John Dewey and the Challenge of Progressive Education*

Leonard J. Waks**
Temple University

Abstract

In *The School and Society* John Dewey noted new tendencies in education, e.g., manual training and nature study. He raised two related questions: (1) how are we to *understand the* new educational trends as reflections of the *social context*—as an *inevitable* effort to bring education into line with the broader pattern of change in industrial society? And (2) how are we to *build upon and direct* them and align them with *democratic social ideals?* Analogous questions arise in today's era of economic globalization, and information technology networks, as we observe new educational trends from collaborative learning to charter schools, and even virtual schools.

This essay reviews Dewey's answers to questions 1 and 2 in *School and Society*, and then uses them as a template for an analogous inquiry into today's situation. I raise two parallel questions: (1) how may we understand *our* new educational trends in relation to the global network context? And (2) how may we build upon and direct these new educational trends to realize the *contemporary* democratic aspirations of a global network society?

Keywords: John Dewey, Progressive Education, Social Context, Information Society

** Leonard J. Waks is emeritus professor of educational leadership at Temple University, Philadelphia USA. His research focuses on the educational arrangements of global network society, and the contributions of American Pragmatism to resolving contemporary social, technological, and educational challenges. His new book, *Education 2.0: The Learningweb Revolution and the Transformation of the School*, will be published by Paradigm publishers early in 2013.

* I prepared this essay to mark the 100th anniversary of *The School and Society*. This paper was originally presented at a meeting of the European John Dewey Society in Rende, Calabria, Italy, in 2000 and published in the proceedings, under the title John Dewey and Progressive Education: 1900-2000, Larry A. Hickman, Giuseppe Spadafora, eds. *John Dewey's Educational Philosophy in International Perspective: A New Democracy for the Twenty-First Century*, Carbondale, SIU Press, 2009. I have subsequently used it as a pro-grammatic guide for further studies of the contemporary situation of progressive educational change, which will be found in the bibliography. The essay has been revised and updated for this publication.

Introduction

In 1899 John Dewey delivered three lectures on the ideas underlying his experimental school. His revision of the stenographic record of these lectures was published as The School and Society in November 1899 with a publication date of 1900. [1]

Noting new tendencies in education - the introduction in the schools of manual training, nature study, and expressive art - Dewey considered them from a "social" vantage point. In doing so, he raised two related questions: (1) how are we to *understand the* new educational trends as reflections of the *social context*—as an *inevitable* effort to bring education into line with the broader pattern of change in industrial society? And (2) how are we to *build upon and direct* them and align them with *democratic social ideals?* Dewey did not think this latter result was at all inevitable - rather it presented a daunting challenge. The first question Dewey saw as a *sociological* precursor to the second, which he saw as a key problem for American *social philosophy* in the industrial era.

Analogous questions arise today in contemporary global network era, as we again stand witness to a fundamental social and technical transformation. Economic globalization, information technology networks, and postindustrial "knowledge" workplaces have prompted new trends in education - cooperative, collaborative, and other forms of active learning; interdisciplinary group projects; Internet-based curricula; charter schools, and even virtual schools, school districts, and universities. Some of these have been couched in a language reminiscent of Dewey and even explicitly in terms of continuities with Dewey's progressivism.

I start this essay by reviewing Dewey's answers to questions 1 and 2 in *School and Society.* I then go on to use his treatment of them as a template for an analogous inquiry into the contemporary situation. I raise two parallel questions: (1) how may we understand *our* new educational trends in relation to the global network context? And (2) how may we build upon and direct these new educational trends to realize the *contemporary* democratic aspirations of a global network society?

Part 1: The School and Industrial Society

Dewey dealt with his preliminary sociological question 1 with just a few paragraphs. He saw the social trend controlling all others at the end of the nineteenth century to be the application of science in industrial production, harnessing forces of nature on a vast and inexpensive scale, creating global markets for American industrial goods and cheap and rapid communications and transport networks. This factory system had gathered people from the ends of the earth into America's industrial cities (MW.1.6-7). It replaced the home and neighborhood system of production, in which industrial processes had "stood revealed" to all, and every member of the household, including young children, had defined tasks. The child participating in household occupations acquired "habits of industry, order, and regard for the rights and ideas of others, and the fundamental habit of subordinating his activities to the general interest of the household" (MW.1.24). The old system thus trained child instincts regarding both *the physical realities* and *social responsibilities* of life.

The introduction of the factory system created a void in both areas. With households and neighborhoods destroyed as centers of production, only the schools remained available as agencies to provide this basic grounding in real-world experience and social responsibility. This was the challenge set for a "progressive" education.

Acknowledging that inherited classroom conventions (fixed seats, mechanical recitations) made it hard to introduce progressive methods employing natural materials and child-centered activities into the schools, Dewey argued that teachers were nonetheless being overwhelmed by the energies of the new urban students that were formally channeled into

family-based activities. Teachers were thus being *compelled to* introduce these new methods merely to engage those irrepressible instincts now neglected at home (MW.1.9). Teachers were acting in self-defense – coping with the classroom situation was the actual driving force for progressive change in actual classrooms. But when asked to justify these new practices, teachers did not speak of relieving their own burdens, but instead adopted a less self-serving rhetoric about the *utility* of the new methods as preparation for home and factory life.

Having explained why the new tendencies were in fact gaining ground in the urban classrooms, Dewey then turned to question 2: how *should* educators *build upon* and *direct* these new tendencies? He rejected the utilitarian justifications - training for life and work in industrial society - as "unnecessarily narrow" (MW 1. 10). Ideally, the school is an instrument for the development of individuality for all citizens; manual occupations in school should serve no direct utilitarian functions.

The justification for progressive methods should be educational, even academic. As components in the community life of the school, the new activities organized around the theme of "occupations" engage the four vital instincts—social, intellectual, constructive, and expressive—no longer engaged at home (MW.1.30). By serving as focal points of school learning, occupations become channels, permitting child instincts to be expressed in ways "permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history and science" (MW.1.19). Occupations are inherently positive and social; they are touched and reinforced by the social environment, they focus intellectual, constructive and expressive energy over weeks and months rather than the few minutes of typical school chores and childhood amusements (MW.1.92—95). They are, in short, natural bridges linking children as given by Nature to children as enduring educational aims prescribe they should become.

But even this *educational justification* was "still too narrow" for Dewey. The *social* feature of occupations is the "the fundamental fact": their use as focal points of school life converts the school into an "embryonic society," introducing a "spirit of free communication, of interchange of ideas, suggestions, results" (MW.1.11). This in turn forges a new form of social discipline that students can carry forward together from school to future social life (MW.1.19-20), leading to a democratic form of industrial society.

Dewey emphasized that the physical and social structures of schools were inhospitable to the progressive methods - that they enforced a passive attitude good only for "listening," not for doing (MW.1.22). Its typical features are "passivity of attitude, mechanical massing of children, uniformity of curriculum and method" (MW.1.23).[2] Schools were antidemocratic, lending themselves only to authoritarian, top-down communication, not to cooperation in defining and resolving common problems. A progressive education would thus require a thorough transformation of space and time utilization, authority relations, and design of school plant and learning activities.

In chapter 3 of *The School and Society,* Dewey provides corrective diagrams (charts 2-4, MW.1.45, 49, 52) of appropriate school layouts in relation to the surrounding social and natural environments, based on his work at the experimental school. In this scheme, environmental factors—the home and neighborhood, gardens and fields, commerce and industry, and the university—surround the school and connect the pupils to natural energies of the outside world that can stimulate their organismic instincts. Practical areas (e.g., textiles shops, kitchen) are at the boundary of the school plant and its natural environment. These are grouped around the new teaching-learning areas that replace traditional recitation classrooms. These areas in turn are organized around the library as the central information source.

In Dewey's scheme, the natural environment is directly and conspicuously connected to the practical areas: for example, the gardens and fields supply foodstuffs for the kitchen. In

place of classrooms (MW.1.33-34), Dewey prescribes a "social clearing house" situated between practical areas at the outside and the library at the building's core (MW.1.51-52), where children confront problems arising from "occupations" in the practical areas, share experiences, and exchange ideas. Rather than instructing and monitoring, teachers criticize and redirect practical work along new lines, or point children to the library for additional necessary information (MW.1.29-34).

Dewey did not shy away from the monumental difficulties involved in such a fundamental structural transformation of the school. While he saw *some* loosening of rigid structures to be "inevitable," he envisioned the thorough transformation of the school required to make it an agency of democratic social reconstruction to be a most daunting challenge. He conceived pragmatism as a comprehensive philosophical and practical *project*, consisting first in framing up a rhetorically powerful democratic idea that clarified the opportunities in "the new education," and then enlisting progressive intellectual and educational leaders in a broad social and cultural movement to place the ideals embodied in the new education into "complete, uncompromising possession of our school system" (MW.1.19).

Part 2: The School and Global Network Society

How, then, are we to view our contemporary educational situation? I here undertake an inquiry analogous to Dewey's for our new century. The first question is how to account for contemporary educational trends in relation to the global network context. Once again, as in 1900, the entrenched physical and organizational structures of schooling appear maladaptive in the emerging situation of knowledge content, distribution, and utilization. To draw the picture in broad strokes, postindustrial "knowledge work" in the global "knowledge economy" is organized in projects of indeterminate time periods; knowledge and information codes are interdisciplinary and constantly shifting; work processes are self-regulated by decentralized, cross-functional or interdisciplinary teams supervised indirectly by dint of information communicated via networks to managers; knowledge and networked information are used by workers even in formerly routine roles such as in manufacturing and transport. Knowledge is now actively circulating throughout the global economy, as business is conducted at "the speed of thought." More static "bodies of knowledge" can be reduced to computer software and manipulated and combined in creative and unpredictable ways by work teams. It is not sufficient for knowledge workers merely to "possess" such "bodies of knowledge;" they must now act on them or transform them.

Dewey is worth quoting at length on this point. He says "there is all the difference in the world whether the acquisition of information is treated as an end in itself, or is made an integral portion of the training of thought. The assumption that information that has been accumulated apart from use in the recognition and solution of a problem may later on be, at will, freely employed by thought is quite false. The skill at the ready command of intelligence is the skill acquired with the aid of intelligence."[3] Dewey's point is reinforced by psychologist Raymond Cattell's contrast of *crystalized* intelligence – the use of acquired knowledge and ability to reason using learned procedures, and *fluid* intelligence – the ability to reason broadly, form concepts, and solve problems based using novel or unfamiliar procedures. Conventional schools and the curriculum produce a specific sort of learning in which memory, classification, and routine verbal-logical problem solving plays a large role – they foster 'crystallized' knowledge, not the 'fluid' knowledge needed by today's network users and knowledge workers. In the knowledge work environment, however, where problems are novel and unstructured, crystalized intelligence is of negligible value and may at times even interfere with fluid intelligence. As Dewey insists, we acquire fluid intelligence only in contexts where fluid intelligence is required and used.

Thus the new educational trends, including active and cooperative learning, interdisciplinary projects, networked distance learning, and global corporate universities, can be accounted for as more or less conscious attempts to bring learning in line with the changing pattern of life and work activities in global network society. At the same time, students are surrounded by the high-technology culture - interactive computer software and games, mobile Internet phones. High-tech interactive media and computer information systems in schools are thus increasingly necessary merely to bring schooling into line with their out-of-school experiences and expectations. Sue Bastian, an educational technology consultant, argues that through networked computers "students are going to have access to stuff that a teacher can't control, [and] the more that happens, teachers are going to have to organize their lessons around it."[4]

Bastian's argument neatly recapitulates Dewey's observation that teacher self-defense has been the prime mover in the transformation of the classroom. And just as they did a century ago, educators once again are justifying these innovations by appealing to familiar but outmoded rhetorical categories: cooperative learning improves math and spelling skills; Web-based instruction is cost-effective. Like those offered in Dewey's time, these justifications are either "painfully inadequate or sometimes even positively wrong" (MW.1.9). Justifications in terms of preparation for the global economy are closer to the mark, but are once again "unnecessarily narrow" in conceiving education in its merely economic capacity.

This brings us to question 2: how are educational leaders to build upon current educational trends to realize our *contemporary* democratic aspirations? In addressing this question I restrict myself to three preliminary observations growing out of the three themes in Dewey's lectures of 1899: (1) *structural transformation* of the school, which is needed to (2) *connect natural processes with children's instincts*, so that (3) educators can shape pupils' activities *to foster democratic habits.*

Structural Transformation

Despite Dewey's considerable influence with educators, intellectuals, and the educated public, and despite the pressures imposed upon older school conventions by new groups of students, the methods he prescribed were not widely adopted and imposed no fundamental change in the schools. While specific "active-learning" practices were adopted by many teachers, most continued to teach as they had before. The schools made merely incremental changes that succeeded only in bringing education into line with the antidemocratic, hierarchical structures of industrial society.[5]

It is possible that such incremental changes will again suffice, that the global network situation will not *compel* fundamental educational change in *any* direction. Bidwell and Dreeben surveyed the development of school organization and curriculum since 1880, finding that in the institutionalization of education, "subject matter forms a sequential, differentiated block structure, and school organization forms an arrangement of students, teachers and material resources that is adapted to the curricular block structure in which instruction is embedded." [6] These structures are precisely those Dewey sought to transform in order to introduce active learning organized around the theme of "occupations," as Bidwell and Dreeben properly note. Yet they show that the structures have remained "remarkably stable" and "remarkably durable" despite equally remarkable changes in school participation rates, educational philosophies, and the educational policies of governments. And they conclude that "it is not easy to foresee substantial changes in them" (p. 360).

This pessimistic conclusion, however, can be questioned. Unlike the situation a century ago, when industrial growth provided an expanding market for unskilled labor, the current school pattern is economically maladaptive - unskilled full-time jobs with union

protection and benefits are gone, and the schools are incapable of generating "knowledge workers". As a result there is pressure not just from progressive intellectuals and educators but also from political/corporate elites *and* ordinary citizens for fundamental change – though of course their images of change differ. Corporate and political elites support networked classrooms, charter schools, and virtual schools, thinking these will generate knowledge workers; the working class clamors for charter school and school vouchers and even turns to home-schooling because it can see no hope for effective reform of mainstream public education.

The *Wall Street Journal* reported a decade ago that the global network situation is forging fundamental change precisely along lines prescribed by Dewey.[7] The author, Robert Cwiklik, observed that according to many experts the "essence" of Dewey's experiential program "really never took root in U.S. schools" (He may have been thinking of Cuban, Bidwell, and Dreeben). The failure of previous reform efforts, Cwiklik says, may have been due to the daunting task of amassing and orchestrating educational resources from real life—the gardens and manual tasks and community activities required for Dewey's kind of progressive education. This critique echoes the well-known critique of progressive education by Joseph Schwab.[8] But according to Cwiklik, many educators now believe that network computer technology "could open the way for a re-introduction of progressive teaching methods," and "progressive methods coupled with computers have already achieved promising results in some schools."

Thus, my first observation: fundamental structural change may not be *inevitable,* but it is *possible,* and it is more likely now in the computer network era than in Dewey's progressive era.

Nature and Child Instincts

Despite the efforts by Dewey and progressive reformers, schools today remain enclosed spaces, no more directly connected to their surrounding natural and social environments than those of Dewey's time. And they still lack practical areas and "social clearing houses" to make use of materials drawn to the school from outside. They are still unable to draw upon many vital instincts of children and channel them in socially responsible activities. Thus, the central problem of education in the industrial era, of bringing the child's inner nature into effective contact with the objective demands of the natural and the social environment, still remains unaddressed today.

But the problem we now face is even more profound than Dewey's. He could speak of natural and occupational processes that "stood revealed" to all in the pre-factory system and were still available in the industrial period to "touch" the child and reinforce learning through school occupations. Even city kids had parents and grandparents familiar with traditional skills of gardening, sewing, husbandry, building construction, and so forth. But in our era of postindustrial cities and factory farms far from population centers, in which industrial processes have been removed to the third world, not much of the real world "stands revealed" to, or "touches" our children at all. And when Dewey speaks of the compensations for the child of city life, "the increase in toleration . . . larger acquaintance with human nature . . . greater accuracy of adaptation to differing personalities, contact with greater commercial activities" (MW.1.8-9), he is thinking of the industrial city of 1900, not the socially isolating suburbs and inner-city ghettos and gentrified enclaves of the fragmented contemporary postindustrial metropolis.[9]

Some educators think a neo-progressive blend of constructivist methods and information technology can address this problem. They think that the wealth of information about the natural and social worlds available on computer software and the Internet can

effectively connect the school with out-of-school life. I agree with them - the Internet is an essential educational resource and the platform for a revolutionary transformation of the schools. But I resist some of the neo-progressive claims.

Larry Hickman, director of the Center for Dewey Studies, has argued that "all of the elements of Deweyan pedagogy are at least potentially available within an educational situation that takes advantage of the Internet. There is the possibility of active participation in the definition and resolution of problematic situations that are relevant to the student's own needs and interests. There are opportunities for students and teachers alike to participate in the construction of broadened avenues of communication in which new meanings are generated. . . . There are learning experiences that are not sequestered from living . . . but that constitute life itself and the living of it."[10]

I am in complete agreement with Hickman on these general claims. However, he goes on to make further claims that go too far. He asks us to consider children following an around-the-world sailing race, with boats wired for Internet communications. The children communicate with the captains via e-mail about marine life and ocean currents. Hickman concludes that such experiences are "precisely the kind of activities that Dewey was undertaking at his Laboratory school ... in the 1890s." The problem here is that while E-mails from sailors and digital videos of their boats may be fun, but the kids are hardly experiencing "sailing"—they don't even get wet! Just where is nature?[11]

Other neo-progressive educators have pinned their hopes for information technology on cyber-simulations of natural and social processes. They see these as easy-to-orchestrate substitutes for real-world experiences that can stimulate children's instinctive needs just as well as, for example, gardening and building and weaving did in Dewey's school. We might imagine someone building on Hickman's sailing adventure and suggest sailing in a simulator as a school activity. Cwiklik in "Dewey Wins!" quotes Linda Darling-Hammond saying that such software as *Sim City 2000* "is a 21st century analog of Dewey's 'let's grow a garden together.'" But is it?

Let's consider a situation in which a computer screen or virtual reality interface points inward at the school's external boundary, encircling practical areas where students work with teachers or peers at computer-mediated work stations, from which they can be directed back to the first area, now serving as a computer-aided information learning center.

At first glance, the objection to this picture is that a virtual garden can't provide foodstuff that kids can prepare for lunch, and kids on separate terminals are not doing anything "together." And if they did, it would *still be* a simulation, not the real thing. No matter how engaging these "virtual" experiences may be, children remain as distant from real life as they are in their dreams.

Few will, on reflection, find the mediated experiences proposed by this model plausible as adequate replacements for those in Dewey's model of the experimental school, and significantly, Dewey would not be among them. He says that vital organismic life is "the great thing" (MW.1.37). He adds, "We cannot overlook the importance for educational purposes of the close and intimate acquaintance got with nature at first hand, with real things and materials, with the actual processes of their manipulation, and the knowledge of their social necessities and uses. . . . No number of object-lessons, got up *as* object-lessons, . . . can afford even the shadow of a substitute for acquaintance with the plants and animals of the farm and garden acquired through actual living among them and caring for them" (MW.1.8). Sailing in a simulator is simply not "the great thing".

The reality of life in nature is the "great thing." Dewey returns to this key point again and again. One possible response some cyber-educators might offer is that Dewey's naturalist concern is antiquated and irrelevant. As Bill McKibben observed in *The End of Nature,* when our technologies determine the climate and ecosystems, these so-called natural systems become "artifacts" and we live at the "end of nature." When we have to reengineer the streams and genetically alter salmon so they can swim upstream, salmon are no more "natural" than software. In our culture of "real virtuality" new technologies have radically blurred the line between artifacts and nature - virtuality and reality. Does anything beyond nostalgia lead today's progressive educators to share Dewey's concern about contact with nature or "the real world?"

Well, raining cherry harvester operators on computers with virtual reality software may now be more efficient than on-site training with real harvesters. The bother is that one cannot *live* among and *care* for virtual cherries, or *eat* them. No matter how immersive the virtual reality training programs may be, eventually the harvesters must break away from them and get into real orchards. Virtual sex with cyborgs may at some point be even hotter and more engaging than the "real thing." But we would hardly expect it to generate bonds of affection - we would and should worry if it did. Simulations can create a *subjective sense* of doing something real and even *subjective satisfactions.* But healthy people want more than the *subjective sense* of living; they want actually to live, to *experience* life—to act, to enjoy, to suffer, and to grow. And preparation for real life ultimately requires learning and acting in real-life settings.

Thus my second observation: reality has not been erased or eclipsed, but it can be obscured by networked information technologies. Access to mediated versions of reality is not connection to real life. 'Cyberspace' is a hoax. While the Internet can serve as the integument of real life, can connect us together for cooperation, collaboration, and collective action, the virtual world is not "the great thing". We ignore the complex relations between the "screen" and the world at our peril.

Embryonic Democracy

The problem of shaping education as an embryonic form of democracy today presupposes an answer to a prior question: what vision of democracy is suitable for the global network era? Once more, the problem we face is more profound than that confronting Dewey and the progressive-era reformers. Painting again in broad strokes, the problem is that in today's global economy narrow economic concerns are driving shared noneconomic educational values to the margins. Schooling as a public enterprise advancing common goals is getting shoved aside by a neo-liberal regime seeking to privatize public education and impose corporation-operated charter schools emphasizing rote learning and standardized testing – and vocational over civic aims. This project is enticing to groups experiencing economic hardship and is splintering support for democratic public education. Multinational corporations are coordinating the project through campaign contributions, cooperative efforts of their philanthropic foundations and through the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). These efforts have weakened the democratic role of national and state governments and in particular have granted corporations inappropriate influence over educational policy. And all of those involved in the enterprise know it; faith in democratic government as an effective instrument of popular will is declining.

And forging a democratic consensus faces an even larger problem: different groups in contemporary society have in response to the hegemonic culture been forming conflicting, postmodern identities. In our postmodern era, large-scale, liberal "metanarratives" of social progress for all, such as Dewey served up in *The School and Society,* are greeted with

skepticism or even ridicule. If neo-progressive educators have little more to say about "democracy" than about "nature," it may be because they do wish to be laughed off the stage.

Most progressive-oriented educators today do demand equal access to high-technology educational opportunities and claim that constructivist methods are effective for learners from disadvantaged groups. If their project succeeds, more members of disadvantaged groups will attain knowledge jobs and move from underclass ghettos to suburbs or urban enclaves. But while the project addresses the question of fair access to knowledge work in the global economy, it neglects the question of power in setting the future orientation of society, by overlooking the growth of corporate power over the democratic state and its public functions. And this may render the project of access to schooling self-defeating. The wage-spreading and social polarization in network society resulting from global capitalism can only be addressed by political means, but our two-party system has failed to provide channels for progressive political action.[12] Meanwhile economic globalization is increasing the extra-educational social factors – unemployment, poverty, depression and hopelessness - that explain most of the school failure of the "have-nots."

In short, the global network society possesses a weak and dependent state, a weak conviction among the public that the state can be an instrument of good, a splintering institution of public education, and at best a weak and contested vision of the common good as a guide. This leads to my third observation: public intellectuals, educational leaders, and democratic publics face a most daunting challenge merely in formulating shared social and human ideals as plausible as Dewey's were in his time, much less placing them into "complete, uncompromising possession of our school system."

Notes

[1] The first edition of 1899 contained chapters 1-3, plus the current chapter 4 as an appendix. The second edition of 1915 deleted the appendix and added five chapters based on articles by Dewey appearing in the *Educational Record* in 1899-1900. The critical edition of 1976, in the Collected Works of John Dewey, Middle Works 1, 1-110, has restored the appendix as chapter 4. Page references in the text are to this edition. To the extent possible, my exposition of the text relies solely on material in the three lectures of 1899.

[2] A year later, in *The Educational Situation*, he expanded on this idea. Mechanics of school organization such as "the grouping of children in classes, the arrangement of grades, the machinery by which the course of study is made out and laid down, the method by which it is carried into effect, the system of selecting teachers and of assigning them to their work, of paying them and promoting them . . . really control the whole system even on its distinctively educational side." The result is that "the more mechanical features of school work [are almost compelled] to lord it over the more vital aims," rendering the desire to develop physical, mental, and moral powers of individual children "either ridiculous or tragic" (MW.1.267-69).

[3] Dewey, *How We Think (first edition)*, New York: D.C. Heath, 1910, p. 52.

[4] In R. Cwiklik, "Dewey Wins!: If the "New" Teaching Methods Pushed by High-Tech Gurus Sound Familiar, It Isn't Surprising," *The Wall Street Journal*, (November 17, 1997), R19.

[5] Larry Cuban, Curriculum Stability and Change, in P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum,* New York: Macmillan, 1992, pages 216-247.

[6] C. E. Bidwell and R. Dreeben "School Organization and Curriculum", *Handbook of Research on Curriculum,* pages 345-362.

[7] Cwiklik, see note 4.

[8] Joseph Schwab, The Impossible Role of the Teacher in Progressive Education, *School Review* 67, 2, 1959, 139-159.

[9]See for example Larry Bennett, *Fragments of cities: the New American Downtowns and Neighborhoods,* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1990; Saskia Sassen, Cities in a World Economy, fourth edition, Sage, 2011; Ray Suarez, *The Old Neighborhood: What We lost in the Great Suburban Migration 1966-1999*, NY: Free Press, 1999.

See for example, Bennett, *Fragments of Cities;* Sassen, *Cities in a World Economy;* and Suarez, *Old Neighborhood.*

[10] See Hickman, Johndewey.edu, in Hickman and Spadafora, eds., *John Dewey's Educational Philosophy in International Perspective: A New Democracy for the Twenty-First Century*, Carbondale, SIU Press, 2009

[11] Hickman also asks us to consider an example involving out-of-school experimentation as well as use of the Internet. This case lies beyond the scope of the argument I am making here, as it does not use Internet to get around the difficulties of orchestrating out-of-school experience—the problem often seen as contributing to the failure of the schools to implement progressive methods. The problem here is that the real-world orchestration difficulties remain in spite of the Internet; educators were unable to prevail over these without the Internet, and the Internet does not help to overcome them.

[12] The Occupy movement, operating beyond the political parties and rejecting their attempts to co-opt it - is one of the most striking political developments of our time. See also Van Jones, *Rebuild the Dr*

References

Bennett, L. (1990). *Fragments of Cities: The New American Downtowns and Neighborhoods.*Columbus: Ohio State University Press,.

Bidwell, C, and R. Dreeben (1992). School Organization and Curriculum, in Jackson, *Handbook of Research on Curriculum,* p. 345-61.

Cuban, L. (1992). Curriculum Stability and Change. In Jackson, *Handbook of Research on Curriculum, 216-4*

Cwiklik, R. (1997) "Dewey Wins! If the 'New' Teaching Methods Pushed by High-Tech Gurus Sound Familiar, It Isn't Surprising." *Wall Street Journal,* Nov. 17,1997, R17.

Dewey, J. (1901). *The Educational Situation,* originally published as "The Situation as Regards the Course of Study," *School Journal 62*, reprinted in (MW I).

Dewey, J. (1899). *The School and Society,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, reprinted in Joann Boydston, ed., The Collected Works of John Dewey, Middle Works 1, Southern Illinois Press, 1-110.

Hickman, L. (2009). "Johndewey.edu: What Dewey Would Have Liked—and Disliked—about the Internet." Paper presented at the European John Dewey Society, Rende, Italy, 2000, and reprinted in , Larry A. Hickman, Giuseppe Spadafora, eds. *John Dewey's Educational Philosophy in International Perspective: A New Democracy for the Twenty-First Century,* Carbondale, SIU Press.

Jackson, P. (1992), ed. *Handbook of Research on Curriculum.* New York: Macmillan.

McKibben, B. (1990). *The End of Nature.* New York: Viking.

Sassen S (1994). *Cities in a world economy*. Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks

Suarez, R. (*1999). The Old Neighborhood: What We Lost in the Great Suburban Migration, 1966-*. New York: Free Press, 1999.

Waks, L. (2001). "Computer-Mediated Experience and Education." *Educational Theory* 51, 4: 415-32.

Waks, L. (2006). The Concept of the Networked Common School. *E-Learning* 1, no. 2 (2004): 317-28. Reprinted in M. Peters and J. Freeman-Moir, eds., *Edutopias: New Utopian Thinking in Education,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, , p. 225-34.

Waks, L. (2006). Globalization, State Transformation, and Educational Re-Structuring: Why Postmodern Diversity Will Prevail over Standardization. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 25, no. 5: 403-24.

Waks, L. (2005). How Globalization Can Cause Fundamental Curriculum Change: An American Perspective. *Journal of Educational Change* 4, no. 4 (2003): 383-418. Reprinted in H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, and H. Halsey, eds. *Education, Globalization and Social Change,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, , p.835-50.

,