

Ethnic Education: A Clash of Cultures in Progressive Chicago

Gerald R. Gems

The City of Chicago recently embarked upon a pioneering effort to transform the quality of its public school system. The concept of decentralization that allows for neighborhood councils, greater decision-making at the local level, and increased parental involvement in the schools is not a new one. Similar governance structures of a century ago fell victim to class and ethnic factionalism. The progressive vision of a homogenous society assumed a passive clientele and a consensus culture. Particular educational programs brought diverse groups closer to the mainstream, but the resultant mass culture accommodated pluralistic values rather than the sought-after homogeneity.

The media and corporate interests often hold the educational system accountable for social problems, the lack of a qualified workforce, and the inability of America to compete effectively in a world economy. Communities and teachers call for multi-cultural studies, while administrators question the academic validity of such courses. Some legislators seek to eliminate bilingual instruction. Such issues are not new; they surfaced more than a century ago. Then, like now, commercial interests offered their own remedies.¹

Financially-strapped school systems seem all too willing, even eager, to accept corporate sponsorship, pre-packaged curricular materials, or offers of "free" technology. Such assistance, however, is hardly value free and often benefits a particular group at the expense of others. History suggests that policymakers should question the wisdom of blind acceptance.

Numerous works have examined and interpreted the assimilation of ethnic groups within the processes of urbanization, industrialization, and education. The earliest of these studies posited the concept of an American "melting pot," arguing that dissimilar migrant groups voluntarily acquiesced in the acceptance of the American cultural norms. They propose that ethnic cultures simply disappeared as immigrants merged with the native populace.² Others have contended that distinct ethnic cultures survived within the mainstream culture. In reality, all groups have selectively participated in American society while

maintaining their own values and institutions. A pluralistic model of culture, rather than the “melting pot,” resulted.³

This study draws upon Antonio Gramsci’s concept of cultural hegemony, which allows for various modes of cultural transmission. Cultural hegemony is an active process, the outcome of which is the domination by one group of others in a society. Subordinate groups accept, reject, adapt, and accommodate with the dominant group, who must continually strive to maintain a position of power.⁴

In the 1830s white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant males quickly subsumed the French-Indian culture of a frontier village and incorporated it as the city of Chicago. They solidified their status as the city’s cultural and commercial leaders over the next two decades. By the early 1890s the middle and upper class Chicagoans who had been building the city since before the Civil War were ready to display it to the world. The Columbian Exposition, the World’s Fair of 1893, served as that display. The many Chicagoans who united in the Civic Federation to produce the spectacle concurred in a particular vision of a cooperative, orderly, and efficient society that became the theme of the exposition. They chose to portray the city as a symbol of the real life they sought to create. Classical architecture symbolized the order, harmony, grandeur and idealism of the organizers’ social vision.

While the Columbian Exposition proved a resounding success in many ways, it failed to achieve any of its social goals or any real progress. The image of a social utopia displayed at the 1893 World’s Fair stood in stark contrast to the reality of the life that occurred around it. The orderliness, efficiency, and harmony of the “White City” were sorely lacking in real-life Chicago. It was filthy, steamy, and depressing, and concerned citizens united to bring about change.⁵

Upper and middle class coalitions formed the basis of the “Progressive Movement” that attempted to incorporate the wayward and unenlightened masses into their particular social vision. Business interests stressed greater commercial and technical education so that they, and their employees, could compete with European industrial powers and overcome the social blight of poverty and unemployment. Political reformers advocated civil service reform to terminate the administrative inefficiency and corruption that plagued urban governments. Social scientists called for objective analysis, efficient organization, and charity to combat health concerns and industrial issues. Despite their different messages, however, all three groups agreed on a common means of approaching the lack of progress: amelioration through education. If reformers hoped to bring order, efficiency, and unity to the culture, they would have to start with the school system. They could not, however, find the going easy. The schools preceded the Progressives by several decades.⁶

Long before native, middle class reformers attempted to produce a centralized public school system, the public schools were local entities, defined by and made to serve the neighborhoods. As relatively early immigrants, the Germans were particularly active in shaping local schools. They introduced their own teachers, language, and the German kindergarten practices. Chicago’s first

kindergarten appeared in the 1860s, with numbers greatly increasing in the 1880s and totaling ninety-two by 1892. The Turners also initiated their exercise system in the schools as early as 1866. The Turner method, which emphasized fitness, strength, and discipline, proved attractive in the wake of the Civil War. It became the basis for the first formal system of physical education in the American public schools.⁷

It was not assimilation (i.e., absorption into the dominant culture), however, but the maintenance of their own traditions that motivated the European groups. Ethnic educational practices and influences often proved inconsistent with the progressive goals for a homogeneous society. The popularly elected school board allowed ethnics a voice in the decision-making process. As eastern Europeans became residents of the city, they, too, found representation and an outlet for their views. As early as 1880 Bohemians petitioned for a Czech language instructor at the Throop School. Adolf Kraus, a Bohemian, won election to the Board of Education in 1881 and became its chairman in 1885. Max A. Drezmal, a Polish Falcon, was elected in 1894 and served on the board's Manual Training Committee, but many ethnics perceived different values in the educational process. Most ethnics saw education as a means to retain their own culture rather than assimilate the native, middle class views. Czech Sokols, similar to the nationalistic German Turners, maintained libraries to retain their language, and Jews operated Talmud schools that were taught in the vernacular.⁸

In the autonomous public school districts, residents were allowed to choose their own teachers and initiate language courses to preserve their native languages. Even so, Poles saw American public schools as secular institutions that inculcated materialistic values and fostered disrespect to parents. By the 1890s a series of Polish language editorials railed against American materialism. Working class Poles and Italians saw school as a nuisance when children could be working and making a more practical contribution to the family's needs. Both Catholics and Lutherans opposed the 1889 law that required English language instruction in private schools and compulsory school attendance. Retaliation came in the form of editorials published in the *Tribune*; but after two successive Republican defeats at the polls, the law requiring English instruction was repealed. In April, 1901, both the Catholic clergy and the ward alderman led neighbors in a protest over a proposed law that would supply free texts only to the public schools. Bohemians claimed that they, too, paid taxes, and, as only the rich went to high school, their children should be entitled to books in the ethnic grammar schools. Moreover, books were expensive items on laborers' budgets. These ethnics supported the education of their children, but they were unwilling to sustain the public schools that their children did not attend.⁹

Most ethnics, who were predominantly Catholics and Jews, sent their children to church-related schools to avoid the Protestant influences of the public educational system. The parochial school system provided separate, yet parallel, organizational structures that allowed ethnics to protect and preserve their religious differences. By 1890 Catholics had established sixty-two

elementary schools with 31,053 students in the city, another 1,571 in the suburbs, and 1,348 in Catholic high schools. Under Archbishop Feehan, administrator of the Chicago Archdiocese from 1880-1902, ethnic parishes grew and prospered. Irish and Polish independence movements, supported and often headed by Old World immigrant clergy, operated within the Church as nationalism and religion remained enmeshed. The widespread parochial school system fostered not only Catholicism, but cultural pluralism, rather than the cohesion sought by the reform groups.¹⁰

Another group with a particular interest in the educational process was the Commercial Club. Constituted by the city's wealthiest businessmen, it believed schooling was an effective means of meeting its needs. Using the former Central High School building, the club incorporated an independent manual training school in 1883, with such members as George Pullman and Marshall Field serving as trustees. Vocational classes started the following year. Unlike the traditional grammar school classes where female teachers taught basic skills, vocational classes, with the direction and support of businessmen, trained workers. Male teachers instructed students in the operation of machinery, reading and measuring technical materials, and how to respond to authority under conditions similar to those found in the workplace. Labor leaders roundly denounced such schools as an alternative to the union apprentice system.¹¹

In the districts where ethnics did not predominate, public school curricula came to be designed to "Americanize" immigrant children. In 1888 Victor F. Lawson, owner-publisher of the *Daily News*, offered medals for patriotic essays and induced the Board of Education to enact his plan by offering the interest on \$10,000 each year as a gift. Superintendent of schools, Albert G. Lane, added U.S. history to the fourth through sixth grade curriculums in 1894 to cultivate patriotism and a high regard for American institutions, in opposition to "immigrant thoughts, politics, and beliefs antagonistic to American institutions."¹²

Lane brought manual training to the public schools in 1895. By 1897 there were nineteen such sites and 122 by 1901. Two years later the Board of Education opened the Crane Technical High School, and all Chicago high schools offered a two-year manual training course. Thus, the commercial agenda was complete.

It was not, however, universally accepted. Adolf Kraus, the Czech President of the Board of Education, opposed manual training classes as early as 1886. In her 1897 address to the National Education Association in Chicago, Jane Addams, renowned social worker, also criticized the American educational practices for failing to meet immigrants' needs. The competitive nature and work-like environment of the school, she said, was due to the manifestation of control in the hands of businessmen. School, like work, was dull and laborious. It exhibited an ethnocentric bias which failed to truly educate children, and merely trained them to become obedient, prompt, unquestioning laborers and clerks. The process of inculcating such habits as obedience, discipline, patriotism, and respect for authority started in kindergarten and progressed

through the manual training and Americanization classes that implicitly denigrated ethnic cultures.¹³

Progressive reformers knew that if ethnics were to become good Americans then they must be taught the values of American culture—and that meant bringing them into the schools. They concentrated their efforts on the children of the immigrants, who lacked the European commitments of their parents. Before that could be accomplished, they would have to get children off the streets and out of the factories.

Child labor laws enacted in 1883 and 1891 were rarely enforced and easily circumvented. Twelve-year old girls operated sewing machines in Chicago's sweatshops and children remained employed in factories as messengers and in department stores, where they composed fourteen percent of the workforce in the seven largest firms in 1897. By 1900 fifty percent of ten to twelve-year olds worked, with immigrant children being five times more likely to be employed than American-born.¹⁴ Poverty and cultural variation fostered different attitudes toward education among Chicago's ethnics. Poles, Croats, Czechs, Slovenes, and Sicilian peasants saw little practical value in formal education. In Europe child labor contributed to family income in the hope of securing a home of one's own.

Given the cultural differences, the truancy law of 1889 met with widespread ethnic opposition. After successive Republican losses at the polls in 1890 and 1892, the law was repealed. An 1897 statute, which required education, was more stringent and allowed the state to assume parental rights via the doctrine of "parens patriae" for violators. In 1898 the city established a reformatory with 1,300 boys as inmates, twenty percent of them for truancy violations. Two years later, Chicago established the first Juvenile Court in the United States. It interpreted delinquency broadly, including such offenses as begging, peddling, and street singing. Dependent children, delinquents, and truants were sent to the new parental school, founded in 1902 through anonymous donations. With the apparatus of enforcement then in place, the legislature passed a more effective child labor act on July 1, 1903, and schools became the primary caretakers of children.¹⁵

In 1889 the Bureau of Education issued the Harper Report, chaired by the University of Chicago president, ostensibly to identify administrative inefficiency, graft, corruption and political influence on the Board of Education, which numbered twenty-one members and seventeen committees at that time. The report recommended reduction in board membership to eleven members, who would serve a four-year term by appointment of the mayor, and reorganization congruent with a business model. Such a move would negate control of the board, as the popularly elected board members had allowed ethnics an influential voice in educational policies and autonomy in local school districts.

The commission also addressed the truancy problem, noting that 15,596 investigations had been conducted over the past year, with 7,428 students being returned to school. A continually rising rate since the inception of the practice in 1894 was apparent. Theodore J. Bluthardt, the city supervisor for compulsory education, stated:

We should rightfully have the power to arrest all these little beggars, loafers and vagabonds that infest our city, take them from the streets and place them in schools where they are compelled to receive education and learn moral principles. . . . measures cannot be taken any too soon looking toward the betterment of conditions which will make the control of this class easier of solution.¹⁶

Truancy officers were subsequently increased from fifteen in 1898 to fifty-three by 1914.

In other statements, the Harper Report of 1899 acknowledged the popular demand for German language instruction and the merit of drawing and musical studies. It recommended manual training for all grades, increased physical culture, citizenship training, and the inculcation of patriotism in lower grades before students had the opportunity to leave school. To reach more students, ninety-four percent of whom left school before the age of fourteen, the report advocated vacation schools to continue education during the summer months and use of schoolyards as playgrounds. In 1896 the Civic Federation opened the Joseph Medill School for manual training as the first vacation school. In addition to the vocational training, sponsors treated students to summer excursions. In 1897 the University of Chicago settlement house opened a second vacation school, and the Chicago Women's Club sponsored five new vacation schools in 1898. Only six percent of the students were American-born, one percent were African Americans and the rest were children of immigrants.¹⁷

The Harper Report provided a grand design for the Americanization and education of immigrants to serve the needs of employers. In order to accomplish such goals, reformers intended to rid the school system of its ethnic influences. The teaching of American values in the regular schools required American teachers. In order to procure and install American teachers, the reformers first had to dismantle the ethnic bases of power within the school system. The centralization process attempted to wrest control of the local school districts and its traditional patronage from ethnic politicians. The great influence of the German Turners might be reduced and physical training less expensive (the 1899 report rationalized) if regular teachers, not specialists, taught the physical culture classes. The middle class reformers thus promulgated a definite plan for the assimilation of the diverse ethnic groups and the dismantling of the organizational structure that had perpetuated the alternative cultures.

The report also proposed higher salaries for male teachers to attract men to teaching positions in the elementary grades, implicitly reinforcing the dominant class and sex roles. Up to that time teachers generally had come from the working class, were mostly Irish, and served an apprenticeship similar to craftsmen or attended a two-year normal training school. The Harper Report referred to such teachers as uncouth and uncultured and recommended a college degree as a teaching requirement and a demonstration of cultural

attainment which might fit them better to inculcate moral teachings. The backlash from the Chicago Teachers' Federation was immediate and effective. Formed in 1897 to safeguard teachers' rights, provide job security, and improve working conditions, it had an extensive membership in 1899, enough to defeat the Harper Bill. When Superintendent Andrews attempted to implement the provisions of the Harper Bill by fiat, he was forced to resign in March, 1900.¹⁸

Edwin G. Cooley replaced Andrews and he received a five-year contract at \$10,000 a year. Cooley continued Andrews' work, centralizing the bureaucracy by decreasing local committees to four and decreasing the number of local superintendents from fourteen to six. Hiring and promotion, previously controlled by the school principal and local community committees sympathetic to ethnic and neighborhood concerns, also became prerogatives of the central administration, which issued efficiency ratings and offered merit pay for teachers' performance. Through such interventions the school administrators centralized the bureaucracy and assumed greater control over appointments and retention, effectively limiting ethnic and working class power.

Teachers fought back, and the battle for control of the school system developed along class lines. When the board threatened teachers with salary cuts in 1900, the educators filed suit against tax evaders, among who were five utility companies owing more than \$2,000,000. Despite the teachers' victory in 1901 and payment of the taxes, the board reneged on salary payments; instead, the money was disbursed to increase building, kindergartens and janitorial services. The Teachers' Federation then joined the Chicago Federation of Labor, despite vehement protestations from the board in 1902.¹⁹

Teacher and ethnic support helped elect a new Democratic mayor in 1905, and ethnics managed to reassert a measure of influence. Consequently, Polish and Jewish residents found representation on the school board, as did Jane Addams, who championed ethnic causes. Charles J. Vopicka, a Czech and president of the Atlas Brewing Company, served two terms on the board, starting in 1901. Walter Kuflewski, a Pole, was elected in 1902, and served as vice-president after 1906. In 1904 the Board of Education appointed James A. Dibelka, a Czech architect, principal of its trade school. He won election to the board in 1912. As early as 1905 Harry Lipsky, manager of the *Jewish Daily Courier*, represented Jewish interests on the school board. He became a prominent voice for pluralism thereafter.²⁰

Progressives hoped to avert the class conflict of the 1870s and 1880s by assuming control of the educational process. The assumption of a passive and pliable clientele proved faulty, however, as control of education was hotly contested between native, ethnic, and class factions. The political power of the ethnics and the laboring class retarded middle class goals as district councils reversed the centralization process, more women were hired as superintendents, and teachers regained a measure of their lost freedom. But Cooley remained as head of the system and the confrontation continued along ethnic and class lines throughout the succeeding administrations. Despite the reform efforts, elements of the ethnic and street cultures persisted in the schools.

The broad-based reform movement reached beyond the schools into the streets and ethnic neighborhoods. Universities, commercial organizations, and private individuals sponsored agencies designed to study and change the society. Among the private agencies that tried to address the myriad social concerns was Hull House. Founded in 1889 by Jane Addams, the daughter of a small town banker, it served the immigrant community of the 19th Ward on the West Side. Hull House became symbolic of the progressive reform efforts, and Jane Addams became a national figure through her work. Hull House served as the headquarters for an international network of social reformers, embodying the best humanitarian concerns of middle class progressives, but also exhibiting the ethnocentric and class biases in which they labored.²¹

Hull House served as the scene for the assimilation of divergent cultures. Ellen Gates Starr, co-founder of the institution, made the first attempt to bring classical culture to the community by offering a lecture on art history. It proved a major disappointment to the few Italian peasant women who showed up. The next attempt at programming provided for more practical needs and met with success when a kindergarten was financed and run by Jenny Dow, the daughter of a wealthy Chicagoan. Addams used her extensive social contacts to acquire funding for her charitable works and social causes. In 1893 Louise de Koven Bowen, one of the city's most prominent socialites, became a member of the Hull House Women's Club and a Hull House trustee. She provided much of its financial support throughout her long life. John Dewey, the eminent philosopher and University of Chicago professor, became a trustee in 1897.²²

Addams and Starr produced a web of support groups for their enterprises. They engaged other special interests, which often crossed paths on educational, social, political and economic issues to create a network of public and private organizations, agencies, and associations to address their concerns. These groups were less than homogeneous in their individual objectives, but they shared the belief that an orderly, efficient, and homogeneous society was a better one for all.

With significant support, settlement houses soon proliferated in the immigrant districts. Unlike the European models, they professed to be secular in nature in order to appeal to both Catholics and Jews. Olivet Institute, founded a year after Hull House, proved an exception. A Baptist institution, it served predominantly the blacks and Italians of "Little Italy" on the North Side, but conducted meetings in at least three languages. Charles Zeublin, a sociologist, established the Northwestern University Settlement, northwest of downtown in 1891. German-Jewish businessmen started the Maxwell Street Settlement in 1893 in order to assimilate their eastern European brethren. It was followed by Chicago Commons, headed by Graham Taylor in 1894. Between 1895 and 1917, social agencies founded another sixty-eight settlement houses in the city.²³

The setting in which Hull House operated was typical of the settlement environment. It drew clientele from a large area with a population of 70,000, representing eighteen different nationalities, with Italians, Russian and Polish Jews, and Bohemians in the majority. Italians and Jews usually inhabited rear

tenements; they were rarely neighbors because of deeply held animosities. Ethnic youths accosted the easily recognized on the streets, and erupted into fights over limited park spaces. The average weekly income was \$5, but laborers in some parts of the city might earn twice that amount if they worked more than sixty hours per week. The average family in slum areas had five members, and more than half of the families had fewer than three rooms. There were 295 saloons in the district; and the pool rooms of the 19th Ward, which comprised one square mile, did a thriving business. Children filled the grimy streets, and railroad workers, who earned \$1.25 per day, attended to leisure pursuits or searched for work, as they were generally employed fewer than thirty weeks of the year.²⁴

With so much unemployment among people who rarely spoke English, play and games figured prominently in the "Americanization" programs of the settlements. The Maxwell Street Settlement attracted eight students to its physical culture class weekly in 1893. When William Kent, a Chicago businessman of inherited wealth, and later a California congressman, donated three quarters of an acre to Hull House for a playground, it proved a major attraction to the local children. The sand lot was improved by the addition of swings, see-saws, and later, a giant slide and building blocks. They achieved their purpose of attracting children to the grounds and away from the unhealthy and hazardous streets. The Chicago Commons Settlement opened its playground in 1896 and the University of Chicago offered a supervised playground, as well as an indoor gym, for use by youths and adults in June of 1898. By that time the public schools had also adopted the playground concept and embarked upon a program of sports and games to train youth. Such competitive activities became a mainstay of progressive reform efforts in both public and private agencies thereafter.²⁵

In addition to the programs directed at children, settlements often served as liaisons for the labor movement. Settlement workers fashioned the agencies that addressed laborers' concerns within the established political-judicial system, thus abating the violent confrontations of the past. Among the reformers, Richard T. Ely, Raymond Robins, and Sidney Hillman became national labor activists. Early women workers who were trained at Hull House assumed both local and national leadership roles in the social reform movement.

The school administrators were less compromising. They directed programs at the groups that they considered a subordinate. It was within the realm of leisure practices and the informal education of the settlements that such divergent groups managed to reach an uneasy and, at times, fragile accommodation as the various groups contended for control in an atmosphere charged by class and cultural differences at the turn-of-the-century. In succeeding years ethnic offspring learned the values of a competitive, commercial system through the sports and games practiced in the city's playgrounds and parks. Commercialism, competition, and the teamwork that symbolized a cooperative society were also in the schools' interscholastic athletic programs that managed to channel ethnic and religious rivalries into more acceptable forms of conflict as it reinforced American patriotism. World War I and its aftermath

solidified that process of Americanization. Ethnics found some agreement with natives in their sporting practices and other forms of commercialized leisure, but debate over appropriate education did not abate.

Both the formal and the “hidden” curriculum continue to reinforce the value systems of a particular group. Cultural hegemony is no longer so visibly Anglo-Saxon or Protestant, but a white, male, corporate ideology still dominates American society and permeates its educational system. Competition, time discipline, ethnocentrism, and materialism are reinforced throughout the school day and in extracurricular activities. Curriculum designed for middle class suburban needs neglect urban youth, who are sometimes trained but rarely educated. Such training meets the needs of a service economy and provides entry level jobs, but such minimal economic roles are inherently unequal and foster a permanent underclass. The work ethic has little value when applied, even assiduously, at a minimum wage. Curricula that continue to promote an untenable American dream give false hope and spawn broken promises. It is an old story, faced by a new generation.

Notes

¹Kenny Williams, “The Fire This Time: Start to Unshackle the Teaching of Afro-American Literature,” *The College Board News*, (February-March 1991): 3.

²Mark Krug, *The Melting of the Ethnics* (Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976); James A. Crispino, *The Assimilation of Ethnic Groups* (Staten Island, NY: The Center for Migration Studies, 1980); Giovanni Schiavo, *The Italians in Chicago: A Study in Assimilation* (Chicago: Italian American Pub. Co., 1927); Harry Sundby-Hansen, ed., *The Norwegian Immigrant Contributions to America's Making* (New York: R & E Research Assoc., 1921).

³See Stow Persons, *Ethnic Studies in Chicago, 1905-45* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987) for an overview. Melvin G. Holli and Peter d’A. Jones, eds., *The Ethnic Frontier* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Co., 1977); Victor Greene, *For God and Country: The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Consciousness in America, 1860-1910* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1975); Werner Sollors, ed., *The Invention of Ethnicity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

⁴Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith, eds., *Selections From The Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York: International Pub., 1971).

⁵*One Hundred and Twenty-Five Photographic Views of Chicago* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1911).

⁶Reid Badger, *The Great American Fair* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1979), 98-9.

⁷David Hogan, *Class and Reform: School and Society in Chicago, 1880-1930* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 79-82; William J.

Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements During the Progressive Era* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986). A survey of the *Manual of the Public Schools of the City of Chicago, 1873-74, 1874-75, 1875-76*; and *A Manual for the Use of Teachers, 1878*, indicates that German influences in curriculum were already firmly entrenched in the post-war years. Kindergarten information is derived from Hogan, 79-82, Wilma J. Pesavento, "Historical Study of the Development of Physical Education in the Chicago Public Schools, 1860 to 1965," (Ph.D. Diss. Northwestern University, 1966), 21. Arthur Todd, *Chicago Recreation Survey, 1* (1937): 20, places the introduction of the Turner System between 1863-1864.

⁸*Svornost*, October 8, 1878; February 27, 1880; May 2, 1880; June 29, 1881; September 10, 1885 (WPA: Foreign Language Press Survey, 1942); D. M. Krzywonos, ed., *Poles of Chicago* (Chicago: Polish Pageant, Inc., 1937), 124-7; Richard T. Ely, ed., *Hull House Maps and Papers* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1970), 105.

⁹*Svornost*, January 8, 1890; *Dziennik Chicagoski*, July 22, 1892, 4; August 27, 1892; and *Zgota*, November 14, 1894, 4; January 19, 1899, 6, on materialism. Parental disrespect is the subject of articles in *Dziennik Chicagoski*, June 6, 1896 and September 1, 1908 (FLPS). Hogan, 57-8, on Catholic and Lutheran opposition to the teaching of English; *Chicago Tribune*, March 26, 1890; March 27, 1890; on the Bohemian protest see *Denni Hlasatel* (Daily Herald) April 14, 1901, and April 15, 1901 (FLPS).

¹⁰Hogan, 125-27, states that Catholics had sixty-two elementary schools with more than 31,000 students by 1890. Bessie L. Pierce, *A History of Chicago* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), 389, estimates the 1890 figure at 38,000. James W. Sanders, *The Education of An Urban Minority: Catholics in Chicago* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), for the initial establishment of the Catholic school system as a reaction to native oppression.

¹¹W. E. Mellinger, ed., *High School Journal*, 134 (July 1884): 3, and 10, 7 (March 1897): 102. Stanley Aronowitz, *False Promises: The Shaping of the American Working Class Consciousness* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), 72-5. Chicago Board of Education, *23rd Annual Report, 1877*, 51-3, 55-6, 63-5, cited in Hogan, 138. When the Board of Education was reluctant to initiate the industrial education courses suggested by business leaders, the labor conflict of the late nineteenth century spurred the commercial interests to pursue independent efforts. Charles H. Thurber, "Is the Present High School Course a Satisfactory Preparation for Business? If Not, How Should it be Modified?" *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, National Education Association* (Chicago: National Education Association, 1897), 808-18, in Sigmund Diamond, ed., *The Nation Transformed: The Creation of an Industrial Society*, (New York: George Braziller, 1963), 411-9.

¹²Hogan, 60, 156; Pierce, 3 (1957) 388.

¹³Hogan, 79-82, 153; Jane Addams, "Foreign Born Children in the Primary Grades," *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, NEA* (Chicago: National Education Association, 1897), 104-112, in Diamond, 420-6.

¹⁴Hogan, 55-6, 100, 102.

¹⁵"The Sweat Shops," from Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Illinois 7th Biennial Report* (Springfield, 1893) 357-99, cited in Diamond, 221; Pierce, 3 (1957): 294-5; Milton Cantor, ed., *American Working Class Culture* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979), 355; Hogan, 55-8, 60-3, 100, 105, 12708, 132, n. 34, 256, n. 46, 270; and 157 reports sewing classes for girls starting in second grade as early as 1892.

¹⁶William R. Harper, *Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago* (Chicago: 1899). The Bluthardt quote is on pages 163-4 of the report. Hogan, 57-8, 195-8. The Harper Commission had no teachers, no women, and no labor leaders among its members.

¹⁷Harper, 129, 135, 174, 176, 221-2.

¹⁸Hogan, 196-8, 223; *Report, Showing Results of 15 Years of Organization to the Teachers of Chicago* (Chicago Teachers' Federation, December 1, 1908) stresses the lack of freedom, subservience, the autocracy of the school system, pay cuts and unfair merit testing. The *Harper Report*, 60, lists only 5,268 Chicago teachers in elementary grades in 1898; far fewer than the 33,000 reported by Hogan, 97-8. High School teachers were not listed by Harper, nor is it clear that membership was open to non-teachers, which would provide greater feasibility to Hogan's figures.

¹⁹Hogan, 199-203, 207; and Julia Wrigley, *Class, Politics and the Public Schools* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982), 62-127, on Cooley, 34-5, 512, on the Chicago Federation of Labor. The Chicago Federation of Labor supported coursework in music, drawing, foreign language, and a liberal education in general. Business leaders opposed such courses and favored increased manual training in all grades, although they provided such private classical instruction for their own children. City of Chicago, *Proceedings of the Board of Education, July 6, 1904-June 21, 1905* (Chicago: Barnard and Miller, 1905), 785-6, on reference to the board's opposition to the teachers' union affiliation. See Robert L. Reid, ed., *Battleground: The Autobiography of Margaret A. Haley* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), for a full treatment of teachers in the labor movement.

²⁰Daniel A. Droba, *Czech and Slovak Leaders in Metropolitan Chicago* (Chicago: Slavonia Club of the University of Chicago, 1934), 68-9; *Denni Hlasatel*, January 17, 1904; November 8, 1912 (FLPS): *Chicago Hebrew Institute Observer*, 1:6 (May, 1918), 3-5; Hogan, 205-06.

²¹Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), 208; Dominick Cavallo, *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and*

Moral Reform, 1880-1920 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), Chapter 6; Allen F. Davis, *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

²²In addition to Dow and Bowen, who died in 1953, many local and national leaders frequented Hull House, while others received their training there. Among them were Henry Demarest Lloyd, Governor John Peter Altgeld, and historian Charles Beard. Allen F. Davis, *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements for the Progress Movement, 1890-1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 33-40, states that more than eighty percent of settlement workers had a B.A. degree, and more than half did graduate work. Most were young and unmarried, and many were teachers who saw the settlements as an alternative form of education with a broader scope than the institutionalized school systems.

²³On the nature of European settlement houses see Davis, *Spearheads for Reform*, 16. Harvey C. Carbaugh, ed., *Human Welfare Work in Chicago*. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1917), 148; Pierce, 3 (1957): 466; Graham Taylor, *Chicago Commons Through Forty Years* (Chicago: John F. Cuneo Co., 1936), Thomas Philpott, *The Slum and the Ghetto* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 283.

²⁴Richard T. Ely, ed., *Hull House Maps and Papers*, (1970 reprint; 1895): 17-21; Michael McCarthy, "Politics and the Park," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 65, 2 (Summer 1972): 159; Philpott, 23, 67, 73-4, counts twenty-six or more nationalities within a three-block area of Hull House by the late 1890s.

²⁵Ely, 106; McCarthy, 160; Clarence Rainwater, *The Play Movement* (Washington, DC: McGrath Pub. Co., 1922), 56; Taylor, xii.

Critique

Gerald R. Gems has successfully put into historical context the significant issues of educational reform in the United States. In 1900, and in 1991, educational issues should be at the center of a national discussion of the kind of country we want to be.

Today the city of Chicago plans to transform the public school system into neighborhood councils with more local and parental decision-making, a startling re-enactment of a drama that was played out a century earlier. Then and now ethnic outsiders to white Anglo Saxon male culture tried to resist education for the purposes of cultural hegemony at home and imperialism abroad. Earlier in the century ethnic outsiders could not prevail before the