

“Selves in need of Advancement”: Dewey, Occupations, and the Lingering Influence of
Herbartian Concepts on Dewey’s Philosophy of Education

Introduction

In his article “John Dewey’s Racialized Visions of the Student and Classroom Community”, Frank Margonis uses John Dewey’s support of Public School (P.S.) 26 in Indianapolis, Indiana to show that Dewey’s beliefs about what type of education is suitable for Black children and White children were affected by his beliefs about race. His argument is that Dewey’s ideas about progressive education were implicitly racist and do not necessarily apply to Blacks or other minorities. This is because, although Dewey was a vocal critic of vocational education specifically for training purposes, P.S. 26 was ostensibly a vocational school that taught skills such as sewing and cooking.

This inconsistency in Dewey’s thought regarding vocational education has been noticed and criticized before, notably by Feinberg in his book, *Reason and Rhetoric*.¹ This contradictory position is all the more perplexing because Dewey was not completely silent on the subject of race; indeed, he was an early member of the NAACP.² There can probably be found nowhere in Dewey’s work any explicit statement arguing for the inherent inferiority of Blacks or for the biological, intellectual, or moral superiority of Whites. However, as Margonis suggests, what Dewey didn’t say about race, and maybe more important, what he did not do about it, may be more important in helping us understand what his ideas were concerning race.

What I would like to do in this essay is to label Dewey a kind of racist, a kind that

is very different from the snarling, ignorant Southern bigot which usually comes to mind when we think of a “racist”. In order to help us understand why Dewey was so silent about P.S. 26’s vocational curriculum and failed to act more strongly to oppose racial violence, discrimination, segregation, etc., we must discuss what race is as an idea or concept for classifying human beings and we must understand the changes that concept has undergone over time. To that end, I would like to introduce the concept of “cultural racism” or “racialization of culture” which has been a topic of discussion in such fields as anthropology, but which I have not seen used as a theoretical tool in many of the discussions of Dewey and his theoretical “blind spots” in regard to race.³

For this essay I am defining “cultural racism” as an ideology that posits the existence of inherent differences, and relationships of superiority and inferiority, between different populations of human beings, and which appeals to differences in culture rather than genetics or biology, to explain these differences. By using the concept of cultural racism, we can understand why and how, as Margonis states, “...Dewey’s path breaking child-centered pedagogy was developed with European-American students in mind” and is “...a codification of the values and privileges of European-Americans...”.⁴ We can also understand that Dewey was not alone in being a “cultural racist” and we can begin to place his ideas in context in relation to the ideas of other theorists who were dealing with the subjects of race and who were active during the early 20th century.

The central thesis of this essay will be that John Dewey revealed by his actions and praise of P.S. 26 that he was a cultural racist, one of the first American intellectuals who can be described by that term (as opposed to being a “scientific” racist).

I will first recapitulate Margonis’ argument and clarify what it means for Dewey,

who rejected scientific racism, to be a “cultural racist”. I will then analyze the history of the concept of “race” European scientific thought and show the effect of the concept of culture on Dewey’s understandings of race. I will defend this statement by first examining the contradiction between Dewey’s opposition to “social efficiency” education and his support of P.S. 26. I will attempt to show that Dewey was quite vocal and active in opposing vocational education and that this opposition brings his support of P.S. 26 into sharp relief.

Next, I will discuss the concept of Race, the history of the concept and the evolution of its meaning. I will attempt to show why Dewey must be considered different from the scientific racists that came before him.

The aim of this paper is to use Margonis’ critique of Dewey’s support for P.S. 26 as starting point from which I will analyze some weaknesses in Dewey’s pragmatic philosophy which would have hindered his ability to adequately theorize and oppose race and racism in America.

P.S. 26

In this section I will attempt to show the extent to which Dewey’s support of P.S. 26 and its curriculum was inconsistent with his own stated principles and his well-documented and vocal opposition to narrow vocational education. I will elaborate on this point and connect it to the subject of race by examining Dewey’s general failure during his life to be as publicly involved in the struggle against racism as he was involved in the ant-poverty and liberal-socialist political struggles of his time. I would also like to say that, in fairness to Dewey, it should be recognized that the opinions and intellectual

positions of everyone change with time and new experiences and it is unlikely that a person who has an academic career and life as long as Dewey's would not have some contradictions between his thoughts and deeds at two different times. However, the really important question here is how Dewey held two contradictory beliefs contemporaneously and just how crucial these contradictions were for American society and the core of his educational theory.

In the history of American education, John Dewey stands out prominently for his opposition to the dominant trend in education theory at the beginning of the 20th century. This trend was the movement for efficiency in education, the social efficiency movement. "The efficiency movement in education was modeled after Frederick W. Taylor's principles of scientific management which was designed to eliminate waste and promote efficiency in the factory".⁵ The efficiency movement viewed the whole of society as one huge factory and conceived of public education as a scientific mechanism for maximizing the efficient management of labor, allocation of resources, and increasing the production and quality of product; the school in turn was seen as factory administered by Taylorist scientific management. In the school, as in the factory and ultimately society, waste was to be avoided and ends were subordinated to means, with the former being decided by upper management; in this case, the ends of American schooling would be decided by members of the business class.⁶

The efficiency movement in education concerned itself with determining early in a student's career the student's inherent aptitudes and abilities for the purpose of finding the future profession that would best suit the student. The efficiency movement was closely tied to the birth of IQ testing and the testing movement as in order for the aims of

the movement to be met, the proper assessment of a student's abilities was crucial.

Dewey was a very public and outspoken opponent of this movement, "More consistently perhaps than any other educational theorist of his time, John Dewey argued for an education antithetical to that of the social efficiency advocates..."⁷ For Dewey, the efficiency and testing movements violated the fundamental principles of democracy. Dewey disagreed with the movement's aims to lock students into very narrow and limited futures, "Dewey believed that education should liberate people, enabling them to change and better their lot".⁸ However, the efficiency movement made no provisions for mobility of any kind. Despite any hard work or effort on the part of a student to acquire new skills and experiences, the best the efficiency model could give was the training that was discovered to best suit the child and that was determined at the beginning of his education. However, what Dewey wanted for students was "...an education that would expand a person's horizons and provide him with the tools to interpret and to alter his world".⁹

One of the most public advocates for the efficiency curriculum was David Snedden. Snedden's support of the curriculum brought him into direct opposition with Dewey, at one point their disagreement was played out publicly in a series of exchanges in the *New Republic*, which was a "clash" that was "...surprising for its intensity and bite, coming from two men who ordinarily managed to find accommodation between their own strongly held views and those of others".¹⁰ Dewey was "...vehement in his opposition to the movement for vocational education and to Snedden's proposals" and he "...did everything in his power to stay the advance of narrow trade training in the schools".¹¹

Ultimately, despite Dewey's fierce resistance, the social efficiency curriculum and its supporters prevailed and shaped American education policy for decades to come. However, the important aspect that I wish to extract from Dewey's opposition to social efficiency and the advocates for a narrow vocational curriculum is the intensity of his resistance. Social efficiency was contrary to ideals that were at the core of Dewey's beliefs about democracy, the nature of the child, and what makes a good society, and he was willing to have a public struggle in defense of his ideals. Dewey was so adamant in his opposition to the efficiency curriculum and narrow vocational education. The question is, why did he support the curriculum at P.S. 26 when according to critics like Feinberg and Margonis, the school's curriculum was simply preparing the Black students for accepting their subordinate positions in American society? Also, there is the question of whether or not the curriculum at P.S. 26 was different from those at any of the other schools which Dewey praised in *Schools of Tomorrow*.¹² Dewey was a proponent of the use of handwork in schools, and he thought that its inclusion in the curriculum would teach "...desirable habits of industry, responsibility, and productive membership in society".¹³ If the students at P.S. 26 were doing handwork and manual labor as part of their curriculum, how was this an aberration from Dewey's educational theory? It may help to compare the curriculum of P.S. 26 with that of contemporary schools that also incorporated strong elements of handwork and vocational education.

P.S. 26 shared many features with schools in Chicago, Cincinnati, and Gary, but underlying these similarities there are some fundamental differences. The Deweys described P.S. 26 in *Schools of Tomorrow* in a chapter titled "The School as a Social Settlement".¹⁴ The Deweys makes clear in the beginning of the chapter that they values

the school because of the role it plays in connecting the school and schoolwork with the community and environment surrounding the school: “This closer contact with the immediate neighborhood conditions not only enriches school work and strengthens motive force in the pupils, but it increases the service rendered to the community”.¹⁵ The school was able to acquire three tenement buildings and converted them into facilities for the students. There was a manual training building which housed a carpenter shop, sewing room, and a class for shoemaking.¹⁶ Another building housed the domestic science and home economics equipment and also a demonstration dining and sitting room, and a kitchen.¹⁷ The third building was converted into a club house for the male students.

At the school, the boys learned how to make things such as tables and chairs, and they learned how to do repairs as well; there was also a shoe-repairing department and tailoring shop which offered classes after the normal school day was finished. Boys also learned cooking, and The Deweys note that the cooking class was more popular with the boys than with the female students. As for the girls, there were classes teaching cooking, sewing, millinery and crocheting. The girls’ work was also used to help raise money for the school: “In the millinery class the pupils start by making and trimming hats for themselves...The millinery has done quite a business in the neighborhood, and turned out some very successful hats”.¹⁸ Also, for the girls, the domestic science classes taught skills such as “...buying, the comparative costs and values of food, something of food chemistry and values, and large quantity cooking”.¹⁹

They Deweys also mention how the surrounding community is involved in the building and maintenance of the school. “When there was a job they could not do, such as

the plastering and plumbing, they went among their friends and asked for money or help to finish the work. Men in the neighborhood dug a long ditch through the school grounds for sewerage connections”.²⁰ This is not just an incidental detail; throughout their description The Deweys make it clear that the transformation of the community, the residents, and the students is a crucial part of the school’s success. The desired outcome was

to make ambitious, responsible citizens out of the student body. Inside the school pupils are taught higher standards of living than prevail in their own homes, and they are taught as well trades and processes which will at least give them a start towards prosperity, and then, too, they are aroused to a feeling of responsibility for the welfare of the whole community...But there are many other activities which, while not contributing so directly to the education of the children, are important for the general welfare of the whole community.²¹

It is clear that one of the aspects of the school with which Dewey was most impressed was its mission of uplift and self-improvement; for example, the students had access to a savings bank so that they could learn “...habits of economy and thrift”.²² One detail that seemed to impress Dewey was the teaching of hygiene to the boys, which “...resulted in a very marked improvement in the appearance and habits of the boys in the class, and has had an influence not only on the whole school, but on the neighborhood as well”.²³ The effect on the community is important; this was part of the school’s work “...to arouse the pupils to a sense of responsibility for their community and neighbors” (347). Indeed, Dewey believed that desire of the community around P.S. 26 was to “...see real, tangible results in the way of more prosperous and efficient families and better civic conditions...” (352).

The focus throughout Dewey’s description is not so much on the curriculum of the school, but on how the school will impact the surrounding community. It is clear that the Black community which housed P.S. 26 was comprised of the “selves in need of

advancement” mentioned in Margonis’ essay; hence, Dewey’s talk about “arousing” the students to an awareness of their responsibility to their community. The students could only be so awakened if they had no prior understanding of such responsibility, or if such understanding was present but only weakly. And if this understand was lacking or was weak then the reason for this must be because the students were not taught such a sense of community responsibility by their families, or the community itself, before being taught this in school. If this is true, then the community and families are themselves somehow deficient and unable to successfully engender the correct values in the youth. Therefore, the Deweys says that the curriculum at the school would “...mean a real step forward in solving the ‘race question’...”.²⁴ If by “race question” he means the subordinate position of Blacks within American society (as opposed to some biological deficiency which could not be solved by more education) then the solution would involve Blacks as a whole being uplifted through similar education which would “arouse” feelings of community. I would like to argue that such uplifting education is central to the Deweys’ educational philosophy vis-à-vis race because, in addition to Whites rectifying their behavior towards Blacks and other minorities, the Deweys argued that the minorities would also have to reach a certain cultural level at which they would be more easily accepted by White American society; however, more will be said about this later. For now, I shall continue with the comparison between P.S. 26 and other schools employing vocational methods that Dewey mentions in *Schools of Tomorrow*.

The schools in Gary Indiana under Superintendent William Wirt, which Dewey wrote about in the chapter “Education through Industry”, had much in common with P.S. 26. Those schools also incorporated handwork—students learned to make their own

clothes, girls learned to cook and sew—but there were some crucial differences too. When one closely examines Dewey’s description of the curricula of these two school systems, one can notice that Dewey chooses different aspects of P.S. 26 to praise which he does not praise when discussing the schools in either Gary or Chicago. Further, the latter schools offered a fundamentally different experience to students than the former school. While handwork, vocational education, and domestic training were a part of the curriculum in all three schools, the aim of the education seems to be rather different from that offered at P.S. 26.

In the Gary schools there were carpenter shops and kitchens as in P.S. 26 but also painting departments, and electrical, machine, pattern, forging, and models shops.²⁵ Maybe P.S. 26 didn’t have the requisite funds for these kinds of facilities, a very real possibility, but not only were the facilities different in Gary, the way they were used to educate was also different. The Gary schools incorporated handwork and technical training with theory and history classes; this is an aspect that Dewey didn’t mention when discussing P.S. 26, possibly because it didn’t exist at that school (but, if they did not exist, why did he not make a point of this and criticize the lack of such programs?). The description Dewey gives of the education of very young children at the Gary schools shows a marked difference with P.S. 26:

[The student] learns to handle the materials which lie at the foundations of civilization in much the same way that primitive people used them, because this way is suited to the degree of skill and understanding he has reached. On a little hand loom he weaves a piece of coarse cloth; with clay he makes dishes or other objects that are familiar to him; with reeds or raffia he makes baskets; and with pencil or paints he draws for the pleasure of making something beautiful; with needle and thread he makes himself a bag or apron. All these activities teach him the first steps in the manufacture of the things which are necessary to our life as we live it. The weaving and sewing show him how our clothing is made; the artistic turn that is given to all this work, through modeling and drawing, teach

him that even the simplest things in life can be made beautiful, besides furnishing a necessary method of self-expression.²⁶

This description paints an image that is very different from that of P.S. 26. The handwork mentioned here does not include simply experiences of cooking, sewing, carpentry and other domestic and vocational labor; the purpose of using handwork in the Gary schools seems to have been to give the student certain experiences through physical activity (not necessarily labor) which would lead to a deeper understanding of physical processes and even history. Comprehension of a process, not simply preoccupation with the finished product or technical considerations, is important in this example, as well as artistry and “furnishing a necessary method of self-expression”:

In the fourth grade the pupils stop the making of isolated things, the value of which lies entirely in the process of making, and where the thing’s value lies solely in its interest to the child. They still have time, however, to train whatever artistic ability they may possess, and to develop through their music and art the esthetic side of their nature.²⁷

The art classes were not just for the younger pupils, students in the upper grades had access to these as well. In addition, there were science laboratories, classes that focused on office work including business methods and typewriting, and even college preparatory classes. The curriculum at Gary covered the gamut of vocational training and prepared its students to enter whatever field that interested them, whether that be in the clerical/business world, academia, or in manual labor.

The curriculum at technical schools in Chicago that were mentioned by Dewey was even more different with respect to P.S. 26. Many features were similar to P.S. 26 and especially the Gary schools; “...most of the schools include[d] courses in mechanical drawing, pattern making, metal work, woodwork, and printing for the boys and for the girls work in sewing, weaving, cooking...and general home-making”.²⁸ However, the

schools in Chicago provided students with an integrated view of the real-world vocations. In these schools there were science laboratories in which students learned "...to understand the foundations of modern industry..." and the "Elementary courses in physics, chemistry, and botany" were taught in connection with real world experiences; "The botany is taught in connection with the gardening classes, chemistry for the girl is given in the form of the elements of food chemistry".²⁹ In one school there was a laboratory class "...where the pupils make the industrial application of the laws they are studying, learning how to wire when they are learning about currents, and how to make a dynamo when they are working on magnets...".³⁰ Dewey explained that "Without this comprehensive vision no true vocational training can be successful...".³¹

At one school, the Lane school, not only were individual subjects taught in class connected to their practical use in the real world, but also, different aspects of a real-world problem or subject were covered in the classes that corresponded to each academic subject. For example, students would be posed with the problem of making a vacuum cleaner and "...the pupils must have reached a certain point in physics and electrical work..."; the students would then design the cleaner starting from "...rough sketches, which are discussed in the machine shop and altered until the sketch holds the promise of a practical result".³² Later, real mechanical drawings of the sketch were made "...from which patterns are made in the pattern shop"; finally, "The pupils make their own molds and castings and when they have all the parts they construct the vacuum cleaner in the machine and electric shops".³³ In this way, Dewey says that "...each pupil becomes in a sense the inventor, working out everything except the idea of the machine".³⁴

This description of the technical schools of Gary and Chicago should make the

differences with the school at P.S. 26 clear. Although I do not think that the curriculum at P.S. 26 was preparing each child for only one future occupation, the vocational education there was quite limited in its scope when compared to the schools in Gary and Chicago. Whereas the curriculum of the latter provided students with an in-depth understanding of industrial processes from the theoretical to the practical, the former used handwork more as a tool for self and community improvement. It may be the case that P.S. 26 offered instruction in physics, arithmetic, industrial history and business management, but the Deweys never mention them in connection with the school. This shows that for him, such subjects, similar to the integrated instruction offered at Gary and Chicago, were not the most remarkable aspects of the school's curriculum.

Compared to the other schools, we can see that P.S. 26 was not limited because its students participated in handwork and other types of vocational instruction. The real limitations come to our attention when we look beyond the school and even the immediate community to the national context. Dewey was against vocational education that limited a student's future possibilities, and he supported the P.S. 26 curriculum because it allowed the child to function better in his community, even if he was not being prepared to be specifically a plumber or carpenter, or some similar occupation. However, Dewey misses the point that if the education the student receives prepares him only to exist better in his immediate surroundings, even if he is taught how to better them he may not be able to change the relationship of his immediate community to the larger national social context. Even if not limited vocationally, Dewey praised a school that, while admittedly doing valuable and needed work, only prepared students to live better within their own community. This may be a criticism that could be leveled at the other schools

that Dewey mentions, but it gains more weight when used for the situation at P.S. 26 because the student body was all Black, members of a race and class that were at the bottom of their society.

Dewey was concerned with resisting the social efficiency curriculum because he rightly perceived that it only served to lock students into their present class position in society; the social efficiency curriculum is a mechanism for social reproduction and Dewey was right to oppose it. However, he was not able to perceive the ways in which his own educational suggestions might do the same thing (not only to Blacks, but to women as well, viz. the concentration on domestic arts for young girls). Even if the students at P.S. 26 learned about tailoring, carpentry, and cooking, etc., they were only being given the tools to survive more successfully under a regime of racism; their education was not one of liberation, but of coping.³⁵ Learning good hygiene, and the “habits of thrift and economy” are obviously important for anyone, but one has to wonder how such features of a curriculum can contribute to solving the “race question”. I submit that the only way Dewey could have thought that such instruction was crucial to tackling the problem of racism, especially in light of the curricula at the Gary and Chicago schools, is if he believed that the students at P.S. 26 were not yet ready to undertake the same instruction as their White counterparts in the other cities. For Dewey, the students and the Black community in Indianapolis, and by extension all Black Americans, would have to learn how to take care of themselves and become good citizens before they could gain the respect of Whites and be allowed to participate in society as equals.

I think that this insight can help to explain much of Dewey’s silence on racial issues during his life. Margonis claims that he “...can find no place in his writings where

he joins the NAACP in calling for the equal rights of African Americans”.³⁶ If this is true, I believe that my above comparison and analysis of Dewey’s comments might explain why this is the case.³⁷ From here, I want to compare Dewey’s relative inaction in fighting for racial equality with his extensive involvement and efforts in struggling for a new political and economic order in the United States.

In order to understand why Dewey sidesteps the issue of race we should think back to the P.S. 26 example and Dewey’s advocating of a curriculum that would help instill a sense of responsibility and self-improvement in individuals who more or less lacked these notions. Also, I believe that an understanding of what is meant by race and racism today, and what those terms may have meant in Dewey’s time is also necessary. In the next section I will examine the changing meaning of race, especially during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. I will also examine theories about racial and cultural development that were formulated at this time and speculate on how they may have contributed to Dewey’s own thoughts about race, education, and what kind of curriculum is appropriate for different kinds of individuals.

History of the Concept of Race

The concept of “race”, referring to subsets of the human species which exhibit particular or exclusive phenotypes, behaviors, and traits has a long history which, in the West, probably begins long before the birth of scientific racism in the 18th and 19th centuries. In a paper titled “Proto-racism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity” Benjamin Isaac states that, “Obviously, in classical antiquity racism did not exist in the modern form of a

biological determinism”, however, there still existed what he terms ‘proto-racism’ “...as a widespread phenomenon in antiquity”.³⁸ However, this early racial ideology was much different from the scientific racism that developed in Europe in the 19th century; “...before Darwin there existed other forms of racism, based on the idea that external influences, such as climate and geography determined the basic characteristics of entire peoples”.³⁹ It was only during the 19th century in Europe that the concept of “race” began to take on the biological determinist connotations it has today.

However, even during the 19th century, the term “race” did not have a completely biological or genetic connotation, and the term was used much differently than the way it is used today and there was much overlap with concepts such as culture, ethnicity, and nation. The anthropologist George W. Stocking Jr. states that because in the late 19th century, “...the processes and the problems of heredity were little understood...” the concept and term “blood” was widely used and “...included numerous elements that we would today call cultural; there was not a clear line between cultural and physical elements or between social and biological heredity”.⁴⁰

Stocking explains that “Those of us today who are sophisticated in the concepts of the behavioral sciences have lost the richly connotative nineteenth century sense of ‘race’ as accumulated cultural differences carried somehow in the blood”.⁴¹ At the end of the nineteenth century “...race was as much product as cause”, and “If it was a determinant of national cultural experience, it was at the same time an outgrowth of previous national and cultural tradition”.⁴² This late nineteenth century idea of “race”, as not only determining people’s developmental trajectory, but also being a product of past development and experience, is very important for understanding Dewey’s views about

the nature of the child and what kind of education is appropriate for children.

The understanding of race described above allowed for both common people and intellectuals to speak of an Irish race, a Chinese race, or a Teutonic race because for them, "... 'race' was a catchall that might be applied to various human groups whose sensible similarities of appearance, of manner, and of speech persisted over time, and therefore were evidently hereditary".⁴³ This understanding of race had much in common with the contemporary concept of "culture" in that it combined behavior and language as a means to classify human populations into groups, much like the concept and use of the word "blood" described above.

Also, during this time in Europe, much intellectual energy was devoted to more clearly and scientifically classifying and hierarchizing human populations into subgroups.⁴⁴ This attempt to formulate a more accurate classification system would lead to the development of scientific racism and theories of cultural evolution that would place Western European society at the apex of a descending hierarchy from civilization to savagery. Scientific racism would be a field that concentrated more on the physical and biological differences that would yield one race superior to another. These scientific racist ideas would also be used to formulate theories of social evolution which focused on the resulting differences in societies and cultures, ranking cultures from least technologically advanced (inferior) to the most civilized (superior). These fields would be combined by the likes of Herbert Spencer, who coined the term, "survival of the fittest".

Since the eighteenth century "...continental scholars such as Louis LeClerc, Comte de Buffon, and Johann Blumenbach fused their aesthetic judgments and ethnocentrism to form an elaborate system to classify the races into a rigid hierarchical

scheme”.⁴⁵ This burgeoning field of scientific racism was very influential in the United States as well. Scholars such as Samuel Morton, Josiah Nott, and Louis Agassiz were instrumental in the founding of American anthropology.

Also, during in the 19th century, the concept of culture, like “race”, had a much different meaning than it has today. As stated above, 19th century social scientists rarely made a distinction between physical and cultural aspects of “races”. While the contemporary definition of culture would probably include some notion of language, traditions, religion, food-ways, etc., “culture” these days is also seen as something which is universal to all humans, regardless of race. However, “culture” in the 19th century was for the most part seen as something only some groups of people fully possessed and that others possessed to lesser degrees. Culture in this case would have very much the same sense that the concept of “high culture” still holds today; culture would be defined as advancements in music, the visual arts, poetry, architecture, and complex machine-based technology. Much like the racial hierarchies that were developed bases on physical factors, different human groups were ranked according to their cultural “achievements”.

As Stocking explains:

Prior to about 1900, ‘culture’ both in the German and in the Anglo-American tradition still had not acquired its characteristic modern anthropological connotations. Whether in the humans or in the evolutionist sense, it was associated with the progressive accumulation of the characteristic manifestations of human creativity: art, science, knowledge, refinement--those things that freed man from control by nature, by environment, by tradition--as weighted, as limiting, as homeostatic, as a determinant of behavior. In general, these connotations were given to the ideas of custom, instinct, or temperament, and they were often associated with a lower evolutionary status, frequently argued in racial terms.⁴⁶

The key difference between 19th century social-scientific conceptions of culture and contemporary understandings of the concept is that social scientists in the 19th

century spoke of a singular, absolute, value-laden phenomenon, “Culture”, while today we speak of “cultures” (plural). Much of this difference results from the work of Franz Boas, the “Father” of American Anthropology. Boas, an opponent of scientific racism, was key in shifting anthropology from a pre-occupation with singular, linear cultural evolution to a pluralist, culturally relativist model.⁴⁷

Thus, we can see that the pre-Boasian culture concept was linear and teleological; the technologically advanced European nations were the apex (and possibly the ultimate end) of the historical development of culture, and the more closely a people resembled this European standard, the more advanced they could be said to be. Dewey was aware of Boas’ work however, while Dewey almost certainly did not subscribe to the pre-Boasian concept of culture and cannot be accused of scientific racism, I do not think that we can say that he was completely a cultural relativist. This will become clear when we examine some of Dewey’s statements on race and culture in conjunction with the theories of other social scientists who influenced him.

The above discussion of the concepts of both race and culture and their 19th century connotations can help us understand why Dewey seemingly held a double standard in relation to the education of Black children at P.S. 26. In order to get a full understanding of this connection, we must combine the contextualized meanings of race and culture presented above with the work of late 19th century theorists who exerted some influence on Dewey’s thought.

In particular, the recapitulation theory of Ernst Haeckel and the cultural epoch pedagogy influenced by the ideas of Johann Friedrich Herbart were quite popular with social theorists and educators during the late 19th century. Recapitulation theory states

that “ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny”, which means that the development of the individual organism, its ontogeny, recapitulates, or repeats, the evolutionary or phylogenetic development of the entire species or group to which that individual belongs. Recapitulation theory, “Applied to the curriculum...became the theory of cultural epochs; units of study were developed which purportedly paralleled the stages of man’s march toward civilization”.⁴⁸

This cultural epoch pedagogy was formulated by the German philosopher Johann Friedrich Herbart, and gained much popularity and many advocates in America. It became so popular with many educators that, “Herbartianism took on the character of an evangelical movement and attracted followers through a kind of conversion experience”.⁴⁹ This enthusiasm prompted one contemporary historian to claim that “To dissent from a Herbartian is to take your life in your hand”.⁵⁰ One reason for this passionate support of Herbartian education might be the emphasis Herbart placed on moral education; “The central theme of Herbartianism was the belief that the highest purpose of education was the development of “ethical character”. All other functions were subordinate to this end”.⁵¹

Part of this moral education was a strong critique of American individualism and a consequent emphasis on the social and the importance of considerations of society in the education of youth. History was another central aspect in the Herbartian curriculum; “History and literature were the centers about which all other studies were concentrated”; concentrating on history would presumably facilitate the linkage between the stages of human social development and the mental development of children.⁵² This social and historical emphasis greatly appealed to John Dewey, who “...pointed to the cultural

epoch theory as a step in the right direction” for teaching students about history, ethics, and social progress.⁵³

In fact, the ideas of recapitulation theory and Herbatianism were a major influence on Dewey’s development of the curriculum for his laboratory school at the University of Chicago. This is the argument of Thomas Fallace, who in an essay titled “Repeating the Race Experience: John Dewey and the History Curriculum at the University of Chicago Laboratory School”, claims that “Dewey’s history curriculum was based entirely upon his own refashioning of the anthropological-sociological-psychological theory of recapitulation. Also referred to as cultural epoch theory or correspondence theory...”.⁵⁴ Fallace states that “[recapitulation theory] explicitly identified Western cultures as the most efficient and advanced and inherently relegated “primitive” cultures to lower status”.⁵⁵

I will attempt to show later that, while not as explicit as a scientific racist such as Herbert Spencer, there are many examples from Dewey’s own work that show he believed that Western European civilization was, in terms of value, a *higher* type of civilization and culture when compared to non-European cultures. When combined with a Herbartian recapitulationist curriculum, we can see that, as Margonis argues, “...the central concepts of progressive educational thought implicitly refer to members of the dominant group...”.⁵⁶

The Implications of Recapitulation Theory

First, I shall turn to Fallace’s article and combine his arguments with examples from Dewey’s work which show that his thoughts about race can be described as “culturally racist”.

Fallace starts his analysis of Dewey's involvement with recapitulation theory by suggesting that "Dewey's pragmatic historicism was an attempt to reconcile Hegelian idealism, scientific positivism, and sociological historicism, which all centered on different theories of historical development".⁵⁷ It is also important that Dewey began his intellectual career in the 1890's, when "...the great intellectual task in American social science was how to construct an evolutionary model that reconciled the innovations of psychological laboratory work with the emerging theories of sociological development".⁵⁸ The intellectual climate at this time was "interdisciplinary in nature" as individuals from various fields attempted "...to discover a unifying theory of how biological impulses translated into cultural innovation".⁵⁹

Obviously, Dewey could not have avoided being influenced and participating in the great intellectual preoccupations of his time. However, as Fallace explains, Dewey's strategy was not to align with one camp or the other, he was neither purely Hegelian, believing in the transcendental progression of history toward greater metaphysical truth- nor was he a historical positivist, believing that trans-historical natural laws governed human social and mental development. Dewey developed a middle path, a "historical pragmatism", a system which eschewed any sort of transcendental laws and conceived of historical development and progress as inextricably linked to human actors and society; "For Dewey, progress was dependent upon human invention, innovation, and creativity. Society was not driven or restrained by transcendent evolutionary laws...rather man employed these laws as tools to help bring order to the world it inhabited".⁶⁰

It is important to note here the importance Dewey places on human control and manipulation of the environment for progress and development. Dewey (1907-1909)

states that, “According to pragmatism, intelligence or the power of thought is developed out of the struggles of organic beings to secure a successful exercise of their functions”.⁶¹ He goes on to explain that it is the chief aim of individuals and societies to “...subordinate the materials and forces of the natural environment so that they shall be rendered tributary to life-functions”.⁶² It is important to remember statements such as these when evaluating the charge of Dewey’s cultural racism. Fallace explains that for Dewey, “nature was subordinated through the experience of the individual as he increased his social efficiency by either contributing to or drawing upon the cumulative historical experience of the race”.⁶³ In light of the above contextualization of the late 19th century concept of “race”, we can understand that here, Dewey is probably speaking of what we might call “nations” or “ethno-cultural” groups today. For Dewey, an individual must use the “cumulative historical experience of the race”—in other words, the technological and cultural accomplishments—in order to subordinate the environment. It stands to reason that a “race” with more historical experience and technological accomplishments can achieve this task more easily.

Fallace continues his analysis by examining more directly Dewey’s connection to recapitulation theory. Fallace first explains that while Dewey accepted the basic premises of recapitulationist/correspondence theory, he did have criticisms for aspects of the theory and how it was implemented by its adherents. Fallace notes at least three major critiques Dewey has of the cultural epoch curriculum: “First, Dewey opposed the idea that cultural epochs represented a rationale for a purely biological basis of the curriculum, wherein content should be selected solely on the emerging instinct-stages of the child”; “Second, Dewey objected to the idea that cultural epochs somehow determined a

particular body of content, or what he called cultural products, to be presented to the child”; and third, Dewey’s “...most significant objection was that cultural epoch theory treated each developmental stage as ‘exceedingly transitory’, as something to move through and then abandon”.⁶⁴ Dewey’s first objection is a result of his belief that basing a curriculum solely on developmental and phylogenetic stages would include some stages which were of little educational value. His second object is a result of his objection to choosing specific “cultural products” (e.g., specific novels, songs, works of art) for the curriculum instead of concentrating on the mental processes that gave birth to those products. The third critique is an embodiment of Dewey’s belief that the past was not simply past but was extant in the present as an important factor. Likewise, that development was not a series of discreet, isolated stages, but “Instead, evolutionary growth was holistic and gradual”.⁶⁵

These objections notwithstanding, Dewey almost certainly subscribed to the fundamental notions behind correspondence theory. In the essay “Interpretation of the Culture-Epoch Theory”, Dewey (1896) states that he does not question “... the correspondence ‘in general’”, and that he is, “Admitting the correspondence in general...” (Dewey 250).⁶⁶ This leads Fallace to claim that “... Dewey retained the basic idea of evolutionary historicism--that the empirical innovations of the past themselves revealed certain knowledge of the present that could only be arrived at by passing through a particular sequence of lived (or relieved) experiences”.⁶⁷

His adherence to the principles of correspondence theory was maybe the major reason why Dewey crafted the curriculum at his laboratory school around the study of history:

In accordance with his pragmatic historicism, the qualitative conditions of the modern world could not be fully understood without an appreciation of their historic development from earlier forms. In practice, this meant that children in the Dewey school had to relieve the carefully selected path of innovation for the entire history of human civilization. The symbols of civilization such as letters and number (i.e., the three Rs) were not introduced until the race had invented them; likewise, students did not learn about the usefulness and products of scientific inquiry until the human race had done so. In this manner, history, organized as an indirect sociology, served as the foundation for the entire curriculum.⁶⁸

It is therefore important to understand that history at the Dewey laboratory school was not merely another subject among many but formed the very basis for how students were to learn. Because Dewey accepted the basic premises of correspondence theory, the idea that “the cultural products of each epoch will contain that which appeals most sympathetically and closely to the child at that epoch”, for him, the study of history would be a means by which children could recapitulate the experiences and discoveries of “the race” and could learn more effectively.⁶⁹

At the Dewey school, the study of history was to be carried out through the study of “social occupations”, what a contemporary anthropologist might call “subsistence strategies” (hunting, gathering, industrial, trade, etc.). For Dewey, the study of “occupations” was important because “Occupations determine the fundamental modes of activity, and hence, control the formation and use of habits...they furnish the working classifications and definitions of value” and “So fundamental and pervasive is the group of occupational activities that it affords the scheme or pattern of the structural organization of *mental traits*”.⁷⁰ Dewey believed that the general “occupation” of a people was an important factor in shaping their psychological development and claimed that because one occupation differs from another “...in the sort of satisfactions and ends... in the objects to which it requires attention... as well as the psycho-physic

coordinations it stimulates and selects. We may well speak... of the hunting psychosis or mental type. And so of the pastoral, the military the trading...".⁷¹

Dewey used the study of occupations as a way to organize the curriculum historically. Although he did not believe that the human culture progressed in discreet stages and while he realized that elements of earlier stages remain in present developments, occupations were a good way to sync the phylogenetic development of the race with the mental development of the child. By concentrating on a particular occupation, such as gathering or trading, at the corresponding stage of the child's mental development, the child would better be able to relive the experiences of the humans who represented that occupation and consequently make the same discoveries and mental developments as those people; "The social occupations of man organized historically not only united the disparate subjects of the curriculum... but it also accorded with the development of the mind of the race".⁷² Therefore, "With guidance from the teacher, students would arrive at the same innovative solutions their ancestors had discovered, only do so in less time and with greater efficiency".⁷³

However, as noted above, not all occupations from all different cultures were necessarily seen as being of equal worth. Dewey definitely placed much importance on the ability to subdue one's natural environment as a measure of intelligence. Although a common criticism leveled against Dewey and other pragmatists is that their system of thought offers no criteria for evaluating different values, for Dewey, at least, growth which leads to the possibility of future growth was such a criterion.⁷⁴ Even as late as 1916, in Democracy and Education, Dewey still referred to "savage" institutions as "backward" and stated that.⁷⁵

In terms of mental development, I do not think it would be too much to say that Dewey would rate those societies which had developed advanced technology and scientific methods of inquiry as being in some way superior to “savage” cultures. The reason being that, with growth that leads to future growth being the criterion of value, and with Dewey’s opinion of such cultures as being stultifying for thought and mental development, by default the technologically advanced, scientific societies allow for more mental growth and therefore are superior. It should also not be too much of a logical stretch to posit that the savage societies that Dewey had in mind were probably African, Native American, Australasian, etc., and the scientific societies would include Europe and North America. As Shannon Sullivan explains in her article “(Re) construction Zone”: “Dewey never uses the word ‘race’ in connection with the term ‘savage’, but he need not do so for his account to be raced. Because ‘savage’ is not a racially neutral term, Dewey’s discussion of savages is racially coded...In the United States, ‘savage’ was most often used to designate Native Americans, but it was sometimes also used to describe other nonwhite groups such as African-American”.⁷⁶

We must be mindful that making Dewey’s racism visible requires subtlety, because, unlike the scientific racists who came before him, he does not attempt to argue for the inherent inferiority or biological superiority of one group over another. For Dewey, “Other, more primitive cultures were not necessarily viewed as inherently inferior, but they were *comparatively inferior*”.⁷⁷ This is an important distinction that sets him apart from scientific racists, like Herbert Spencer, and in my opinion marks Dewey as one of the first *cultural* racists. Dewey even attacks the theories of scientific racists and he specifically singles out Spencer’s ideas for criticism.

Dewey had at least three major criticisms of the scientific racism of social scientists like Spencer. First, he criticized the way in which the scientific racists examined disparate cultures from different geographical locations for the purpose of "...establishing a certain common property of primitive minds".⁷⁸ Dewey compared this to a biologist comparing insects, reptiles, and different mammals in order to find a common trait which united them all. Second, Dewey explicitly criticized the way these scientific racists described other cultures in terms of "lack" or "absence". He realized that "...present civilized mind is virtually taken as a standard, and savage mind is measured off of this fixed scale".⁷⁹ Dewey recognized that other cultures should be examined within the context in which they developed. His third criticism was that thinking about human development in the way Spencer did would "...yield only loose aggregates of unrelated traits--not a coherent scheme of mind".⁸⁰ This criticism seems to be related to Dewey's own pragmatic historical method; Dewey probably believed that his method would give a more coherent understanding of human development because of his historical view and his insistence that past states are factors in present states, leading to a present state which is incorporative of the past and whose future development is determined by past experiences. He argued that "We must recognize that mind has a pattern...and that it is the business of a serious comparative psychology to exhibit these patterns, forms or types in detail".⁸¹

In light of these very strong criticisms of scientific racism, made during a time when almost certainly his opinion was in the minority, it may seem off-the-mark for me or anyone else to level the charge against Dewey that he was a racist of any sort. However, my charge only seems wrong if we forget that, as I detailed above, the concept

of “race” has gone many changes over time and in the late 19th century incorporated much of what we would designate as “cultural”, “ethnic”, or “linguistic” today. It was approximately at the time during which Dewey was beginning his intellectual career that the biologized, scientific racist conception of race was beginning to shift into a type of racism that focused more on the cultural side rather than the biological, and I believe that Dewey was an important part of this shift.

Dewey’s historical pragmatism was premised on a valuation of “growth” and prioritized scientific thought and the ability to subdue one’s environment. Although his arguments were not couched in biological terms and did not include hard distinctions between superior and inferior groups, “...his theory still relegated aboriginal, African, and American Indian civilizations to prior steps in the evolution of man” therefore he “identified Northern European industrial society as the most fully realized (and most socially efficient) culture and, thereby, placed Euro-American society at the top of a hierarchy of civilizations”.⁸²

It is also very important to understand the time in which Dewey was writing and to note any change or continuity in his thought over the course of years. I mentioned above that, at this time, another important intellectual, Franz Boas, was changing the intellectual landscape of American anthropology and social science by attacking scientific racism and arguing, much like Dewey, for understanding each culture on its own terms. However, I would argue that Boas’ stance was even more radical than Dewey’s because, while I do feel that Dewey’s pragmatic historicism was a bold move away from scientific racism in relation to human mental development, Boas took the step toward full cultural relativism. One important aspect in which Dewey differs with Boas is

Dewey's apparent belief that modern Euro-American society is dominated by scientific inquiry and rational thought processes. Boas, on the other hand, argued that while in modern Euro-American society there are individuals who frequently make use of scientific inquiry, the majority of people, even scientists, simply received a body of facts or "knowledge" which had been created by generations of scientists and philosophers but they never really fully analyze this received knowledge rationally. The combined effort of the work of generations of scientists exists for the modern Euro-American as simply a type of folklore, a mass of largely unexamined "known-facts" about the world. While a so-called "primitive" might explain a new phenomenon in terms of the action of spirits or supernatural powers and a modern individual would attempt to describe the same phenomenon in some vaguely "scientific-sounding" terms, neither offers "...a causal explanation of the new perception. They simply amalgamat[e] it with 'other known facts'".⁸³

In other words, the traditions from which people of different cultures draw in order to explain their world might be different, but Boas realized that even in cultures which had developed science, most people are simply drawing on second-hand knowledge to explain social or natural phenomena; that some explanations might involve magic while others rely on received scientific knowledge does not make the latter inherently more critical, observant, or rational. Instead of "occupations" which shaped the mind into patterns or types, "...the general effect of Boas' argument was to show that the behavior of all men, regardless of race or cultural stage, was determined by a traditional body of habitual behavior patterns passed on through what we would now call the enculturative process and buttressed by ethically tainted secondary rationalizations".⁸⁴

It seems to me that Dewey would rather argue that, due to occupations which shape the mind into patterns, the explanations each culture would offer for natural or social phenomena would be a result of a conscious, rational process, yet due to a limited ability to think analytically about such phenomena, the resulting explanations offered by “savage” societies would in turn be somewhat limited and deficient, conditioned by the mental patterns resulting from their chief “occupations”. This limited analytical ability would, for Dewey, probably be almost causally connected to the inability of some peoples to subdue their environment properly. The important difference with Boas’ thinking is that for him cultural behavior began unconsciously and, “...once established, a piece of customary behavior tended to become more unconscious the more it was repeated”.⁸⁵ After the establishment of this unconscious behavior, Boas posited that emotional, not rational, attachments became connected with it, and any subsequent novel behaviors met with emotionally based resistance. This emotional reaction is what triggers an awareness of the first unconscious behavior and provokes subsequent secondary rationalizations:

The more automatic any series of activities or a certain form of thought has become, the greater is the conscious effort required for the breaking off from the old habit of acting and thinking, and the greater also the displeasure, or at least the surprise, produced by an innovation.

The antagonism against it is a reflex action accompanied by emotions not due to conscious speculation. When we become conscious of this emotional reaction, we endeavor to interpret it by a process of reasoning. This reasoning must necessarily be based on the ideas which rise into consciousness as soon as a break in the established custom occurs; in other words, our rationalistic explanation will depend upon the character of the associated ideas.⁸⁶

Conclusion

Thus, while Dewey did understand the importance of understanding cultures in

their own temporal and geographic context, unlike Boas, he didn't seem to have as strong an idea of the relative value of the accomplishments of the cultures that were not industrial and Euro-American. Dewey was not unaware of Boas' work, and he was influenced by him and cited him often in his own work.⁸⁷ Many of Dewey's own ideas seem very similar to Boas', for example in the article "Racial Prejudice and Friction". Dewey states that there is an "...instinctive aversion of mankind to what is different from what we are used to, and which thus shocks our customary habits" (243).⁸⁸ Later he says that "There is no lesson of anthropology more striking than its testimony to the universal antipathy which is aroused by anything to which a tribe or social group is not adjusted in its past habits" (245). This is not evidence of a direct influence of Boas' ideas on Dewey's thought, but the language certainly is reminiscent of the explanation for the origin of cultural explanations of phenomena that Boas offers. Nevertheless, it seems that Dewey maintained his belief in the correspondence theory (and therefore, maintained his culturally racist ideas) as late as 1916 (after he wrote *Schools of Tomorrow*), and probably beyond that time.⁸⁹

I call Dewey's attitude "culturally racist" precisely because he accepts the new analytical concept of "culture" and seems to agree with its importance in determining human behavior. In this regard, I am not too dissimilar from others who have criticized Dewey. One example would be Shannon Sullivan, who analyzes Dewey's use of the term "habits" in an article about racial prejudice, quoted above. Sullivan realizes that Dewey uses "habits" in this context in much the same way as he used "occupations" and "patterns of mind" in earlier essays. Sullivan also calls Dewey a racist, while being careful to state that he didn't appeal to biological or scientific justifications of racism. I

think that what my analysis adds to hers is the aspect of culture and the way Dewey's belief in recapitulation theory and his ideas about cultural evolution conditioned his appraisal of the merits of different types of cultures.

I believe that by focusing on this aspect of Dewey's intellectual heritage, we can begin to answer some of the questions raised by Margonis and earlier commented on by Feinberg, namely, why Dewey felt that what amounted to a vocational education was appropriate for Black children, while he was otherwise a vocal opponent of vocational education and the social efficiency curriculum. The analyses of both Margonis and Feinberg are correct; Margonis is correct in speculating that for Dewey, the students of P.S. 26 were "selves in need of advancement" who needed to learn how to care for themselves and their community. Feinberg is correct in noting that Dewey's support of the school was guided by his belief that "...that the best way for a Black man to cope with American society was to fit into it as best he could and as best as it would allow".⁹⁰ My hypothesis that Dewey was a cultural racist guided by a belief that children recapitulate the stages of development of their respective races is simply an explanation for how Dewey might have arrived at these beliefs concerning the students at P.S. 26 and Black people in America in general.

For Dewey, Black people, and also other ethnic and racial minorities, were culturally different from the dominant Anglo-Saxon people of the United States and a true solution to the race problem in the country would require further *cultural* evolution on the part of minorities and American society as a whole until all groups could live together peacefully. This belief led to his gradualism in regard to combating racism and other social ills, for which he is criticized by Margonis and Feinberg, among others.

However, in practice, for Dewey culture was not completely separate from biological race as a new conceptual tool for analyzing the antagonisms in society; culture seems to have only stood in the place of biological race. Different vocabulary was used, but because Dewey believed that “occupations” or modes of living had a long-term effect on the development of the minds of different groups of people, in practice, the effect of appealing to culture was not fundamentally different than appealing to biology, in terms of its effects on certain populations.

1. Walter Feinberg, *Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of 20th Century Liberal Education Policy* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, INC., 1975)

2. <https://naacp.org/nations-premier-civil-rights-organization/>

3. Faye V. Harrison, “The Persistent Power of “Race” in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism,” *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 24 (1995): 47–74.

4. Frank Margonis, “John Dewey's Racialized Visions of the Student and Classroom Community,” *Educational Theory* 59, no. 1 (2009): 17-39.

5. Feinberg, 62

6. Feinberg, (63-64)

7. Walter H. Drost, "Social Efficiency Reexamined: The Dewey-Snedden Controversy," *Curriculum Inquiry* 7, vol.1 (1977): 19-32.

8. Drost, 25

9. Drost, 20

10. Drost, 20

11. Drost, 28

12. John Dewey and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow*, (New York: Dutton, 1962).

13. Drost, 25-26

14. Apparently, while the book, *Schools of Tomorrow*, was co-authored by Dewey and his daughter Evelyn, the chapter concerning P.S. 26, “The School as Social Settlement” was authored by Evelyn alone.

15. Dewey and Dewey, 340

16. Ibid., 343

17. Ibid., 345

18. Ibid., 344

19. Ibid., 345

20. Ibid., 346

21. Ibid., 349

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., 345

24. Ibid., 341

25. Ibid., 367

26. Ibid., 371

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid., 378

29. Ibid., 379

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., 382

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. I call this coping because although Dewey advocated deeply understanding the dynamics of a culture and society and then using his experiment democratic method to change the society, especially when it came to race, he seems to have missed just how much societies can morph the forms of social institutions, while still maintaining those institutions. I will discuss this point more in the concluding section of this essay.

36. Margonis, 20

37. I also performed such a search for the terms “lynching” and “racism” within the online collection of Dewey’s works. The latter term yielded no results while the former only about three, and these were not used in relation to violence against Blacks. Dewey probably refrained from using the term “racism” because he did not think that race itself existed. I will discuss this more in the conclusion.

38. Benjamin Isaac, “Proto-Racism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity,” *World Archaeology* 38, no. 1, (2006): 33

39. Ibid., 34

40. George W. Stocking, “The Turn-of-the-Century Concept of Race,” *Modernism/modernity* 1, no. 1 (1994): 4-16, 6.

41. Stocking, “The Turn-of-the-Century Concept of Race,” 6.

-
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., 7
44. Faye V. Harrison, "The Persistent Power of 'Race' in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, no. 1 (October 1995): 47-74, 50.
45. Lee D. Baker, "Columbia University's Franz Boas: He Led the Undoing of Scientific Racism," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 22 (1998): 89-96, 89.
46. George W. Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," *American Anthropologist* 68, no. 4 (1966): 867-882, 870.
47. Stocking, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," 871.
49. Ray N. Hiner, "Herbartians, History, and Moral Education," *The School Review* 79, no. 4 (1971): 590-601, 591.
50. Hiner, 593.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., 590.
53. Ibid., 593.
54. Ibid., 596.
55. Thomas Fallace, "Repeating the Race Experience: John Dewey and the History Curriculum at the University of Chicago Laboratory School," *Curriculum Inquiry* 39, no. 3 (2009): 381-405, 382.
56. Fallace, 383.
57. Margonis, 19.
58. Fallace, 386.
59. Ibid., 384.
60. Ibid., 384.
61. Ibid., 386.
62. John Dewey, "The Bearings of Pragmatism Upon Education", *Progressive Journal of Education* 1, no. 2 (1908): 1-3, 1.
63. Dewey, "The Bearings of Pragmatism Upon Education", 1.
64. Fallace, 386.
65. Ibid., 389-390.
66. Ibid., 390.
67. Dewey, ??? MW 5: 250

-
68. Fallace, 392.
69. Ibid., 394.
70. MW 5: 247.
71. John Dewey, "Interpretation of Savage Mind," *Psychological Review* 9, (1902): 217-230, 219-220.
72. John Dewey, "Interpretation of Savage Mind," 220.
73. MW 4: 190.
74. Fallace, 393.
75. J.L. Simich and Rick Tillman, "Radicalism vs. Liberalism: C. Wright Mills' Critique of John Dewey's Ideas," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 37, no. 4 (Oct. 1978): 413-430, 418.
76. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1966), 36.
77. Sullivan, Shannon, "(Re)Construction Zone: Beware of Falling Statues," in *In Dewey's Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction*, ed. William J. Gavin, (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2003), 119.
78. Fallace, 399, (emphasis added).
79. Dewey, "Interpretation of the Savage Mind," 217.
80. Ibid., 218.
81. Ibid., 219.
82. Ibid., 219.
83. Fallace, 399.
84. Stocking, "Boas and the Culture Concept," 876.
85. Ibid., 877.
86. Stocking, "Boas and the Culture Concept," 877.
87. Franz, Boas, "Some Traits of Primitive Culture," *The Journal of American Folklore* 17, no. 67 (Oct.-Dec. 1904), 243-254, 246.
88. The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Volume 13: 1921-1922 "Types of Philosophic Thought", pp. 349. In this syllabus for a course, Dewey mentions Boas' *The Mind of Primitive Man*.
88. The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Volume 13: 1921-1922, Essays. "Racial Prejudice and Friction", pp. 242-254.
90. The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Volume 9: 1916, *Democracy and Education*, pg. 41-42.
91. Feinberg, 110.

Draft

Bibliography

- Baker, Lee D. "Columbia University's Franz Boas: He Led the Undoing of Scientific Racism." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 22 (1998): 89-96. doi:10.2307/2998850.
- Boas, Franz. "Some Traits of Primitive Culture." *The Journal of American Folklore* 17, no. 67 (1904): 243-54. doi:10.2307/534224.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. "The Essential Social Fact of Race." *American Sociological Review* 64.6 (1999): 899-906. Print.
- . *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. 2nd ed. Lanham, Maryland, United States of America: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, INC., 2006. Print.
- Bordeau, Edward J. "John Dewey's Ideas about the Great Depression." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 32.1 (1971): 67-84. Print.
- Clift, Virgil A. "Does the Dewey Philosophy have Implications for Desegregating the Schools?" *The Journal of Negro Education* 29.2 (1960): 145-154. Print.
- Cohen, Patricia. "'Culture of Poverty' Makes a Comeback." *The New York Times* Print. 17 Oct 2010 2010.
- Dewey, J. (1909). The bearings of pragmatism upon education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The middle works, vol. 4* of the collected works of John Dewey (pp. 178-191). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. Types of Philosophic Thought. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The middle works, vol. 13* of the collected works of John Dewey (pp. 349-405). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Drost, Walter H. "Social Efficiency Reexamined: The Dewey-Snedden Controversy." *Curriculum Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1977): 19-32. Accessed February 26, 2021. doi:10.2307/1179396.
- Eldridge, Michael. "Challenging Speculation about "Dewey's Racialized Visions" " *Educational Theory* 60.4 (2010): 503-517. Print.
- Fallace, Thomas. "Repeating the Race Experience: John Dewey and the History Curriculum at the University of Chicago Laboratory School." *Curriculum inquiry* 39, no. 3 (2009): 381-405.
- Feinberg, Walter. *Reason and Rhetoric: The Intellectual Foundations of 20th Century Liberal Education Policy*. n.p.: John Wiley and Sons, INC., 1975. Print.

- Harrison, Faye V. "The Persistent Power of 'Race' in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, no. 1 (October 1995): 47–74. doi:10.1146/annurev.an.24.100195.000403.
- Hickman, Larry, ed. *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Electronic Edition. Schools of to-Morrow*. 6: 1931-1932, Essays Vol. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972. Web.
- Hickman, Larry', ed. *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Essays*. 13 Vol. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978. Web.
- Hickman, Larry, ed. *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924. Essays*. 13: 1921-1922, Racial Prejudice and Friction Vol. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978. Web.
- Isaac, Benjamin. "Proto-Racism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *World Archeology* 38.1 (2006): 32-47. *JSTOR*. Web. 09/20/2010.
- Lawson, Alan. "John Dewey and the Hope for Reform." *History of Education Quarterly* 15.1 (1975): 31-66. Print.
- Margonis, Frank. "John Dewey's Racialized Visions of the Student and Classroom Community." *Educational Theory* 59.1 (2009): 17-39. Print.
- Neubart, Stefan. "Democracy and Education in the Twenty-First Century: Deweyan Pragmatism and the Question of Racism." *Educational Theory* 60.4 (2010): 487-502. Print.
- Paddock, John. "Oscar Lewis's Mexico." *Anthropological Quarterly* 34.3 (1961): 129-149. Print.
- Simich, J. L., and Rick Tilman. "Radicalism Vs. Liberalism: C. Wright Mills' Critique of John Dewey's Ideas." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 37.4 (1978): 413-430. Print.
- Stocking, George W. "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective." *American Anthropologist* 68, no. 4 (1966): 867-882. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/670404>.
- . "Lamarkianism in American Social Sciences: 1890-1915." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23.2 (1962): 239-256. Print.
- . Stocking, George W. "The Turn-of-the-Century Concept of Race." *Modernism/modernity* 1, no. 1 (1994): 4-16. doi:10.1353/mod.1994.0015.
- Stocking, George W., Jr., ed. *A Franz Boas Reader: The Shaping of American Anthropology 1883-1911*. 1st ed. New York, New York:, 1974. Print.

Sullivan, Shannon. 2003. ““(Re)Construction Zone: Beware of Falling Statues.” In *Dewey's Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction*. edited by William J. Gavin, 109-127. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

---. "From the Foreign to the Familiar: Confronting Dewey Confronting Racial Prejudice." *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 18.3 (2004): 193-202. Print.

Taylor, Paul C. "Silence and Sympathy: Dewey's Whiteness." *What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question*. Ed. George Yancy. New York, New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Draft