

WORKPLACE DEMOCRACY FOR TEACHERS: JOHN DEWEY'S CONTRIBUTION

John Dewey may prove to have been one of America's most important philosophers of technology. Like Thorstein Veblen, however, Dewey took technology to encompass all applications of scientific method to the solution of human problems. Thus his 'instrumentalist' approach to problem-solving included, indeed came to focus on, social organization as a *sine qua non* for enhancing the democratic ideal. Especially important in this respect was Dewey's persistent dedication to the well-being of working people. He was, to be sure, an intellectual but a distinctively pro-labor intellectual. More than that, he was an activist in behalf of unions -- for 'handworkers' and 'brainworkers' alike. In this cause he had few allies among academicians. Now, however, three decades after his death, American professors are beginning to unionize -- hopefully with the same breadth of vision that motivated Dewey.

This offbeat encomium of the great philosopher will no doubt please few Dewey scholars, but for quite different reasons. Leftists like Garry Brodsky, in keeping with their forebears' approach during Dewey's lifetime, dismiss this concern for workers as empty bourgeois rhetoric. But they may be reacting less to Dewey than to his right-wing interpreters, such as Sidney Hook, Ernest Nagel, and Lewis Feuer. Both sides miss the point just to the extent that they read Dewey too narrowly through their own lenses, neglecting his lifelong search for justice in a world marked by accelerating concentration of power and wealth. Conservative defenders of Dewey, in particular, fail to include in their interpretation of his views any account of his pro-union orientation. The resulting caricature borders on being schizophrenic.

Lewis Feuer, for example, says Dewey was an inept experimentalist; but because of his 'scientific character' he was our 'greatest intellectual.'¹ This title he awards to Dewey because he helped Leon Trotsky modify his belief in the socialist system; belatedly spotted the treachery of the Soviets while other intellectuals were still soft on Communism; and predicted the Nazi-Soviet Pact. He does not honor Dewey for supporting low-vote-getter Socialist Norman Thomas, and certainly not for his longtime heroic support of the rights of workers in the U.S. Instead, Feuer calls this an emotive attachment, uses the Soviet system as a slippery slope objection, and asks if Dewey has not perhaps exceeded 'the experimental constraints that an

instrumentalist pragmatism might have placed on his socialist enthusiasm.' Having thus set the trap, Feuer springs it on Dewey by using, he thinks, Dewey's own method against him:

Dewey's faith that ordinary citizens can be relied upon to make rational decisions with respect to basic political issues is itself a hypothesis to be verified, limited, or contravened; and when Walter Lippman challenged it, Dewey actually adduced little evidence against him.²

This Hamiltonian skepticism about democracy Dewey had in fact countered (a) constructively, by his lifelong commitment to education of the working class, and (b) explicitly, in his 1928 article, 'Philosophies of Freedom':

Practically, every one admits that there is a new social problem, one that everywhere affects the issues of politics and laws; and that this problem, whether we call it the relation of capital to labor, or individualism versus socialism, or the emancipation of wage-earners, has an economic basis. The facts here are sufficient evidence that the ideals and hopes of the earlier liberal school have been frustrated by events; the universal emancipation and the universal harmony of interests they assumed are flagrantly contradicted by the course of events. ...³

To explain how this 'earlier liberal school' could have been so wrong, Dewey points to what he calls 'the real fallacy.' This, he says,

lies in the notion that individuals have such a native or original endowment of rights, powers, and wants that all that is required on the side of institutions and laws is to eliminate the obstructions they offer to the 'free play of the natural equipment of individuals.' ... The notion that men are equally free to act if only the same legal arrangements apply equally to all -- irrespective of differences in education, in command of capital, and the control of the social environment which is furnished by the institution of property -- is a pure absurdity, as facts have demonstrated. ... The only possible conclusion, both intellectually and practically, is that the attainment of freedom conceived as power to act in accordance with choice depends upon positive and constructive changes in social arrangements.⁴

In some respects Dewey may well have been our 'greatest intellectual,' as Feuer contends. But, I submit, there are better reasons for assigning him such an honorific title than because of some passing success in applying the scientific method to a social problem. In particular, he merits comparable recognition because of his lifelong battle for workplace democracy despite lack of support from the American intellectual community.

I. DEWEY'S ACTIVIST DEFENSE OF UNIONS

Dewey's academic career, which began in 1884 at the University of Michigan and ended in 1939 at Columbia University, spanned the crucial years during which American workers struggled for and won the basic rights to organize and bargain collectively the terms and conditions of their employment. Throughout that period he proved himself a staunch defender of the labor movement.

His lifelong commitment to industrial democracy was already in evidence in the earliest years. All over the country, workers to whom the law granted few rights were challenging the autocracy of capitalist entrepreneurs; and their challenge was frequently countered by systematic, government authorized, if not initiated, violence, the most notorious instance of which occurred at Haymarket Square in Chicago in 1886. At this time Dewey was teaching an ethics course on the 'disequilibrium' of capital and labor; and in 1888 he published *The Ethics of Democracy*, in which he argues that economic and industrial democracy is necessary to avoid the kind of violence that was then so tragically characteristic of industrial relations. Later, during World War I, he joined with Thorstein Veblen and others in actively protesting government persecution of the controversial International Workers of the World.

During his long tenure at Columbia University, Dewey matched his well-known attention to education with comparably dedicated attention to the concerns of educators. He organized and actively participated in unions, pioneered in labor education, and was a front-line activist in behalf of rights he considered essential to industrial democracy.

In the years immediately before World War I, he was a key factor in the organization of the New York Teachers Union and its affiliation with the American Federation of Teachers, which was itself affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, as Local No. 5. He served for three years as its first vice-president. Over the years he repeatedly defended the propriety of teachers' belonging to unions in public addresses which in published form influenced ever wider audiences.⁵ In the 1930s, when over seventy years of age, after failing to prevent a Communist takeover of his Local No. 5, he led 300 others from that union to establish the New York Teachers Guild; and he provided similar support to embattled unions elsewhere: AFT Local 195 at Cambridge, Massachusetts; the National Education Association (1931); and the New Haven Teachers Association (1933).⁶

Education was for Dewey the key to developing a working class that

would make democracy workable. Over the years, he showed his commitment to labor education in many ways, e.g., obliquely, by opposing ROTC programs in colleges and universities and, more obviously, by opposing the proposal of certain manufacturers to put academically unpromising students over fourteen to work in factories (rather than providing alternative learning).⁷ The New School for Social Research, of which he was a co-founder, was envisioned as a center of learning where political, social, and economic problems could be studied in a free atmosphere, without fear of recrimination. But the focal point of Dewey's commitment to labor education was the Brookwood Labor College at Katonah (Westchester County), New York. Growing out of the socialist-oriented 'X' Club (organized in 1903), Brookwood was financed by leading social progressives and various labor unions with the aims of applying Dewey's educational philosophy to industrial relations. Increasingly it was branded as socialist by its right-wing opponents, including A. F. of L. vice president Matthew Woll. Reacting to Dewey's favorable report on the Soviet Union, Woll denounced Dewey as 'a propagandist for Communist interests' at the union's 1928 convention; this led to the AFT's withdrawal of support for the Labor College.⁸ Dewey complained that this condemnation was based on no investigation whatsoever and was mainly a ploy on the part of Woll to further his goal

to eliminate from the labor movement the schools and influences that endeavor to develop independent leaders of organized labor who are interested in a less passive and a more social policy from that now carried on by the American Federation of Labor....⁹

These words did not save the Labor College. It had to be closed for lack of funds. But they do reveal Dewey's objectives, which he pursued more broadly in the public arena.

In addition to his efforts in behalf of teachers' unions, John Dewey helped organize and direct a number of organizations whose objectives included better public understanding of the legitimate demands of the working class. He was singularly responsible, along with fellow philosopher Arthur O. Lovejoy, for the founding of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), served as its first president (1915), remained active in the organization and was eventually awarded an honorary life membership. He was one of the founders of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in 1920, and served on its National Committee through that decade. Dewey joined the League for Industrial Democracy in 1925; and he was the first president of the League for Independent Political Action (LIPA), which was

organized in 1930 to reform New York City government.¹⁰ From 1929 to 1936 he served as first president of the pro-labor People's Lobby and wrote numerous articles in its bulletin that called for social protection of the unemployed.¹¹

Dewey was also an outspoken defender of the rights of academicians, which he based not on 'academic freedom' but on the importance of protecting the university's responsibility to the public rather than to its administration. Thus did he defend (1) a pro-labor economist fired in 1915 by the University of Pennsylvania; (2) three anti-war professors dismissed in 1917 by Columbia University (Dewey himself supported America's involvement in World War I); and (3) philosopher Bertrand Russell, whose chair in philosophy the City University of New York took from him in 1941 because of public disapproval of his views about sexual morality.¹²

II. DEWEY'S THEORETICAL DEFENSE OF UNIONS

The rights that Dewey sought to secure for workers through his actions he endeavored to justify in his writings, especially by appealing to instrumental principles. These principles, in turn, were themselves a function of the social, political, and economic problems that dominated the American scene throughout his lifetime. I have already noted his early commitment to industrial democracy. This objective he explained in 1916 by saying that the growth of democracy is connected to the development of (1) the experimental method in the sciences, (2) evolutionary ideas in the biological sciences, and (3) industrial reorganization.¹³ The latter necessitates reform; evolutionary ideas suggest that reform is possible; and the experimental method provides a non-violent means to bring it about. Thus twenty years later Dewey was advocating socialism and freedom of assembly in the workplace as ideas that flow necessarily from these democracy-building developments.

Writing in 1938, Dewey pointed out that ordinary people can use new technologies very well once they are introduced into 'the organized means of associated living.'¹⁴ These organized means of associated living also include, for Dewey, the results of the activity he variously called 'thinking,' 'the method of intelligence,' 'the method of inquiry,' and, most descriptively of all, 'the method of cooperative experimental intelligence.'¹⁵ This social technology involves 'the intervention of inquiry in the way of observation, inference and reasoning.'¹⁶ Inquiry does not take place in isolated minds, as was imagined by the atomistic theory of the early liberals, but requires the collective interaction of the inquirers. Thus subjected to social control,

inquiry would be far more reliable as a guide to public policy than is the propaganda disseminated by politicians and pressure groups.¹⁷

The awesome agenda of Dewey's social technology was already in place in 1916, when he recommended 'a thoroughgoing and constant dependence upon the practice of science' in such enterprises as diplomacy, politics, and ethics.¹⁸ If only philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce's 'laboratory habit of mind' could be carried into such fields as politics and law and political economy, intellectual changes beyond prediction would come about.¹⁹

In the 1930s, Dewey's democratic agenda remained essentially unchanged; but by then he had learned to be more guarded about the ease with which it might be carried out. Social phenomena, he now suspected, could not be understood independently of 'extensive prior knowledge of physical phenomena and their laws.'²⁰ Yet he was now persuaded that effectuation of the agenda had become critically important. The 'new force generated by science and technology,' he had to admit, 'has not accrued to the betterment of the common human estate' in anything like the degree that Francis Bacon had anticipated. The institutional framework of society was built upon 'coercion and oppression on a large scale.' This failing, however, was due not to scientific method and technology but to 'institutions and habits originating in the pre-scientific and pre-technological age' and as yet 'untouched by scientific method.' These obsolete institutions and habits society must discard - not by resorting to violence in the name of the class struggle, especially in view of the destructiveness of technology-based modern warfare, but through 'the impact of inventive and constructive intelligence.'²¹

At stake, according to Dewey, was the achievement of a 'vital and courageous democratic liberalism': 'the one force that can avoid reducing the issue for the future to a struggle between Fascism and Communism.' This collectivist liberalism, unlike its timid predecessor, endorses 'organized social control of economic forces.'²² In particular, the *laissez-faire* liberal who objects to a publicly funded social security system in the name of 'rugged individualism' fails to recognize that

servility and regimentation are the result of control by the few of access to means of productive labor on the part of the many.²³

This being the case,

regimentation of material and mechanical forces is the only way by which the mass of individuals can be released from regimentation and consequent suppression of their cultural possibilities. . . .²⁴

Stated still more strongly,

The only form of enduring social organization that is now possible is one in which the new forces of productivity are cooperatively controlled and used in the interest of the effective liberty and the cultural development of the individuals that constitute society.²⁵

The context of these assertions is, of course, the Great Depression. But Dewey's commitment to the democratic potential of working people was in place much earlier. It was at the heart of his attack on Taylorism in 1916. Recalling Plato's definition of a slave as 'one who accepts from another the purposes which control his conduct,' Dewey warned that such slavery would surely result from the so-called 'scientific management of work.' Rejecting this 'narrow view' of the role of science with regard to workers, Dewey called upon scientists to address the 'technical, intellectual and social relationships involved in what [workers] do.'²⁶

For Dewey, then, the whole person goes not only to school but also to work. And it is precisely this consideration that constitutes one of Dewey's principal objections to *laissez-faire* liberalism, namely,

that it conceives of initiative, vigor, independence exclusively in terms of their least significant manifestation. They are limited to exercise in the economic area. The meaning of their exercise in connection with the cultural resources of civilization in such matters as companionship, science and art, is all but ignored.²⁷

Thus is American collectivistic liberalism set apart from British individualistic liberalism by its openness to 'the use of governmental action for aid to those at economic disadvantage and for alleviation of their conditions.'²⁸ This involvement of government he defends along modified libertarian lines, asserting that the police function of the state encompasses protection of our constitutionally guaranteed freedom of association. Writing just at the time when Congress was debating the future National Labor Relations Act (1935), Dewey says:

It is the business of the state to protect all forms and to promote all modes of human association in which the moral claims of the members of society are embodied and which serve as the means of voluntary self-realization.²⁹

Such government protection of the right to organize is of crucial importance because, in spite of pre-industrial individualist values, 'the isolated individual is well-nigh helpless' in the modern industrial setting where 'concentration and corporate organization are the rule.' Concern about giving the state too much power is misplaced, since '[the state's] exercise of coercive power is

pate in contrast with that exercised by concentrated and organized property interests.³⁰

This countervailing-force defense of state intervention to protect working people's interests is clearly not statist in intent. For Dewey's confidence in the potential of face-to-face democratic process remained the very touchstone of his *praxis*, setting his position apart, at times rather subtly, from the more radical responses which he rejected. What is here manifested, then, is an act of desperation on the part of a dedicated guild socialist who has come to recognize that democratic values would not survive without government protection in behalf of the people.

As Arthur Lothstein has noted, Dewey does not provide us with a full-blown description of how worker self-management might be carried out.³¹ But neither has he simply left us in the dark on this subject. For his own activism provides a number of relevant and historically significant examples of professional interest-group self-management, not in isolation from but in responsible attention to the public good. 'Ideas' suitable for incorporation into public policy are to be developed co-empirically, by the method of intelligence. Or, as he put it in his later years, a liberal program has to be developed independently of government and 'enforced upon public attention, before direct political action of a thoroughgoing sort will follow.'³² To the methodology for developing that liberal program Dewey devoted much of his attention.

Showing in his earlier years the influence of Thorstein Veblen, Dewey spoke of applying the methodology of scientists and engineers to bring about 'the invention and projection of far-reaching social plans.'³³ In later formulations he tended more to an account that maintained an epistemological equivalence between comparably reasoned conclusions about quite different kinds of subject matter. As he put it in *The Quest for Certainty* (1929), one may arrive at unqualifiedly scientific conclusions about 'fuller and more complex social and moral affairs' if one proceeds methodically, method being the determinant of a cognitive conclusion's value.³⁴ Epistemological subtleties aside, reasoning, as Dewey understood it, articulates a problem from experience and projects the possible consequences of a tentative solution. If this solution is implemented in action, it is the task of thinking to discover the specific connections between the action taken and its actual consequences. In this way 'inquiry' transforms an indeterminate situation into a unified, partially determinate whole.³⁵

This, Dewey repeatedly warned, cannot be accomplished by any mechanistic application of abstract science to the world of common sense. That kind of

so-called 'applied science,' which reduces qualitative matters to the quantitative and final to efficient causes, is responsible for a great deal of social disintegration; and this, says Dewey, is why people make such a sharp distinction between 'common sense inquiry and its logic and scientific inquiry and its logic.'³⁶ If democracy is to be truly viable, the method of inquiry must be used not as an external technology that mechanizes life and enslaves people but rather in a 'naturalized' (i.e., interest group-originated) way.³⁷ Only so can the *ancient social dichotomy between free citizens and workers* at last be abolished. And once this social dichotomy has been abolished, *the epistemological distinction between theory and practice, which arose out of that dichotomy, will collapse.*³⁸

This, in briefest outline, is how Dewey attempted to justify philosophically the right of workers to organize — a right which, as we have seen, he himself defended actively over the course of his life as a dedicated unionist. In fact, his activism increased in his later years. Yet even at the time of Dewey's death, in 1952, very few American university professors belonged to a union. Now many do. What changes have brought this about? In particular, has the American professoriate as a group come to share some of the political insights that motivated Dewey's unionism?

III. AMERICAN PROFESSORS IN UNIONS

American professors during Dewey's lifetime thought of themselves as elite professionals, a view that Dewey shared. This collective self-image changed little during the first twenty years after his death. The post-war expansion of American higher education brought many middle and even working class people into the ranks of the professoriate. But so long as the 'sellers' market' for qualified academicians prevailed, these new arrivals were able to disregard the Depression-era concerns of their forebears. They moved freely, like independent contractors, from one academic job opportunity to another. By 1972, however, the euphoria of the 'brick-and-mortar' era had dissipated. Their job opportunities having dwindled, academics had to adjust to the less autonomous role of comparatively immobile employees. Like other professionals, they too began to share, in ever increasing numbers, John Dewey's recognition of the benefits of organization. In fact, since 1972 American professors, along with other white collar workers, have constituted the fastest growing sector of the unionized workforce. This coming to terms with reality amounts, however, to a reluctant accommodation to facts that have yet to be internalized. What appears to be lacking in this will-to-unionize is precisely

the sort of theoretically grounded political sensitivity that Dewey brought to his role as an academician. Consider first the basic data in this regard, then some interpretive observations.

The unionized segment of the total workforce in the United States fluctuated slightly around an average of twenty-three per cent between 1973 and 1981, according to U.S. Department of Labor statistics. This stability is not what one would expect in view of the high unemployment and worker displacement during that period of time. For, due to these 'hard times,' there was a sharp decline in union membership over a wide range of industries, especially in manufacturing. Fortunately for the figures, blue collar attrition was counterbalanced by the rapid increase in unionization among white collar workers, including college and university faculty.

In 1970 about 5 million white collar workers belonged to unions; in 1980, almost 8.5 million, representing 37.8% of all unionized workers. And of this total almost half, i.e., about 4 million, were professional and technical workers. Overall union membership among professional, technical, and kindred workers in the United States rose from just under 14% in 1974 to nearly 30% in 1980. And the two sectors most responsible for this increase are health care and especially education.

The extraordinary transformation in the role of health care professionals, including physicians, is due to many factors; but chief among these is the intensification of government regulation coupled with a decline in government funding and the correlative privatization of health care facilities. In this context the percentage of unionized registered nurses rose from barely 8% in 1974 to 16.5% in 1980. Comparable increases occurred among pharmacists, chiropractors, health technologists/technicians, radiologic technologists/technicians, and even health administrators. Among related helping professionals there were some even more dramatic increases: psychologists (from about 9% to 22%), social workers (from under 20% to 29%), and social welfare clerical assistants (from 17.5% to 43%). A comparatively smaller number of physicians have joined unions; but considering the income level of this profession (average annual income over \$100,000), it is remarkable that 25,000 out of a total of just over 500,000 doctors had organized by 1985.³⁹

Similar and in some respects even more impressive increases have occurred in John Dewey's own bailiwick, that of education. This is especially true of the K-12 sector; but, as already noted, there have been noteworthy increases in higher education as well.

The level of organization among different groups of teaching professionals is discernible from U.S. Department of Labor statistics. Between 1974 and

1980 the percentage of unionized teachers on the preschool and kindergarten level rose from under 12% to 24%; unionized adult education teachers, from 14% to 22%; unionized elementary school teachers, from 26% to 54%; and secondary school teachers, from under 29% to nearly 60%; and trade and industrial teachers, from none to 70%.

The overall impact on different industries served by professionals can be summarized as follows. From 1974 to 1980 the percentage of the workforce that was unionized in welfare services rose from under 17% to over 21%; in libraries, from 9% to almost 20%; in hospitals, from 13.4% to 17.6%; and in elementary and secondary schools, from, roughly, 22% to 42%. Considering these increases in terms of governmental unit, local government workers were under 27% unionized in 1974, over 37% in 1980; state government workers rose from under 19% to over 29%; and federal government workers, up from under 16% to over 18%. During this period the percentage of union members among all college and university employees doubled, going from under 9% to over 16%.

Meanwhile, there has been a significant increase in the percentage of college and university teachers who are unionized. In fact, unionization in this sector is occurring at a more rapid rate than in the workforce as a whole. This increase can be documented by comparing (a) figures reported in 1974, (b) relevant figures in the 1974-1980 Bureau of Labor Statistics report just considered, and (c) figures reported in 1984 by the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.

Its members having decided in 1972 to compete with the NEA and the AFT in bargaining elections, the previously aloof American Association of University Professors in 1972 published a *Primer on Collective Bargaining for College & University Faculty*. In the introduction a list of higher education institutions with faculty bargaining agents is preceded by the following statement:

From the first four-year institution to select a collective representative in 1968, there are now more than 71 four-year colleges and universities, private and public, whose faculties are collectively represented. This includes multi-campus state systems in New York, Pennsylvania and Hawaii, as well as small private colleges such as Bard in New York and Regis in Colorado. In addition, the faculties of more than 240 two-year institutions are engaged in collective bargaining. As many as 80,000 faculty members, representing perhaps 15 percent of the American professoriate are now collectively represented.⁴⁰

Job categories used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics do not neatly distinguish college and university faculty from their K-12 colleagues or from

comparably trained professionals who are not academics. But the Bureau reports that 'Miscellaneous Teachers, College & University' were unionized barely 1% in 1974 and over 20% in 1980; and 'Teachers, College/University, not specified' rose from under 7% in unions in 1974 to over 13% in 1980.

By 1984, according to the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions,

about 25% of the 3,200 colleges and universities in the United States had unionized faculties. As of that year there were 429 recognized bargaining agents, of which 355 were at public institutions.

These figures are remarkable for several reasons. In the nation as a whole, the unionized sector of the workforce dropped, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from 23% to 18%. Second, the U.S. Supreme Court's 1980 *Yeshiva University* ruling that private university faculty are managerial personnel and hence not covered under the NLRRA has effectively put a lid on organizing in that sector. In fact, before *Yeshiva* more than 90 private institutions were unionized, and by the end of 1984 that number had dropped to 62. Third, the rate of increase in the number of states with enabling legislation for public higher education bargaining slowed almost to a halt during this period, with Illinois one of few states to be added to the list in 1983.⁴¹ In view of these counterindications, the manifestly established trend towards collective bargaining in higher education requires some explanation.

In 1973 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published a study by Everett Carl Ladd, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset entitled *Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education*. According to Ladd and Lipset, almost two-thirds of faculty surveyed in 1969 favored the idea of collective bargaining and about half the idea of going on strike; and 'after three years in which unionization had made considerable headway, academe was evenly divided as to its benefits.'⁴² In their opinion,

the rapid growth of collective bargaining in higher education during the past half-decade should be seen as the extension - to the level of university governance and faculty life - of the powerful trends toward equalization and away from elitism that have characterized many sectors of American society since the mid-sixties.⁴³

While an interest in expanding democracy is not to be discounted, less abstract explanations are ready to hand, and are not all that different from the reasons for bargaining increases among professionals outside of academe: concern about the decline of autonomy and professionalism as a result of societal intrusions of all sorts. In addition to these factors, there may be added as catalysts for faculty unionization an impoverishing salary level that,

combined with other demoralizing working conditions, threatens to drive as much as forty percent of the American professoriate, especially those in the arts and sciences, out of academe within the next five years. This situation is by no means unique to the United States; but it is not for that reason any less serious. According to one analyst of the trend, Michael I. Sovern, the resulting impact on higher education is 'a potential disaster for the country and for the chain of human knowledge.'⁴⁴

Faculty engagement in collective bargaining is hardly a panacea for all that ails our colleges and universities. But it can counterbalance the many forces indifferent to the value of knowledge that are infiltrating and undermining what we still call higher education. If a faculty union is to function as a defender of intellectual integrity, however, its members must be motivated not only by the bread-and-butter incentives to which nationally affiliated organizers typically appeal but also and indeed preeminently by the direct responsibility of 'brainworkers' to the public.

Happily, we may more easily attain this broader perspective if we stand on the shoulders of John Dewey — not to see merely what he saw but to know better how to look.

Indiana University, Indianapolis

NOTES

- 1 Lewis S. Feuer, 'Was John Dewey, as Franklin D. Roosevelt said, 'the Worst' of the Intellectuals?', paper read at joint session of Society for Philosophy and Technology and Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy, Washington, DC, 27 December 1985.
- 2 Feuer, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
- 3 *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 43.
- 4 'Philosophies of Freedom,' originally published in *Freedom in the Modern World*, ed. Horace Kallen (New York, 1928), reprinted in *On Experience, Nature and Freedom*, ed. Richard J. Bernstein (Indianapolis/New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1960), pp. 271-272.
- 5 'Professional Spirit among Teachers,' *American Teacher*, October 1913, pp. 114-116; 'Professional Organization of Teachers,' *American Teacher*, September 1916, pp. 99-101; 'Why I Am a Member of the Teachers Union,' in *American Teacher*, January 1928, p. 4.
- 6 George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston with introduction by Harold Taylor (London and Amsterdam: Feffer & Simons; Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), pp. 256-258.
- 7 Dewey, 'The Manufacturers' Association and the Public School,' *Journal of the National Education Association* 17 (1928): 61-62. See Hewlett (note 10, below),

- p. 119; Dykhuizen, p. 231.
- 8 Dykhuizen, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-232, 239; Hewlett (note 10, below), p. 119.
- 9 Dewey, 'Labor Politics and Labor Education,' *New Republic*, 2 January 1929, p. 213.
- 10 Charles F. Hewlett, *Troubled Philosopher: John Dewey and the Struggle for World Peace* (Port Washington, NY, and London: Kennikat Press, 1977), pp. 119, 121-122; Dykhuizen, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
- 11 Dykhuizen, *op. cit.*, p. 229. These same concerns Dewey also publicized in the pages of the *New York Times*: 'Asks Hoover to Act on Unemployment' (21 July 1930, p. 17); 'Asks Federal Fund to Aid Unemployed' (12 May 1930, p. 35); 'Puts Need of Idle at Two Billions' (26 October 1930, p. 21).
- 12 Dykhuizen, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-169, 304-307; Hewlett, *op. cit.*, p. 33. See Dewey, 'Professional Freedom,' *New York Times*, 22 October 1915, p. 10; 'The Case of the Professor and the Public Interest,' *Dial* 62 (1917): 435-437. Dewey was also involved in the defense of secondary school teachers.
- 13 *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1916), preface, p. 5. (Cited hereafter as DAE.)
- 14 *Liberalism and Social Action* (New York: Capricorn, 1963; original, 1935), p. 52. (Cited hereafter as LSA.)
- 15 *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- 16 *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1938), p. 163. (Cited hereafter as LTI.)
- 17 LSA, pp. 47, 71.
- 18 *Essays in Experimental Logic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916; reprinted New York: Dover, 1954), p. 414.
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 306.
- 20 LTI, p. 492.
- 21 LSA, pp. 72, 74, 75, 82, 83-87.
- 22 *Ibid.*, pp. 92, 90.
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 38; see also pp. 35-37.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 90; see also LTI, pp. 504-505.
- 25 LSA, p. 54.
- 26 DAE, p. 98.
- 27 LSA, p. 38. Years before, at the time of World War I, Dewey had directed similar criticisms against the elitism of both the German and the British educational systems. See Gary Bullert, *The Politics of John Dewey* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1983), pp. 23-24.
- 28 *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.
- 29 *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- 30 *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 64.
- 31 Arthur Lothstein, 'Salving from the Dross: John Dewey's Anarcho-Communalism,' *The Philosophical Forum* (Boston), 20 (Fall 1978): 98.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 15-16.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 73. Dewey himself considered *Democracy and Education* (1916) to be pivotal to an understanding of his views on the relation between science and morality, but regretted that philosophers, unlike teachers, seldom read it. See *On Experience, Nature and Freedom*, ed. Richard J. Bernstein (Indianapolis/New York: Bobbs-

Merrill, 1960), pp. 14-15.

³⁴ *The Quest for Certainty* (New York: Capricorn, 1960; original, 1929), pp. 198-200. See also *Experience and Nature* (2d ed.; LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 1929; original, 1925), pp. 128-129. Special thanks to Larry Hickman and an anonymous reviewer for goading me to clarify this point.

³⁵ LTI, pp. 104-105ff.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

³⁷ LSA, p. 31.

³⁸ LTI, p. 73. Thus did he encourage teachers to organize in order to bring 'brainworkers' together with 'handworkers' in 'service to the general public': 'Professional Organization of Teachers' (note 5, above).

³⁹ Don Colburn, 'Physician, Organize Thyself,' *The Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, 12 August 1985.

⁴⁰ Matthew W. Finkin, Robert A. Goldstein, and Woodley B. Osborne, *A Primer on Collective Bargaining for College & University Faculty* (Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors, 1975), p. i.

⁴¹ Scott Heller, 'Faculty Unions Still Growing, Study Finds,' *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 8 May 1985, pp. 1, 24; National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, New York, NY, 1985.

⁴² Everett Carl Ladd, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset, *Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education* (Berkeley, CA: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973), p. 11.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁴⁴ Robert L. Jacobson, 'Low Pay and Declining Working Conditions Seen Threatening Colleges' Teacher Supply,' *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 27, 1985, p. 21; *On Campus*, December 1985/January 1986, p. 3. See Michael I. Sovern, *Passing the Torch: Graduate Education and America's Future*, Columbia University President's Report, 1985.