he share the conviction of the importance of stages of child development that Parker drew from G. Stanley Hall (Ryan, 1995, pp. 348-349).

Blaine’s “Gift”: Dewey, Harper, and Parker’s University School

The heiress Mrs. Anita Emmons Blaine provided a $1 million endowment to the University of Chicago for a teacher training institute and an attached elementary school under Parker’s direction in 1899. In 1901, the University acquired the Chicago Institute of Education with its own training school. Parker’s program, staff, and model of reform were to be transferred to the control of an independent board of trustees in the university. In the interval, Harper sought to arrange a merger of the institute with the new division of the School of Education. Harper had to reassure Parker that the work of the Cook County Normal School would not be hampered when put into the larger university system of education. Harper also undertook to bring two secondary schools into the School of Education: the Chicago Manual Training School and the South Side Academy. Harper envisioned the new organization as having vertical integration as in industry (Storr, 1966, p. 301).

Parker was given charge of the University’s School Education that embraced Parker Elementary and teacher training program; Dewey was director of the Laboratory School and departmental work in which the lab school originated. That created two different laboratory schools. One was the University Elementary School (the Dewey School) and the other as the University Elementary School of the Blaine Foundation (Storr, 1966, p. 302). Harper also expressed his desire for Dewey to expand his work to the high school.

Parker died before the school was incorporated into the university (1902). At this point, the lack of clarity of the relationship between Dewey’s chair of pedagogy and the teacher training program produced discontent (Ryan, 1995, p.
There was also some dismay and confusion for Dewey in the existence of the two University Elementary Schools. Dewey suggested combining Parker’s elementary school with Dewey’s Laboratory School.

To complicate this part of the story a bit more, Blain had previously subsidized the publication of The School and Society, which Dewey dedicated to her and, as reported above, she had given Dewey money for his Laboratory School. Dewey did not have good relations with Wilbur Jackman, who headed the School of Education until Parker’s death. Jackman and the teachers of the school felt that Dewey slighted faculty of the School of Education by calling them mere trainers of teachers. Within this context also, Dewey appointed his wife Alice as the principal of the new school without consulting anyone after Parker’s death. Harper, for his part, did not make clear at first to the Deweys that the appointment of Alice was incorrect and would be on an interim basis only. The decision, however, alienated John Dewey (Ryan, 1995, p. 154). Menand sees the conflict over Dewey’s wife as central in Dewey’s decision to move to Columbia University in 1904 (Menand, 2001, p. 332).

PROGRESSIVISM, AMERICAN ENLIGHTENMENT DREAMS, AND SCIENCE IN THE PURSUIT OF DEMOCRACY

Dewey, Harper, and Parker provide a way to understand the emergence of particular institutional practices and the expertise of social planning that ordered American Progressivism. The new university generated the scientific knowledge for planning reforms that were to change society by changing people.\textsuperscript{11}

The different reform movements of Progressivism created the modern welfare state and marked the end of the laissez faire and notions of positive liberty where government refrained from interference in markets. Earlier nineteenth-century Jacksonian agrarian populism was (re)visioned into the notion of government in care of its populations.\textsuperscript{12} Labor laws, social security programs, public administration of transportation, energy, and health, among others, were enacted to change the conditions of people of the city produced by urbanization and industrialization.

But the Progressive reforms were not merely the creation of institutions and social structures. They were made reasonable through new forms of knowledge. This is evident in the universities.\textsuperscript{13} No longer as a site of merely reproducing knowledge, the university was to produce scientific knowledge that worked for a more progressive society. Midwestern universities (Michigan, Wisconsin, and Chicago, for example) incorporated the John Hopkins’ “German Science model” of higher education with the Napoleonic polytechnic model of education and the older English Cardinal Newman university system of educating elites. The resulting university expressed the general democratic populism of Progressivism. The university was to promote civic responsibilities, enable progress, promote human happiness, and provide policies, theories, and programs to grapple with the urban moral disorder (see, e.g., McCarthy, 1912). The theories and methods of social and educational science were to provide professional expertise that was “in service of the democratic ideal” (McCarthy, 1912).
Harper, Dewey, and Parker were among the “first” and “second generation” of professionalized intellectuals who had a university position to pursue science as a paid career. New departments and schools, for example, were created in the social sciences to guide and assess reform efforts. Dewey’s position in Chicago’s Department of Education was to design the Lab Schools and to develop scientific knowledge for professionalizing teaching (see, e.g., Mattingly, 1977).

THE UNIVERSITY “IN SERVICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL”

The trope of democracy gives attention to the contribution and significance of the knowledge produced in the university. As recognized in the founding of the republic, the citizen is made and not born, and republican forms of government require participation to govern. The university in this context of Progressivism bears the double quality of the modern welfare state in “care of populations.” It provides disciplined and systematic knowledge to assist policy across different social, cultural and economic arenas. And the university was to provide the theories and methods to change people in the name of the democratic ideal.

Harper (1905) thought of the university in terms of enlightenment ideas that, in some ways, capture Kant’s notion of guardians. The mission of the university, Harper argued, was to contribute to the progress of humanity through enabling a better and higher national life. The university would serve as “an institution of government, the guide of the people, and as an ally of humanity in its struggle for advancement” (Harper, 1905, p. 1) of human civilization. No hesitation about universalizing to all of humanity from the particular! The development of society, Harper continued, required guidance that would enable the evolution of “humanity, in its slow and tortuous progress toward a higher civilization” (Harper, 1905, p. 1).

The metaphor of “priest” gave expression to the position of the university’s identification of the universal rules that harmonize and solidarity humanity, a word that capitalized on Harper’s scholarly background in religion. The priestly function was spoken about as universal enlightenment principles of the cosmopolitan citizen who acts to provide for the conditions of human progress. The university was:

…the priest, whose great duty it is to enlarge the vision of his followers, takes infinite trouble to teach men that the ties of humanity are not limited to those of home and country, but extend to all the world; for all men are brothers. Human kind is one. And now the university stands as mediator between one country and another far remote. …The inner secrets of the soul of humanity (not a single man), of mankind (not a nation) are the subjects of study and of proclamation. (Harper, 1905, p. 27)

The freedom of the soul is secular and catholic in character so that the individual has “the right of free utterance” (Harper, 1905, p. 4). Communion and redemption of the soul is in the use of reason:

The university, like the priest, leads those who place themselves under its influence, whether they live within or without the university walls, to enter into close communion with their own souls – a communion possible only where opportunity is offered for meditative leisure. (Harper, 1905, p. 23)
The knowledge produced by the university is “the keeper, for the church of the democracy, of holy mysteries, of sacred and significant traditions. These are of such character that if touched by profane hands they would be injured” (Harper, 1905, p. 24).

The guardian of civic virtue, democracy, and progress is philosophy and science. Philosophy makes apparent the common good. The university is “the philosopher of democracy, because it and it alone furnishes the opportunity for the study” (Harper, 1905, p. 33) of the problems that form the bases of democratic progress. Harper turned to Thomas Jefferson as “the great apostle of democracy” through which to think about the university as “important in identifying the laws which regulate intercourse of nations, and harmonize and promote interests of society” and enable “the importance of public property and individual happiness” (Harper, 1905, p. 33).

The hierarchical placement of philosophy is not surprising. Even today I hear philosophers talk about their discipline as the pinnacle of all knowledge because it is presumed to ask the most fundamental questions about life. That belief in Harper’s time had currency in moral philosophy taught by the presidents of the elite East Coast universities as the final mandatory class for all students (Harper attended Yale University). Philosophy was presumed to be the culmination of all learning, the pathway for the moral life that brought one closest to God. Harper’s pronouncement links the theological moral life to the new empirical natural laws found by science.

Philosophy was tied to an anthropological psychology that forms Dewey’s pragmatism. The science and philosophy, however, was not merely cognitive. It entails a sublime through which the political form functions as an aesthetic and as a sense of beauty. Philosophy is scientific, Dewey argues, but not as a distinctive form of knowledge that “somehow knows reality more ultimately than do the other sciences” (Dewey, 1918/1967-1990, p. 41). Philosophy is “a form of desire, of effort at action – a love, namely, of wisdom”, “an intellectual wish, an aspiration subjected to rational discriminations and tests, a social hope reduced to a working program of action, a prophesy of the future, but one disciplined by serious thought and knowledge” (p. 42).

The sublime is evident through the overlap of a moral ideal (the belief in “the love,” “wisdom,” “wish,” and “aspiration”) with science in enabling action (agency) that secures individual happiness and the common good. The disposition to act embodied in the sublime is central in a world that has no certainty. That conditionality, Dewey argues, impels a new individuality as the idea of a universe that is not all closed and settled, that is still in some respects indeterminate and in the making, that is adventurous, and that implicates all who share in it, whether by acting or believing, in its own perils (cf. Dewey, 1927/1929, p. 439).

Parker, although having none of the theoretical armaments of Dewey and Harper, embodied the principles of pragmatism in the instrument practices to construct teacher education as a professionalized activity. The Quincy school and teacher education brought together American enlightenment notions of reason and science in the training of the teacher. “The faculty of the normal school,” Parker argued, is to be “a body of earnest, devoted students of education, who believed
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that human progress is co-ordinate with educational progress, and that human progress depends upon education as its fundamental and intrinsic factor” (Parker, 1899/1902, p. 753). The notion of human progress in education was tied to the new sciences of child study and development. Parker, in contrast to Dewey, has a sentimental enthusiasm for childish innocence embodied in every stage of child development, drawing on G. Stanley Hall’s study of children’s growth and development (Ryan, 1995, p. 348-349).

To summarize, the new university disciplines of philosophy, science (psychology), and pedagogy gave focus to American enlightenment themes about reason and science. The belief in science was to replace entrenched traditions, yet at the same time installed a new assembly of faith with science as the motor of progress. The new university knowledge was phrased as in “the service of the democratic ideal.” Harper’s university as “priest,” Dewey’s pragmatism combining philosophy and social psychology, and Parker’s teacher education were to make “earnest” and “devoted” people in the governing of the democracy. West (1989) argues, for example, that whereas Dewey was critical of the rise of professionalism, yet he remained its proponent and promoter: “He was convinced that the only way in which America could acquire a core and coherence was by producing and cultivating critical intelligence by experts” (p. 84).

DEMOCRACY IN SALVATION NARRATIVES OF PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE

The formation of the republic in the eighteenth century overlapped religious and political discourses as individuality shifted from the subject of the Sovereign to that of the self-governing citizen. The republic joined “the health of the soul and the regeneration of the Christian and the virtuous citizen, exultation of the divine and the celebration of design” (Ferguson, 1997, p. 43). Proclaiming that “all men” had the same common nature had particular Calvinistic boundaries concerning who had instinctive capacity for moral judgments through theology (see, e.g., Wood, 1999, p. 41). Their idea of the nation drew on Puritan salvation themes of “the city on the hill” and “errand into the wilderness.” The new Republic was fulfilling the role of a New Israel, with individuals creating the greater corporate mission (McKnight, 2003, p. 25). America was the home of the chosen people, a radical “otherness” in which the nation’s citizens were the “racially elect” (Glaude, 2000).

The religious language of salvation and redemption across the work of Dewey, Harper, and Parker should not be surprising. The commitment to identifying paths for human perfectibility through democracy merged notions of science and philosophy with salvation themes about Protestant (Calvinist) ethics. The ethics is discussed in the first part below. Democracy and Christianity as a mode of life are thought of as the same. The second part focuses on the notion of community as providing the conditions for moral actions. The language of patriotism is used by Harper to connect the democracy as the search for truth and the nation, the latter as the embodiment of the democratic life constituted by agency, participation, and community.
THE UNIVERSITY AS PROPHET

THE ETHICS OF PROTESTANT REFORMISM AND SCIENCE

Whereas Darwinist influences in the United States replaced scripture with nature, philosophy, and social science, religion was never left behind. Protestant themes of reform were embodied in the belief that society could be perfected by education, most strongly by the moral sciences through which the somewhat flawed nature of man could be understood and directed toward the common good (Jack, 1989, p.193). The resulting mode of life would bring infinite progress and morally righteous and productive lives to the civic world. Harper, for example, viewed democracy "as the highest ideal of human achievement" and "the glorious and gold sun lighting up the dark places of all the world" (Harper, 1905, p. 1). The site of that achievement was the nation. It serves as "the great temple of democracy." It adopts "Enlightenment …purpose and holy enthusiasm" in the making of “loyalty to truth, and true loyalty” (Harper, 1905, p. 25).

The language of loyalty is also one of patriotism that is a scaled virtue. For the republic to work, it requires intelligent action of citizens. The calling of democracy is the search for truth and loyalty to its methods. That is given as the ethical way of life that advances the common good: “Patriotism, to be a virtue, must be intelligent, must know why it is exercised and for what (Harper, 1905, p. 25).

While using the redemptive language of religion, Harper (1905) asks, “Is democracy a religion?” and his response is no, yet it forms a religious creed through enlightenment notions about universal, cosmopolitan reason and science:

Has democracy a religion? Yes; a religion with its god, its altar, and its temple, with its code of ethics and its creed. Its god is mankind, humanity; its altar, home, its temple, country. The one doctrine of democracy’s creed is the brotherhood, and consequently the equality of man; its system of ethics is contained in a single word, righteousness. (p. 21).

The righteousness of democracy is its ecumenical feeling and code of moral conduct in which the “enlightenment of mind and soul” enables individual and collective action to combat ignorance, and to secure and safeguard the future against “that which is demoralizing and degrading.” Patriotism is given a double quality. The pursuit of truth resides not only in the individual but also in the collective embodiment of the nation. The moral code of the enlightened citizen is made possible through the “civilizing” process inscribed as the mission of the university through its philosophy and sciences of human affairs. Education is to provide the “prophetic spirit” and provide “the very food on [the life of democracy] depends” (Harper, 1905, p. 11).

The righteousness of being open-minded is given as a devotional value of teacher education. The characteristic of the teacher is “devoted” to open-mindedness, “with unbounded faith in possibilities; … ready to abandon the useless and to adopt the useful” (Parker, 1899/1902, p. 754).

Dewey’s prophetic vision of democracy links the ethics of a generalized Christianity (Calvinism) to the progressive revelation of truth (Dewey, 1892/1967-1990). The “Christian Democracy,” as Dewey called it in his early writing, emphasizes the rationality of science, the qualities of the democratic citizen, and a
generalized Protestant notion of salvation (see, e.g., Childs, 1956; Westbrook, 1991). Dewey (1892/1967-1990) wrote:

I assume that democracy is a spiritual fact and not a mere piece of governmental machinery... If God is, as Christ taught, at the root of life, incarnate in man, then democracy has a spiritual meaning which it behooves us not to pass by. Democracy is freedom. If truth is at the bottom of things, freedom means giving this truth a chance to show itself, a chance to well up from the depths. Democracy, as freedom, means the loosening of bonds, the wearing away of restrictions, the breaking down of barriers, of middle walls, of partitions. (p. 8)

This joining of Christianity and democracy enabled Dewey to speak of democracy as revelation. Christianity is the ethical mode of reflection that entails the “continuously unfolding, never ceasing discovery of the meaning of life” (p. 5). That ethical mode reveals truth, Dewey continues, through science that helps to “uncover and discover” and “bring home its truth to the consciousness of the individual” (p. 5).

Reflection replaced revelation in finding happiness. “Democracy is revelation,” that is, “the means by which the revelation of truth is carried on” (Dewey, 1892/1972, p. 5). The prophetic vision of democracy is loyalty to open-mindedness.

The prophetic vision of democracy and science is embodied in the teacher education reforms of Parker. The righteous teacher works on the soul of the child, Parker (1899/1902) argues, to develop open-mindedness:

The one thing, above all, by which the teacher or teachers exerts a powerful influence is in the spirit in which he works. If he betrays a genuine hunger and thirst after righteousness, if he show meekness and open-mindedness, an overmastering love for children and all mankind, then his spirit passes over to the students and inspires them to do the best work of which they are capable (p. 755)

The school curriculum is to reveal “the great book of nature, God’s infinite volume of everlasting, inexhaustible truth” (p. 765). Pedagogy is the creation of the unity of “the soul, mind, and body”. It acts to discipline action and bring moral behavior into “controlling action; motive, image, and self-expression” (Parker, 1899/1902, pp. 771-772).

The ethics of democracy and notions of truth that commanded one’s loyalty to the nation embodied of particular language of salvation and redemption derived from American Protestant reformism (Calvinism) that Bellah (1975) calls “civil religion”. Questions of individual freedom, conscience, and the right of individuals to communicate directly with God were (re)visioned as secular beliefs about civic virtue and the reasoned citizen. The public notions of the common good were revisioned in individuality as the personality formed through the applications of techniques of self-watchfulness in the private pursuit of the “signs of grace” represented in the construction of the self. Harper (1905) discusses democracy in metaphoric language, speaking of its “mission,” “prophets,” and “prophetic
The notions of action and community were important to the democratic mission. The two notions became intellectual “tools” to order the principles that enabled the righteousness of the citizen whose open-mindedness contributed to and established the collective good.

Action is how truth and revelation are secured. Dewey argued that spiritual meaning and individual freedom are bound to intelligent action. Action models the experimental method of the natural sciences. Theories and doctrines became working hypotheses tested by the consequences in actual life situations (Ryan, 1995, p. 38). The methods would resolve conflicts about beliefs and revise ideas in response to experience. Action entails a set of plans of operation to enable people to transform a given situation through resolute action in a world that is continually in the making.

Action, however, does not occur alone. Dewey and Parker emphasized the individual who participated in communities to act on an environment of continual processes of change. Parker (1899/1902) said, for example, that “the ideal school is considered the ideal community” (p. 760), found in:

- the feeling of responsibility, the dignity of belonging to a community, the desire to be personally recognized as of some use, (and to have) stimuli that increase in power as duties to come, as insight is gained, as right motives are developed. Arbitrary government grew slowly into self-government, the order of assembled souls, the order of duty, of obligation, of free will. (p. 761)

Community interactions and communications provide the unity necessary for social relations. Democracy is given expression, according to Dewey, through “the community of ideas and interests through community of action, that the incarnation of God in man (man, that is to say, as organ of universal truth) becomes a living, present thing, having its ordinary and natural sense” (Dewey, 1892/1967-1990, p. 9). The conceptualizations of action and community brought the transcendental good associated the ethics of Reform Congregational (Calvinism) into secular life as a solution for social issues. The cathedral of community and individual agency stressed a moral imperative to life and self-responsibility through which the person becomes fit for civilized society by losing the passions, greed, lust, and pride. Pastoral images of face-to-face relation with God’s creations of nature were (re)visioned in the city through the authenticity given by the networks of interactions (see, Popkewitz, 2008, chapters 4 and 5).

To summarize, democracy is not merely an ideal to achieve. Its principles formed in a grid of practices that had prophetic qualities. The particular solutions and plans for action embodied Protestant beliefs in perfecting society by education. The new expertise generated ethical techniques of individual self-monitoring and control as methods of revelations (finding truth) in the uncertainties of the world. Community gave the conditions of finding the common good.
The writings of Dewey, Harper, and Parker embodied a shift in how collective belonging and home were articulated. The language of loyalty, patriotism, and community assembled a particular Puritan salvation narrative. During much of the nineteenth century, that narrative instantiated the nation as the New World, the biblical belief of the land as the idyllic reincarnation of the Garden of Eden that escaped the corruption of the Old World. By the end of the nineteenth century, the notion of the millennial past reclaimed was no longer accepted, and the narratives of the nation took on a new form that looked to the promise of the future rather than of reclaiming the past (see, e.g., Menand, 2001). The emergence of unbridled capitalism, economic depression, the problems perceived with the urbanization and the breakdown of moral order in the city, and the brutality of modern warfare coupled with the struggle over slavery in the American Civil War, among other things, posited moral grace given to the nation through its political system as the site in which “the city on the hill” would be constructed.

For many, classical economics and its principles of laissez-faire that inscribed notions of the rational subject whose individual actions formed the collective good and the social contract were not sustainable. The deadly strife associated with the Pullman Strike when Dewey came to Chicago, for example, brought to the fore the need for social regulations and the primacy of the social in forming the boundaries of individuality. Dewey’s work and friendship with Jane Addams, who directed the Chicago Hull Settlement House, placed emphasis on the need to reform social conditions to reestablish unity, authority, and moral order (Menand, 2001, p. 315).

Progressivism’s reforms and its sciences embodied images and narratives of what Nye (1999) calls the “technological sublime,” a cultural dialogue that told the story of the nation through the marvels of the railroad, electricity, bridges, and skyscrapers that drew on religious imagery about the national “manifest destiny” and its “Chosen People.”

The notion of sublime provides a way to historicize the rationality given to science. As I argued earlier with democracy, it is not merely about the ordering and classifying things of the world. “Seeing” and thinking entail not only classifying and cognitive ordering but also principles through which beauty, aesthetics, awe, and fear are established. The technological sublime that ordered the cosmopolitan reason and science underlie Dewey’s and Parker’s notions of love, wisdom, and “aspiration” that linked with science in the pursuit of democracy.

The triumphs of art and science narrated a causal chain of events in the liberation of the human spirit realized by the young republic. Foundation stories were told about Americans transforming a wilderness into “a prosperous and egalitarian” cosmopolitan society whose landscape and people had a transcendent presence through their technological achievements (Nye, 2003, p. 5). The technological promise would overcome the evils of modernization that prevented progress.

The prior discussion of the university as the guardian of the future as philosophy (bringing moral actions) and professional knowledge (science) embodied a transcendent presence and human advancement that captures Nye’s discussion of
the technological sublime. It might seem far from the technological sublime when talking about the work done at the University of Chicago, but it is not. The privileging of science in the new psychologies was as a mode of living that would civilize and bring progress through everyday actions and processes of reflection. The new psychology in the school as the scientific laboratory, discussed in the following, gave specificity to the merging of the sublime that gave intelligibility to democracy as revelatory processes and the university as “the priest.”

THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY: SCIENCE AS THE APOTHEOSIS OF REASON

Dewey, Harper, and Parker did not merely take eighteenth-century American enlightenment notions of science and reinserted and (re)visioned them in Progressive thought. The sciences that they spoke about were to liberate the human spirit and create collective belonging in the nation assembled two overlapping trajectories of science that I examine in this section.

Science was to calculate and plan changes in the conditions of social life by changing people that embodied the technological sublime. Harper’s notion of the university as priest captures this notion of science as the liberation of the human spirit. The new psychology embedded in the work of Dewey and Parker entailed the displacement of the metaphysical and static notions of the mind with notions of the mind as active and changeable through its development in social relations.

But science was not only a way of explaining and interpreting. It was a mode of everyday life. Harper spoke about education, for example, as not merely the formal school but of life beyond formal education, which we speak of today as “the learning society”. Harper (1905) called learning outside of schooling popular education. That education was not to learn the facts of scientifically generated propositions and theories; “nor in the sense that the great principles of science will enter largely into popular conceptions of life and truth; but rather in that simple sense that accurate methods of thought will be inculcated; that truth as it is accepted will be something truer than it would have been, something more absolute” (p. 51). The learning of science as an all encompassing mode of life, Harper argued, will proceed at levels that “are more ethical, more spiritual. It is not merely the practical that interests and occupies the public mind. The ideal, in spite of the teaching of science, plays a large part in the constantly shifting sciences of the drama of human life” (p. 51).

The faith in science as a mode of living is embodied in pragmatism. Dewey saw science as a continual pursuit or method through which agency was enacted in the process of change. Further, the procedures of science brought difference to social actions rather than the standardization of practices: “Command of scientific methods and systematized subject-matter liberates individuals; it enables them to see new problems, devise new procedures, and, in general, makes for diversification rather than for set uniformity” (Dewey, 1929, p. 2). Action and problem solving were to teach children how to rationally order actions, which enabled the wise conduct of life – the liberation of human spirit and the enabling of the moral progress through the revelatory processes and the university as “the priest” of democracy.
Science was not merely science! Dewey thought, for example, that all that was wrong with the nation was that the Christian ideal of fraternity had not yet been achieved in the nation, that society had not yet become pervasively democratic. Science was to order the future by shedding unwarranted traditions identified with dogma and ignorance: “The old culture is doomed for us because it was built upon an alliance of political and spiritual powers, an equilibrium of governing and leisure classes, which no longer exists” (Dewey, 1929, pp. 501-502). The concept of action was to venerate the new and the present. There is no turning back “the hands of time,” and one needs to plan for the future!

The salvation themes expressed were homologous to those of Progressive reforms. The new psychologies were spoken of as the great panacea for equality. They envisioned the empirical building blocks of selfhood as the tasks of deliberate design (Sklansky, 2002, pp. 148-149). For the progressives, such as Dewey, the problem of design embodied the triumph of cooperation over competition as the natural destiny of human progress (p. 161).

Psychology was viewed as an experimental science of the mind through the use of laboratories and an academic program of research (see, e.g., Danziger, 1990). That psychology, Dewey argued, combined “man’s religious nature and experience” (cited in Menand, 2001, p. 272). Psychology goes in “the depths of man’s nature” to “the instinctive tendencies of devotion, sacrifice, faith, and idealism which are the eternal substructure of all the struggles of the nations upon the alter stairs which slope up to God … (I) can discover in its investigations no reason which is not based upon faith, and no faith which is not rational in its origin and tendency” (cited in Menand, 2001, p.272).

Parker’s report of the city superintendent of schools contained similar themes about a scientific psychology as a mode of redemption in which the duties and higher functions associated with the nation are established in the individual. Citing Dewey about the school is society, Parker (1899/1902) wrote, “The function of the teacher, then, is to make life, society, the state, the nation, what they should be; and the function of a normal school is to train men and women for these duties, which are indeed higher and more important than others” (p. 752).

The new psychology organized the training of teachers. It emphasized the importance of bringing the child’s nature into studies as a “rolling year” curriculum, in which subjects were adapted to different stages of child growth, as art and nature were correlated (Parker, 1899/1902, p. 766). The findings of science are “the mental nutrition” of teaching and its subject matter, according to Parker.

Bringing the science of education and the art of teaching together was not merely adapting to children’s growth. It would “mean everlasting progress, mean economy of personal energy; it proves that knowledge and skill are means for the development of character” (Parker, 1899/1902, p. 757).

Schooling became a foundation story of the transforming of the wilderness through the science of child development and child studies. The study of the child would replace older values no longer seen as sufficient for the future. For Parker (1899/1920), science is given as the hope and awe of the future in overcoming tradition through constant experimentation and innovation: “Constant change, elimination, innovation, experiment, tentative conclusions – this was the manner of
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progress” (p. 754), and the devotion and wisdom of the resulting teacher education provides the “unity of action, consistent with the greatest personal liberty, recognizing that personal liberally is the one means of making the individual of worth to the mass” (p. 754):

We went to work with enthusiasm and earnestness, determined to solve some of the immediate and pressing questions of school economy. One a week, for two or three hours, we met to discuss questions that were forced upon us by our daily teaching and training. Every teacher was required to explain his teaching and give reasons for it. He was also required to criticize all the instruction and plans of order that came within his observation. He was asked to present suggestions, new plans, and devices which, in his opinion, would improve the school. When the printing establishment became available, each teacher made out a syllabus, which was printed and distributed for study and discussion at the faculty meetings. (p. 754)

The art and science of teacher preparation was to produce a continual process of innovation. The presenting and revising the plans of teaching was directed through the “eye” to the future through “thinking” about notions of child development and growth. The critical yet instrumental process of reflection and action was to bring the wisdom and revelation seen as necessary for the function of democracy. Problem solving was the scientific messenger!

The science in the projects of Dewey, Harper, and Parker embodied a cultural dialogue of the cosmopolitan society whose transcendent presence would overcome the past evils of modernizations. The promise of future linked faith and the progress produced by science and technology. The democratic ordering of life was more than the rationality of observation, experimentation, and forming hypotheses. The psychologies of teaching and teacher education embodied particular Reform Protestant salvation themes about the good works of the individual in finding collective belonging and “homes.” Science tamed uncertainty to provide moral harmony and stability to change.

THE SCHOOL AS THE SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY

The Laboratory School of the university placed science with the transcendent presence and the apotheosis of the reason of progress. Harper, Dewey, and Parker inscribed this view of science as a cultural thesis in which to order the idea of the laboratory school. The school provided pedagogical research for the improvement of teaching as did “the extension of political economy into business and the early alignment of political science and law (Storr, 1966, p. 297). Harper asserted that work in the elementary school was as important as in any laboratory in the university. He compared the school to a hospital serving a medical department (Storr, 1966, p. 297). The Laboratory School, it was thought, provided the initial testing and demonstrating of principles that would serve as fundamental in education.

Dewey saw his Laboratory School of the university as similar to the laboratories of biology, physics, or chemistry, the place where principles of pedagogy would be
Pedagogy became a laboratory that merged the wisdom attained with philosophy as a conviction of moral values with a social psychology to develop a culture of “critical action that focuses on the ways and means by which human beings have, do and can overcome obstacles, dispose of predicaments, and settle problematic situations” (West, 1989, p. 86).

Parker talked about a normal school as not merely the training of teachers. It was “a laboratory, an educational experiment station, whose influence penetrates, permeates, and improves all education and education thinking” (Parker, 1899/1902, p. 752).

It is important to recognize that the rationality through which pedagogy ordered classroom experiences had little to do with science. Its thesis was to order action that connected with notions of community and democracy an ethics of daily life that had little to do with what scientists did. The rationality that teachers were to inscribe in classroom life was drawn from universalized and generalized notions of the philosophy of science that provided the principles of the psychologies of the child (Rudolph, 2005). The psychological principles, however, were not only about science in ordering action. The psychologies assembled particular historical notions about agency that were ordered through procedures for planning for the future and participation in community interactions. The norms of action and community were generated at the intersection of the technological sublime spoken about earlier as assembled and connected to Protestant reformism, moral philosophy, and political theories about democracy and the republic.

I speak of the ordering principles of teaching in this manner in order to recognize that the distinctions and classifications of pedagogy are never merely about instruction. They entail a grid of historical cultural and social practices through which the events of daily life are “seen”, thought about, acted on, and felt.

THE SOCIAL QUESTION, PROGRESSIVISM IN THE WELFARE STATE, AND SCIENCE

The city appears as a normative center in which the new knowledge of society and people are directed. It was not accidental, for example, that Harper designed the University of Chicago to be located in the city’s center. The city was the heart of Progressive reforms and what Harper (1905) called the “seat of learning,” capturing the cosmopolitan sentiments in speaking about civilization in an evolutionary language of the development of the “industrial spirit” that will include “within its grasp the whole world” (p. 9). The city provides foundation stories of a transcendent presence through its technological achievements.

But along with the hope of the city as “civilizing” processes were fears. If I return to the technological sublime, it embodies not only the hopes of the future but also the threats to that envisioned hope of the future. The Progressive reforms’ hope of changing the conditions of poverty and urbanization were coupled with fears of the moral disorder and dangers of the unlivable spaces of the city (see, e.g., Rodgers, 1998; Tröhler, 2000, 2006). The Settlement House movement in the United States, which Dewey was associated with, for example, combined Reform Protestantism and the Social Gospel of Victorian critics of industrialism into city
reforms. The city was the sociological laboratory or living textbook in which the scientific mind could promote an experimental life, with philosophy as an experimental science (Menand, 2001, p. 320). Dewey likened the urban conditions of the city to a place where “all hell turned loose & yet not hell any longer, but simply material for a new creation” (cited in Menand, 2001, p. 319). It was “to inculcate [immigrants] with American civic and cultural norms in a setting where their particular national heritages were acknowledged and respected” (Menand, 2001, p. 399).

The simultaneous qualities are embodied in Harper’s talk about “the war cry” of the university as “Come, let us reason together” and to help those who are downcast, taking up its dwelling in the very midst of its squalor and distress (Harper, 1905, p. 19). Parker (1899/1902) spoke optimistically of education as a social enterprise overcoming the “defectives and dull or backward children” (p. 776). Child study was to counteract the belief that the cause of the backward children was “from some defect of body or brain; in a word, from some physical abnormality” (p. 777). Parker’s optimism was that education would provide a “more rational and effective” (p. 754) solution for changing the social conditions by which to civilize the child.

Pedagogical projects were to reduce or eliminate the dangers of those who challenged order and harmony. Jane Addams, founder of the Hull House in Chicago, and John Dewey, for example, searched for ways “to transform social relations and establish patterns of thinking so that increasing numbers of people, from increasing numbers of cultural traditions, could live together in crowded, urban conditions and still maintain a sense of harmony, order, beauty, and progress” (Lagemann, 2000, p. 55).

A FEW (NOT TOO MANY) CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

My reading of Dewey through Harper and Parker explored the writings as conceptual personae. The enunciation of problems and the methods for finding solutions through the university and its knowledge of philosophy and science were expressed through the topos of “in the service of the democratic ideal.” I argued that democracy is not a normative ideal whose essence becomes the benchmark of existing practices. Rather, democracy is a floating signifier that is shaped and fashioned through a grid of practices that give the term intelligibility.

That intelligibility entailed the overlapping of enlightenment images and narratives of enlightenment reason and rationality that mutated into the technological sublime at the turn of the twentieth century. The new expertise of the university was the guardian of civic virtue and the shepherd of progress through the principles generated about reflection and action. Human agency, participation, and community were linked with salvation themes of Protestant (Calvinist) reformism in the search for democracy as a process of living to enable human perfectibility. Perfectibility was given as universal but historically particular in connecting principles of the American enlightenment, the national exceptionalism revisioned through the technological sublime, and the new philosophy (pragmatism) and the
new psychology. The hopes of Progressivism, however, also engender fears of the dangers and of dangerous populations that threaten the future of the republic.

The different registers of the university, philosophy, psychology, and schooling provide a way of thinking about American Progressivism as a pattern of governing. Harper’s university as “priest,” Dewey’s pragmatism, and Parker’s progressive child-centered pedagogy constituted cultural theses about democratic modes of living. The modes of living formed a particular kind of individuality that was modern –“modern” in the sense of organizing life through human agency whose self-responsibility and motivation were linked to the common good through the scientific modes (rationality) of action directed to the future.

Science, philosophy, and pedagogy that were given a place in the university were never merely about cognition and rationality. They were given sense and sensibility, as they embodied ways of seeing, thinking, feeling, and acting. The notion of the sublime in the technological sublime is a way to understand how notions of intelligent action or child development make ‘sense’ through the overlapping of salvation themes about human perfection and happiness. Cognition is never merely understanding concepts and their applications but entails the formation of what is “seen” with a sublime, an aesthetic, sense of beauty, awe, and fear. Further and central to the argument, Dewey, Harper, and Parker are conceptual personae who articulated a particular system of reasoning about individuality and collective belonging. The system of reason gave intelligibility to American Progressive reforms, the principles that ordered progress, and the sensibilities generated about individuals’ actions as “reasonable people.”

NOTES

1 Paper prepared for presentation at the international conference, “Pragmatism in the reticle of modernization – Concepts, contexts, critiques” at the Centro Stefano Fancsini, Monte Verità, Ascona, Switzerland, September 7-12, 2008.

2 My readings about Progressivism in my undergraduate education and then again in graduate school were through social and political histories rather than education. My use of the term refers to this broader set of social, political, and educational movements of reform. Institutionally, there were varied reforms. My interest is in the cultural theses generated about mode of life. When I am referring to educational reforms, I will use the term Progressive Education.

3 If I think about the works of Foucault, Derrida, Deluze, and Guattari, for example, they are attempts to rethink the logocentricity of Western thought and in some ways overlap with certain of the qualities that Jullien discusses in relation to Chinese aesthetics but in different conditions of possibilities. I have to add, as well, that the confrontation of different philosophical orientations to how truth is known and told suggests the historical difficulty of those who reduce such questions to a Eurocentricity and in that characterization apply the very analytics tools of the West to engage in critique. The focus on analytics that order and classify “reason” are more appropriate than distinctions of geography.

4 Cosmopolitanism is used as an analytic “tool” to interrogate its principles and set of relations in assembling the rules and standards of “reason” and not as a normative ideal in which to judge whether or not the icons of Chicago discussed used it faithfully. This strategy is used as well with other topoi, such as science, democracy, among others. The words, if I can use the phrase generically, are the empirical events of study.
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5 Rockefeller subscribed $2,000,000, Marshall Field (Puritan descendent) gave the new institution a block and a half, and the university bought the same amount from him. Other support came from the City of Chicago.

6 He was a graduate of Yale University.

7 Storr reported that the Trustees provided funds for the fifth anniversary of the university that was exactly the same cost as Dewey’s school request ($2,500) and that Dewey might have felt uneasy with that expenditure being so close to what the school requested (Storr, 1966, p. 299). In general, the school was self-supporting from tuition.

8 Parker was a colonel in the American Civil War and kept the title after.

9 When describing the democratization of the school, it is interesting that Cremin (1962) quotes the following about Parker: A Teacher wrote that Parker was “somewhat autocrat but loved. One child was supposed to have said to her mother that “Colonel Parker put his hand on my head today. I think that he blesses children just as Jesus did” (p. 132).

10 One could summarize the pedagogical borrowing as follows: Pestalozzi for method, Froebel for his view of the child, and Herbart for the doctrine of concentration.

11 For an interesting discussion of science and the university in the nineteenth century, see Reuben (1996).

12 There is a bit of irony in the populism, as Jacksonian democracy was agrarian, anti-business, anti-government, anti-professional, and anti-science.

13 As Wagner (1994) suggests, the relation of registers of social administration and freedom implied in the distinctions made here are historically embodied in European and North American modernities from the nineteenth century. My discussion, however, only relates to the United States.

14 The emergence of the social sciences as a disciplinary and specialized practice in the university illustrates the changes occurring in which Dewey, Harper, and Parker worked. The American Social Science Association, for example, was formed at the end of the American Civil War (1865) to inform state policies about the conditions of poverty. Its members came from a wide variety of middle class occupations and had no training in empirical methods. By the turn of the century, the social sciences had become more disciplinary oriented and were given departmental “homes” in the university, a practice that did not happen until much later in Europe.

15 For example, the University of Wisconsin’s charter of 1848 called for a professor of pedagogy, but that professor was not appointed until 1898.

16 It is important to think about democracy in this inquiry as “a floating signifier” rather than as a concept or as having a fixed identity.

17 As with the term cosmopolitan, my use of the term “democracy” is descriptive in the sense of understanding how it is textually deployed in relation to other notions and practices, asking discursively what is being named.

18 I am using the word “civilizing” to express the continual reference in texts to notions of civilization and at points, to a continuum of values in which to differentiate “advanced civilizations.” Further, whereas the discourses about democracy and education were inclusive, the very systems of reason continually embody comparativeness: The notion of civilizing and civilization creates a continuum of values that differentiates and divides. Second, I am using education rather than school, as Harper talks about popular education that exists beyond the formal school to include settlement houses, unions, and social agencies in civic society.

19 The Settlement House was a cross-Atlantic movement of Protestant reforms that Addams revisioned from its uses. In England, the settlement house was a place for college men (called “settlers”) to live and work for social reform. Their “brotherly contact with the poor was improving to the soul” (Menand, 2001, p. 307) and was to counter the urban cultural impoverishment of the working-class through exposure to literature and art (Menand, 2001, p. 307).

20 It was an educational institution that sponsored classes, lectures, dietetic instruction, athletics, and clubs for men, boys, girls, and women; it had a kindergarten, playground, nursery, day-care center, drama group and choral group, Shakespeare Club, and Plato Club.
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