


**JOSH COLE AND IAN McKAY**

# Organized Lightning
## The liberal arts against neoliberalism[1]

*The fundamental problem — a problem of a political nature, and colored by ideological hues — is who chooses the content, and on behalf of which persons and things the 'chooser's' teaching will be performed — in favor of whom, against whom, in favor of what, against what.*

**~ Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Hope***

*Open minds Operate best.*
*Critical thinking Over tests.*
*Wisdom can't be memorized.*
*Educate! Agitate! Organize!*

**~ Innosanto Nagara, *A is for Activist***

To be an intellectual or an activist — or an intellectual activist — in the early 21st century, one must have a healthy sense of irony. The late French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu understood this. After spending decades attacking the class-based structure of public schooling, he found himself defending it late in life. As he told his audience at the December 1999 meeting of the American Modern Language

Association, he felt he had to adapt to new historical circumstances — those of the "progressive-retrogressive" forces of neoliberalism that had been gathering steam since the 1970s. As he explained, the right-wing activists behind neoliberalism were intent on breaking down the progressive achievements of the postwar period — schooling and higher education, universal health care, and 'welfare-state' solutions to the problem of economic inequality. He implored his colleagues to do the same, while maintaining a "merciless critique" of these same institutions.[2] In this spirit we draw out the progressive — even radical — potential of the liberal arts, so often seen as inherently conservative. What the liberal arts bestow upon us is a creative, critical consciousness that neoliberals abhor, and for good reason.

First, we need to define our terms, beginning with liberalism. We see immense value in the view of liberalism put forward by the Canadian philosopher, C. B. Macpherson. For him, the essence of being human lay in the exertion and development of creative human capacities. In a well-governed social order, "the capacity for rational understanding, for moral judgment and action, for aesthetic creating or contemplation for the emotional activities of friendship and love," should only be limited only to the extent that they do not deny or impede the exercise of such properties by other individuals. Labour — the capacity to do, exert, create — is thus essential to humanity, and "socially destructive capacities" are, implicitly, *nonhuman*.[3]

This human nature — inclined toward growth and development, best realized among equal individuals co-existing together — was thwarted by the development of capitalism, which wrenched those individuals away from their nature, towards what Macpherson called "possessive individualism" — a narrowing of human nature and its possibilities under capitalism. Here, people are reduced to one-dimensional economic actors, whose essence is to search for economic and material satisfaction, regardless of others. Those others becoming mere enablers or impediments to material "ownership or satisfaction." Property becomes valued above all things, and the complex organic nature society is reduced to a one-dimensional set of market relations.[4]

The major liberal development of the 20th century was the taming of this possessive individualism, as nation-states intervened to ensure that capitalism and its deleterious effects were held in check for the good of all. That said, this moment did not last. Neoliberalism — born

in the 1960s and coming to fruition in the 1970s — is possessive individualism realized. Here, the state uses its considerable resources to protect and enhance private property rights, to create new markets where none existed before, and to coerce all who disagree with this course of action into compliance. Under neoliberalism, the invisible hand of the market rules serves as the cure for all social problems, and the state is described as a mere 'night-watchman' albeit a watchman decked out in riot gear.

In defining liberal *education*, we begin with what it is not. It is not a timeless artistic or literary 'canon' of 'great works' that pupils must absorb mechanically. Rather, it has always been a tradition of human thought and creativity *in process* that has animated societies since at least 1500 B.C.E. Buddhists, Janists, Chinese Mandarins, and Greek thinkers such as Isocrates have all engaged with it, and made it central to what it means to be a 'free' citizen.[5]

As societies change, so do the liberal arts. Yet they retain a certain form: one studies history, literature, art, philosophy, and other humanities in order to become an intelligent, engaged citizen. More precisely, the liberal arts are "*activities that are designed to cultivate intellectual creativity, autonomy, and resilience; critical thinking; a combination of intellectual breadth and specialized knowledge; the comprehension and tolerance of diverse ideas and experiences; informed participation in community life; and effective communication skills*."[6] If we bear this definition in mind, the liberal arts become quite open: accommodating pure science, progressive pedagogies, new media, feminist thought, post-colonial criticism, and cultural studies among many other disciplines — as long as they cultivate creativity and critical consciousness, they can be considered among the liberal arts.

Neoliberals frown upon liberal education, instead favouring education as *vocational* training — a means of creating docile worker-citizens directly connected to the (possessive individualist) global economy. Is there a conspiracy at work? Probably not, but it is undeniable that neoliberals see little to no value in the liberal arts, which amounts to the same thing. Instead, they emphasize an education based upon 'practical skills,' which in our present moment include STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), financial literacy, instruction in the practical trades, and the 'three R's,' delivered through rote learning. Importantly,

neoliberal education is cast as a social justice issue. The best way to help impoverished children and young people, so the argument goes, is to give them 'skills' they can use to 'get a job'; after all, kids won't pirouette their way to prosperity.

But this argument is made in bad faith. Proof of this is that the children of neoliberal elites (think Barrack Obama, Rahm Emanuel, or Christy Clark) are often shuffled into private schools, where they get the best of liberal arts educations. So, the message is clear: the decision-makers of the future need to be creative, critical, and 'innovative.' The children of the rabble need only obey them, preferably quietly.

**Importantly, neoliberal education is cast as a social justice issue. The best way to help impoverished children and young people, so the argument goes, is to give them 'skills' they can use to 'get a job'; after all, kids won't pirouette their way to prosperity**

Margaret Thatcher was the greatest of all neoliberals. She was also a great aphorist, and one of her greatest slogans was "there is no alternative." In other words, history has ended, and neoliberalism now constitutes a permanent present — just get used to it. Yet, of course neoliberalism has a history, and so does neoliberal education. Understanding this can help us get our bearings, and allow us to reckon with what we are losing under the neoliberal erasure of the liberal arts.

After the Second World War ended, western nation-states became desperate to stave off economic depression and a return to the extreme politics of the 1930s. The welfare state — mass public education, universal health care (outside of the U.S.), Keynesian economic intervention — was developed to ensure that this did not happen. In the resulting 'Golden Age,' global economic growth spiked and prosperity was spread relatively evenly among populations for the first time in modern history.[7]

Knowledge and education were crucial to this project, and all nation-states promoted education as a social, economic, and political panacea. After the first Sputnik satellite was launched by the USSR in

1957, financial support for schooling and higher education spiked, and experimental pedagogies flourished.[8]

The results were electric. As historian Diane Ravitch points out, both education and the *idea* of education as a public good absorbed all the "energy youth, and dynamism" the 1960s had to offer. It united "federal agencies, university scholars, major philanthropic foundations, big-city school systems, and almost everyone else in the field."[9] Leftists that had worked outside of the system for decades were drawn back in by the promise of a truly 'progressive' system, backed by the power of the postwar state.[10] Educators, activists, and even business leaders called for a contemporary approach to liberal education that would foster creative, flexible, critical workers and citizens.

By the end of the decade however, this idealism had dissolved. The growth of corporate capitalism, the assassination of key political leaders, and the overwhelming growth of a seemingly unstoppable 'military-industrial complex' took the shine off a seemingly utopian moment of individual and social liberation.[11] A new pessimism arose regarding the state's role in postwar life, and social institutions came under increasingly vicious criticism.[12] In education, too, confidence crumbled. After the advances of the early 1960s, "scorn, disappointment, and despair" became commonplace, and education came to be viewed in dystopian terms — as a means of producing and reproducing class, race, and gender-based inequalities.[13]

Simultaneously, a 'New Right' was forming, and over time would prove much more focused and resourceful than anything that the left and centre-left put forward. Further, the 'progressive' mainstream in the 1960s failed to take the threat of a right-wing insurgency seriously at all.[14] Their opponents were hardly so sanguine. As Lisa McGirr explains, the New Right offensive began in California in the early-1960s among activists who were profoundly alienated from the 'great society' being built around them. Their goal was to level it, and put an alternative system in its place. This conservative utopia would constitute a "revolving back … to the foundations of society" before the "internal communist conspiracy" that forged the welfare state came into being.[15]

Schools were essential to this project. These activists saw their children as being forcibly subjected to 'liberal' indoctrination in public schools — represented by "displays of the United Nations in school

hallways," "sex knowledge inventory tests," and "progressive education," writ large. As one aggrieved parent put it: "Our child in kindergarten was taught evolution. Her religion was ridiculed and her confidence in her parents was shaken."[16] Thus, they began to remove their children from public schools, while setting up alternative schools to take their place.[17]

This would happen through 'school vouchers': tax-supported grants that parents could 'spend' by placing their children into any number of privately run schools. Catholics approved of this "relief from the double burden of public school taxes and parochial school fees," while white segregationists were enthusiastic about escaping the consequences of the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision.[18]

In the 1970s and 1980s, vouchers were taken up by academics, including the high-profile economist and public intellectual, Milton Freidman. Here, we see a key shift: from religion and race to a neoliberal conception of free markets as a solution to all educational problems.[19] John Chubb and Terry Moe's seminal *Politics, Markets and America's Schools* solidified this position, arguing that the "natural dynamics of competition and choice" would and should replace cumbersome and ineffective educational bureaucracies.[20] The dreams of the 1960s for a school-system that was accountable, responsive, and democratic would finally come to pass, but through neoliberalism and not leftism or leftist liberalism.

At the same time, high-level Democrats including Albert Shanker, President of the Teachers' Federation of America, also argued for school choice as a means of renewing public education. As Shanker argued, innovative educators should be given "charters" — or grants — to start up alternative schools. These 'charter schools' would operate "for five or ten years, as long as parents and teachers continued to support the experiment."[21] Though Shanker recoiled from the plan when he realized that charters would draw corporate interests into education, the damage was already done, and neoliberal education reform came to be seen as a project with appeal to both the right and the left.[22]

Meanwhile, charter advocates engaged in groundwork; they opened schools to demonstrate their ideas, lobbied governments for political and financial support, and most importantly, turned themselves into expert voices on education for the mainstream media — where they always steered the conversation back to the virtues of

charter schools. Soon enough, charters were in vogue, attracting the support of billionaire philanthropists like Bill and Melinda Gates and Mark Zuckerberg, as well as those such as Rupert Murdoch, who were simply looking for fresh markets to exploit.

By the 2000s, the process was complete. What began as a small project in California now reached the highest levels of government in the U.S. and U.K. The administrations of Barack Obama and David Cameron both created coercive mechanisms for replacing public schools with charters — or 'free schools' as they are known in the U.K.— predominantly by tying the public system's very existence to high performance on standardized tests — the sort of tests that charter schools, relatively free from public oversight, can specialize in. In short, the system is rigged in favour of charters. And what are charters like? They focus on literacy and STEM to the detriment of the liberal arts. They employ much more discipline that the public system allows. They focus on testing and test score above all else. Their primary concern is with what philosopher Martha Nussbaum calls "the cultivation of the technical."[23]

Perhaps because of its decentralized education system, neoliberal schooling has made little headway in Canada. That being said, this country has its share of advocates. As teacher and blogger Seth Bernstein has recently argued, 2014 saw a number of attempts to convince the public that a neoliberal educational shift is needed. John Manley, Chief Executive of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (and former Liberal Deputy Prime Minister), tried vigorously to stir up a national panic over sliding math scores on the OECD's PISA international league tables. Amanda Lang, the CBC's lead business reporter, used the public broadcaster as a pulpit from which to preach the need for a "skills strategy for the 21st Century economy" — or, a federally-mandated neoliberal school system. Conservative Federal Employment Minister Jason Kenney recently stumped for a "skilled trades focus" in Canadian schooling and tertiary education.[24]

With those at the very top of the social heap on board with neoliberal education, we should expect leftist and left-leaning educational workers to be storming the gates, waging war on behalf of the modern society's most important public institution. Alas, this is not the case. Since the 1970s — just as the new right and neoliberalism gathered steam — many leftists have retreated to the

academy, divesting themselves from a responsibility to the public interest. When education is discussed, the dominant tone is negative — a holdover from the later-1960s. Schools are reduced to oppressive 'ideological state apparatuses' geared toward social control, or treated as a whiggish instrument for lifting all children up, bypassing the shared sacrifice of mass income redistribution.

But all is not lost. We can draw on intellectual and practical examples to help us articulate the value of the liberal arts as a means of beating back neoliberal school reform (and thus neoliberalism writ large). Here, we offer two thinkers — Antonio Gramsci and Maxine Greene — and two practical examples — Chicago's CORE teacher union, and Finland's postwar school-system — which can show us the way.

Antonio Gramsci was an Italian Marxist theorist and activist famous for his theory of hegemony, through which he analyzed modern political power as the acquisition of the consent of the governed, rather than as the result of raw coercion. He is less well-known — and, when known, misunderstood — for his educational thinking. He has been cast as a pedagogical conservative for his rejection of progressive education, but what he was really concerned with was ensuring that all children and young people received exposure to the liberal arts.

Gramsci believed that collective human freedom lay in the development of the individual's critical and creative faculties through education. This was "liberalismo" (the philosophy of freedom), which he contrasted with "liberismo" (a liberalism warped by capitalist values). The best way to achieve liberalismo was through education — that is, through the acquisition of knowledge in an atmosphere of disciplined exploration and self-discovery. Education was thus conceived by Gramsci as a voyage of "self-knowledge, self-mastery and thus liberation" through the acquisition of the skills of logical and empirical analysis, combined with a sensitivity to the arts and culture in a broader sense.[25]

This was to be an active, not a passive education; steeped in history, yet not subservient to it. Through the hard work of study, the child would become creative, critical, and resilient: all crucial qualities for budding social activists. Crucially, this was to be a liberal education for *all* children, not just those of the elite. No child would be sacrificed to utilitarian ends.[26] In giving a liberal education to all children and young people, Gramsci hoped to give them — particularly the most

disadvantaged — the ability to think and to rule or, at the very least, to "control those who rule."[27] What was to be avoided at all costs was vocationalism in education, or training for immediate economic needs. Gramsci correctly noted that it is always those most in need of liberal education who are denied it, as they are handed an education that was called democratic, but which in fact perpetuated social division and inequality.

**Gramsci correctly noted that it is always those most in need of liberal education who are denied it, as they are handed an education that was called democratic, but which in fact perpetuated social division and inequality.**

The American philosopher Maxine Greene is unique for the consistent emphasis she put on the radical potential of the liberal arts from the 1960s to her death in 2014, as well as for her prescient warnings about the neoliberal incursion into public life through education.

In her classic essay, "Wide-Awakeness and the Moral Life" (1978), Greene identified the danger of neoliberal education reform. She argued that American schools of the late-1970s were increasingly under the twin-sway of a "proliferation of bureaucracies" and a "plethora of corporate structures" which transferred to the daily lives of students as an unending series of "schedules, curricula, and testing programs."[28] What these 'reforms' quashed was the possibility of individual agency, moral intelligence, and a sense of social justice — what Greene called a "wide-awakeness" toward social possibilities.[29] While her fellow liberals slumbered, she sounded the alarm.

Greene furthered her critique of in 1988's *The Dialectic of Freedom*. During the tenure of Ronald Reagan (1981-9), what was stirring in the 1970s became increasingly blatant, as all pedagogies that encouraged students to "share meanings, to conceptualize, to make varied sense of their lived worlds" were derided and defunded. Under neoliberalism, students were reduced to "human resources" whose social and educational horizons were reduced to competence "on some level of an increasingly systematized world." What was considered pedagogical success was an "ill-defined, one dimensional 'excellence'" — a far cry from education's utopian possibilities, according to Greene.[30]

Some — the wealthy and the 'gifted' — would be given access to the liberal arts. The others would get "technical and 'coping' skills," or "accommodation … to what is inescapably there." And what was there? Greene was horrified by the prospect of a public school system based upon the glorification of the "possession of commodities, community status, a flippant way of talking, [and] good looks." There was another lesson hidden here as well: do not resist, for alternatives are a pipe-dream.[31] Greene insisted that educators would have to learn to articulate the values of "self-determination" and "connectedness or being together in a community," which the liberal arts alone could bestow upon children and young people. Further, they would have to fight for this vision, just as the neoliberals are fighting for theirs.[32]

A particularly important large-scale resistance to neoliberal education can also be found in contemporary Chicago. For over a century, Chicago has been the storm-centre for American education reform. In the past few years, it has given rise to both a vicious neoliberalism, and a focused and powerful movement against it, through the Chicago Teachers' Union. In 2004, Mayor Richard M. Daley and the new CEO of the Chicago Public Schools (later to become Barack Obama's Secretary of Education) Arne Duncan implemented a plan they dubbed "Renaissance 2010." This 'rebirth' of the city was to begin with the imposition of charter schools upon Chicago communities. This policy saw all Chicago public schools deemed 'low performing' (that is, failing to deliver high scores on standardized test), shuttered, and "turned around" — or replaced by privately underwritten and controlled charters.[33]

In response, many parents began agitating against Renaissance 2010. A rump of the Chicago Teachers Union soon joined them. These teachers aligned themselves with parents and against their union and the city. The Caucus of Rank-and-File Educators, or CORE arose out of this moment. These leftist intellectuals mastered the neoliberal terrain, immersing themselves in the fine-print of new education laws, as well as critical literature on education and society. They vigorously defended the liberal arts against neoliberal attacks, stressing their importance for the full development of children and young people, and opposed the movement of funds from arts and physical education programs to STEM subjects and programs (such as the International Baccalaureate) which primary serve privileged students.

CORE soon attained leadership of the CTU, and began to oppose *all* education reform projects everywhere that put profits before individual growth and social justice. The Union then staged a remarkable 2012 protest which saw 30,000 supporters close down the city-centre in protest against what was now referred to as 'educational deform' by CORE. In a way that would have been recognized by Gramsci, the very experience of being a part of CORE proved deeply educational for those involved — teachers, parents, children and young people. As one participant in the protest put it: "After being degraded by the corporate media, the mayor and his henchmen … taking a stand for ourselves, our children and our community restored us to the level of human beings"[34] It is noteworthy that defending the liberal arts can be a pedagogical *and* humanist act.

Our final example is a national alternative to neoliberal education: that of postwar Finland. Like most countries after 1945, Finland took a hard look at its school system, and found it wanting.[35] The politicians involved — right, left, and centre — agreed on little, but they did agree that any national education system worth its salt had to be intellectual and cultural as well as vocational — the first never subordinate to the second. A number of educational commissions and reports followed, and by the later-1960s, a new system took shape: one in which compulsory education was extended, private schools were discouraged, and a general "progressive, future-oriented" educational direction was established, in which both individual growth and social justice were emphasized.[36] Crucially, the liberal arts were foregrounded, just as other Western countries began to lose faith in their democratic potential.

As Pasi Sahlberg explains, it is the Finnish school system's *legal responsibility* to educate each child equally. All students must proceed through the same nine years of liberal arts schooling, although the "content, organization, and pace" of their individual progression is made as flexible as possible, so that all young Finns receive the same introduction to the cultural tradition regardless of socio-economic background.[37] All teachers are highly educated, in both subject matter and pedagogy, and are all expected to work with diverse groups of students to ensure that they become creative and critical citizens, steeped in the past and thus prepared for the future.

Crucially, these measures are seen as extensions of Finland as a social democracy, and in this sense, Finland is perhaps the best

expression we have of a society that has realized the potential of the liberal arts. This is expressed as the philosophy of "peruskoulu," in which teachers and students learn together, developing as individuals and as members of a group, in "small-scale democracies, just as John Dewey had insisted."[38] Diane Ravitch is one of the many scholars that have pointed toward Finland as an example of a society that has rejected possessive individualism in education, while proving that radical democratic schools can beat the neoliberals at their own game (Finland has, in recent years, come to be seen as an 'education superpower,' consistently placing near the top of international education rankings beginning in the early 2000s — all without submitting to utilitarian pedagogy, excessive testing, or any other neoliberal shibboleth).[39]

Most commentators on the liberal arts have been conservative, seeking to impart a timeless, untouchable, apolitical artistic canon to students for reactionary purposes. Thus Matthew Arnold sought to counter the growth of democracy by placating the mob with 'sweetness and light,' and Allan Bloom, in his *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987) sought to turn students away from Nietzsche and rock n' roll in order to stabilize post-1960s society.

We think that the liberal arts are, in fact, inherently destabilizing, and therein lies their value. A society made up of citizens schooled to be critical of the existing social order and 'wide-awake' to social alternatives is the only society that can meet a contemporary situation full of ever-increasing challenges — economic, political, environmental, and so on. Regarding the value of the liberal arts as a means to this end, we agree with Fernando Cardinal, director of the campaign to end illiteracy during the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua: "[w]e believe that in order to create a new nation we must begin with an education that liberates people. Only through knowing their past and their present, only through understanding and analyzing their reality can people choose their future. Education, therefore, must encourage people to take charge of their lives, to learn to become informed and effective decision makers, and to understand their roles as responsible citizens possessing rights and obligations."[40] We urge the readers of *Our Schools/Our Selves* to take up this fight, and resist the dumbing down (and thus disarmament) of our children.

**JOSH COLE** is a PhD candidate in the Department of History at Queen's University, Ontario, Canada. His interests include the history of education, the history of liberalism and neoliberalism, public history, and public scholarship. His SSHRCC-CGS funded dissertation is entitled *Children, Schools, and Utopias: Education and Modernity in Ontario's Long 1960s*. He has published in *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, *Our Schools/ Our Selves, Encounters on Education / Encuentros sobre educación / Rencontres sur l'éducation, Sembrando Ideas, The Encyclopedia of Informal Education, and Rabble.ca*. A chapter co-authored with Rosa Bruno-Jofré on the history of Canadian teacher preparation was published in *Teacher Education in a Transnational World* (University of Toronto Press) in 2014. He is an Associate Member of the Theory and History of Education International Research Group (http://orgs.educ.queensu.ca/their/).

**IAN McKAY** is Professor of History at Queen's University, Ontario, Canada. His research interests lie in Canadian cultural history, the history of Canada as a liberal order, and in the history of both Canadian and international left-wing movements for socialism. His books include *Rebels, Reds, Radicals: Rethinking Canada's Left History* (2005), *Reasoning Otherwise: Leftists and the People's Enlightenment in Canada, 1890-1920* (2008) (which won the Canadian Historical Association's John A. Macdonald Prize for the best 2008 book in Canadian history), and *Warrior Nation? Rebranding Canada in a Fearful Age*, co-authored with Jamie Swift (2012). Over the next 10 years, he plans to bring out two more volumes on the history of the Canadian left, as well as a general book on Canada as a liberal revolution and a study of the influence among western socialists of the work of Antonio Gramsci. In 2014, he was elected to the Royal Society of Canada.

## ENDNOTES

1 This piece is partially based upon a paper called "Commanding Heights, Levers of Power: A Reconnaissance of Education Reform, 1945-2014," published in Encounters on *Education / Encuentros sobre educación / Rencontres sur l'éducation* Vol. 14, 2014. It can be found here: http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/encounters/issue/view/526. We are very grateful to the journal editors for allowing us to use that material here.

2 Pierre Bourdieu, *Firing Back: Against the Tyranny of the Market 2* (New York, NY and London, England: The New Press, 2003), 23.

3 Peter Lindsay, *Creative Individualism: The Democratic Vision of C. B. Macpherson* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996), 28; C.B. Macpherson, Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1977), 4.

4 Macpherson, *Ibid*., 199.

5 Paul Axelrod, *Values in Conflict: The University, the Marketplace, and the Trials of Liberal Education.* (Montreal, QC, and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), 9-12.

6 *Ibid*., 34-5.

7 Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*. London, England: Abacus, 2004), 257-343.

8 Herbert Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 266-70.

9 Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1983), 232-3.

10 *Ibid*., 159.

11 Murray Bookchin, *Anarchism, Marxism and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays 1993-1998*. Edinburgh, Scotland, and San Francisco, CA: AK Press, 1999), 72.

12 Max Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che*. London, England, and New York, NY: Verso, 2006), 15.

13 Bookchin, *Ibid*., 15; 239.

14 Alice Echols, *Shaky Ground: The Sixties and its Aftershocks* (New York and Chichester, NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), 81-2.

15 Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4; 75

16 *Ibid*., 75.

17 Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (Cambridge, MA, and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2011), 214-19.

18 *Ibid*., 214-5.

19 Diane Ravitch, *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2011), 4.

20 Quoted in Rogers, *Ibid*., 216.

21 Richard D. Kahlenberg, *Tough Liberal: Albert Shanker and the Battles over Schools, Unions, Race, and Democracy* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2007), 311.

22 Ibid., 313.

23 Martha C. Nussbaum, *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 23.

24 Seth Bernstein, "The CEOs of Public Education," December 10, 2014: https://onedupoli.wordpress.com/2014/12/10/the-ceo-of-public-education/

25 Antonio Gramsci, Se*lections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York, NY: International Publishers, 1971), 350.

26 *Ibid*., 164.

27 *Ibid*., 259.

28 Maxine Greene, *Landscapes of Learning* (New York, NY, and London, England: Teachers College Press, 1978), 43-4.

29 *Ibid*. 47.

30 Maxine Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York, NY, and London, England: Teachers College Press, 1988), 12.

31 *Ibid*.

32 *Ibid*., 1

33 Micah Uetricht, "Uncommon CORE." Jacobin, March 6, 2014: https://www.jacobinmag.com/2014/03/uncommon-core-chicago-teachers-union/

34 Marilena Marchetti, "The Striking Lessons We Learned," *Socialist Worker,* May 7, 2014. http://socialistworker.org/2014/05/07/the-striking-lessons-we-learned; Uetricht, Ibid.

35 Pasi Sahlberg, *Finnish lessons: What Can the World Learn from Educational Change in Finland?* (New York, NY, and London, England: Teachers College Press, 2011), 16.

36 *Ibid*., 20.

37 *Ibid*., 21.

38 *Ibid*.

39 Diane Ravitch, "The Myth of Charter Schools," *The New York Review of Books*, November 11, 2010: http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2010/nov/11/myth-charter-schools/.

40 Quoted in Angela Davis, *Women, Culture, & Politics* (New York, NY: Vintage, 1990), 195.