Chapter 6  Independence and Education

§ 1. The Revolutionary Governments

There is no doubt the Revolutionary War disrupted the operation of schools in America. In the cities the war seriously interfered with and in a number of cases caused the shutdown of the higher schools – Latin grammar schools, academies, many of the private schools, and the private tutoring of children of the wealthier classes. It certainly shut off the upper class practice of sending sons off to English schools and turned off the immigration of English teachers and clergy to the United States for the duration of the war. The war debts incurred by the states and the United States as a whole likewise produced great difficulties in getting school institution back on its feet after the end of the war because of lack of funds for what many people regarded as a less urgent matter than the serious economic and political disruptions that occurred in the immediate post-war period. The last, as well as the military history of the war, have been well covered elsewhere and so will not occupy us here in this present treatise.

Nonetheless, a review of the history of the Revolutionary and post-war institutions of the state and general governments must occupy us for a bit because these institutions did have direct and pertinent consequences for post-war education in the United States. It is true that before the war schools were less important in American public education than were home schooling and apprenticeship. Apprenticeship failed in the Economy revolution that began prior to the war, and because apprenticeship education was the primary institution for education past the simple stages of reading and writing, its loss was by far the most serious blow to American education. Further, the institution was not revived after the war and this made school institution, by default, into the most critical part of public education for the post-war United States. The American institution of government played a central role in how the post-war institution of education developed, and therefore we must take a look at the wartime and post-war institutions of government in the U.S.

§ 1.1 The Second Continental Congress

The second Continental Congress assembled in Philadelphia on May 10, 1775, three weeks after the battle of Lexington and Concord. The call for another Congress was issued by provincial congresses and conventions organized through committees of correspondence. Officially illegal, the latter had been set up after the first Continental Congress created a Continental Association, in October of 1774, to organize a boycott of British imports to the thirteen colonies. The call for a Congress took place this way because when the legal colonial assemblies called for elections of delegates to the Congress they were dissolved by the royal governors [Nettels (1938), pp. 646-54]. Nettels tells us,

When the news [of Lexington and Concord] reached New York and Georgia, the townspeople seized control of the ports of New York and Savannah, whereupon the patriot leaders called upon the electoral districts to send delegates to provincial congresses, which met respectively in May and July 1775. Elsewhere the war gave the signal for the provincial congresses to take over the legislative and financial functions of government. Next they seized the executive powers as the royal and proprietary governors were driven from office. By the end of 1775 all such governors except those of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland had been expelled; by July 1776 they too were gone. In Rhode Island and Connecticut, where there were no royal governors, the patriots converted their established institutions of government into revolutionary agencies. Since the principal task of the provincial congresses after May 1775 was to wage war against Britain they had then become distinctly revolutionary bodies. [Nettels (1938), pp. 652-3]

The second Continental Congress was not a legal governing body under any of the colonial
charters (which were, prior to July 4, 1776, what Americans regarded as the legal basis for their governments). Consequently it did not start out as a national revolutionary government but simply as an advisory body advising the provincial congresses. Hart wrote,

On May 10, 1775, three weeks after the battle of Lexington, the second Continental Congress assembled in Philadelphia and continued, with occasional adjournments, till March 1, 1781. To the minds of the men of that day a congress was not a legislature, but a diplomatic assembly, a meeting of delegates for conference and for suggestions to their principals [the provincial congresses]. To be sure, this Congress represented the people, acting through popular conventions and not the old colonial assemblies; yet those conventions assumed to exercise the powers of government in the colonies, and expected the delegates to report back to them and to ask for instructions. Nevertheless, the delegates at once began to pass resolutions which were to have effect without any ratification by the legislatures. Of the nine colonies that gave formal instructions to their representatives, all but one directed them to "order" something, or to "determine" something, or to pass "binding" acts.

Thus Congress began rather as the advisor than as the director of the colonies; but it advised strong measures. On May 30, 1775, a plan of conciliation suggested by Lord North [Great Britain's prime minister] was pronounced "unreasonable and insidious." On the request of the provincial congress of Massachusetts Bay, it recommended that body to "form a temporary colonial government until a governor of his Majesty's appointment will consent to govern the colony according to its charter." . . . Like the First Continental Congress, it framed several petitions and addresses to the British people and to the king of Great Britain. During the first six weeks of its existence, therefore, the Second Continental Congress acted chiefly as the center for common consultation and as the agent for this joint expostulation. [Hart (1897), pp. 73-4]

Congress also called, within a week after assembling, for an immediate boycott of "certain commerce" with Great Britain, and a week after this called for the militia of New York to be armed and trained to resist in case British troops attempted to take control of the port. On June 14 it resolved to raise a continental army and appointed George Washington as its commander in chief. In October it authorized the formation of a navy and the commissioning of privateers. In November it created a "Committee of Correspondence with our friends abroad," i.e., it undertook to conduct foreign relations and eventually began sending ambassadors to other countries. It opened all ports to foreign trade (in open violation of the Trade Acts) and prohibited the slave trade¹. Except briefly in South Carolina and Georgia for a time after the end of the Revolutionary War, importation of slaves was never resumed [Alden (1969), pp. 367-8]. On June 22 Congress ordered the issuing of paper currency and opened subscriptions to national loans. Thus, although it had no sanction in law to act as a national government, the second Continental Congress began acting as a de facto national government almost from its beginning.

Despite the outbreak of open warfare in New England, neither Congress nor more than a small minority of patriot leaders were yet in favor of outright independence from Great Britain. What they wanted was the king's consent to placing their local charter governments on equal footing with parliament, which would have basically reorganized the colonies into commonwealth

¹ It did not abolish or attempt to abolish existing slavery in the colonies. As it happens, prohibiting further import of slaves was desired by the southern slave owners because imported slaves depressed the market value of the slaves they already owned and because, like the Romans and the Spartans of earlier ages, southern whites had begun to fear the possibility of a slave revolt as the population of slaves grew. The British government's refusal to allow prohibition of slave trade was one of the South's chief grievances against Parliament. It is worth remembering that the institution of slavery in America was a British, not an American, institution, to which the southern economy had become addicted in the eighteenth century.
nations – a restructuring Britain in fact undertook in the twentieth century with all its colonies after World War II. Towards this end, in July 1775, Congress issued what became known as the "Olive Branch Petition" to George III. This conciliatory move was led by John Dickinson and supported by the conservative members of Congress. But,

In August, George III refused to receive the Olive Branch Petition (on the ground that it was drafted by an illegal, disloyal body) and on August 23 he issued a proclamation stigmatizing the Americans as rebels and ordering that all persons refrain from giving them their assistance. Parliament completed the work of repression by an act of December 22, 1775, which prohibited all trade with the thirteen colonies – an act embodying the view of Lord North that because "the Americans had refused trade with Great Britain, it was but just that they not be suffered to trade with any other nation." [Nettels (1938), pg. 655]

From this point forward, it was inevitable that the rebellion in America would become a war for independence.

On June 7 [1776] Richard Henry Lee introduced in the Congress a three-fold resolution declaring in favor of independence, foreign alliances, and American federation. The conciliationists headed by John Dickinson postponed a vote, but a committee composed of Jefferson, Franklin, Roger Sherman, R.R. Livingston, and John Adams was named to draft a declaration of independence. On July 1 Lee's resolution was approved by delegates of nine colonies; on the next day South Carolina, Delaware, and Pennsylvania voiced their assent. Jefferson's declaration was then debated and, slightly modified, was adopted on July 4. New York – the only colony that had not acted – joined its sister states when its provincial congress ratified the Declaration, July 9. Not until August 2 and afterward was it signed by the members of the Continental Congress. One last impetus for separation was the news received at Philadelphia in June that Britain had hired twenty thousand German mercenaries for the American war. [ibid., pg. 657]

So it was that July 4 became the date officially marking the change of name from the United Colonies of America to the United States of America. So too it is that Lincoln later said, on July 4, 1861, "The Union is older than any of the States and in fact it created them."

The de facto role of Congress as the federal government of a republic is demonstrated by the following observation Hart makes:

That the states did not regard independence as freeing them from the relation to Congress may be seen from the fact that their new governments were formed under the direction or with the permission of Congress. The outbreak of the Revolution in 1775 had suddenly destroyed the constitutional governments with which the colonies were familiar. Everywhere the courts were prevented from sitting, and governors were impeded or driven out. In order to organize resistance and also to carry out the ordinary purposes of government, in each colony there arose a revolutionary and unauthorized body, known as the Provincial Convention or Provincial Congress, which took upon itself all the powers of government. The new arrangement was unsatisfactory to a people accustomed to orderly government and to stable administrations. They turned to Congress for advice. At first Congress suggested only temporary arrangements. In November, 1775, it encouraged the colonies to form permanent organizations, and on May 10, 1776, it advised them all to "adopt such governments as shall . . . best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular and America in general." [Hart (1897), pg. 81]

§ 1.2 The State Governments

All thirteen states responded to Congress' May advice by establishing state constitutions that defined their forms of government. Two states, New Hampshire and South Carolina, had done so
Rhode Island and Connecticut both simply retained their colonial charters with some rewording of their preambles. Vermont became the 14th State on March 4, 1791.

shortly after Congress' initial November 1775 "encouragement," although both ended up re-doing their constitutions later. Table 6.1 provides the dates of adoption for the original constitutions by state [Morison & Commager (1930), pg. 107]. Connecticut and Rhode Island did not bother with new constitutions but instead merely amended their colonial charters and had these serve as constitutions. In their cases the charters were already so democratic that the citizens of these states deemed that nothing more needed to be done to form a state government.

The establishment of State government by a popular Constitution was a remarkable first in the long history of political science, and to the old European nations of the day it was nothing short of radically innovative. Morison and Commager, with a detectable note of pride, wrote,

The writing of the state constitutions was a splendid opportunity for the democratic elements to remedy their grievances and realize their ambitions. Most of the new constitutions showed the impact of democratic ideas, but none made any drastic break with the past. They were built by Americans on the solid foundation of colonial experience, with the timber of English law and practice. And there was a remarkable uniformity in the new governments. The reason was that the main work of drafting a constitution must always be done by a few men, and those few selected were men of education and experience, who saw eye to eye on the fundamentals of popular government. 'Government is a very simple, easy thing,' declared a local convention in Maine. 'Mysteries in politics are mere absurdities.' But when simple men tried to draft a constitution they found it not so easy.

The new constitutions were, for the most part, the work of able and talented men. John Jay, Robert Livingston, and Gouverneur Morris were the architects of the New York constitution, which was regarded as a model by contemporaries. The conservative 'Essex Junto' of Massachusetts: George Cabot, John Lowell, and Theophilus Parsons, worked hand in glove with John Adams. The South Carolina convention contained the names of Pinckney, Rutledge, Gadsden, Laurens, and Drayton . . .

Americans are so accustomed to living under written constitutions that they take them for granted; yet the written constitution is a distinctly American contribution; and these were the first in history. 'In all free states the constitution is final,' John Adams had written, and Americans everywhere had demanded 'a standing law to live by.' The written constitution was the natural, the inevitable result. Although solidly based on the colonial charters from which they evolved, and on colonial experience, they contained much revolutionary theory. The doctrine of delegated powers was implied or expressed in most of the new constitutions. Virginia, for example, declared 'all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them.' It took time, as John Jay observed, to change subjects into citizens. The ancient fear of government, the belief that if not limited it would usurp the liberties of the people, led to an elaborate system of checks and balances in state and federal government alike. The three departments [legislative, executive, and judicial] were balanced against each other . . . and elaborate bills of rights placed the fundamental civil rights beyond government usurpation. [Morison & Commager (1930), pp. 110-111]
Some of the enthusiasms in this quote must be moderated. There is no shortage of scholars – at least, not yet – who would be prepared to dispute the claim that the American state constitutions were "the first in history." Even Morison & Commager found it difficult to make this assertion stick in their book. After all, did not Aristotle and that anonymous author known to history today as the pseudo-Xenophon write about an Athenian Constitution? Did not Aristotle also incorporate the idea of a "constitution" in his Πολιτικῶν (Politics)? Were not Rome's Twelve Tables [Durant (1944), pp. 25-33] and the Old Testament's Deuteronomy constitutions of a sort? If constitutions were unknown in Great Britain prior to the American Revolution then Thomas Paine could not have written,

In England, it is not difficult to perceive that everything has a constitution except the nation. Every society and association that is established, first agreed upon a number of original articles, digested into form, which are its constitution. It then appointed its officers, whose powers and authorities are described in that constitution, and the government of that society then commenced. [Paine (1792), pg. 159]

In the cases of both Aristotle and pseudo-Xenophon, the word each of them used was πολιτεία (politeía). This word is riddled with contextual definitions that include: condition and rights of a citizen, citizenship; government, administration; course of policy; form of government, esp. republican government, free commonwealth [Liddell & Scott (1996)]. As Paine correctly noted,

That men mean distinct and separate things when they speak of constitutions and of governments is evident; or, why are these terms distinctly and separately used? A constitution is not the act of a government, but of a people constituting a government; and a government without a constitution is power without a right.

All power exercised over a nation must have some beginning. It must be either delegated or assumed. There are no other sources. All delegated power is trust, and all assumed power is usurpation. Time does not alter the nature and quality of either. [Paine (1792), pg. 153]

What was historically unique about the American State Constitutions was that each of them established one or another variant of a new form of republic, one not quite like any the world had seen before. Republic and non-consensus democracy are two of the four historically common empirical forms of Society governance illustrated in figure 6.1 below. All the states assumed, in divers degrees, the general form of democratic republics – i.e., majority rule in the selection of the agents of government and governance of the State by mechanisms and processes worked by these agents – and none of the state constitutions clearly understood the distinction between the antisocial concept of ruling and the social-Critical concept of governance authority. Rather, authority was, as it usually is today, mistaken for power. In no case was a State government constituted as a democracy (i.e. governance of the State Community according to the principle that majority opinion is to rule2), although all incorporated some democratic mechanisms in the selection of legislators. Hence, all thirteen States were set up as democratic republics.

---

2 Contemporary state ballot initiatives for putting into effect various laws affecting all the state's residents are the most common empirical expression of governance by democracy found in the United States today. In states that permit ballot initiatives, the most frequent uses to which they are put are popular mandates on taxes (usually in the form of decreasing them) or to impose religious laws. The majority opinion of those who vote (which is limited in expression to either 'aye' or 'nay' without any mechanism to amend or limit the proposed law) rules, quite regardless of the dissent of the minority. The initiatives that impose religious laws are, generally without exception, violations of the social contract - therefore despotic and destructive of the civil Community because they become perpetuated acts of injustice. This is tyranny of democracy in action and is one means of eventually provoking the disintegration and fall of a Society.
What also was unique about these State constitutions was that they were the first empirical trials of the many new ideas of populism and political governance that had been produced in the great movement of the European Enlightenment. Europeans had been talking and writing about these ideas for quite some time by 1776, but nowhere in Europe had any of these ideas been tried and put to the test. In this sense, the United States of America was the world's first real trial of the Enlightenment political ideas and a new social-natural political science emerging from them.

Without exception, the new state constitutions were put together by members of the Patriot party. However, like other political parties, members of the Patriot party held a spectrum of diverse political views and informal systems of political metaphysics or pseudo-metaphysics. (A metaphysic, you should remember, is "the way one looks at the world"). Figure 6.2 illustrates the spectrum of subjective flavors in the various political judgments of the individuals involved. The terminology used in this figure for broad classifications of these judgments (conservative, liberal, and radical) is the terminology used by the Patriots at the time of the Revolution. It is a point of possible confusion that these same terms are used in American politics today but that the meanings associated with these words have changed and do not match the meanings used by the Patriots in 1775-1796. I will discuss what these terms meant in the revolutionary period shortly. Before doing so, there is another point to be discussed, namely, the emergency conditions under which the state constitutions were drafted. Alden describes the situation in the following way:

The Patriots also developed praiseworthy methods both for the making and for the adopting of such constitutions. The first of those instruments contrived by the Patriots were drawn by Revolutionary gatherings in hurry, in troubled times, even in the shadow of advancing British armies. They were prepared and put into effect by men much engaged in raising money, collecting troops, repressing Tories, and carrying on the everyday business of government. Late in 1775 the Continental Congress urged that no Revolutionary body undertake to draft a constitution unless that body was chosen by "a full and free representation" of the people in an election in which constitution-making was an issue. Most of the Revolutionary assemblies were authorized by Patriot voters to make constitutions. How-

Figure 6.1: The governance circumplex illustrating the four principal empirical forms of government most commonly encountered in history in various Societies.
Figure 6.2: Circumplex model of the spectrum of political/governance views within the Patriot party.

ever, some constitutions were drawn by men not specifically permitted to act. In no state was the handiwork of the Revolutionary legislature submitted to the voters for approval or disapproval. Soon there was a public outcry against such procedures. Was it right that fundamental law should be molded by men not specially and exclusively elected for that purpose? And ought not the voters to decide whether the product of the constitution framers was satisfactory? And if they were not permitted to render a verdict by popular vote, ought not their will to be expressed through conventions specially elected by them to weigh the merits of those constitutions? . . . Had the plain men of Concord taken up their muskets on April 19, 1775, merely for the replacement of British masters by American ones? . . . Thomas Jefferson and many liberal-minded public men . . . pointed out that the compact theory enunciated by the hallowed John Locke and the Declaration of Independence required that citizens – at least property owners and taxpayers – take an active part in the making of new political contracts. Gradually that argument won acceptance. [Alden (1969), pp. 330-331]

The terminology of Social Contract theory did not yet exist in Revolutionary America. Very few Americans in those days had ever heard of Rousseau, although some of the more highly educated Patriot leaders knew their Locke and their Montesquieu. Nonetheless, the making of the state constitutions – and, later, the Articles of Confederation and the U.S. Constitution – were exercises in forging social contracts. This, more than any other factor, is what gives the American constitution – whether of the general government, state government, or even a small town charter – its dominating social importance. Never before in the history of Western civilization had the instituting of a government been carried out with near-explicit recognition that a constitution is a social contract. That is what Alden refers to when he calls Locke's second treatise on government "compact theory." This term means "theory of compacts," i.e., social contracts.

Now let us turn to figure 6.2 and the terminology of the divers subjective political tastes of the
Table 6.2: the Revolutionary State Constitutions (1776-1780)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>political flavor of state constitution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>political flavor of state constitution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>conservatively liberal</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>liberally radical</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>liberally radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>liberally radical</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>liberally radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>radically liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patriots. Both Alden (pp. 333-8) and Nettels (pp. 665) provide us with some descriptions of the three major Patriot classifications of political philosophies. The first point to emphasize is that the political views illustrated in figure 6.2 are not crisply classifiable in the way that today people are identifiable members of political parties such as the Republican party or the Democratic party. It is true that the contemporary Republican party has much in common with the views and attitudes of the conservative Patriots. Many of today's "neo-conservatives" are the equivalents of the patrician oligarchs in figure 6.2, a few ('libertarians') are anarchists. Democratic party "liberals" correspond to the radical Patriots (who, by the way, were also called 'the Democrats'). Those who are called "moderates" today were called "the liberals" by the Patriots. The divisions of figure 6.2 represent a continuum or spectrum of views in which some conservatives such as John Adams held views closer to liberals, such as Thomas Jefferson, than to others who were also identified with the conservative classification. As Alden remarked, "the labels Conservative, Liberal, and Radical are useful; they are not precise and absolute descriptions" [Alden (1969), pg. 336].

The state constitutions reflected these differences in political philosophies and can be classified in terms of them. Table 6.2 summarizes the political character of the original state constitutions that were established. Nettels described the liberals as "moderate democrats," radicals as "radical democrats," and conservatives as "ultra-conservatives." However, it is important to emphasize that all three classifications were, and regarded themselves as, republicans except at the far left and far right extremes of the political spectrum. Nettels' terminology is less precise than Alden's and shows more of a tendency to associate the Patriot labels with contemporary political party labels. He wrote,

In most states the problem of erecting a new government evoked a bitter struggle between the democratic and conservative forces. One section of the democracy stood for three main principles: a liberal franchise, equal representation of all districts in proportion to population, and the supremacy of the popular house of legislature over the upper house, the executive, and the judiciary. Such was the program of the radical democratic leaders like Franklin, Tom Paine, and Samuel Adams. More moderate democratic leaders, including Jefferson, Madison, and [Richard Henry] Lee, mistrustful of all government and fearing that an elected lower house might become as tyrannical as an oligarchy of aristocrats, favored a government of limited powers in which the executive, judicial, and legislative branches would keep each other in check. The ultra-conservatives desired to withhold the right to vote from the poor, to give wealthy districts an influence greater than the population alone would warrant, and to provide a strong upper house and an independent executive and judiciary, all three to serve as brakes on the lower house. Radical democrats thus favored popular rule, moderate democrats wanted as little government as possible, and conservatives believed with John Jay that "those who own the country ought to govern it." The radical democrats were small farmers, small tradesmen, artisans, and mechanics; the conservatives were generally the largest property owners; while the moderate democrats were men of liberal sympathies and substantial property, often at odds with the largest property owners and yet not disposed to countenance mob rule or unrestrained attacks on property rights. [Nettels (1938), pg. 665]
Alden provides a more detailed description of the differences among Patriot views:

The Patriots were indeed much divided with respect to their political goals. They had not formed an indivisible mass before the battle of Lexington and Concord. They all desired an end to British domination. They were nearly all republicans. So long as the War of Independence continued, they also agreed that Loyalists must not be permitted to take an active part in public affairs. However, when they began to labor toward creating a new nation, they fell into three quarreling groups. One of these, the Conservatives, desired as little fundamental change as possible from the regime that had existed before the war. Led by planters, wealthy merchants, prosperous lawyers, the Anglican and Congregational clergymen, they believed that the power formerly wielded by the British ought to pass to American patricians – themselves – who had shared authority in the past with royal and proprietary officers. Those worthy, those superior, those experienced men ought to rule. The Conservatives desired restricted suffrage; bicameral legislatures; indirect election and long terms of office for members of the upper chamber; relatively powerful executives; high property qualifications for lawmakers and governors; and appointed and independent judges. They stood for sound money; they tended to defend established churches; they were averse to re-districting that would enable city mechanics and Western pioneers to voice their wishes more effectively. As the War of Independence continued, they increasingly favored the establishment of a strong national government, which, of course, they hoped to dominate. Among the Conservatives were Edmund Pendleton and George Washington of Virginia; the Rutledge brothers, John and Edward, of South Carolina; John Dickinson; John Adams; and sundry other prominent men less distinguished for character and magnanimity.

At sharp odds with the Conservatives were the Radicals, also known as the Democrats. The labels applied to them correctly indicate that they desired many and far-reaching changes. The mass of them was composed of plain and poor farmers, backwoodsmen, tradesmen, artisans, laborers, and clerks. But they were not without educated leaders, for lawyers, planters, and politicians such as Patrick Henry, George Bryan of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Person of North Carolina espoused their cause. The Radicals demanded representative democracy. To them, one white man was as good as another. Hence, all white adults ought to possess the suffrage, and the vote of a poor backwoods settler ought to have as much weight as that of a prosperous Tidewater merchant. The Radicals sought for unicameral legislatures, or for bicameral bodies in which the upper house was directly elected by the voters for short terms. They desired weak executives who could not become tyrants; they urged that judges be popularly chosen for short periods of office. They disliked established churches. Often, being debtors rather than creditors, they sought to improve their own condition by expanding the supply of paper currency. Even more than other Patriots, they were disposed to deal harshly with the Loyalists.

Between those Democrats and the Conservatives was a smaller body of moderates, the Liberals. These were men who detested domination by the sophisticated, propertied, and selfish few, but who doubted that all white males should immediately exert equal weight in public affairs. They would have a generous suffrage. Perhaps, in time, it would be safe, and even indispensable, to permit all adult males to vote. The liberals disliked unequal election districts. They rather favored bicameral legislatures in which the lower house would have larger authority than the upper. They disliked strong executives and independent and arrogant judges. The Liberals were hostile to established sects; they desired religious freedom. Looking forward to the future, they favored the founding and fostering of schools at public expense. As the mass of Americans became more enlightened, the suffrage could be expanded. The Liberals desired progress, and believed that it could be achieved. They sought to find a middle way. Their sympathies were with the mass rather than class. As the years passed, they came to believe, with misgivings, that it was necessary to create a sturdy national government. Their leaders included broad-minded planters, lawyers, physicians, and newspaper publishers. Conspicuous among them were Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, and George Clinton of New York. [Alden (1969), pp. 335-6]
These differences in views will be familiar today to those who make it a habit to follow on-going affairs in American politics.

The framers of the state constitutions (and, later, the U.S. Constitution) were practical political scientists in an age when political science, while not an exact science, was, nonetheless, a social-natural science. They knew that, as Bloom would put it two centuries later, politics was the authoritative arena of effective good and evil and of the love of justice. They were intimately familiar, through first-hand experience, with the nature of government in the colonies and were aware of the political order in Britain and other countries. They knew their Locke and their Montesquieu, although few of them had ever heard of Rousseau. Among them, the most influential writer on the topic of government was John Adams. Adams' short treatise on the subject, "Thoughts on government" (1776), was highly influential with constitution framers, although no state adopted Adams' ideas wholesale. Adams, a conservative, held views that stood in close sympathy and kinship to those of Jefferson [Adams (1814)]. Although the two men often sharply disagreed on some particulars, they were friends and political co-spirits throughout their long public and retired lives. If one were to seek for a life model of what it meant to be an American republican at the end of the eighteenth century, one would find it to be a syncretic fusion of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison.

Both Nettels [(1938), pp. 665-9] and Bolton & Marshall [(1920), pp. 546-9] provide some detail describing the character of the state governments established by the new constitutions. Referring to table 6.2, the seven conservative state governments followed the conservative preferences and biases described by Alden. These states accounted for an estimated 1,685,500 people (including slaves) in 1780, or about 61% of all American residents. The right to vote and hold office each had property qualification restrictions and the resulting governments were similar in nature to both the early Roman republic's patrician government and to the upper-class-dominated parliament of Great Britain. Power was centered in the hands of the wealthier men and at least politically the old colonial governments sans the British were more or less continued. The role of mimesis in the political ideas of governance in the conservative states is more or less evident. The ruling officials favored Order, tradition, and the continuation of status quo.

The liberally radical governments accounted for an estimated 727,000 American residents, or about 26.1% of the 1780 population. These governments were democratic republics (see figure 6.2) in which suffrage was more broadly granted and the political institution was closer akin to the present-day democratic republic of the United States. The character of these governments generally favored Order, but with changes in the old status quo, and majority rule.

Only two states, Connecticut and Rhode Island, established liberal governments and their constitutions were basically continuations of their previous colonial charters with sovereignty of the king replaced by sovereignty of the people. Rhode Island was a moderate democratic republic, while the government of Connecticut had more the flavor of a moderate meritocracy republic (see figure 6.2). These two states accounted for about a quarter of a million American residents or about 9.2% of the American population. The remaining roughly 3.5% of Americans lived in Maine and Vermont, which were not yet states. The case of Vermont is rather singular in the sense that the people of the Green Mountain region had to revolt not only against the British but against the state of New York as well to establish their independence as a state. Vermont became a state and joined the Union in 1791 as a radical-leaning democratic republic.

In no state was universal suffrage granted to all white men. Every state had some property qualification required for the franchise and to hold office. In the radical republics this barrier was set low and most white males could meet it. In Georgia clergymen were banned from holding public office, and in a number of respects Georgia was the most radical of the radical democratic republics.
§ 2. The Neglect of Public Education

Although some states, particularly in New England, recognized having a literate and educated citizenry as important, in no state was the institution of education recognized as a basic part of the institution of government. This has continued to be true to the present in the United States and in almost every other country on earth. Not too surprisingly, this coincides with the disposition of the states to establish judiciaries that are comparatively weak relative to the power that was given the state legislatures. In Social Contract theory, the institution of public education is recognized to be part of the judicial branch of the institution of government and a social-natural necessity of human nature for civil Community governance. An erroneous presumption built into all the state constitutions was that the legislative body is a *ruling* body in a republic — a prejudice dating back to the Roman republic. Although the Patriots did recognize in an abstract way the ultimate sovereignty of the people in the Community, they failed to mark the Critical distinction between ruling and governing. It is a shortcoming in political theory not unique to the United States. Even Rousseau failed to fully apprehend this difference in *The Social Contract*, and this was one of the principal failings in Rousseau's version of social contract theory. Kant also failed to sufficiently mark this distinction, and this is one reason Kant was unable to correct the errors in Rousseau's theory and construct a practical social contract theory.

The neglect of public education's function in government ensured the three previously noted colonial general attitudes toward education were continued in the new United States. Further, the education function of the apprenticeship system was not recognized by the Americans — who continue to this day to regard apprenticeship, then, and vocational education, now, as relating exclusively to preparing young people with skills required in narrowly defined types of jobs in a *status quo* economy. Thus the loss during the Economy revolution of America's main element of public instructional education went unrecognized for what it was.

This attitude is entirely antagonistic to Progress in a Society. It tends to foster this oligarch's attitude: that it falls to some elite caste to decide "what the common people need" from the institution of education so that they might be properly "fitted" for limited economic roles within Society. It is a subtle but insidious artificial barrier to the liberty of the individual to extend his *Personfähigkeit* through the accomplishments of his own enterprise. Consequently, it not only artificially hinders creativity in a Society but actually promotes civil dissatisfaction and reinforces other tendencies favoring the formation of Toynbee proletariats. It is: (1) an *uncivic* attitude toward public education; (2) a subtle violation of the condition for social contracting; and (3) an incubator for the eventual breakdown and disintegration of a Society because it promotes winner-and-loser types of competition rather than conduces to civil cooperations.

The Communism movement of the 19th to 20th centuries is the outstanding example of social upheaval led to by this error in understanding the function of public education. In the present day as they appear when viewed under Critical Social Contract theory, the fundamentalist-theocracy movements in Islamic Societies, extreme antisocial ideology in the post-Reagan Republican party in the United States (so-called 'neo-conservatism'), and a rising factor of Judaic fundamentalism in contemporary Israeli politics can be seen as present day counterparts of the old Communist movement. If unchecked, these movements *will* lead to horrific and bloody civil wars. If you understand the inevitable role the institution of education always has for justice in a Society, you will also understand the more-than-tiny grain of truth captured in Matthew Arnold's poem:

Ah, love, let us be true
To one another! for the world, which seems
To lie before us like a land of dreams,
So various, so beautiful, so new,
Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
And we are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night. – Matthew Arnold (1867), Dover Beach, st. 4

As I have discussed in volume I, Education and Society, social-natural education is logically divided into dimensions: learner-as-a-free-person and learner-as-a-member-of-the-Community. In the unscientific jargon of traditional education theory, these dimensions are usually mistaken as representing "vocational" education and "liberal" education, respectively, and educators have tended, erroneously, to regard the two as real-separable instructional activities addressing two independent objectives. I presume the traditional phrase "vocational education" is familiar enough to contemporary readers. Shop classes, "voc-ed" programs, etc. are its instructional representation today. Most professional programs in colleges and universities – e.g., engineering, medicine, law, etc. – are now essentially vocational education programs, just as the 18th and early 19th century instructional education in American colleges was little else than the vocational education of ministers.

What is meant by "liberal education"? Here I will be presumptuous enough to say most people have no correct idea what it means because the phrase has long been embroiled in political propaganda and distorted to the point where it is rhetorical grapeshot fired into audiences by demagogues. A few 1950s educators, those affiliated with what was called "the Great Books Movement," had a partially correct, partially incorrect idea of what a "liberal education" is, and they tried to convey this to their readers and audiences. Whether or not the movement could have ultimately succeeded is a moot point today because it was politically aborted by the American civil war of the 1960s. This had so destructive an impact on curricula in American schools that American public education has yet to even begin to recover from the damage it sustained.

Most educators in the Great Books Movement claimed that liberal education had been lost and abandoned, and went further to claim that it was the education of the Founding Fathers. They were mistaken on both points. There is no evidence that "liberal education" ever existed at all in the United States, and it was certainly not the public instructional education of Patriot leaders. The Great Books advocates did correctly recognize and state the need for liberal education in any civil Society governed according to precepts of popular government with a social contract. Robert M. Hutchins, one of the foremost spokesmen in the Great Books Movement, wrote,

What is a liberal education? It is easy to say what it is not. It is not specialized education, not vocational, avocational, professional, or preprofessional. It is not an education that teaches a man how to do any specific thing.

I am tempted to say that it is the education that no American gets in an educational institution nowadays. We are all specialists now. Even early in high school we are told that we must begin to think how we are going to earn a living, and the prerequisites that are

3 Many people today will and do deny that the violent upheaval of the latter half of the 1960s was a civil war at all. Folks, Americans were shot dead in their streets, public and private property was destroyed, thousands of people became refugees fleeing to other countries (most notably Canada), and many laws were openly violated. It ended only when agents of government smelled sulfur in the wind and acquiesced to ending the war in Vietnam and moving forward with civil rights legislation, thereby removing the flashpoint grievances that provoked the conflict. War is any violent conflict between two or more Societies involving the application of deadly force against specific groups of persons who another corporate person regards as an enemy. In the 1960s Americans splintered into several violently antagonistic Societies and engaged in violent confrontations. Every "demonstration" and "peace rally" that took place was always only a badly chosen word or a single pugnacious action away from exploding into riot and deadly violence. That is a war and, as it was confined to the United States and its people, it was a civil war.
supposed to prepare us for that activity become more and more the ingredients of our educational diet. I am afraid we shall have to admit that the educational process in America is either a rather pleasant way of passing the time until we are ready to go to work, or a way of getting ready for some occupation, or a combination of the two. What is missing is education to be human beings, education to make the most of our human powers, education for our responsibilities as members of a democratic society, education for freedom.

That is what liberal education is. It is the education that prepares us to be free men. You have to have this education if you are going to be happy; for happiness consists in making the most of yourself. You have to have this education if you are going to be a member of the community; for membership in the community implies the ability to communicate with others. You have to have this education if you are going to be an effective citizen of a democracy; for citizenship requires that you understand the world in which you live and that you do not leave your duties to be performed by others, living vicariously and vacuously on their virtue and intelligence. A free society is a society composed of free men. To be free you have to be educated for freedom. This means you have to think; for the free man is one who thinks for himself. It means that you have to think, for example, about the aims of life and of organized society. [Hutchins (1959), pp. v-vi]

There were, to be sure, some Patriot leaders who had acquired by means of educational Self-development activities of their own many of the Enlightenment ideas of Europe, and who were able to apply them to the formidable task of setting up popular constitutional governments. Many though not all of these men were delegates at the 1787 Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Notably absent at this watershed event in U.S. history were John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, both of whom were serving as ambassadors to Europe at that time. Some of them, whose political persuasions were those of the liberal group, understood the need for the sort of liberal education Hutchins spoke of. How, then, did it come to pass that the Constitutional Convention produced a Constitution for the United States that failed to mention the role of education-as-government?

One fairly obvious reason was the colossal scope of the challenge facing the United States at that moment in history and threatening to break apart the frail Union that had hung together during the War. As soon as the War had been won, the many underlying competitive antagonisms of the individual states resurfaced, and the weak Congress established by the Articles of Confederation proved to be too ineffectual to function as a general government for the nation. A glance at table 6.2 makes clear the sorts of fundamental metaphysical differences in political philosophies that divided the States. Not recognizing public education as an inherent part of the justice system in a civil republic, bringing with them the habitual presupposition of the legislative branch of government as a ruling branch of government (with the executive branch assigned to carrying out the day-to-day details of running and enforcing the mandates of Congress), and far underestimating the importance of the judicial branch of government, it is not in the least unusual that the topic of education commanded only the most minor priority level on the Convention's agenda of urgent tasks.

The topic of education was not raised until the waning days of the Convention, when it can be fairly presumed that the delegates were anxious to wrap things up, leave for home, and begin taking on the also-formidable task of selling their States on the plan of the Constitution. On Friday, September 14, 1787 Madison and Pinkney introduced an amendment to the then nearly-completed draft of the Constitution. Madison recorded the debate in his notes for that day:

Mr. Madison & Mr. Pinkney then moved to insert in the list of powers vested in Congress a power – "to establish a University, in which no preferences or distinctions should be allowed on account of religion."

Mr. Wilson supported the motion.
Mr. Govr. Morris: It is not necessary. The exclusive power at the Seat of Government
will reach the object.

On the question:

N.H. no – Mass. no – Cont. divided, Dr. Johnson ay, Mr. Sherman no – N.J. no – Pa. ay –

[Farrand (1911), vol. II, pg. 616, 14 Sept.]

The Constitutional Convention concluded its business and adjourned sine die three days later, on
Monday, Sept. 17, having begun its work four months earlier on May 14, 1787. We can note from
the individual States' votes that the failure of this amendment was not along conservative-radical
lines in the state governments; one cannot fix the cause of the Convention's decision along those
lines and, therefore, probably not along the lines of the three colonial attitudes towards education.
If that were so, it would be incomprehensible why Massachusetts voted 'nay' on the motion or
why Pennsylvania delegate Gouverneur Morris would speak against it and then vote 'aye.' A more
likely explanation is simply that what Morris said was true: at that moment the proposed new
Congress would have already had the power to establish a national university if it chose to do so.

That power, however, it was soon to lose because of what some have regarded as the strangest
omission made at the Constitutional Convention, namely, omission of a Bill of Rights in the final
version of the proposed Constitution. Inclusion of a Bill of Rights had not been entirely
overlooked; a motion by George Mason of Virginia to appoint a committee to draft one had been
made, also near the end of the Convention, on Sept. 12. It had failed by a vote of 0 to 10 [ibid.,
pg. 588, 12 Sept.]. The deciding factor here seems to have been a point made by Roger Sherman
of Connecticut, who said that the States' Declarations of Rights were not repealed by the
proposed Constitution of the general government, and that these were therefore sufficient already.
It is more than a little interesting to read the somewhat-embarrassed-sounding explanations some
of the delegates were later obliged to offer on this point when the lack of a Bill of Rights
produced a great fever of passionate objection in the state legislatures and conventions [Farrand
(1911), vol. III, pp. 143-4, 161-2, 256, 297-8, 357].

In any case, a Bill of Rights added by amendment was one of the first things the new Congress
of the United States took up; indeed, the pledge to do so was necessary to obtain ratification of
the Constitution at all. It was when the Tenth Amendment was ratified – "The powers not
delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved
to the States, respectively, or to the people" – that Congress lost the power to create a national
university (or, indeed, any national system of education). If you peruse Farrand's Records, you
might perhaps find it striking how often the delegates at the Convention passed over issues on the
basis that good men of common sense would understand implied powers of the branches of the
general government. The rest of the country, it would seem, placed less reliance on this and the
Tenth Amendment codified that natural – and not inappropriate – mistrust of a powerful general
government. Some of its unintended consequences are both interesting and striking. For example,
the Tenth Amendment – almost certainly unintentionally – also took from Congress the power to
directly prohibit child labor in factories after the U.S. industrial revolution began. The power to
amend the Constitution is necessary to sustain a viable republic, but it is a two-edged sword.
Amending the Constitution is always fraught with great danger from unintended consequences.

§ 3. National Institution of Education in the American Republic

The national emergency that challenged the new United States almost immediately after it had
won its independence was the imminent danger of the immediate disintegration of the Union. The
danger posed was the fundamental provocation for the essential change that was ratified in 1788
in abolishing the original Articles of Confederation (which had basically merely maintained the
form of the Continental Congress) and replacing them with the U.S. Constitution and the system of the general government that has existed since 1789. Seen in this context, the fundamental objective of the Constitution was the preservation of the Union of States as one confederate Republic – the principle of *E pluribus unum* every U.S. schoolchild once learned in grade school until the late 1960s. In this treatise, I take it as a presupposition that maintaining this Union is still a vital civil interest for every U.S. citizen and a fundamental condition of the national social contract that binds all American citizens together.

The word "republic" does not designate one unique form of institution of government. Rather, it is a general term that understands a divers plurality of governance institutions. Every state government established by the early state constitutions was a republican institution of government and Article Four, Section 4, of the Constitution mandates that every new state admitted to the Union is to have a republican form of state government. The U.S. Union is a union of republics – what Montesquieu called a confederate republic [Montesquieu (1748), vol. I, Bk. IX, pp. 126-8]. Within this Union, the individual states established themselves in divers forms of governmental institution but these forms can be broadly classified according to one of two tendencies: what Montesquieu called the "aristocracy" form of republic; or what he called the "democracy" form of republic [ibid., Bk. II, pp. 8-15]. The conservative states listed in table 6.2 tended originally toward aristocracy forms of republic, while the radical states tended originally toward democracy forms of republic, i.e., the forms of democratic republic.

Examination of Farrand's *Records* clearly reveals that much debate at the 1787 Constitutional Convention centered on the issue of whether the general government would have the form of institution of a democratic republic or an aristocracy republic (although neither term is recorded as being actually spoken at the Convention). The issue had great pertinence because it determined how members of Congress were to be selected. In the end, a compromise was reached by which the House of Representatives would be determined through the general form of a democratic republic, while the Senate would be determined through the general form of an aristocracy republic (Senators were originally appointed by the state legislatures, not through popular vote). This was probably the best compromise that could have been reached at that time and in a number of ways it was a wise compromise. Each of the two species of republic has its advantages and its disadvantages, and these tend to be complementary. The hybrid species codified in the U.S. Constitution attempts to optimize the overall constitution of the general government through the advantages each species provides. The hybrid mixture was intended to produce a co-negation of the disadvantages of each. The aim of the Constitution was not homogeneity in the state by state institutions of government; it was the achievement of a stable and effective confederate republic.

---

4 No government currently in existence anywhere on earth is a democracy in the context of the only real meaning of that term, despite the fact that several nations call themselves "democracies." The government of ancient Athens was a true democracy (a non-consensus democracy). When any contemporary writer refers to the U.S.A. (or any other republic) as "a democracy," he can only be taken to mean "democratic republic" if we are to assume he is not deliberately lying to us. In the 19th century, the institution of the government of the confederate republic of the United States and almost all the individual states underwent major changes in which the aristocracy republic form by and large gave way to that of the democratic republic. This happened through the broadening of the franchise, abolition of property requirements, etc. associated with what became known as "The Age of Jackson." Recent proposals by the Republican party in the U.S. to place various restrictions on who is to be allowed to vote in elections are proposals that in effect attempt to restore a form of aristocracy republic. In a number of states where laws pertaining to voting in primary elections have been effected, the result is to convert the political parties themselves into aristocracy republics. Political party rulers don't like to hear it put this way, and party propaganda denies it is so, but despite all such denials, that is the truth of the matter: the national political parties are aristocracy republics and the state-level parties in a number of states are also either aristocracy republics or striving to become aristocracy republics. What they are not are "landed-gentry aristocrat" republics; they are *plutocratic*. 

---
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for the Union. Such a government is neither a *national* government nor a *federal* one but is instead a mixed partially-national and partially-federal form. Madison explained this in *The Federalist*, no. 39 [Hamilton et al. (1787-8), pp. 209-15]. Writers who refer to the United States' general government as either a "national" or a "federal" government are in factual error with regard to the basic constitution of the institution of governance in the United States. One can only presume these writers are ignorant of the basics of government institution in the United States. The correct term is the U.S. *general* government.

That this unique new form of republican governance required for its successful realization new educational requirements for the intellectual *Personfähigkeit* of every U.S. citizen was understood by several of America's most prominent revolutionary leaders and became clear to others soon after the new Constitution was published and put into effect. Among them were: Thomas Jefferson; James Madison; Benjamin Rush; Robert Coram; James Sullivan; Nathaniel Chipman; Samuel Knox; Samuel H. Smith; Lefitte du Courteil; Pierre Samuel Du Pont de Nemours; and Noah Webster. It would be strange indeed if Benjamin Franklin did not also realize this, and there is reason to think John Adams understood it as well, despite his denial that he had ever put much thought into the subject of education [Adams (1814)].

That Americans well informed of the ideas of the European Enlightenment were well aware that different institutions of government required different institutions of education is beyond any reasonable doubt; Montesquieu had already said as much:

The laws of education are the first impressions we receive; and as they prepare us for civil life, every private family ought to be governed by the plan of that great household which comprehends them all.

If the people in general have a principle, their constituent parts, that is, the several families, will have one also. The laws of education will be therefore different in each species of government; in monarchies they will have honor for their guide; in republics, virtue; in despotic governments, fear. [Montesquieu (1748), vol. I, Bk IV, pg. 29]

It is in a republican government that the whole power of education is required. The fear of despotic governments naturally arises of itself amidst threats and punishments; the honor of monarchies is favored by the passions, and favors them in its turn; but virtue is self-renunciation, which is ever arduous and painful.

This virtue may be defined as the love of the laws and of our country. As such love requires a constant preference of public to private interest, it is the source of all private virtues; for they are nothing more than this very preference itself.

This love is peculiar to democracies. In these alone the government is entrusted to private citizens. Now, a government is like everything else: to preserve it we must love it. Has it ever been known that kings were not fond of monarchy, or that despotic princes hated arbitrary power?

Everything, therefore, depends on establishing this love in a republic; and to inspire it ought to be the principal business of education: but the surest way of instilling it into children is for parents to set them an example. People have it generally in their power to communicate their ideas to their children; but they are still better able to transfuse their passions.

If it happens otherwise, it is because the impressions at home are effaced by those they have received abroad. It is not the young people that degenerate; they are not spoiled until those of maturer age are already sunk into corruption. [ibid., pg. 34]

Over a century later, much the same point was echoed by Mill:

When an institution, or a set of institutions, has the way prepared for it by the opinions,
tastes, and habits of the people, they are not only more easily induced to accept it, but will more easily learn, and will be from the beginning better disposed, to do what is required of them both for the preservation of the institutions, and for bringing them into such action as enables them to produce their best results. It would be a great mistake for any legislator not to shape his measures so as to take advantage of such pre-existing habits and feelings when available. On the other hand, it is an exaggeration to elevate these mere aids and facilities into necessary conditions. People are more easily induced to do, and do them more easily, what they already used to; but people also learn to do things new to them. Familiarity is a great help; but much dwelling on an idea will make it familiar, even when strange at first. . . . The amount of capacity which a people possess for doing new things, and adapting themselves to new circumstances is itself one of the elements of the question. It is a quality in which different nations, and different stages of civilization, differ much from one another. The capability of any given people for fulfilling the conditions of a given form of government cannot be pronounced on by any sweeping rule. Knowledge of the particular people, and general practical judgment and sagacity, must be the guides.

There is also another consideration not to be lost sight of. A people may be unprepared for good institutions; but to kindle a desire for them is a necessary part of the preparation. To recommend and advocate a particular institution or form of government, and set its advantages in the strongest light, is one of the modes, often the only mode within reach, of educating the mind of the nation not only for accepting or claiming, but also for working the institution. . . . The result of what has been said is, that, within the limits set by the three conditions [of good government] institutions and forms of government are a matter of choice. To inquire into the best form of government in the abstract (as it is called) is not a chimera, but a highly practical employment of scientific intellect; and to introduce into any country the best institution which, in the existing state of that country, are capable of, in any tolerable degree, fulfilling the conditions, is one of the most rational objects to which practical effort can address itself. . . . In politics, as in mechanics, the power which is to keep the engine going must be sought for outside the machinery; and if it is not forthcoming, or is insufficient to surmount the obstacles which may reasonably be expected, the contrivance will fail. This is no peculiarity of the political art; and amounts to only saying that it is subject to the same limitations and conditions of all arts. [Mill (1861), pp. 7-8]

I would like you to especially notice Mill's phrase "educating the mind of the nation" in this quotation. Education in general, in its Critical real explanation, is the acquisition, development or perfection of knowledge, skill, mental capability, practical character, or aesthetical taste by an individual. Such is the relevance of the opening sentence in the quote just given in regard to opinions, tastes and habits of the people. To educate is to cause education to occur.

**Figure 6.3:** 2LAR of the Enlightenment's empirical Idea of the perfectibility of Man.
The Enlightenment idea of a relationship between education and republican governance was the product of philosophically (rather than politically) liberal thinking and was based upon one of the Enlightenment's most fundamental themes: the unbounded perfectibility of Man (humankind) and his institutions. Much of what is known to contemporary history of the impact this theme had on education scholarship is owed to the research of Allen Oscar Hansen [Hansen (1926)]; I have noticed that other authors' essays and works on this theme frequently cite Hansen's book as one of their sources. Hansen undertook to examine the extant records of the proposals put forward by the previously noted American thinkers of the Revolutionary era and was able to compose from their individual proposals four broad principles under the theme of perfectibility. Hansen's own interpretation of these principles had a few shortcomings, owing to his own metaphysical (and ontology-centered) presuppositions, but a Critical analysis of his findings shows that these principles are congruent with epistemology-centered metaphysics and with the principles of *homo noumenal* human Nature from mental physics. Furthermore, the principles have a synthetic unity and from this unity the theme can be organized in the form of a 2LAR. Figure 6.3 illustrates the structure of the Enlightenment principles and the placement of these four working principles under the headings of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Modality.

The Enlightenment Idea does not provide a complete metaphysic for republican education. This is because this Idea and its principles covers only one of the three required pieces of the metaphysical bridgework required to connect fundamental principles of Critical metaphysics proper to an empirical natural science of education. Specifically, the Idea and its four principles only reflect empirical principles and omit two functions needed for completing the groundwork of natural science, viz., transcendental principles on the rational side of science and transitive principles bridging the rational and empirical characters of natural science. Nor do these principles in and of themselves served to *define* a social-natural science of education; rather, they serve as principles for assessing and evaluating Progress owed to the science and the institutions constructed from it. Nonetheless, the principles do have importance as standard-setting principles for practical governance of education institution.

These principles can all be discerned as presuppositions upon which were based all the proposals for republican education that Hansen was able to find. He examined and summarized proposals by Rush (1786), Coram (1791), Sullivan (1791), Chipman (1793), Knox (1799), Samuel H. Smith (1796), Lafitte du Courteil (1797), Du Pont de Nemours (1800), and he gathered together the opinions of Noah Webster that Webster publicized at one time or another in various essays and speeches or recorded in his diary. Each of these proposals had its own individual idiosyncrasies, but there is nonetheless a number of striking resonances of agreement among them all. These can be traced to a common ground in the overarching theme of perfectibility and the four logical principles figure 6.3 identifies.

The theme of the perfectibility of Man and his institutions is a nucleating Idea of Progress. As I have previously pointed out, perfection is a process and not an end result. It was a powerful contribution of the European Enlightenment to free men's thinking regarding their potential from superstitious presuppositions of inevitable fate and random chance. Enlightenment thinkers had boldly claimed Man can take charge of his own destiny and do things to improve his own lot and that of others. Man was not to be seen as a sheep passively submissive to its shepherd but, rather, as a natural force in his own right capable of shaping the world and his place in it for the better. In a Europe dominated and ruled by absolute monarchs and church officials, this was a radical idea and was regarded as dangerous by kings, bishops, and Protestant authority figures alike.

The principle of Quantity is the principle of justifiable institutions. It holds that all human institutions are justifiable only if they contribute to the advancement and welfare of mankind. The principle puts a justice requirement on the erecting of any human institution, namely: because the institution is made possible only through the support of the people of the Society, the institution
itself must be of service to all the people and not just to some restricted special class or private special interests. An institution funded by all but serving the interests of only a few is an unjust institution. If, as some people claim today, education is only a private good and not a public good, then public institutions of education cannot be justified and must not look for their support to taxes and public laws. If, on the other hand, public education provides a public good under just terms and conditions of a social contract, then the institution is justified and it becomes a civic Duty of every citizen to contribute to its provision and to the assessment its performance.

The principle of Quality is the principle of progressive education. The principle states that education is the principal means for Progress in any Society. Hansen put it this way:

Among the means for advancement education was given first place. . . . The new mode of society required a different mode of education, different in content and in method. . . . Upon the basis of the essential goodness of the nature of man, education would seek to free the latent possibilities and to give an opportunity for individual initiative; [Godwin5 wrote]

"Mind will be suffered to expand itself in proportion as occasion and impression shall excite it, and not be tortured and enervated by being cast in a particular mold."

Education and political reform were considered inseparable. Innovation in order to be constructive must be directed and moderated. If the child were allowed to live naturally and to receive his education in connection with real purposeful activities he would proceed, "With as ardent a passion for innovation as ever" although he would feel "himself more patient and tranquil" because of the habit of experimentation. Education for constructive citizenship should involve "investigation into the humbler walks of private life" as well as into "the cause of reform." Education should be an engine of government but not for the kind of governments that never changed. [Hansen (1926), pp. 14-16]

As interpreted by American thinkers, "education" was equated with "schools." The principle was interpreted as calling for a top-to-bottom change in the curriculum and teaching methods from the traditional and very limited English model to something more akin in spirit to the academy concept pioneered in Philadelphia by Franklin. The Latin grammar school was to be discarded as obsolete and useless and replaced by schools devoted to useful and practical studies applicable to real life in America. Potter described Franklin's academy program in the following way:

The plan, though radical in comparison with the Latin grammar schools, included many of the courses offered by the private evening schools and the English grammar schools. . . . One part of his plan was the suggestion that the schoolhouse be "furnished with a Library . . . with Maps of all Countries, Globes, some mathematical Instruments, and Apparatus for Experiments in Natural Philosophy, and for Mechanics." . . . The master of the school, said Franklin, should be "learn'd in the Languages and Sciences, and a correct pure Speaker and Writer of the English tongue. Few schools of the time were much concerned about the master's command of English as long as his Latin was good. A proposal that went beyond anything in the private schools was that the academy include physical activity – "Running, Leaping, Wrestling, and Swimming." As regards the studies, the ideal would be to teach "every Thing that is useful, and every Thing that is ornamental"; but since that is impossible the students should "learn those Things that are likely to be most useful and most Ornamental. Regard being had to the several Professions for which they are intended." The curriculum would particularly stress English reading and writing and the various practical studies. Although it would be possible for students to take Latin and Greek, no student

5 William Godwin (1756-1836) was an English philosopher, influential in his day and almost completely forgotten today. He is most noted for two books, Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness and Caleb Williams (a novel), and for marrying Mary Wollstonecraft and being the father of Mary Godwin Shelley. He was something of a rebel in his day. For reasons that aren't very clear, Hansen seems to regard him as a better spokesman for the Enlightenment than its actual major contributors, e.g., Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and others whose works are still discussed and cited.
would be required to do so, and those who did must not neglect their "English, Arithmetick, and other Studies." The subjects taught would be writing, arithmetic, accounts, geometry, astronomy, English grammar, history (with Greek and Roman historians in translation), oratory, geography, chronology, morality, French, German, Spanish, natural history, history of commerce, agriculture, mechanics, and logic. The culmination of education was to be "an Inclination join'd with an Ability to serve Mankind, one's Country, Friends, and Family." [Potter (1967), pp. 75-76]

Franklin's plan for the academy had been published in 1749 and the academy was established not long thereafter. Franklin's academy was an enthusiastically popular success. It followed the establishment by Franklin and a group of his friends, known as the Junto, of the first subscription library in America, the Library Company of Philadelphia, in 1742. The Junto later became the American Society, and in 1769 it merged with a similar organization to form the American Philosophical Society (APS). By 1800 membership in the APS included over 650 of the greatest influential minds in America and Europe: Thomas Paine, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Rush, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Washington, Samuel H. Smith, and John Adams. Europeans including Buffon, Du Simitiere, Linnaeus, Le Roux, Decquemare, Dennis, Rozier, Condorcet, Danbenton, Dubourg, Lavoisier, and Du Pont de Nemours. Franklin was elected the APS's first president (1769-1790); he was followed in office by David Rittenhouse (1790-96) and Thomas Jefferson (1796-1815), the only American ever to serve concurrently as the sitting President of the United States and the presiding officer of a major philosophical society.

The principle of Relation is the principle of the human determinability of Progress. It is the principle that men design lines of human Progress, and is a principle for the primacy of science and scientific method in determining, moderating, and controlling progressive innovation. The eighteenth century was the great period of the establishment of empirical science, following upon the ideas and contributions of seventeenth century thinkers like Bacon, Newton, Huygens, Harvey, Leibniz, and Descartes. Here it is important to remember that science in the eighteenth century was not narrowly and artificially confined to physical-natural science (e.g. physics). The thinkers of that age saw no topic as immune to perfection by scientific investigation: education, ethics, commerce, leadership, mathematics – no topic that admitted to an organizing Idea. The artificial equation of science with physical-natural science and a dogmatic methodology in physics was an artifact of nineteenth century positivism and its pseudo-metaphysics of ignorance, presumption, and mimesis. It was in the nineteenth century that social-natural science decayed into mere social science, the humanities became mired in romanticism, philosophy was booted out of the academies of science6, and education failed to become a science.

Hansen's constructive description of this principle, once we lure him away from Godwin and his own Progressive Education Movement sympathies, was the following:

The doctrine of the eighteenth century was that "the inner forces of growth and life can be trusted." Institutions, then, in order to further progress, must be in harmony with these inner [human] forces. In the eighteenth century the idea dominated that if a scientific evaluation and direction of effort were instituted, it would be possible to realize an indefinite progress of mankind. Two things were necessary in order that institutions might function for desirable ends. On the one hand, there must be a clear conception of human values, and on the other hand the means for their realization must be scientifically determined and controlled. Through the progress of invention and discovery man had come

---

6 The man most responsible for philosophy's downfall from its centuries-old position as Queen of the Sciences was Hegel and his hopelessly speculative ontology-centered metaphysics. The most notable accomplishment of Hegel's philosophy was that it provided the pseudo-philosophical groundwork for Communism in the nineteenth century. Hegel once basically as much as said that if Plato had thought things through a bit deeper, Plato would have been Hegel. The man did not lack arrogance.
into a body of materials that might be used for the gaining of incalculably superior materials for the achievement of social welfare. The liberation that began in the early Renaissance and that had in some phases been increasingly developed was but a small indication of the achievements yet to be made. Science had but barely begun to indicate the possibilities in the development of natural resources and yet it had almost entirely changed the outlook of mankind. Through its method there would ultimately be evolved a basis of rational living. This was the doctrine of Diderot, D'Alembert, and the rest of the Encyclopédistes. What had been accomplished in the narrow range of smaller social units could be accomplished for humanity at large. [Hansen (1926), pp. 12-13]

For this hopeful picture to ring true, it is crucial for the idea of "natural resources" to include the homo noumenal resources of the individual person. The artificial nineteenth century restriction of the idea of "natural resources" to mean only "physical-natural resources" was disastrous inasmuch as blind faith in the good employment of machinery proved a flimsy shield against the enormities that would be committed in their antisocial employments in the nineteenth century. Deus ex machina was never an Enlightenment doctrine. The cultivation of human potential and values is more important than the design of machinery and gadgets because Man determines the machine and the uses to which it will be put.

Finally, the principle of Modality is the principle of the necessity for flexible institutions. There is a natural human ambivalence to change. At the mental physics level, every change in human behavior is provoked by disturbances to equilibrium; behavioral change is at root an outcome of practical Reason's master regulation for seeking a practical restoration of equilibrium. The behavioral phenomenon of satisficing choices is a direct consequence of Reason's categorical imperative and the process of pure Reason's utterly practical Nature as a process that knows no objects of cognition and feels no feelings. Progressive change requires in the development of the practical faculty of judgment the establishment of practical tenets and maxims for dealing with change when empirical experience encounters disturbing events.

Hansen had a bit of trouble getting a firm grasp on this principle – a situation not uncommon when a principle of Modality is involved. On the one hand, he leaned a bit too much on Godwin's radicalism and on another he seems to have had a mistaken impression that Hegel made any contribution to the Enlightenment – a curious assumption since Hegel did not graduate from the University of Tübingen until 1793 and then his graduation certificate, after commending his talents, declared that his industry and knowledge were mediocre, his speaking poor, and that his knowledge of philosophy was particularly deficient. There are still many today who regard Hegel as a great thinker and important philosopher – but, to inject my own opinion, God knows why. Obscurity of thought and flights of fantasy should not be mistaken for profundity. Hansen did, however, manage to get his fingers around the core idea of the Modality principle:

Institutions could be justified only when they functioned creatively for human development. The doctrine set forth in Bacon's Atlantis, that society should definitely organize itself for regular periods of readjustment, found expression in the eighteenth century through the writings of Voltaire, Diderot, Saint-Simon and others. That is, institutions should be reconstructed as often as the changes in circumstances demanded and new enlightenment had been gained. [ibid., pp. 9-10]

Jefferson better expressed the principle when he wrote,

I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with; because, when once known, we accommodate ourselves to them, and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know also, that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made,
new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him as a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors. . . . Let us . . . avail ourselves of our reason and experience, to correct the crude essays of our first and unexperienced, though wise, virtuous, and well-meaning councils. [Jefferson (1816), pg. 559]

Plans and proposals put forth by the various individuals named earlier were all congruent with these four general principles and shared a number of common themes and features. They were all plans for institution of school systems and were generally agreed upon the following points:

- the institution of school systems should be a national institution;
- the institution of schools should be a public, not a private institution;
- the institution of the school system was a necessary part of the political governance of the nation;
- there must be a major reform of the traditional curricula;
- the school system should be a tiered system.

In context with these commonalities, the propositions of different authors did have particular differences in the details, as one would reasonably expect. Further, they differed in the level of detail presented, ranging from rather vague general statements to very specific proposals. Because (as the saying goes) "the devil is in the details," only those proposals that were detailed are to be dignified with the label "plan." The others can be accurately called "vision statements," "mission statements," "values statements," or any of a number of other currently popular catch phrases, but without specifics they should not be called "plans." Of the propositions Hansen reviewed, only three can properly be identified as plans: the Knox plan; the Smith plan, and the Du Pont de Nemours plan. These, while differing in fine detail, did share many common features over and above those bulleted above, and I review these commonalities next.

§ 4. Common Features of the Knox, Smith, and Du Pont de Nemours Plans

In 1797 the American Philosophical Society held a contest offering a cash prize for "the best system of liberal Education and literary instruction adapted to the genius of the Government of the United States; comprehending also a plan for instituting and conducting public schools in this country on principles of the most extensive utility." As this Call for Papers suggests, the APS had already determined within its own counsels that an instituted system of American education should be both a liberal system of education as well as a public system of education. This much at least had been presaged by the vision statements of Benjamin Rush, Robert Coram, James Sullivan, Nathaniel Chipman, and A.M.L. de Lafitte du Courteil. Many papers were entered into this competition but in the end the APS determined that the two best were those submitted by Samuel Knox and Samuel Harrison Smith. These two men shared the APS prize, and their plans were ordered to be published. Unfortunately for history, they are the only known surviving plans from the APS competition. Du Pont was sitting in a prison cell in France at the time, arrested in 1794 for being too sympathetic to the monarchy. He was exiled to America in 1799 and did not publish his plan until 1800, at the request of Thomas Jefferson. Du Pont's plan also shared the commonalities of the Knox and Smith plans. In addition to the bulleted points noted earlier, the principal features of all three plans included the following.

(A) Cost was not to be a prohibitive factor at any level of attendance. The first purpose of public education was to serve the basic and essential need for good citizenship in the confederate republic of the United States, without which this radical American experiment in self-governance would fail. This meant that schools at every tier level were to be free of cost to the learner and
his/her family, and were to be financed with public money.

(B) Tiered school system with five levels. Elementary education at the primary school level should be offered to (and required of) every American child, boy and girl, up to at least age ten years. The primary schools were to be local (town, township, or district) schools. Secondary education at the level of the county academy was to be available to older children who had shown they were qualified and suited for a more advanced level of education. All academically qualified children should be strongly encouraged (or perhaps even required) to proceed to this next level. Opinion was divided on this point, with: (1) argument for mandatory attendance, based on the need the confederate republic had for the best-educated citizenry possible; and (2) argument for choice by the learner and the family, based on the recognition that not every qualified learner would have an interest in continuing with schooling or that other family circumstances might mandate against it from Duty to oneself or one's family. However – and here is an important point – the republican Community did have the civil right to require mandatory education if the members of the Community agreed to make this a civic Duty to be required of all citizens – meaning a Duty of the citizen-parents, not minor children (who are too young to decide this).

The next tier was the level of the state college, which at the eve of the nineteenth century meant what we today would call the advanced high school level up through the baccalaureate degree level. It was presumed that higher tier levels, being more academically demanding, would admit to fewer qualified students, and so assigning this tier level as a state-level function was basically a matter of economy of scale. One of the more amusing features (to the contemporary eye) of all the plans was their extraordinarily modest suppositions about how large the pool of qualified students was likely to be. Even as a percentage of state populations in the smaller states, it is very probable that the attendance projections were ludicrous under estimations of people's intellectual capacities. However, the solution for this was also recognized, mainly because of the population sizes of the larger states: a state might have more than one college. Again, all qualified learners (or, at least, all qualified male learners – the plans differed on this point) were to be strongly encouraged to attend college. No argument was made for mandatory college attendance.

The penultimate tier was the national university. Education at this level was to correspond to what we today call graduate school. One of the most pressing needs of a confederate republic is the need for having the most meritorious people to fill the many offices required for the system of republican governance that had been put in place after independence. The most pressing worries debated at the Constitutional Convention were how to ensure that agents of government would be good and faithful servants of the people and how to keep "designing men" from becoming agents of government who might usurp power for themselves or plunder the nation's wealth. This is a very old and well known problem in political science, one which the practical-minded Romans had expressed long before in a famous question, *Quis custodiet ipso custodes?* ("who will watch those who watch?"). Another pressing need was the national need for well-educated scientists to find the advances necessary for on-going Progress in the national welfare. The national university was the proposed answer to both issues. Again, the planners all seemed to greatly underestimate how large the pool of qualified learners would be, and none of them seems to have thought more than one national university would be needed to produce the supply of statesmen, scientists, justices, attorneys, and other qualified public servants a confederate republic required.

The ultimate tier was continuing education available to every citizen after he had completed his formal schooling. In a world of on-going Progress, no static body of knowledge could ever be sufficient for adapting to changing times and circumstances. The need for new skills would be ever emerging, some old skills would cease to be useful, and a mechanism was needed so that every citizen could attain to and enjoy every advantage of Progress made by the American Society. Today we would call this idea *generalized extension education* and it would cover not only how to improve existing enterprises but how to undertake new enterprises as well.
(C) Board governance of the school system. The plans all recognized that governance of the national school system was a necessary part of its institution. All three plans called either for one or for a tier of school boards. They differed as to which education tiers would be governed by which board or boards. Each called for a national board to oversee the national university and set admission standards. Two plans called for state boards to manage the state colleges. Du Pont extended this to county boards to administer the county school and set admission standards, and either local boards or school masters to administer primary schools. Appointment to serve on a board was to be made by a legislative branch of government. The plans called for appointments to be made either by some state or national legislative assembly or by some mixture of both.

All the plans envisioned hierarchical structure in a school board system, recognizing that the progression of students from the lower to the higher levels in the tiers required coordination and cooperation of tiers. Where the plans differed was in the character of this hierarchy. Knox favored a federal-like governing system, Smith a more national-like system, Du Pont a mixed system bearing a greater similarity to the organization of the general governments of both the United States and France. Madison provided the operational distinction between a national government and a federal government in The Federalist when he explained the Constitutional character of the general government of the United States:

Were [the general government] wholly national, the supreme and ultimate authority would reside in the majority of the people of the union; and this authority would be competent at all times . . . to alter or abolish the established government. Were it wholly federal on the other hand, the concurrence of each state in the union would be essential to every alteration that would be binding on all. The mode proposed by the plan of the convention is not founded on either of these principles. In requiring more than a majority, and particularly in computing the proportions by states, not by citizens, it departs from the national and advances towards the federal character. In rendering the concurrence of less than the whole number of states sufficient, it loses again the federal and partakes of the national character.

The proposed constitution, therefore, . . . is, in strictness, neither a national nor a federal constitution, but a composition of both. [Hamilton et al. (1787-8), no. 39, pg. 215]

Obviously, Madison's distinctions have to be made wider and more encompassing in scope when we are dealing with local, county, state, and national tiers. Extending it does not seem to face any fundamental stumbling block. A governing system is national when its interactions are reciprocal with all its citizens, federal when its interactions are reciprocal with all its corporate persons (e.g., states). Thus, local-county, county-state, and state-union interactions can each be made "national-like" or "federal-like" or mixed in the character of relationships of the higher-and-lower tiers.

In all three plans, governing structure is one principal shortcoming because all combined the three branches of governance as a single branch in the form of boards of education. However, separation of the legislative, executive and justice functions with checks and balances is necessary, as John Adams had pointed out two decades earlier [Adams (1776)]. All the plans placed these functions in one governing body that legislated, selected (or delegated the selection of) the agents of the institution, managed it, and judged its performance. Therefore none of the plans really present a system of school governance congruent with the republican principles used in the nation's political system. The problem of instituting a system of governance is never a simple problem, as the experience of the 1787 Constitutional Convention had shown. While default to a familiar convention is a satisficing solution in the short run, it is usually inadequate in the long run. It seems curious that planning for the institution of a new species of progressive school system unlike any before would so totally ignore the Modal principle of the necessity for flexible institutions. The planners merely opted for a traditional form of administrating a public function, and that is nothing but choosing a satisficing habit. Adams had written,
Nothing is more certain from the history of nations and the nature of man, than that some forms of government are better fitted for being well administered than others. We ought to consider what is the end of government before we determine which is the best form. Upon this point all speculative politicians will agree, that the happiness of society is the end of government, as all divines and moral philosophers will agree that the happiness of the individual is the end of man.

. . . there is no good government but what is republican. . . . As good government is an empire of laws, how shall your laws be made? . . . The first necessary step, then, is to depute power from the many to a few of the most wise and good. . . . The principal difficulty lies, and the greatest care should be employed, in constituting this representative assembly. It should be in miniature an exact portrait of the people at large. It should think, feel, reason, and act like them. That it may be the interest of this assembly to do strict justice at all times, it should be an equal representation, or, in other words, equal interest among the people should have equal interests in it. Great care should be taken to effect this, and to prevent unfair, partial, and corrupt elections.

A representation of the people in one assembly being obtained, a question arises, whether all the powers of government, legislative, executive, and judicial, shall be left in this body? I think a people cannot be long free, nor ever happy, whose government is in one assembly. My reasons for this opinion are as follows: –

1. A single assembly is liable to all the vices, follies, and frailties of an individual; subject to fits of humor, starts of passion, flights of enthusiasm, partialities, prejudice, and consequently productive of hasty results and absurd judgments.

2. A single assembly is apt to be avaricious, and in time will not scruple to exempt itself from burdens, which it will lay, without compunction, on its constituents.

3. A single assembly is apt to grow ambitious, and after a time will not hesitate to vote itself perpetual.

4. A representative assembly, although extremely well qualified, and absolutely necessary, as a branch of the legislative, is unfit to exercise the executive power for want of two essential properties, secrecy and despatch.

5. A representative assembly is still less qualified for the judicial power, because it is too numerous, too slow, and too little skilled in the laws.

6. Because a single assembly, possessed of all the powers of government, would make arbitrary laws for their own interest, execute all laws arbitrarily for their own interest, and adjudge all controversies in their own favor.

But shall the whole power of legislation rest in one assembly? Most of the foregoing reasons apply equally to prove that the legislative power ought to be more complex; to which we may add, that if the legislative power is wholly in one assembly, and the executive in another, or in a single person, these two powers will oppose and encroach upon each other, until the contest shall end in war and the whole power, legislative and executive, be usurped by the strongest.

The judicial power, in such case, could not mediate, or hold the balance between the two contending powers, because the legislative would undermine it. And this shows the necessity of giving the executive power a negative upon the legislative.

To avoid these dangers, let a distinct assembly be constituted, as a mediator between the two extreme branches of the legislature, that which represents the people and that which is vested with the executive power. Let the representative assembly then elect by ballot, from among themselves or their constituents, or both, a distinct assembly which . . . we will call a council. It . . . should have a free and independent exercise of its judgment, and consequently a negative voice in the legislature.

Any seven or nine of the legislative council may be made a quorum for doing business as
a privy council to advise the governor in the exercise of the executive branch of power and in all acts of state. . . Judges, justices, and all other officers . . . should be nominated and appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of council . . . All officers should have commissions under the hand of the governor . . .

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislative and executive, and independent upon both, that so it may be a check upon both, as both should be checks upon that. The judges, therefore, should be always men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness, coolness, and attention. Their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests; they should not be dependent upon any man, or body of men. To these ends, they should hold their estates for life in their offices; or, in other words, their commissions should be during good behavior, and their salaries ascertained and established by law. For misbehavior . . . the house of representatives should impeach them before the governor and council, where they should have the time and opportunity to make their defense; but, if convicted, should be removed from their offices, and subjected to such other punishment as shall be thought proper . . .

Laws for the liberal education of youth, especially of the lower class of people, are so extremely wise and useful that, to a humane and generous mind, no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant . . .

A constitution founded on these principles introduces knowledge among the people, and inspires them with a conscious dignity becoming freemen; a general emulation takes place, which causes good humor, sociability, good manners, and good morals to be general. That elevation of sentiment inspired by such a government makes the common people brave and enterprising. That ambition which is inspired by it makes them sober, industrious, and frugal. . . . If you compare such a country with the regions of dominion, whether monarchical or aristocratical, you will fancy yourself in Arcadia or Elysium. [Adams (1776), pp. 233-240]

These precepts pertain as much to the management of a Community engaged in private sector joint Enterprise as they do to the political governance of a nation. They pertain as well to the administration of a public school institution. Perhaps anything resembling the system Adams described might seem unnecessarily complex and cumbersome, but as Madison would later write,

But what is government itself but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. [Hamilton et al. (1787-8), no. 51, pg. 288]

It makes no difference whatsoever whether the governance function is the political governance of a nation, the business governance of a commercial Enterprise, or the functional governance of an institution of public schools. Government of any entity is the administration of the application of a Community's public corporate Personfähigkeit for the general welfare of that Community. The institution of that government must be set up so as to best ensure that the Kraft of its authority is well-realized. Yet almost every commercial Enterprise, and every agency of government, school, labor union, or other organized Enterprise you can think of, down to this day, ignores Adams' prescient precepts. Failure of governance is always the principal cause of the failure of an Enterprise. The authors of the education plans we are discussing did not properly provide for good governance of the school system institution.

(D) Curricula. The authors of these plans each presented a proposed system of curricula along
with vision statements for what the curricula in the various tiers were intended to accomplish. But they did so with a strange disconnect between the specifics of the curricula and the vision for the general outcomes. On the whole, the vision statements were innovative and fully congruent with Enlightenment principles. The specific course topics were not innovative or even slightly original. While representative of a major expansion from the limited offerings of the old colonial era 3Rs, Latin grammar, and college courses, curriculum subjects were no different from what had been offered in the Pennsylvania and other academies, some private schools, and some of the upper class private schooling education. Mimesis, not analysis, was the basis of the curricular plans.

Primary schools would, of course, have to cover the basic 3Rs (with a greater emphasis on the pupils' practical applications for these), some physical education, and a rudimentary coverage of history (particularly U.S. history) and geography. The county school would add to this languages, more history and geography, more advanced (but still practical) mathematics beyond simple arithmetic, natural history, and practical mechanics. At the college level there were to be courses in still-more-advanced mathematics, moral philosophy, economics, political literature, and jurisprudence. The Knox plan was vague about what be offered at the national university; Smith specified that "the highest branches of science and literature shall be taught"; Du Pont's plan was very similar to a plan developed nearly two decades later by Jefferson and a Commission the Virginia legislature appointed to define a new Virginia state college. All the plans left to the school board(s) the details of how these courses were to be taught in such a way that any of them actually supported the vision principles for public education. Basically, the curriculum topics were specified without a prior study of how appropriate they were for meeting the outcomes specified by the principles, or even whether they were appropriate at all. Beyond from some commonality of topics (e.g. history, mathematics, geography, languages), what the plans shared in common was a theme of general curriculum reform away from the old religion-dominated curricula. Astoundingly, citizenship education was omitted at the primary and county tiers.

The principal ends to which the curricula were to be directed included the following:

1. The schools would each serve a dual function based on (a) preparing qualified learners for the next tier, and (b) preparing the rest of the learners for entry into private life;
2. school education was to be practically oriented, substantial, preparatory for leadership, and productive of virtuous citizens;
3. school education was to be aimed squarely at achieving Progress for the public welfare through science and the arts, with a heavy emphasis on empirical experimentation;
4. equal support and equal opportunity for all grades of schooling was to be provided;
5. school education was to be flexible to meet changing needs, better tailored to suit the learners' needs and talents, was to enlist the support of the public, and be responsive to public needs and opinions;
6. school education was to be general, constituting what every citizen needed to know; and
7. school education was to be individualized to suit the specific talents and interests of the individual learners.

How all of this was to be accomplished, and how it would be determined which learners were destined for educational advancement and which were at the terminal stage of their school education, were troublesome details not addressed by any of the plans. Nor did any of the plans provide practical definitions for how achievement, or non-achievement, of these principles aims was to be recognizable. What, for example, does it mean for education to be "substantial"? What does it mean for a person – much less a whole people – to be "virtuous"? How are a learner's "interests and talents" to be judged? Particularly given the malleability and impressionability of young children, did one simply wait for "interests and talents" to reveal themselves spontaneously or was education to cultivate specific interests and talents? Like most of what have come to be called "vision and value statements" in modern times, the strategic principles specified in the
§ 5. The Plans as Viewed in a Modern Perspective

In fairness to the planners, we must note that these plans did not evolve in a vacuum. There were prior essays and arguments presented by others that one can assume would have served to help clarify some and perhaps most of the objections I have just raised to the plans (I don't object to the plans' aims; I object only to their tactical shortcomings). Coram (1791) had stressed relationships between education and property rights, social integration and control, citizen obligations to the government, and economics. Sullivan (1791) had called for specialists to be put to work researching what was pertinent in education to achieving effective political and industrial control and development. Chipman (1793) had discussed the (then) modern concepts of history and social development. Noah Webster – probably the most un-silent man in U.S. history prior to William Jennings Bryant – had written and spoken at length on almost every conceivable aspect of education. Hansen wrote of Webster,

Beginning with his *Sketches of American Policy* in 1785 he became one of the truly great pamphleteers following the Revolution. As a writer it is said that if his journalistic essays in the *Minerva* and the *Herald* alone were published, they would make over twenty large volumes. . . . Some of Webster's leading ambitions were the following: First, to form a distinctive American character; second, to create a consistent national tongue; third, to work out an adequate political philosophy that would be humane in character and universal; fourth, to create a flexible institutional control as a means for the realization of these humanitarian ideals in life; and fifth, fundamental to it all, was the establishment of a system of education. . . .

During practically the whole of his career Webster traveled up and down the Atlantic coast . . . During his travels it was his custom to meet all of the leading political and educational men. It is noted for instance that they conversed "upon the great question, What are the means of improving & establishing the Union of the States?" He met Franklin and discussed the political and educational issues of the day . . . He had been in Washington's home more than once and had played cards with him. . . . In this way he knew the governors of the states, presidents of the colleges, the leading political writers and gained in a most direct manner what might be called the superior part of his education for leadership in American thought. . . . When he published his *Essays* in 1790 he had practically all of the leading men of that day as subscribers for the volume. [Hansen (1926), pp. 202-204]

It would be unreasonable to suppose that any major plan for instituting education in the United States would have been compiled without the planner being very aware of Webster's essays. It is, however, always an error for a planner to present a plan without including in it a setup phase – steps necessary to prepare for implementing the new system – as a part of the planning tactics. Strategy without tactics is impotent; tactics without strategy is blind.

It is neither particularly surprising nor a peculiar shortcoming of the age that leaders and planners of turn of the century America produced plans like those we have been discussing. The planning process across Western civilization was much the same and is much the same today. One thing one does not find in any Western institution of instructional education since the Middle Ages is specific concentrated attention to persuasion education. To this day, it is a little-offered topic of education and very little has been added to it since the works of Aristotle (c. 335-330 BC) and Cicero (55 BC). The people who have studied it the most are lawyers, advertising agents, and other propagandists. Outside of highly technical project work (as, e.g., in engineering), planning has always been primarily an expression of exposition of judgments of taste and an art without science. None of the plans reviewed here contain a particle of it in their curricula, and as a social
skill it is one neglected by education since the times of ancient Athens and Rome. Yet, as Cicero taught in specific reference to oratory, this skill is a basic mechanism of general leadership in its persuasive character:

Moreover . . . there is to my mind no more excellent thing than the power, by means of oratory, to get a hold on assemblies of men, win their good will, direct their inclinations wherever the speaker wishes, or divert them from whatever he wishes. In every free nation, and most of all in communities which have attained the enjoyment of peace and tranquility, this one art has always flourished above the rest and ever reigned supreme. For what is so marvelous as that, out of the innumerable company of mankind, a single being should arise, who either alone or with a few others can make effective a faculty bestowed by nature upon every man? Or what is so pleasing to the understanding and the ear as a speech adorned and polished with wise reflections and dignified language? Or what achievement so mighty and glorious as that the impulses of the crowd, the consciences of the judges, the austerity of the Senate, should suffer transformation through the eloquence of one man? What function again is so kingly, so worthy of the free, so generous, as to bring help to the suppliant, to raise up those who are cast down, to bestow security, to set free from peril, to maintain men in their civil rights? [Cicero (55 BC), pp. 23-25]

Today this is made no part of general education and has, like almost all topics, become the private property of specialists, principally in the fields of law, advertising, and journalism.

Two vital issues were pointed out in the Knox plan, although both were merely pointed out as issues that had to be addressed and Knox offered no plan for how to address them. These were: the shortage of textbooks specifically designed and written to support the educational aims; and the shortage of teachers qualified and expert in delivering the sort of instruction that could realize the national aims of public education. Hansen wrote,

A rather deplorable condition existed throughout the nation in that "Every teacher has his favorite system, and consequently the books best adapted to it are those he recommends." How far it might be advisable to adopt a uniform system of school books did not seem clear, but that something should be done to raise the quality both of the matter and of the construction of school books was certain. . . . Certainly, "Nothing would come under the direction of the Literary Board of greater importance than the selection of the best school-books for each department of science." . . . This uniformity of text-books would apply to the colleges, academies, and primary schools, but could not apply to the national university for its office was to further improvements, and for this reason it must be left free in this respect. . . .

If a universal provision of education were to prove effective, well qualified teachers would be necessary. Some provision must be made whereby those who had special abilities might be encouraged to be "educated for the purpose of becoming teachers." At first undoubtedly there would be a shortage of such, but if proper inducements were given, "This in the course of a few years would train up a proper supply of tutors, both masters and assistants for the different seminaries." The chief item of encouragement would be that of offering adequate salaries. Perhaps this ought to take precedence over "providing buildings and accommodations." [Hansen (1926), pp. 134-135]

Knox was rather too sanguine in his suppositions about how quickly and effectively either objective could be achieved. In regard to textbooks, there would later come a great improvement in these within the American institution of education. It would, however, not be a lasting improvement. For the past thirty years I have been witnessing a steady and accelerating erosion in the quality of engineering and science textbooks at the university level, and have not noticed anything in the textbooks of other fields that leads me to think the situation is any different there. Certainly in history textbooks the decay in quality is at least as bad as that which I find in science
and engineering textbooks. In my professional judgment, a majority of textbooks being published right now, in comparison with books being published forty to fifty years ago, is trash.

Part of this has a causal basis in simple economics. There has been a great reduction in the number of independent book publishers; holding companies buy up the independents and restrict the opportunities for authors to get their works into print. "Divisions" formed from once-independent publishing houses generally retain their old names, and so the actual shrinkage in the supply of textbook publishers is masked. But the supply has nonetheless been reduced because all of these divisions are answerable to the rulers of the holding company. The textbook marketplace has become pronouncedly an oligopoly marketplace trending toward monopoly.

The abolition by American universities of the old university presses has further exacerbated the situation. The general trend is institutionalized by a peculiar and destructive policy that has been adopted by colleges and universities: the almost complete discounting of textbook writing as a factor in teacher performance evaluation and promotion. Indeed, writing a textbook today is more likely to hurt the author than to bring him reward or scholarly recognition from his colleagues or the university's administrative bureaucracy. "Publish or perish" specifically does not apply to writing books. It rewards only mostly trivial papers published in archival journals, read by few, of practical use to anyone for only a brief time, then shelved and forgotten for all the rest of time. In addition, journal papers are singularly unsuitable for teaching purposes. These papers are written by experts for experts, not for learners. To a student – and not infrequently to many professors – they are as incomprehensible and indecipherable as Mayan hieroglyphics.

At root, the production and distribution of textbooks has fallen victim to uncivic free enterprise and the educational purpose of textbooks has been sacrificed to private commercial interest. Whether the new technology on the block – namely, the Internet – can work to counter this source of rot in the quality of instructional education remains to be seen. If it does, it will not owe whatever success might be achieved to financial remuneration: Internet material is provided free of charge. That, at least, has the societal virtue of making it available to every student.

The second vital issue – supply of qualified teachers – as viewed through the lens of history is a challenge that is nothing less than chilling. The issue here is not so much with the availability of people choosing teaching as their vocation, nor with their sincere dedication to public service. In point of fact, I know of no other group of public servants more dedicated or imbued with a sense of the importance of their Duty than teachers. But what is the craft of instruction necessitated by a civil institution of public instructional education under a social contract? What must the future teacher learn in order to fulfill the civil task of public instruction? Here the American institution of public education badly fails to provide adequate education of educators. A 1997 report issued by Public Agenda states,

Idealists can often light the way as humanity strives to improve itself, but is there a point when a visionary agenda is so detached from daily concerns that it becomes counterproductive? Professors of education have a particular vision of what teaching should be – one that has some appealing features. But their prescriptions for the public schools gloss over the concerns voiced variously by the public, parents, classroom teachers, business leaders, education reformers, and even students themselves. . . . If there's a single question raised by this recent Public Agenda study, it is, "What price perfection?" Or, to put it another way, has the professors' strategy for education become a riveting example of letting the perfect be the enemy of the good? . . .

Most typical Americans . . . are alarmed by the number of youngsters they see who lack even basic skills, particularly such fundamentals as spelling and grammar. But for education professors, training teachers who stress correct English is a distinctly low priority. . . . The public has voiced repeated concerns about discipline in the schools, and teachers often talk painfully about their struggles to maintain orderly classrooms and cope
with rowdy, disruptive students. But once again, most professors of education consider this a low-level problem. . . . My point here is not to play the all-too-frequent game of blame-shifting, nor to suggest that the professors' idealism about learning does not have its important message within it. But the disconnect between what the professors want and what most parents, teachers, and students say they need is often staggering. It seems ironic that so many of those who profess to believe that "the real endeavor" is about questioning and learning how to learn are seemingly entrapped in a mind-set that is unquestioning in its conviction of its own rightness. [Farkas et al. (1997), pp. 28-9]

I'm not going to mince words here. The social-natural scientific answer to the question that opens this quote is, "Yes, and that point occurs much sooner than most people think." There is a fatal flaw in the current American institution of public instructional education, and that institution is undergoing breakdown and disintegration now. The cause, however, does not lie with mythical "elitists" or fantasy-driven conspiracy. It is an institutionalized failure – a failure that was built into the fabric of the institution in the twentieth century. Elitists there are; but they are products of the system, not producers of it, and, as such, perpetuators of it. One specific empirical factor among many pertinent to this was recently pointed out by Mirel:

For at least half a century, education reformers have quipped that 120th Street in New York City, the street that separates Teachers College from the rest of Columbia University, "is the widest street in the world." Underlying this quip is the belief that Columbia's liberal arts faculty members regularly dismiss the child-centered educational methods promoted by their colleagues at Teachers College as at best misguided and at worst anti-intellectual. In turn, professors at Teachers College routinely denounce their liberal arts colleagues as musty traditionalists who fail to recognize that most elementary and secondary students in American schools find discipline-based education as useless and irrelevant to their lives. As cartoon-like as this portrait is, it contains more than a kernel of truth. Since the creation of public schools in the early 19th century, people have been debating questions about the relative importance of subject matter and pedagogical methods in teacher training programs. . . . This situation began to change drastically in the first half of the 20th century. Schools and colleges of education became an integral part of American universities, and state-created "normal schools" (charged specifically with preparing teachers) became colleges in their own right. In both cases, these institutional changes seemed to offer the prospect of uniting specialists in subject matter and pedagogical methods. Instead, these groups sought to establish their separate areas of expertise and thus wound up widening the gap between them. [Mirel (2011), pp. 6-7]

The root cause is institutionalized specialization resulting from a social process unguided by scientific precepts based upon real human Nature and abandoned to a hodgepodge of objectively invalid and contradictory presuppositions and prejudices of pseudo-metaphysics. To "unite the specialists" practically means nothing else than for them to combine their efforts under one Idea of unity, and when this is done the practice is called a science. There has never been a social-natural science of education; the old Greek myth of the unalloyed good of specialization has rarely been questioned in the West; and so it is little wonder that Platonic prejudices and the lack of a unifying Idea under which to unite the efforts of practitioners would lead to the collapsing institutional structure that is public education in America today. The liberal – and generally if not specifically correct – notions of the late 18th century education planners had no chance to be coalesced into a science – as these thinkers all desired – when the bases of the divers enterprises were granulated by contradictory contexts of pseudo-metaphysics, satisficing solution-seeking, and misplaced mimesis.

For decades in the 20th century, the rickety lean-to structure of public instructional education was held together by little more than tradition. That tradition was one of the casualties of the
1960s civil war. Critic Allan Bloom was not incorrect when he witnessed to this testimony:

"You don't have to intimidate us," said the famous professor of philosophy in April 1969, to ten thousand triumphant students supporting a group of black students who had just persuaded "us," the faculty of Cornell University, to do their will by threatening the use of firearms as well as threatening the lives of individual professors.

The professors, the repositories of our best traditions and highest intellectual aspirations, were fawning over what was nothing better than a rabble; publicly confessing their guilt and apologizing for not having understood the most important moral issues, the proper response to which they were learning from the mob; expressing their willingness to change the university's goals and the content of what they taught. As I surveyed this spectacle, Marx's overused dictum kept coming to my mind against my will: History always repeats itself, the first time as tragedy, the second as farce. The American university in the sixties was experiencing the same dismantling of the structure of rational inquiry as had the German universities in the thirties.

The university had abandoned all claims to study or inform about value... while turning the decision about values to the folk, the Zeitgeist, the relevant. Whether it be Nuremberg or Woodstock, the principle is the same. The fact that the universities are no longer in convulsions does not mean that they have regained their health. [Bloom (1987), pp. 313-14]

About the sixties it is now fashionable to say that although there were indeed excesses, many good things resulted. But, so far as universities are concerned, I know of nothing positive coming from that period; it was an unmitigated disaster for them. You don't replace something with nothing. Of course, that was exactly what the educational reform of the sixties was doing. The criticism of the old is of no value if there is no prospect of the new. The reforms were without content, made for the "inner-directed" person. They were an acquiescence in a leveling off of the peaks, and were the source of the collapse of the entire American educational structure, recognized by all parties when they talk about the need to go "back to the basics." This collapse is directly traceable to both the teachings and the deeds of the universities in the sixties. [ibid., pp. 320-321]

I personally arrived on the U.S. university scene at the tail end of all this. What I found available to me as a student even then were shredded humanities and social science offerings devoid of content, of vision, of practicality, of citizenship, and even so much as any real human interest. The only humanities course I took as an undergraduate student that was of the least value to me was an English course in propaganda analysis. I came to college eager to learn the theories of Mill, Rousseau, Adams, Madison, Santayana, and others I had been exposed to as a boy. Not one single course at my university offered anything whatsoever that I had come looking for outside of training in engineering, science, mathematics, psychology, and economics. For all the good it did me, the rest of the university could have burned to the ground and I wouldn't have missed a thing. It took me many years and considerable expense to eventually provide myself with the education the university did not and still does not offer.

My point in bringing this up now is this: Once the institution of public education is smashed and broken, the damage lasts for generations. Teachers teach what they themselves have been taught. When the educational institutions of the classical era were smashed at the beginning of the European Dark Ages, the damage lasted for over eight hundred years. Lack of qualified teachers, and lack of institutions for educating new teachers, doomed the Carolingian Renaissance begun under Charlemagne. The Vikings had very little to do with that failure; they came along just a little later in history, after Charlemagne's reforms had already died with him.

Where, when, and how did the educational plans of the last decade of the eighteenth century go astray? That will be critiqued in the chapters to come, step by step until we arrive at where American public education finds itself today.
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