

SCHOOLS AS COLONIZERS: THE DESCHOOLERS OF THE 1960S

KIRSTEN OLSON

TO

SARA LAWRENCE LIGHTFOOT,
MENTOR EXTRAORDINAIRE

PEDRO NOGUERA,
SUPPORTER AND BELIEVER

STEPHEN BROOKFIELD,
GENTLE, THOUGHTFUL CRITIC

HERB KOHL,
HOPEMONGER



**“MOST OF ALL, WE MIGHT GROW UP WITHOUT THE SHELL,
THE CASEMENT, THE SURROUNDING LACQUER,
THAT PROTECTS US FROM
ACUTE PERCEPTIONS OF THOSE THINGS WE UNDERSTAND, OR
VISIBLE ACTION ON THOSE EVILS WE PERCEIVE.
WE MIGHT GROW UP
TO BE BRAVE AND SUBVERSIVE
HUMAN BEINGS.
IT IS AGAINST THIS EVER-PRESENT DANGER THAT TWELVE YEARS IN
PUBLIC SCHOOL
PROTECTS US.”**

**JONATHAN KOZOL,
THE NIGHT IS DARK AND I AM FAR FROM HOME,
1990**

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

1. WHY THE DESCHOOLERS NOW?
2. THE DESCHOOLERS AND THE 1960S
3. SIX DESCHOOLERS AND THEIR EARLY WORKS
4. WHAT DID THE DESCHOOLERS SAY?
5. WHY ARE THE DESCHOOLERS REJECTED NOW?

APPENDICES:

- A. WERE THE DESCHOOLERS CRITICAL THEORISTS?
- B. CONTEMPORARY DESCHOOLERS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

OVERVIEW

What is the purpose of education, and how does our society define a well-educated person? How did a “forgotten” group of radical educational thinkers and reformers define the purposes of education, and what are the implications for contemporary educational policy?

From the early 1960s to the early 70s, an influential group of education writers and critics whom this work names the *deschoolers*ⁱ wrote accessibly, for the everyday reader, about what they regarded as the embalming, stultifying, and radically unequalizing effects of institutionalized education on growing students and grown up adults. Impassioned, fiery, and sometimes almost mythically full of ardor, to this group of critics schools were not gentle, benign, apple-on-the-desk acculturating institutions where children and teenagers could innocently be sent each day to learn the skills they needed to succeed in a meritocratic, capitalist society. Instead schools were organizations designed to colonize, imprint, and shape from within the most vulnerable and least powerful individuals in our culture.

Without political power or representation, and compelled to attend year after year, children were plunged into the worldview and control of teachers and administrators who were the “secular priests” (Illich, 1970) of these totalizing institutions. Teachers, often unaware of or deliberately unconscious of their power, taught a mind-numbing curriculum of useless information and competitive values, while replicating a racial, class, and intellectual caste system that reflected the larger inequalities of the culture. Moreover, to the *deschoolers* a false consciousness pervaded the entire enterprise: children were to “enjoy” school and learn to compliantly please adults there; people who worked in schools were to “love” children, while their daily interactions expressed hostility and disdain for their mistakes and individualities. Parents and the larger culture were to approve of, but mostly look away from, the actual goings on inside classrooms and schools. Grownups were not to speak about the mindlessness, alienation, and sense of shame they experienced in school, and were to reinforce acquiescence to authority, compliance, and control in the next generation of children.

Using a cultural reproduction theoretical frame, and a psychology of colonization perspective, I argue that the *deschoolers* saw institutionalized education as intruding on the lifeworld (Habermas, 1987), alienating pupils from some of the most powerful and mythic qualities of self-determined learning. As a consequence, human reality was disordered and estranged. The *deschoolers* believed that the purpose of education was to encourage human beings’ unfettered capacity to learn, to be deeply and intensively engaged, to be curious and to question, and to face new situations with animation and thoughtful courage. They wanted humans to be less fearful, and they saw unfettered, unplanned learning as central to human enlightenment. To the *deschoolers*, an education for braveness and subversiveness--for the questioning of prevailing norms--would most contribute to the social good and improve human life.

The first two chapters of this book place the *deschoolers* in context, suggesting what these critics have to offer now and how they emerged out of the tumultuous decade of the 1960s. Chapters Three and Four are rhetorical and philosophical analyses of six landmark books from the *deschooling* period, using the authors’ lives as jumping off points to describe the work and its impact. Thematically arranged, these chapters analyze: John Holt’s *How Children Fail* (1964), George Dennison’s *The Lives of Children* (1969), INTERNET DOWNLOAD VERSION: Olson, Kirsten (2008). *Schools As Colonizers: The Deschoolers of the 1960s* (2008), Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag. 131 pages. Full text available at Amazon.com.

Jonathan Kozol's *Death At An Early Age* (1967), Herb Kohl's *36 Children* (1967), Paul Goodman's *Compulsory Mis-Education* (1963), and Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society* (1971). Chapter Five argues that since the 1983 publication of "A Nation At Risk" (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) the central purposes of education, and what it means to be a well-educated person, have undergone seismic shifts in the American national educational reform dialog, often without explicit, out-loud reflection that they have changed.

Arguing for the continued relevance of the deschooler's critiques of education today, this book suggests that the deschoolers' views about the meaning and purpose of education have been strategically marginalized. Polarization of opposing viewpoints and gangsterization of the discourse, fueled by a market-driven media, has resulted in a near silencing of multiple points of view on educational purpose and meaning in the mainstream educational reform discourse. For those who question whether educational improvement should be defined almost exclusively in terms of enhanced national economic productivity and increased personal, individual competitiveness, the deschooler's critiques have ongoing vividness, freshness and meaning. They deserve another hearing.

CHAPTER 1: WHY THE DESCHOOLERS NOW?

“Our struggle for a better world takes many forms, but none is more important than the rearing and education of our children.

We believe that children raised in wholeness and natural pride will not grow up to be slavish adults, nor agree to immoral politics and irresponsible technology. Our present system of public education, coercive in its methods, is a symptom and major cause of our unsatisfactory way of life...”

-George Dennison, New York Review of Books, 1971ⁱⁱ

So began a letter to the *New York Review of Books*, published in February 1971, written collectively by George Dennison, John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, Nat Hentoff, and Paul Goodman, announcing the birth of the New National Seed Fund, an organization formed to capitalize alternative schools. The New National Seed Fund, designed to encourage the opening of new schools and help existing and imperiled ones stay alive, urged individual readers and sympathizers to send a dollar on their birthdays, for children to donate loose change, even a quarter, because while, “we cannot solve large problems with these sums, we can contribute to a large solution. Above all, we can keep alive one of our few working models of freedom.”

This letter, and the sentiments of its writers, marked a dramatically different era of educational policy reform than our world at present. Like many of the intellectual and cultural movements of the 1960s, the New National Seed Fund’s ideas about educational improvement, theories of effective political action, and rhetorical stance contrasts sharply to our era’s No Child Left Behind legislation, passed into law in January 2002. Instead of celebrating “wholeness and natural pride” in children, and urging supporters to send along their pocket change, No Child Left Behind mandates a single test-based accountability system in all sectors

of public education. It puts new mechanisms for accountability into place for all states, and as one of its central architects and former member of the Houston Independent School District Board suggestively stated, “[it] develops and deploys a new core curriculum [while] outsourcing major business functions to improve children’s achievement” (Donald R. McAdams, October 2000).

No Slavish Adults, No Immoral Politics, No Irresponsible Technology

Reflecting profoundly different views of efficacious social action, the appropriate role of institutions in individual political and educational life, and even philosophical conceptions of the child, the deschoolers wrote pungent, controversial, and singularly accessible books about education that challenged practitioners, researchers, and general readers about foundational issues related to education.

The deschoolers proposed fundamental, first order, difficult-to-answer questions about common educational practices and assumptions. Is learning the result of teaching? Why are schools structured and operated as they are? Are there ways in which schools resemble prisons, hospitals, asylums, and the church? Do some pedagogical practices have harmful psychological and spiritual effects upon pupils? Do our beliefs about ability and academic performance tend to be doctrinal and theological? Is the central purpose of education to make us more attractive commodities in an exchange economy? Challenging conventional wisdoms about the purpose and function of schooling, they sought to incite a public they regarded as passive and quiescent to examine the effects of conventional educational practices on children, and to rally them to change.

Some works quiet, writerly and reflective; some contentious and morally scorching, the deschooler’s offered detailed, literary, psychologically-penetrating observations of actual children in classrooms, and then made bold, startling claims about the nature of educational experiences for most pupils in school. Reflecting on his years of teaching, for instance, John Holt’s, *How Children Fail* (1964) described in nearly incontestable detail how schools—even the “best,” elite private ones where he was an instructor—were places where “children learn to be stupid,” where pupils were conditioned to become reflexively answer-centered, and where children who didn’t produce the right answers were, “made fun of by the other children and very often by the teachers themselves.” Mockery and contempt characterized the experiences of many children for mistake-making and real thinking about problems, said Holt. That children sometimes shouldered on and became intellectually engaged in academic learning and the problems of the larger world was a testament to their courage in the face of adult insensibility.

George Dennison, a fiction writer of unusual skill and intensity, described his two years teaching twenty-three children at a free school on the Lower East side of Manhattan. In Dennison’s *The Lives of Children* (1969), students who had been abandoned by the school system and were regarded as incorrigible were described by Dennison as having an “anxiety that amounted almost to desperation.” Drawing portraits of individual children and their social situations with sensitivity and skill, Dennison sketched a picture of “organic,” Deweyian learning in which children were regarded as psychological, spiritual and physical beings requiring “real” emotional and spiritual encounters at every level. Vehemently opposed to the teaching method Paulo Freire called “banking,” Dennison reflected, “When a teacher ... addresses himself to his pupils as to containers of varying capacities into which the information must be poured, he is creating conditions which are fatal to growth.” Human growth, and the expansion of human creativity and meaning, were central objectives of the deschoolers in their reconfiguration of education.

On the effects of racial segregation in schools in Boston, Chapter Two of Jonathan Kozol's, *Death At An Early Age* (1967) began in deceptively conversational tones, "Most people in Boston are surprised, even to this day, to be told that children are beaten with thin bamboo whips within the cellars of our public schools and that they are whipped at times for no greater offense than for failing to show respect to the very same teachers who have been describing them as niggers." Stoked by moral outrage that was lighting America on fire, Jonathan Kozol described from the inside how segregated schools in Boston ravaged children of color, how racist hatred and fear tinged every interaction between teachers and pupils, and what the effects of a colonizing institution like schooling might be on the hearts and minds of children.

Among the "throwaway" children in Harlem in Herbert Kohl's classroom of *36 Children* (1967), Kohl found uncommon intelligence, almost unlimited creativity, and a powerful desire to be taken seriously among his pupils, once Kohl himself had dispensed with much of the pedagogical nonsense of being a teacher and had created a curriculum that challenged and was relevant to the children in his room, and himself. "The pupils' behavior is a direct response to the institutionalized hypocrisy that is characteristic of schools in the United States today," wrote Kohl. "The thirty-six children are suffering from the diseases of our society."

Some of the deschoolers offered analyses of culture and society that echoed Frankfurt School critics of the 1930s and 40s. Raising questions about the relationship of individuals to a modern, urban, industrialized environment, Paul Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd* (1960) suggested that adolescents in the United States failed to grow up because they lived in a society unfit to grow up in. In *Compulsory Mis-Education* (1964) Goodman asked, "Since schooling undertakes to be compulsory, must it not continually review its claim to be useful?" He proposed the end of compulsory education and the reorganization of schools into mini-schools and apprenticeships—structural changes now being considered in the reform of comprehensive American high schools some forty-five years later. Goodman's uneasiness with the effects of compulsory schooling upon pupils, and the growing disparities between an educated, upper class elite and a much more vast uneducated class of workers, was intense. "The administrators, professors, academic sociologists and licensees with diplomas who have proliferated into an invested intellectual class [are] worse than anything since the time of Henry the Eighth," Goodman wrote in *Compulsory Mis-Education*.

Ivan Illich, the Viennese-born former parish priest and vice-rector of the Catholic University of Puerto Rico, offered an even more searching evaluation of schools, saying that education must be deinstitutionalized altogether. While Paul Goodman perceived schools as failed and unworthy of resuscitation except in a limited form as mini-schools, Illich argued that schools themselves were toxic, dominating entities that tyrannized children as Brazilian landlords dominated Brazilian peasants. Proposing learning networks and learning webs instead of institutionalized education, in Illich's view the problem with schools was not that they taught nothing at all, but instead, that they instructed too well a hidden curriculum of conformity and psychological impotence. Illich memorably commented, "School instructs us on our own inferiority." As Jonathan Kozol reprised some years later, "U.S. education is by no means an inept, disordered misconstruction. It is an ice-cold and superb machine...The problem is not that public schools do not work, but that they do" (Kozol, 1990, p. 27).

Popular with general readers--several of the books analyzed were bestsellers--and highly influential in school improvement movements in the late 1960s and early 1970s, even in their day the deschoolers were controversial. Often described as sensational and exaggerated, accused of confounding variables, charged

with making too global a case based on too little evidence or with failing to develop specific political and legislative agendas for transforming schools, many contemporaneous educational critics deplored the deschoolers for their tendencies to overstate, generalize and personalize. Calling Jonathan Kozol an “instant expert” in 1967, a reviewer for *Time* magazine warily agreed with many of Kozol’s claims about racism and segregation in schools, but found his tone too jarring, too unbalanced, and simply too upsetting.

In their approach to educational reform and in their passionate beliefs about the importance of learning in human life, the deschoolers were neither coolly analytic nor “objective.” To challenge conventional wisdoms about the purpose and function of schooling—mass schooling was a ‘mass superstition’ said Paul Goodman—they deliberately sought to incite a public they regarded as inert, dormant and complicit--asleep. The deschoolers wanted to rouse readers to reaction: to propel parents angrily into their children’s schools to demand change, to encourage teachers to leave existing schools and start their own (many did), and for America as a nation, and students in particular, to consider questions about what we educate for. Deliberately adopting a partisan, provocative stance to encourage dialog around issues they felt were under discussed, the deschoolers sought to pry up the foundational assumptions of their readers through surprise, simplicity, straightforward reasoning, and the morally-evocative image. Jonathan Kozol, perhaps the most lyrically provocative of the six writers analyzed here, has a passionate, poetic, dramatic voice that often makes people angry. He has often been critiqued as “offside” and unbalanced by the academy. To this Kozol has replied: discomfort with anger, real conflict and blunt acknowledgement of irreconcilable positions forces change. But “we enjoy the comforts of self-consensus, and remaining oblivious, too much,” he reflected in 1990. As his searing newest work indicates, *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America* (2005), Kozol’s fundamental outlook has not changed in the decades since.

The deschooler’s tone and directness, sometimes the reason cited for their marginalization and lack of voice around important educational issues now, was not a product of lack of discipline or loss of rhetorical control, but a deliberate strategy suggestive of the seriousness with which they regarded education. Reframing education was central to the transformation of society, in their eyes. “I want to raise the general question of the mutual definition of man’s nature and the nature of modern institutions which characterizes our world view and language. To do so, I have chosen the school as my paradigm,” wrote Ivan Illich in 1971. The transformation of consciousness of the reader could not be achieved through the even-handed tones of the academy, the deschoolers believed. How could educational reform ideas be forged to become part of a weapon to “shatter” the structure of society and to dismantle the structures of privilege, an Australian educator questioned Ivan Illich in 1974? “Acute awareness,” was necessary, said Illich. “A sudden shattering crisis of consciousness such as the French Revolution” (Illich, in Lister, 1974, p. 76). A sudden shattering of consciousness about the meaning of education was exactly what many of the deschoolers wished to bring about.

As the global climate of education reform has shifted dramatically through the passing decades, the deschoolers have attracted less attention from popular and academic audiences. They are still named as *iconic offenders* by some conservative educational reformers however, and politically, through the 1980s and 90s, served as necessary blame objects in a dualistic, us-against-them discourse of school improvement. In the new accountability and high stakes testing reform climate, the deschoolers and other similarly-minded critics have been held responsible for a host of educational ills: the decline of SAT scores beginning in the mid-1970s, low expectations for students, a loss of “discipline” in schools, and faddish Progressivist instructional and assessment practices. Conservative educational historian and former assistant secretary of education Diane Ravitch suggested that it was during the deschooler’s era that, “schools withdrew from their

responsibility to teach knowledge, good conduct, and appropriate behavior” (Ravitch, 2000, p. 403). In fact, said Ravitch, the deschoolers and other radical critics rejected “knowledge itself.” Ravitch’s even more conservative colleague Paul Peterson, a vociferous critic of American public schools and a passionate proponent of market-based school reforms, warned, “The Progressive transformation of American education...probably took a good fifty years to unfold...Our nation is still at risk.” (Peterson, 2003).

As national education policy hurtles down a high-stakes, test-oriented accountability track—Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings promises to expand the scope and bite of annual yearly progress requirements to colleges and universities—this is an opportune moment to explore the thoughts of this powerful group of heretical voices, in light of the claims laid against them. Did the deschoolers actually reject knowledge? Did they foster intellectual freedom at the expense of basic skills? Were they simply a part of the utopian and rebellious “purple decade” of the 1960s, properly discounted and marginalized?

What about our current education reform discourse so thoroughly rejects the deschoolers’ positions, since they believed that the purpose of education was to encourage human beings’ unfettered capacity to continue to learn, to be deeply and intensively engaged, to be curious and to question, and to face new situations with animation and thoughtful courage? The deschoolers wanted human beings to be less fearful and more self-determinative, and saw unfettered, unplanned learning as central to human enlightenment. To them, an education for braveness and subversiveness—for the questioning of prevailing norms—would most contribute to the social good and improve human lives. For some readers the deschoolers are more relevant now than ever.

Organization. Organized in three parts, this work analyzes six landmark texts from the deschooling period. I focus on texts that are frequently cited as the most important, most influential, and most complex of their period. Part One looks at the evolution of the deschoolers’ thoughts on pedagogical practices, social institutions, and social reform through mini-biographies and analyses of the reception of the work during the book’s period of publication. Part One is thematically arranged around three central concerns of the deschoolers:

- ***the effects of common pedagogical practices on children in classrooms*** (John Holt’s, *How Children Fail*, 1964 and George Dennison’s, *The Lives of Children*, 1969)
- ***the consequences of racism and defacto segregation on the hearts and minds of children in classrooms*** (Jonathan Kozol’s, *Death At An Early Age*, 1967 and Herbert Kohl’s *36 Children*, 1967)
- ***critiques of schools as deadening, life-sapping, psychologically-nullifying institutions*** (Paul Goodman’s *Compulsory Mis-Education*, 1964, and Ivan Illich’s *Deschooling Society*, 1971).

Through exegesis of the six texts themselves, Part Two explores the ways in which the deschoolers animated discussion among *both* popular and research-oriented audiences. Looking at the structure and tone of the books—eloquent, passionate, often funny, and very bold—Part Two looks philosophically and rhetorically at how these six authors galvanized readers, and how their words helped give birth to a small but significant radical educational reform movement.

Finally, Part Three considers why we might be interested in the deschoolers now. What did the deschoolers observe about education, and do their observations currently have relevance? What did they propose were the problems with education as it was structured, and in relationship to other pursuits and purposes in human life? What do current educational reform movements, by reflection, suggest about the meaning and purpose of education? How does our society define a well-educated person and what are the implications for human life?

Other Works On The Deschoolers

As I have indicated, at this moment the deschooler's works are surprisingly unknown or out of fashion. When I first discovered their texts, almost by happenstance in my graduate school library several years ago--George Dennison's *The Lives of Children* was in the library discard pile next to the pay phones—I was intrigued by the skill of Dennison's writing and the wholeness of his view of children as learners. Next I found John Holt, whom I believe is one of the most important educational philosophers of the 20th century. Then came Jonathan Kozol and Herb Kohl, and onward. I proposed putting together a project to investigate several of the works of the deschoolers, looking at their claims about education and examining their work in historical context. This plan met with disinterest and resistance. When the world was turning ever more to objective, test-driven definitions of meaningful educational performance, why investigate a group of writers for whom the spiritual, emotional aspects of education were at the forefront, I was cautioned. Alternatively, I was warned, this was professional suicide: young scholars must go to where the action is, and the action was decidedly *not* with the deschoolers. Poking around the scholarly work on the deschoolers and this period of educational reform, I also discovered the lack of serious scholarship on them and the dearth of critical investigation of their philosophical roots or pedagogical messages.

To the degree that the deschoolers have been seriously analyzed at all, mainstream educational critics, researchers and historians have characterized them as eye-catching, incendiary flashes in the educational reform pan. As described in her big, popular work on the failures of Progressivism and progressive school reform, Diane Ravitch's *Left Back: A Century of School Reform* (Simon and Schuster, 2000) blames the deschoolers for a general, growing abnegation of schools from their responsibility to teach discipline, good conduct and knowledge in the 1960s. Other less politically turgid historians such as Patricia Albjerg Graham (*Schooling America: How the Public Schools Meet the Nation's Changing Needs*, Oxford, 2005), Joseph Featherstone, and Lawrence Cremin have tended to regard the deschoolers not so much as the next generation of increasingly overcast and radical Progressivists, but as part of a larger reappraisal within society of the significance of schools as an agent of socialization in children's lives. As Graham has described it, in the early 1960s people were talking more and more about schools as “weak treatments” for other socioeconomic condition. In her view, the deschoolers' work was in part, an outgrowth of this.

Other, more limited historical studies have analyzed the ambiguous role of adult authority in schools in the free school movement of the late 1960's and early 1970's (Swidler, 1979), or looked at the influence of parent ideology in the construction of free schools (Blinn, 1981; Sperounis, 1981). While an emergent and increasingly rich cultural and historical literature on the 1960's suggests that the decade, “plunged Americans into a complex and anguishing scrutiny of the meaning of their most fundamental beliefs and institutions in a renewed test of history” (Isserman and Kazin, 2000), the deschoolers as helping to foment

that scrutiny in education, or as posing important challenges to educational beliefs and institutions, is examined by almost none of these cultural histories. Todd Gitlin's landmark 700-page history of the sixties, for instance, contains only two and a half pages on education or school reform. Only within the last two years Ron Miller's comprehensive and authoritative history of the free school movement of the 1960s (*Free Schools, Free People*, SUNY, 2002) appeared. It traces the relationships between larger philosophical and cultural movements of the 1960s and the free school movement itself. As well-researched and balanced as Miller's work is, however, he analyzes none of the landmark books of the period considered here in depth, nor communicates why a reader might find these texts important now.

To the degree that the deschoolers have been considered in a meta theoretical sense, they have largely been characterized as "critical progressives" reprising many of the themes of John Dewey and his followers: that education must and should be valued in its own right, that children have an inherent ability and willingness to learn if appropriately supported and unconstrained, and that the workplace ultimately is, "subservient to the educational process" (Carnoy and Levin, 1985, p. 16). In their limited and cursory treatment, however, Carnoy and Levin do not consider the deschoolers' views on schools as agents of social change or democratic freedom, analyze their ideas about the spiritual meaning of education in individual and collective human life, or accurately characterize the range of opinion among deschoolers. Similarly, Morrow and Torres (1995) devote a chapter to the relationship between Frankfurt school critical theorists and Ivan Illich, but look at no other deschoolers.

Philosophically, a few specific studies have analyzed progressive education in relation to Marxism in the development of educational policy in America in the 20th century (the simultaneous growth of monopoly capitalism and the development of Progressivist educational theory; Gonzalez, 1982). Only two scholars have compared a few radical education writers of the 1960s to Rousseau (Barrow, 1978), or other theories of educational practice and knowledge acquisition (Lister, 1974). Relatively few studies have considered the deschoolers individually or comparatively, and no studies comprehensively analyze the philosophical and theoretical aspects of the deschoolers' work in relation to other twentieth century critical theorists. How powerful an agent of social change did the deschoolers see schools as representing? Did schools reproduce the social order, or effectively challenge it? What is the purpose of social criticism, and how might it enliven and strengthen individuals to fight against the "creeping barbarism...of culture so that people can realize their humanity and freedom" (Brookfield, 2001, p. 10), as the deschoolers suggested it should?

Finally, no study has considered a group of prominent deschoolers as skillful education writers, analyzing pacing, anecdotes employed, and metaphors used for schooling, nor reflected upon the impact of *lyrical provocation* as a potentially influential element of educational policy making. As Morrow and Torres conclude, at the moment, the deschoolers are mostly off the scholarly map. "Curiously, Illich has virtually disappeared from discussion in the context of more recent critical theories of education. What is the significance of this continuing silence in educational circles? Have his more enduring insights been forgotten, or have they become so commonplace that they have simply become pervasive features of contemporary progressive educational theory? The situation appears to be more complex than either of these possibilities," Morrow and Torres suggest. Part Three explores the relationships between the deschoolers' critiques and observations of the educational system's failures in our contemporary era.

During the 1960s, John Holt, George Dennison, Jonathan Kozol, Herbert Kohl, Paul Goodman, Ivan Illich and other deschoolers spoke viscerally and vividly about the effects of schooling in children's lives, proclaiming some of education's larger meanings and purposes. Memorably, they held the nation's

attention. As No Child Left Behind falters forward and teachers and students express ever greater dissatisfaction with the batch-processing effect of institutionalized schooling, the deschoolers clearly have something to teach us now. This book explores their ambiguous legacy.

ⁱ I call this group the *deschoolers*, although not all these critics saw the only systemic remedy to the ravages of schooling as the deinstitutionalization of education altogether.

ⁱⁱ Dennison, G., et al (1971). *New York Review of Books*, February 11, 1971.