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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the current crises in democracy in the U.S. and around the world and its effect on education and education evaluation. I begin by describing a similar crisis faced by educators at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York in the 1930’s and the faculty’s response to that crisis. I then point out the relationship between the crisis today and its effect on education and education evaluation with regard to the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the International Early Learning Study (IELS). Finally, I describe components of democratic evaluation and suggest a way forward by recommending RECE develop a political platform to use when working with groups and institutions to promote the kind of educational programs and policies that we believe are more just and democratic.

A Look Back

Almost 70 years ago in the 1930’s the faculty at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York believed they faced a national emergency. Teachers College (TC) is the oldest school of education in the U.S and boasts of several renowned former faculty members, including John Dewey and Patty Smith Hill. In 1940 the faculty published this statement: “Europe and much of Asia are under the domination of ruthless, military dictatorships. It can no longer be in doubt that the present world crisis constitutes a threat of the most serious character to the United States and to the democratic way of life” (Teachers College Faculty, 1940). To the TC faculty the
speed and effectiveness with which authoritarian dictators replaced and over ran democracies and democratically elected governments was breathtaking.

The Teachers College faculty were also troubled by several events within the U.S. that threatened democratic values in the 1930’s. For example, Henry Ford, one of the nation’s largest automobile manufacturers, and a known anti-Semite, published his views in *The Dearborn Independent*, which he owned, claiming that a vast Jewish conspiracy was infecting America (Public Broadcasting System, 2018). Ford’s newspaper was available in all Ford car agencies throughout the country. Ford, who was very popular in the U.S., was thought to be a possible presidential candidate. Hitler was inspired by Ford’s technological innovations, particularly the assembly line method of manufacturing he developed as well as his writings, and in 1939 awarded Ford the Grand Cross of the German Eagle.

Other factors must have alarmed the TC faculty. For example, the weekly broadcasts of a Father Charles Coughlin in the 1930’s, listened to by one-third of the nation, had a tremendous influence on Depression-era America (Social Security History, 2018). Coughlin’s core message was one of economic populism, but included attacks on prominent Jewish figures, that many people considered evidence of anti-Semitism. As his remarks became increasingly controversial in the 1940’s, the Catholic Church forced Coughlin to cease his broadcasts.

Also of concern to the faculty must have been the pronouncements of the American First committee founded in 1940 by a group of students at Yale University who were opposed to the U.S. entering World War II. At its peak America First had 800,000 members from across the country. Its most famous spokesman, Charles Lindbergh, known for his nonstop flight across the Atlantic, visited Germany in 1939. Impressed with Germany’s military might, he thought no nation could defeat it. He wrote that the Western nations, “…can have peace and security only so
long as we band together to preserve that most priceless possession, our inheritance and
European blood” (Lindbergh, 1939). Hermann Goering awarded Lindberg the Service Cross of
the German Eagle in 1938.

Likewise alarming to the TC faculty must have been the presence of America Nazis
demonstrating throughout the State of New York in the 1930’s, orchestrated by the German-
American Bund, the fastest growing American version of the German Nazi Party. Members of
the Bund held numerous parades and established summer camps for children and adolescents
whom they wished to educate in fascist ideology. No less alarming was the Bund rally at New
York’s Madison Square Garden in February 1939, attended by approximately 22,000 “hate-
spewing American Nazis” (Sander, 2017). During the 1939 rally, a Jewish protester rushed the
podium and was beaten savagely before being rescued by the police. Many analysts liken the
New York rally to the “Unite the Right” demonstrations in Charlottesville, Virginia in 2017, the
largest white supremacist rally held in the U.S. in over a decade (Reilly, et.al., 2018). During the
rally members of the Alt-right held a torchlight parade to show unity among the disparate
factions of neo-Nazis, fascists, and other racists in their support for President Trump, shouting,
“Jews will not replace us.” One of those white nationalists used his car to mow down anti-Nazi
protesters, killing Heather Heyer, a 34-year-old paralegal passionate about civil rights. Trump
did not condemn the violence, considered by the Right as support for their movement, though
four white supremacists were slapped with federal conspiracy charges in August 2018 (Reilly, et
al., 2018).

In 1939 threats to democracy from abroad and within the U.S. prompted the Teachers
College faculty to develop a manifesto that they hoped would start a conversation about the
meaning of democracy and the relationship between those beliefs and education. They called
this manifesto the “Creed of Democracy” which set forth 60 core beliefs, signed by 137 members of the faculty. A few of the core principles are cited below, however the complete manifesto appears Appendix A. The Creed begins, “We believe in and will endeavor to make a democracy which”:

- respects the personality of every individual, whatever his origin or present states;
- insures to all a sense of security;
- does not tolerate an enduring social stratification based on birth, race, religion, or wealth, inherited or otherwise acquired;
- protects the weak and cares for the needy that they may maintain their self-respect;
- maintains human rights to be more important than property rights;
- renews its strength by continued education as to its meanings and purposes.

The Creed was presented orally at a mass meaning and later distributed in pamphlet form to students and printed in educational journals, including the Journal of the National Educational Association. A poster highlighting key points in the manifesto was printed and displayed.

Current Realities

Educators today face a similar crisis. Democracy is under threat in the U.S. and around the world. Guarantees of free and fair elections, the rights of marginalized people, freedom of the press, and the rule of law are all under attack (Abramowitz, 2018). Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt, two Harvard professors who have spent more than 20 years studying the breakdown of democracies in Europe and Latin America, claim democracies no longer end with a bang – a revolution or military coup – but with a whimper - the slow steady weakening of critical institutions, such as the judiciary and freedom of the press, as well as the gradual erosion of long-standing political norms (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018), such as the expectation in the U.S. that
candidates for public office release their tax returns. These researchers argue that this same situation existed in Europe between the two World wars – when demagogues took over political parties that had been mainstream. Today, democracies wither at the hands of insiders who gain power initially through elections, as in Russia, the Philippines, Turkey, Venezuela, Ecuador, Hungary, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Poland and Peru (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). At the time of this writing Brazil can be added to this list. Levitsky and Ziblatt cite four indications that a political leader is a dangerous authoritarian: he demonstrates a weak commitment to democratic rules, denies the legitimacy of opponents, tolerates violence, and is willing to curb civil liberties or the media, characteristics that describe the current administration in the U.S. Further, because of the influence of money in politics, former president Jimmy Carter claimed that America today is more like an autocracy than a democracy (Carter, 2017).

This loss of democratic values is seen by some as related to neoliberal political theory, that, at the very least, advocates lower corporate and personal taxation; a thinning of the welfare net; the weakening of trade unions; deregulation of the business community; and the privatization of publicly-owned industries and companies (Coates, 2017), including the privatization of public education in the U.S. Further, neoliberalism fosters a competitive spirit between individuals that regards failure as the fault of one’s inadequacies, not political or economic structures of inequality. This hyper-individualism undermines the development of strong community ties, feelings of concern for others, debates about the common good, and democratically oriented associations. Henry Giroux stated, “Under neoliberal fascism, the plague of privatization weakens democratic culture and promotes a flight from any sense of political and social responsibility” (Giroux, 2018). Noam Chomsky agrees that a crucial principle of neoliberalism is that it undermines social solidarity and mutual support and popular engagement
in determining policy. “We have constructed a perfect storm,” he said (Chomsky, 2017). In addition to undermining mutual solidarity and support, neoliberal policies have marginalized democratic education and treated students as “human capital.”

Students as Human Capital

The influences of neoliberal policies on education are numerous. Business models have been adopted where schools are run like businesses (Apple, 2001); the bottom line is student achievement (not profit), measured by tests that lack validity and reliability (Berliner, 2015; Stake, 2018; Urban & Swadener, 2016). Competition between schools is regarded as necessary to progress. Under neoliberal views of education lies a vision of students as human capital, “…students as future workers…[who] must be given the requisite skills and dispositions to compete efficiently and effectively” (Apple, 2001, p. 38). This metaphor, students as human capital, highlights one widely accepted purpose of schooling, the need for students to learn job-related skills, but neglects to emphasize that, historically, other purposes have been articulated, such as the need to promote the understanding and commitment to democratic ideals and processes.

In addition, conservative governing policies have had a tremendous influence on school practice and a curriculum planning process that excludes the voices of parents and children, a process that undermines a democratic education (Gutmann, 1987). The identification and articulation of specific job skills has dominated discourse as to the goals and objectives of the curriculum and education evaluation. The late Herbert Kliebard might apply the metaphor of “production” to describe the current view of curriculum development and evaluation practices held by business-oriented interests (Kliebard, 1975). In this sense, metaphor is not just a fancy literary device but a fundamental way to organize thoughts and generate new ways of
understanding (Kessler, 1991). Using the metaphor of production, one would view schools as factories. Students are the raw material who are run through an assembly-line process (the curriculum) where they are shaped and molded to design specifications and emerge as a finished product. This product is then examined and tested to determine if the manufacturing process has been successful or if it needs adjustment.

In contrast there are other ways to view education or other metaphors that might apply. The metaphor of “growth views the curriculum as a greenhouse…where students will grow and develop to their fullest potential under the care of a wise and patient gardener” (Kliebard, 1975, p. 84). Many would apply this metaphor to Froebel’s view of early childhood education. The metaphor of “travel” describes the curriculum as “…a route over which students will travel under the guide of an experienced guide and companion” (Kliebard, 1975, p 85). Side trips along the way are expected and encouraged depending on a student’s interests; not all students would experience the same curriculum. This metaphor is most often associated with John Dewey (Kliebard, 1980). The metaphor, students as human capital, should be evaluated according to its disclosure value and by applying an ethical standard (Kessler, 1991). What is highlighted when students are viewed as raw material and/or as human capital and thus, the way to accomplish one’s vision of the good life (Kessler, 2018), a vision that in this case, embodies economic competition between nations? What alternatives to this view are hidden or obscured? Further, applying an ethical standard to this metaphor, one must ask, “Is it good or just to regard students as raw material or human capital, the means to an end based on this vision? Is it fair?” I think not. The metaphor of production can be applied to the view of the learner, the curriculum recommended and the assessment practices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) projects, the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the International Early Learning Study (IELS), sometimes called “Baby PISA,” exemplify the influence of corporate interests on education and the use of students as human capital. Currently, OECD tests 15-year-olds to determine the extent to which the countries they represent have the human capital to be competitive in the global economy. In 2015 over half a million students representing 28 million 15-year-olds in 72 countries took the two-hour test, where they were assessed in science, mathematics, reading, collaborative problem solving and financial literacy (OECD, 2018). Results were published, and countries ranked, alarming many policy makers who considered making changes in programs, including the curriculum, that would promote higher scores among their students.

Furthermore, OECD, with impetus from business communities, has set forth a set of competencies in a document called, “Program Definition and Selection of Competencies” (DeCeCo). According to DeCeCo, students should be able to achieve specific competencies in order to boost productivity and market competitiveness, minimize unemployment, and develop an adaptive qualified labor force. The competencies are: use tools interactively (e.g., language, technology); interact in heterogeneous groups; and act autonomously (OECD, 2018). Thus, OECD’s has extended its reach into the realm of curriculum planning – determining what knowledge is of most worth for children all over the world to possess to make nations economically competitive. This action should alarm us all. If the curriculum represents a vision of the good life, or a utopian vision (Kessler, 2018), and I think it does, we must examine and judge the vision held by OECD. Does the good life consists primarily of countries competing for
economic prosperity on the backs of students? I suggest we articulate our own vision of the good life. For example, the importance of creating an inclusive environments for children indicates how we want to live together and what kind of a society we want (Mara Sapon-Shevin, 2018). Mathias Urban (2018) maintains that contemplating a utopian vision is important. As he put it, “Utopia is an important place.”

Furthermore, OECD’s latest initiative is to test children between 4.5 and 5.5 years of age in a program now called The International Early Learning and Child-Well-being study (IELS) the purpose of which is “to identify key factors that drive or hinder the development of early learning” (OECD, 2018). How should educators respond to these impositions by OECD that have highjacked curriculum development and education evaluation to suit its own narrow needs and interests? Should we develop a manifesto like the TC faculty did in the 1930’s? If so, how would we go about it? What would it look like? What would we do with it?

Numerous critiques have been set forth regarding PISA/IELS. Experts cite problems with the design and implementation of the tests, what I call technical critiques. Others criticize the program by drawing upon questions of philosophy, asking questions such as, what is the purpose of schooling? Still others criticize the program from a political point of view.

Technical Critiques of PISA and IELS

Bob Stake, former director of the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) at the University of Illinois and an early proponent of case study methodology in research and evaluation (Stake, 2004), cited several problems with PISA, when I interviewed him in the Spring of 2018 (Stake, 2018). He pointed out that OECD has spent absolutely no money on validation. He was quite adamant on this point, “Not a single penny,” he emphasized.
That is, no efforts have been made to study if the tests measure what the testing programs seeks to measure, such as the relationship between a nation’s school system and economic development. David Berliner agrees, pointing out that most tests (of 15-year-olds) can measure achievement reliably, but the national scores have substantial validity problems when used to predicting a nation’s future economic growth (Berliner, 2015). Others point out the well-established fact that there is low reliability of results in standardized test with young children (Urban & Swadener, 2016). Yet, OECD proceeds as if its testing policies and procedures are meaningful. Words cannot express the absurdity of this process and the influence it has on education around the world.

Another fault lies in the way such assessments are used (Berliner, 2015; Stake, 2018). As in the parable of the blind man and the elephant, if one were blind, he/she could learn about one part of the elephant, such as its tail, by touch for example, but could never understand the whole. “PISA is quite like the elephant,” Berliner states. “There are so many facets to this enormous and ambitious program, and each facet could be the object of study for years. And even were those many studies of the various facets of PISA competently completed, we are still not likely to have a good grip on the whole.” (Berliner, 2015). Yet OECD assumes that the tests results of a few thousand students can accurately describe a school system of a nation and suggest its failings.

David Berliner makes another important point. Out-of-school factors greatly influence test scores of students. He asks, “…how do …national educational policies, school level variables, and a myriad of out-of-school factors influence in-school achievement and interact with one another to influence PISA test scores?” (Berliner, 2015). This argument reminds me of another comment made by Bob Stake in the late 1970’s when I interviewed for a research
assistantship at CIRCE. He said, “We don’t evaluate students here, we evaluate the curriculum.”

Today I wonder: What if OECD evaluated the out-of-school experiences of students in various locales, or the “curriculum of the community,” if you will? This curriculum would not be viewed as a “course of study,” the most common definition of curriculum. Instead, the out-of-school experiences of children in the home and in the community would be examined, including the political and economic contexts of those experiences. Recently, Berliner emphasized this point in an interview published in *The Washington Post* (Strauss, 2018). Berliner claims that three factors alone – family income, level of parental education, and the percentage of single-parent households in a community - can predict with great accuracy the performance on standardized tests of students, results that are used by that community to judge its schools. As he puts it, “Although demographics may not be destiny for an individual, it is the best predictor of a school’s outcomes – *independent of that school’s teachers, administrators and curriculum!*” (Original italics) This argument is supported by the results of PISA tests given in Australia in 2003 (Perry & McConney, 2010). Researchers found that an increase in the mean SES (socio-economic status) of a school is associated with significant increases in students’ academic achievement. As they put it, “In the Australian case, the socio-economic composition of the school matters greatly in terms of students’ academic performance” (p 1). Wouldn’t a study of the SES of students in their neighborhoods and communities address the stated purpose of IELS, to identify key factors that “drive or hinder the development of early learning” (OECE, 2018)? And wouldn’t recognition of this relationship lead to different solutions?

**Philosophical Critiques of PISA and IELS:**

Philosophical critiques claim, as Urban and Swadener (2016) point out, that very important questions are not asked in the IELS study, such as the purpose of early childhood education and
care. In addition, they argue, larger and more ambitious goals, such as promoting democracy, citizenship, and children’s civil rights are not addressed in the IELS. This argument was also made by educators who signed on to an op-ed in *The Guardian* in 2014. They pointed out that PISA addresses the economic goals of education, but fails to measure other educational objectives, such as physical, moral, civic, and artistic development (*The Guardian*, 2014).

**Political Critiques of PISA/IELS**

Turning now to the political-oriented critique of PISA and IELS, I again refer to remarks made by Bod Stake. When I asked him what he thought of PISA, he immediately said, “I’m against it.” When I asked why, he replied, “For the same reason I’m against any kind of testing. Any comparison and description [of] individuals leave some less strong and disenfranchised [these are the ones] who don’t win” (Stake, 2018). So, in his view the very fact of testing itself sets up political dynamic where the more powerful and influential impose upon the weaker, establishing authority over them. Furthermore, signatories to the op-ed I mentioned earlier point to the fact that OECD has no mandate like that of UN organizations, such as UNESCO or UNICEF, where there is an agreed upon goal to improve education and the lives of children around the world. Yet, OECD has assumed the power to shape educational policy, with no debate about the necessity or limitations of its goals (*The Guardian*, 2014). Arguments made by panel members at a symposium at Hunter College in New York, hosted by Lacey Peters and including Beth Swadener and Mathias Urban, add to this claim (Symposium, 2018). Discussants found the IELS program to be decidedly undemocratic in that it suffers from a lack of transparency and excludes the voices of professional early childhood educators and other affected groups. Regarding the political nature of PISA and IELS, Pence (2018) put it well:
“…actions deemed important by a few are not allowed to be visited upon the many without an open and fully informed debate and opportunity for contestation” (p. 57).

Bureaucratic Evaluation

It might be helpful to view the OECD testing program as an example of what the late Barry MacDonald calls “bureaucratic evaluation,” contrasted with “democratic evaluation.” Bureaucratic evaluation serves government agencies and offers information which enables them to accomplish their policy objectives (MacDonald, 1997). Thus, I maintain that bureaucratic evaluation serves the interests of political structures and individuals and groups and, therefore, cannot be regarded as objective or neutral. Bias is a characteristic of all evaluation projects and threatens the worth of such endeavors as a social good. In strong language, MacDonald describes evaluation as not just an enterprise of questionable social worth, but a form of political action (My italics). As he put it, “Unless we can…solve the fundamental issues raised by the widespread acknowledgement that evaluation is a significant form of political action, then I doubt very much whether the kind of activity in which I and many others throughout the Western hemisphere are presently engaged can survive as a defensible social role” (MacDonald, 1978).

Whose interests are served by the OECD testing program? - the interests of the OECD as an institution, the interests of the companies that manufacture the testing instruments, and individuals who depend on the OECD for gainful employment. Stake remarked that a former student of his, whom I will call James, graduated with a doctorate in education evaluation from the U. of I. and went to work in Paris for OECD. “He was in charge of the whole thing. I love James, but I don’t like what he is doing” (Stake, 2018). When I asked how someone whose training in education evaluation that advocated case study methodology and qualitative research methods (Stake, 2004) could engage in developing and implementing PISA, Stake replied, “It
[the program] didn’t take. The doctoral program was not fully developed at that time.” Then he added, “It was a career decision.”

This comment recalled statements made by Michael Apple (2001) who maintains that the move to the right in education policy, what he calls “conservative modernization,” is not a unitary movement, but exists as a coalition of groups and individuals. Neoliberal policies in education exert the largest influence, he writes, but another part of this coalition is comprised of technical experts and educational professionals, “… a faction of the professional new middle class that gains its own mobility within the state and within the economy based on the use of technical expertise” (p. 57). He continues, “They are experts in efficiency, management, testing and accountability; they provide the technical expertise to put in place the policies of conservative modernization. Their own mobility depends on [its] expansion…” (p. 58).

I wonder if educational professionals whose research points to best practices that raise test scores unwittingly support current practices and policies though they may have liberal leanings. I recall another remark made by one of Apple’s students, Lanny Beyer. (Beyer, 1981). He claimed that most educational research “moves the furniture around in a classroom,” that is, offers ways to make small improvements in curriculum and pedagogy, but fails to address the elephant in the room – the structures of inequality, such as poverty-stricken neighborhoods, that account for students’ experiences of the schooling and student achievement. I wonder about my own research. Does my work simply move the furniture around? Whose interests are served by the work that I do? This is a question we all must ask ourselves.
Democratic Evaluation

In contrast to bureaucratic evaluation, MacDonald advocates democratic evaluation. “Democratic evolution is an information service to the community about the characteristics of an educational programme” (MacDonald, 1977, p.226). It recognizes a plurality of values and acts as a broker in exchanges of information between different groups. Bob Stake writes, “The democratic evaluator seeks to serve the public and others remote from power, not those in political, economic, and academic control” (Stake, 2004, p. 201). House and Howe (1999) agree and view democratic evaluators as facilitators of information and debate (p. 202).

The OECD testing projects, PISA and IELS, contrast sharply with the basic tenets of democratic evaluation. They do not serve those remote from power, nor do they foster the exchange of information between groups. Further problematic is that PISA/IELS further the entrenched interests of elites for control of educational structures, including the curriculum, that undermine democratic education and democratic values in the U.S. and elsewhere.

Another point I want to emphasize was made by William Pinar who first coined the term, “reconceptualists,” in his well-known work in curriculum theory called, Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualist (Pinar,1975). Contributors to this edited collection offer alternatives to the “technical-rational” approach to curriculum planning that focuses on goals, objectives, pedagogy, and outcomes. I and others thought the idea of “reconceptualizing” should be applied to our organization, and so it was in 1991. Pinar admonished us that to reconceptualize was simply the first step in promoting educational change. To stop there, he claimed, was irresponsible (Canella, 1977). He strongly suggested that researchers point to a way forward or propose possible solutions to identified problems.
Heeding Pinar’s directive, I found several alternatives to the current approach to education evaluation exemplified by PISA/IELS, that embody principles of democratic evaluation. One approach advocates the collection of many kinds of information, such as student self-assessments; teacher observations; interviews; portfolios; and school reviews by outside experts, including the results of town meetings (Meier & Koestner, 2017). Katrin Macha (2018) describes ways in which researchers can identify the views of children and use them to improve education programs. For example, in one study, when observers were about to go outside to examine outdoor spaces, the children cautioned that these researchers should put on their outdoor shoes, a rule in this center. Then the children modified their views and decided that visitors could exit with their indoor shoes on, but children could not. Thus, children learned this rule applies to some individuals but not all. Curricularists would cite this experience as an example of what is called the “hidden curriculum,” learnings children acquire that are not intended or even desired. Educators in this setting who learn children’s views of this rule might want to rethink the curriculum to reflect more desired outcomes.

Hartley (2018) suggests ten principles for building a high-quality system of assessment. One suggestion, number seven, states: “Include meaningful, ongoing input and collaboration from local communities and diverse stakeholders in the development and continuous improvement of the system.” Further, the concept of “competent systems” (Urban, et al., 2012) requires that linkages exist between various stakeholders in an education endeavor; such as policy makers, administrators, teachers, and parents, another example of a more democratic approach to education evaluation.

Finally, I found one approach to improving education worldwide that invokes the idea, “Educational Diplomacy.” Education diplomats do not represent states or countries but
represent learners. As diplomats, educators acquire specific skills “…and approaches that bridge understanding, solve education challenges, and promote transformative agendas that ensure equitable and inclusive, quality education” (Murphy, 2018, p. 3). As such, they engage in information gathering, reach certain objectives via negotiation, achieve agreement between diverse participants, and focus on building long-term relationships (Hone, 2018, p. 8). What if we acted like education diplomats? How would that change our work to influence OECD and policy makers in our individual countries?

A Way Forward

How can we convince the OECD and policy makers to agree to more democratic forms of curriculum development and education evaluation that are more humane and just? If we view the OECD projects as political endeavors, even as forms of “political action” (MacDonald, 1978), we must act in the political arena to bring about change. However, to act politically I believe we educators must think carefully about who we are. What are the core values and beliefs that influence our work? What if we created a position paper, or manifesto, like that published by the Teachers College faculty in 1940, that would state our basic principles and beliefs as to what democracy means to us and its relationship to curriculum development and education evaluation? What if we created a poster that summarized those beliefs and posted it in school hallways and classrooms?

Another way forward would be to view such a manifesto as a political platform, like that developed by political parties. For those of us interested in RECE taking a political stand, we could begin by suggesting topics or issues to guide our work in creating such a platform. Issues could include curriculum and evaluation, educational funding, environmental justice, children’s rights, inclusion, the rights of indigenous peoples and members of the LGBTQ community.
immigration, teacher education, and so forth. All RECE members would be welcome to propose additional topics. Committees could be formed consisting of members who have a commitment to or expertise in one or more of these areas, committees that would lay out four or five positions that altogether could become our platform. A platform such as this might be endorsed by some, but not necessarily all, RECE members. What if we used such a document to create coalitions with likeminded groups, such as members of professional associations like the Association of Childhood Education International (ACEI), revising the document as we go along? What if we worked with international organization such as UNICEF and UNESCO to influence educational policies, curriculum development, and evaluation practices related to programs for young children? UN documents such as “Sustainable Development Goals” (UN, 2018), that includes ending poverty and hunger, and providing a quality education for all, as well as the UN “Declaration of the Rights of the Child” (UN, 1990) could inform and inspire us. “The Creed of Democracy” could also provide many ideas as to what a manifesto could include.

With such a platform in hand we could approach organizations in our respective countries, as well as policy makers, and advocate, agitate, and maybe even march to advance our political agenda. We might even consider engaging in an uprising like that successfully carried out recently in Norway, where teachers, family members, teacher educators and others, through protests and sit-ins, managed to stop the standardization and testing of language skills in all programs for 5-year-olds (Appendix B). I believe that acting in the political arena is the only way to create meaningful educational change in curriculum development and evaluation practices in early childhood education and care programs throughout the world.

Notes
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Appendix A

**Democracy And Education In The Current Crisis**

Introduction. Out of the conferences called by Dean Russell during the Summer Session to consider the desired and possible contributions of education during the present national emergency, came a number of proposals. One of them was that education attempt to promote the unity of our people by clarifying the meaning of democracy and by helping to develop a greater and more intelligent support of it. This proposal being approved by the Faculty of Teachers College, the Dean appointed a committee to prepare and to promote such plans as it considered wise. As reported elsewhere in this issue of THE RECORD, the Dean also appointed five other committees to consider other contributions that educational organizations, and especially Teachers College, might make for the defense of the nation. "Democracy and Education in the Current Crisis" is a manifesto prepared by a committee (Professors Briggs, chairman, Childs, and Norton) and revised after criticism by a number of the faculty. This manifesto was presented orally at a mass meeting that overflowed the Horace Mann Auditorium on the evening of August thirteenth, and it was widely distributed in pamphlet form to students of the Summer Session. It has received wide and most favorable approval, not merely by educators but also by laymen in many fields. Up to date many thousand copies have been themselves.

A number of educational journals, including the Journal of the National Education Association, have either reprinted the entire Creed and, in some cases larger parts of the document, or have indicated their intention to do so.

It is hoped that large numbers of schools, organizations, and individuals will use the manifesto for study leading to a clearer understanding of democracy, a more sincere respect for it, and an unshakable faith that it is the highest form of social and political life. It is believed that the democratic answer to propaganda by those who believe in the totalitarian form of society and of government is a better understanding of what democracy is, an unshakable faith in its superiority, and a determination to apply it in all phases of life.

The manifesto is reprinted in the following pages. Professors of the faculty of Teachers College who have indicated their substantial agreement with the creed in "Democracy and Education in the Current Crisis" are:

Allan Abbott
Carter Alexander
Roy N. Anderson
Benjamin R. Andrews
H. J. Arnold
Arthur E. Bestor, Jr.
Jean Betzner
Thomas H. Briggs
Clifford L. Brownell
Herbert B. Bruner
Edmund deS. Brunner
Mary deGarmo Bryan
Lyman Bryson
Elizabeth C. Burgess
Raymond Burrows
R. Freeman Butts
Frank Callcott
Mabel Carney
Wilbert L. Carr
Adelaide Case
Hollis L. Caswell
Robert C. Challman
Mary E. Chayer
John L. Childs
Norval L. Church
Harold F. Clark
John R. Clark
Donald P. Cottrell
George S. Counts
Gerald S. Craig
Albert L. Cru
Merle Curti
Frank W. Cyr
Milton C. Del Manzo
Lester Dix
Miles Dresskell
Gertrude P. Driscoll
Fannie W. Dunn
Willard S. Elsbree
N. L. Engelhardt
Mary Evans
Edward S. Evenden
Ray Faulkner
William B. Featherstone
Frederick L. Fitzpatrick
Hamden L. Forkner
Merle Frampton
Will French
Elbert K. Fretwell
J. Montgomery Gambrill
Roma Gans
Manifesto on
DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION IN THE CURRENT CRISIS
GRAVITY OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

THE American people have watched with growing alarm the series of events which have brought
most of Europe and much of Asia under the domination of ruthless, military dictatorships. It can no longer be doubted that the present world crisis constitutes a threat of the most serious character to the United States and to the democratic way of life. The situation calls for clear thinking and prompt action. It is a primary duty of all liberty-loving citizens to make an immediate and realistic appraisal of the crisis which now confronts our nation. This appraisal may well begin with a frank statement of the factors which compose the current crisis.

The gravity of the present situation is due, first, to the speed and effectiveness with which the dictatorships are achieving their designs. Their success has been the result of a variety of factors. The totalitarian regimes have had clear and definite ideals and aims. They have dramatized their purposes and have skillfully suffused them with emotional appeals. They have rallied their citizens to unified and vigorous action. They have made skillful use of the powerful technical resources produced by the Western World during more than a century of scientific research and invention. They have been persistent, assiduous, and unscrupulous in their activities. The accelerated progress made by the dictatorships in subduing increasing amounts of territory and mounting numbers of people to their control has resulted in an accumulation of prestige which now constitutes one of their most important assets. Should the dictatorships triumph completely in the Old World, there can be little doubt that they would seek economic and possibly even military domination of the Western Hemisphere.

The gravity of the present situation, however, is not due solely to the accelerating triumphs and accumulating prestige of the totalitarian regimes. Our nation is endangered today by internal weaknesses as well as by threats from without. We have taken democracy for granted—have failed to realize that its perpetuation and development require from each generation an ever deeper search for fuller understanding and for more inclusive application of its principles, as well as struggle, vigilance, and sacrifice. We have not defined clearly and fully the meaning and implications of democracy for all areas of our life, especially under the profoundly changed conditions of today. As a result, our national ideals and aims lack clarity and definiteness. Confusion, disunion, and dilatory action thwart social progress. Crucial problems, such as unemployment and economic and social insecurity, remain unsolved. Activity within our own country of groups hostile to democracy further confuses the people and increases the gravity of the situation.

Our failure properly to define and pursue the purposes of democracy is also reflected in an inadequate educational program. The curriculum of many American schools should be refashioned to meet more exactly and fully the needs of citizens living in a complex industrial society. It should develop more adequate understanding of democracy and devoted loyalty to it. Educational opportunity should be more equitably distributed among our population. Flagrant neglect of the educational and economic needs of millions of American youths gives rise to one of our most serious internal liabilities. A realistic appraisal of the dangers which threaten our democracy from without and from within counsels neither despair nor surrender. Rather it challenges us to clarify our understanding of democracy, to realize its implications for all aspects of life, and to give it our devoted service. Our nation possesses vast assets, adequate to building a better and more powerful democracy. We should take full account of these in appraising the present situation.

THE ASSETS OF OUR NATION
However grave the situation in which we find ourselves, a situation, as has been pointed out, recently made serious by forces developed in other lands but also arising from weaknesses in our own culture, this nation has many assets of the highest value. These assets make possible an optimistic look toward the future. Possessing them, we can hopefully and even confidently plan a program that promises even greater happiness for our people and ultimately, we hope, for other parts of the world.

The United States has unparalleled wealth—natural, human, and technological—of which we can be justly proud. More nearly than any other great nation it is able to continue and to maintain a sound, well-balanced national life. Our country has also a geographic isolation that furnishes a strong defense from actual or potential military invasion from overseas. But neither its wealth nor its location affords defense in the war of ideals or in the economic war of competition for world markets. We must prepare for continuing and strengthened attacks on both these fronts. Such preparation demands a stronger national unity based upon a clear understanding of the ideals which make democracy great.

Among the important assets of which we are proud and which we can use in the defense of democracy are the following:
—A common speech and a common culture;
—A willingness to consider with open mind the contributions offered by diverse races, cultures, and religions, and to adopt those that promise enrichment of the national life;
—A widespread respect for human personality and a recognition of each individual's right to live his own life so far as it does not interfere with the welfare and happiness of others;
—An established belief that the welfare and happiness of the individual are the objectives that justify all social organizations, including government, and that they are superior to the deification of government and to the exaltation of its agents;
—A common conviction that it is the duty as well as the privilege of every individual to share in the making of decisions concerning general policies that affect the welfare of all;
—A long experience in self-government, in which every adult may take such part as his interests and abilities warrant;
—Dissatisfaction with the present, and hope that stimulates to activity for a better future;
—Agreement that changes must be made by peaceful means;
—A general willingness to abide by majority decisions made at the polls, with due respect for minorities who may continue their activities to influence a subsequent decision;
—Recognition of the right of any minority, however small, to propose, to advocate, and even to agitate by proper means for social changes without as well as within the pattern previously approved by the majority;
—A widespread approval of the right of the individual to secure, interpret, and disseminate information, to come to such conclusions as it indicates, freely to express opinions, to exert the influence of argument, to choose one's associates, to assemble, to vote, to move freely, to labor at work of one's own choosing, and to enjoy the fruits of one's labor, after contributing a just and proportionate share to the cost of protection and promoting the general welfare;
—Generally approved and practiced civil liberties, which may not be abrogated or curtailed, even by majorities;
—A widespread system of free education;
—Sympathy for and care of the unfortunate and the needy;
—Intolerance of enduring social stratification, whether caused by birth, race, religion, or wealth, inherited or otherwise acquired;
—The right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscience;
—Equality before the law and a presumption of innocence until proved guilty;
—Freedom from fear of persecution by those in authority.

Though by no means exhaustive, this list of assets of our country gives everyone something to fight to defend and something to work to preserve and extend. Accustomed as we are to these rights and privileges, we could not endure a defeat that took them away, that resulted in the loss of freedom and the violation of sacred personality. With such general assets it is imperative that we clarify the meanings of democracy, develop a renewed faith in them and devotion to them, and also that we realize their implications for modern life. The defense of our nation demands that we understand what democracy is, that we passionately believe it superior to all other ways of living, and that we apply it consistently to making our country the best possible for a free people.

THE MEANING OF DEMOCRACY

1. Democracy the Basis of American Life and Education
Democracy is both a personal way of life and a system of social and political organization. Its aspirations, loyalties, institutions, and behaviors constitute the core of the moral and political tradition of the United States. Were this democratic heritage to be destroyed, America would lose its most distinctive meaning, and our life as a people would be impoverished. In this critical period, it is therefore important to recall certain elemental things about this heritage. First, democracy is not the inevitable result of natural forces. It is rather the achievement of a long human struggle, inspired by ideals of justice and brotherhood, and led by men who loved life but preferred death to the degradation of enslavement.

Second, democracy does not perpetuate itself automatically. It is renewed only as those who have experienced its ways are disposed to make its form of life the controlling object of their allegiance. American democracy, now threatened by attacks both within and without the nation, will survive only as we achieve definite ideas about its essential meanings and conditions, and are prepared to work with intelligence, courage, and persistence to maintain them and to make them effective in increasing the welfare of all men.

Third, the meanings, faiths, attitudes, and habits inherent in the democratic way of life are not given at birth. The young acquire them only as they learn them through a process of participation and deliberate education. Hence, one of the primary obligations of the American educational system is to provide the most effectual conditions for the young to attain the equipment in knowledge and attitude required to carry on our democratic way of life. American education should make no pretense of neutrality about this great social objective. Our schools should be deliberately designed to provide an education in and for democracy.

2. The Moral Meaning of Democracy
Democracy makes respect for the individual human being its basic and abiding moral purpose. It
seeks to develop a way of living together—social, economic, political—which is in harmony with this regard for the intrinsic worth of each person. This has led it to affirm the ideal of equality of opportunity, and to oppose all discriminations based on factors of race, wealth, family, religion, or sex. The maximum growth of each individual is the democratic aim. Democracy holds, as a corollary, that the individual is not to be regarded as the pawn of the state or of any other institution. It tests the validity of the state and of all other social arrangements by their effort and success in promoting the welfare of human beings. According to the democratic conception, individuals are the end, institutions the means.

Democracy is a positive, not a negative thing. Its aim is the welfare of the individual, yet it recognizes that a good life for the individual is to be sought only in a good society and in a good state. The maintenance of the kind of social conditions required to fulfill this democratic ideal demands that individuals place the common good ahead of private advantage. Thus membership in a democratic society has its responsibilities as well as its privileges. A society which seeks to give each person maximum opportunity for the development of his own capacities is not a society in which each individual can be a law unto himself. Loyalty to democracy necessarily involves active support of those social, economic, and political arrangements which make possible an abundant life for each and every person.

3. The Sovereignty of the People

The political consequence of this moral emphasis of democracy on the worth and dignity of each person is popular sovereignty. From the beginning of the American Republic we have perceived that the welfare of all can best be made the persistent concern of our nation if government is of, by, and for the people. Thus, although providing for the delegation of authority for specified purposes, final authority in the American political system rests with the sovereign community of citizens. The state with its officials is always the agency of this community. We have progressively rejected the notion of control by an elite, whether based on property, family, race, or sex, and we have moved steadily to extend the rights and responsibilities of citizenship to all adults.

The ability both to determine basic policies and to choose leaders by peaceful means is characteristic of a democratic society. We should not permit use and habit to dull our appreciation of the great forward step taken by the human race when it began to substitute methods of deliberation, free discussion, and voting for the method of power based on brute force or superstition. Although our practice still falls short of this ideal, we are convinced that it defines the direction in which we want to continue to move. Therefore any movement or reform which repudiates either the method of persuasion by reason or the principle of majority rule should at once be suspect before the American people.

4. Democracy and a Strong Government Are Compatible

Ours is a representative system. Nor is there anything inherent in the principle of popular sovereignty which requires that a truly representative government be weak, or that duly elected leaders be denied the initiative and power required to carry on delegated functions. A democratic society does not necessarily believe that the best government is the least government. On the contrary, under present interdependent conditions democracy, in order to survive, requires strong, efficient government. It measures efficiency, however, by three searching tests: First, is
government equipped to do its part in providing for the needs of the people, however they may
cchange? Second, are the activities of government so conducted that they actually do promote the
long-run interests of all? Third, are all groups adequately represented in those social and political
processes by which the fundamental policies of local community, state, and nation are
formulated and reviewed?

5. Democracy Has Faith in Intelligence
The effectual exercise of sovereignty requires not only the right to vote, but also knowledge of
the essential objectives of a democratic society, of the nature of interest and needs—social as
well as individual, and of the bearing of changing conditions upon life-interests and purposes.
Unless the individual citizen has access to information which makes reliable judgments possible,
he easily becomes the victim of the propagandist and the demagogue. The ability to make sound
dgments also involves freedom for the members of a society to inquire, to assemble, to
associate, to confer, and to publish in order that ideas may be exchanged, sifted, evaluated, and
matured. The exercise of these rights and the acceptance of these responsibilities are important
means for the development of resourceful human beings in the realm of social and political
affairs.

The Bill of Rights which legalizes these practices is more than a mere schedule of personal
liberties. These civil liberties also constitute a part of the social machinery required for the
successful functioning of democracy; for it is by these means that an intelligent public opinion is
maintained. So long as our society remains democratic, it will be governed well or poorly to the
extent that the common man has and avails himself of opportunity to inform himself about
conditions and events. Democracy is committed not to blind obedience, but to the ways of
intelligence. The civil liberties are indispensable means to this public intelligence.

6. The Creative Role of Minorities
The acid test of the status of civil liberties is the freedom enjoyed by minorities. In a democratic
society, the possibility of the peaceful adjustment of institutions to changing conditions depends
upon the ability to keep open the avenues of criticism and agitation, so that innovating minority
groups have genuine opportunity to get their case before the public, which has ultimate
responsibility for making decisions. Thus a democratic society recognizes the creative role of
minorities in its social and political processes and gives them encouragement and protection so
that their proposals for change may have fair consideration. A totalitarian regime, on the other
hand, demands uniform obedience to predetermined doctrines and programs and regards
criticism and agitation as a crime against the state. Unfortunately, as a result of our failure to
clarify the nature of a democratic society, there are elements in our population who assume
that democracy can be defended by suppressing civil liberties. Actually, the triumph of their attitude
would be fatal to democracy.

7. The Abuse of Civil Liberties an Attack on Democracy
Present events are again emphasizing, however, that democracies can be defeated from within,
as well as by attack from without. The civil liberties in our country, in recent years, have been
exploited by groups whose first loyalties are given to foreign governments and foreign political
movements. These groups, feeling no obligation to do their part to maintain the primary
institutions of a democratic society, and operating as undercover, disciplined bodies, often exert
an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. By boring from within, by exploiting race and national prejudice, by taking advantage of the idealism and the inexperience of youth, by exploiting the distress of underprivileged groups, and by resorting to methods of slander, ridicule, and intimidation, these elements often confuse many sincere people, breed suspicion and discord, and divide the democratic forces which should stand together. Civil liberties are both abused and endangered by these practices. The genuine friends of democracy should be alert to make the public aware of the real nature of these practices and the ulterior purposes which inspire them. Tolerance does not mean indifference to practices which contradict the spirit and the purposes of our way of life.

Another serious threat to democracy is presented by those groups which desire to manipulate the present movement for national preparedness for selfish purposes of one sort or another. Under the name of patriotism and the need for national unity, they would suppress all criticism of existing conditions. Unfortunately, many sincere people join in these "witch-hunts" because they do not understand the crucial importance of the civil liberties in a democracy. We need to be on our guard against any movement which defines "Americanism" to mean the suppression of our historic and essential freedoms. Such movements make not for defense, but for destruction, of our American way of life. Thus today the supporters of American democracy are confronted with the difficult task of protecting the civil liberties against the manipulations of conspiratorial agents of foreign powers on the one hand, and against the attacks of the "witch-hunters" on the other.

8. Economic Foundations of Democracy
Both the moral and the political aspects of democracy require that certain economic conditions be maintained. Great discrepancies in wealth and its consequent power among a population tend to destroy the very foundations of popular sovereignty. As Daniel Webster observed a long time ago, "A general equality of condition is the true basis of popular government." Coerced by want, insecurity, and a sense of helplessness before complex events that often seem too difficult to be mastered, individuals lose their faith in democracy, fail to take advantage of its established means for meeting their needs, and are tempted to exchange their political and civil freedom for a deluding promise of economic and social security. Present conditions which leave unemployed and insecure millions of deserving individuals who would work if they could do so constitute a very serious threat to the social health of our nation. We are convinced that these conditions are not permanently compatible with our democratic way of life.

We are also confident that our country has the resources and the will to remedy these conditions. We are not, however, in full agreement about the specific means by which this can be most satisfactorily accomplished. Recognizing our differences, we propose to unite in a determined effort to make the implications of this critical economic situation more widely known, and to cooperate with the representatives of all public-minded groups in a search for democratic social means of resolving this tragic paradox of want, unemployment, and insecurity in the midst of potential plenty.

9. American Democracy and the World Situation
The American people are widely and justly regarded as a peace-loving people. Although one of the Great Powers of the modern world, we have not been and are not now inclined toward world
conquest. Both geographic and economic factors are partly responsible for this. But the
democratic character of the United States has also been a powerful influence. We have felt that
the pattern of a nation in arms is incompatible with the pattern of a democratic society in which
the interests and unhampered pursuits of the people are primary. We have wanted to be related
to other nations not through military conquest and authoritarian control, but through friendly
intercourse, trade, and philanthropic undertakings for mutual good in the fields of science,
religion, art, education, public health, and social work.

Today we are confronted with a changing world. We believe that present interdependence makes
it imperative that we use our national strength in a persistent and determined effort to develop a
world order which will forever ban the ways of war, and provide security for all peoples to
pursue freely their own manner of life. Although our first responsibility is to develop a truly
democratic society in our own land, we have, as a group of educators, an ultimate loyalty to the
whole human race and not exclusively to our own citizens. Present circumstances, however, are
not favorable to the immediate development of this worldwide community on principles in
harmony with democracy. To be sure, the possibility of rapid change in the temper of world
affairs cannot be dismissed, but the probabilities are that now and for a considerable period we
must be prepared to defend democracy by defending our nation.

This defense should be thorough and comprehensive—not merely to defeat an external enemy
but also to overcome weaknesses within our own national life. It includes, as a necessary part,
such an early resolution of internal economic and social problems as will renew the faith of our
people in the reality of our professions of democracy. Citizens cannot be expected to manifest
heroic devotion toward a country which leaves them insecure and has no place for them in its
constructive life activities. In order to preserve democracy we must organize resources to meet
the challenge of these negations of its spirit.

But the defense of the nation must now of necessity also be military. We may pray that we shall
not have to resort to arms, but if the trial of battle comes we should be equipped to meet it with
the best plans, manpower, and physical equipment of which we are capable. Democracy must
not be driven from the earth by the sheer power of unopposed brute physical force. Much as we
deplore the necessity, we must be ready to meet force with superior force. That such military
preparation carries threats to our democratic and peaceful patterns of life cannot be doubted. But
these risks we must take. Our problem is to prepare for adequate national defense under such an
aroused and alert public opinion that democratic values will not only not be destroyed, but will
rather be strengthened by this determined, united effort of our people. As members of the faculty
of Teachers College, we are ready to use our every strength to achieve this outcome. We believe,
however, that as educators our primary responsibility and challenge is to help the people of
America gain a more adequate understanding of the ideals and of the conditions of the
democratic way of life, and a more thorough grasp of the implications, possibilities, and dangers
in the economic, social, political, and moral forces now operating in the national and world
situation.

To aid in promoting a widespread reconsideration of democracy and a consequent clarification of
its meanings, we present:
A CREED OF DEMOCRACY

We believe in and will endeavor to make a democracy which
1—extends into every realm of human association;
2—respects the personality of every individual, whatever his origin or present status;
3—insures to all a sense of security;
4—protects the weak and cares for the needy that they may maintain their self-respect;
5—develops in all a sense of belongingness;
6—protects every individual against exploitation by special privilege or power;
7—believes in the improvability of all men;
8—has for its social aim the maximum development of each individual;
9—assumes that the maximum development possible to each individual is for the best interest of all;
10—provides an opportunity for each and every individual to make the best of such natural gifts as he has and encourages him to do so;
11—furnishes an environment in which every individual can be and is stimulated to exert himself to develop his own unique personality, limited only by the similar rights of others;
12—assumes that adults are capable of being influenced by reason;
13—appeals to reason rather than force to secure its ends;
14—permits no armed force that is not under public control;
15—implies that a person becomes free and effective by exercising self-restraint rather than by having restraint imposed upon him by external authority;
16—imposes only such regulation as is judged by society to be necessary for safeguarding the rights of others;
17—assumes that all persons have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;
18—guarantees that rights and opportunities accorded to one shall be accorded to all;
19—insures standards of living in which every individual can retain his own self-respect and unabashed make his peculiar contribution to the society in which he lives;
20—does not tolerate an enduring social stratification based on birth, race, religion, or wealth, inherited or otherwise acquired;
21—recognizes a desire on the part of people to govern themselves and a willingness to assume responsibility for doing so;
22—holds that government derives its powers solely from the consent of the governed;
23—tests the validity of government by its effort and success in promoting the welfare of human beings;
24—lays on individuals an obligation to share actively and with informed intelligence in formulating general public policies;
25—requires that the responsibilities and activities of citizenship be generally held to be among the highest duties of man;
26—holds that men deserve no better government than they exert themselves to obtain;
27—believes that the decisions concerning public policies made by the pooled judgment of the maximum number of interested and informed individuals are in the long run the wisest;
28—weighs all votes equally;
29—has faith that an individual grows best and most by actively and intelligently exercising his right to share in making decisions on public policy;
30—permits, encourages, and facilitates access to information necessary to the making of wise
decisions on public policies;
31—provides free education from the beginnings of formal schooling as long as it may be profitable to society for each industrious individual to continue;
32—attempts a general diffusion among the people of the ideals, knowledge, standards of conduct, and spirit of fair play which promote a sense of equality;
33—permits the unhampered expression of everyone's opinions on public policy;
34—guarantees the right of free expression of opinions on all matters, subject to reasonable libel laws;
35—implies that all who are bound by decisions of broad public policy should have an opportunity to share in making them;
36—demands that minorities live in accord with the decisions of the majority, but accords the right to agitate peacefully for the change of such decisions;
37—exercises tolerance to others without sacrificing the strength of conviction favoring different notions and practices;
38—accepts representative government as an economy necessitated by the size of the population;
39—delegates responsibility to individuals chosen by the people for their peculiar competence in defined areas of action, but retains the right to withdraw this authority;
40—develops a steadily increasing sense of obligation to a constantly enlarging social group;
41—induces a willingness to sacrifice personal comforts for the recognized general welfare;
42—stimulates a hope of constant betterment and provides means which the ambitious and earnest may use;
43—encourages constant reappraisal of things as they are and stimulates a hope that leads to action for their betterment in the future;
44—uses peaceful means for promoting and bringing about change;
45—holds that the fundamental civil liberties may not be impaired even by majorities;
46—permits unrestrained association and assembly for the promotion of public welfare by peaceful means;
47—recognizes and protects the right of individuals to associate themselves for the promotion of their own interests in any ways that are not incompatible with the general welfare;
48—grants the right to labor at work of one's own choosing, provided it does not interfere with the interests of society;
49—guarantees the right to enjoy the fruits of one's honest labor and to use them without molestation after paying a part proportionate to wealth or income to the cost of necessary government and general welfare;
50—encourages individual initiative and private enterprise in so far as they are compatible with the public weal;
51—maintains human rights to be more important than property rights;
52—so regulates the natural resources of the country as to preserve them for the widest use for the welfare of all the people;
53—Insures freedom of movement;
54—guarantees a legal assumption of innocence until proof of guilt, definite charges before arrest and detention, and open and speedy trial before a jury of peers, with protection of rights by the court and by competent counsel;
55—guarantees freedom from persecution by those in authority;
—provides that no individual be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; 
—permits worship according to the dictates of one's conscience; 
—separates state and church; 
—provides such security, freedom, opportunity, and justice for all of its members that they will.

Appendix B

In Norway there is a Kindergarten-Uprising (Barnehageopprør) going on that I think it is important to mention.

The Kindergarten-Uprising started as a response to the Norwegian Government’s White Paper no. 19 (2015-2016). It is a collective response from practitioners within the ECEC-settings, side by side with teacher educators, retired professionals from within the ECTE and others with engagement for children, early childhood and ECEC (like parents, grandparents, uncles and
aunts). This White Paper was a prelude to changes in the Kindergarten Framework Plan and the Kindergarten Act, which was implemented this August. It is no need to say that some of the suggested changes did not sit well with the above-mentioned groups of childhood-advocates. The illustration is my own drawing. It is a photo of the frontpage of my response to the request for comments to the changes in the Kindergarten Framework Plan (FWP). "Trust the Profession" is the title. There are also words in my own handwriting that highlights central aspects of children’s rights/main aspects of considerations for working within ECEC settings that by my opinion had been weakened and almost disappeared from the suggested new FWP.

Eide Consult

The Kindergarten-Uprising has an action group and a Facebook group. The action group kind of co-ordinate actions/events in different regions in Norway and uses Facebook to ‘show-and-tell’ about actions and events. The group on Facebook has close to 24,5K (!) members. It is not a public group.

Through massive media coverage, a high number of responses to request for comments on the changes in the Kindergarten Framework Plan and on the Kindergarten Act, together with protest and events in major cities/different regions of Norway, the Kindergarten-Uprising 2016 managed to stop the suggested standardization of language skills and the mapping and testing of language skills of all 5-year-olds in Kindergarten. Thanks to Kindergarten-Uprising 2018 play remain central to our kindergarten tradition, and the Kindergarten-Uprising 2018 influenced the child : teacher ratio.

One of the protests/event was a kind of a sit-down outside of the parliament. At the date for the process of the changes in the Kindergarten Act, parents took their children out of the
kindergarten and sat down in front of the parliament-building, as a strike. This protest/event was arranged by the Kindergarten-Uprising 2018 and their sibling the Parent-Uprising 2018 (Foreldreopprøret 2018). (They have close to 23K members in their public Facebook group.) The action group for the Kindergarten-Uprising handed a collection of 365 stories showing how the statutory minimum child : staff ratio is #uansvarlig (#irresponsible) and insufficient over to the Minister of Education and Integration. The Parent-Uprising handed over an appeal with 27K (!) signatures, saying that the minimum standard for staff in kindergarten must apply for the entire opening hours, not for just a few hours of the day.

Still there is work to do regarding inequality in granting of public and private kindergartens – the system is insufficient – and the statutory child : staff ratio is insufficient and does not apply for the entire opening hours, to mention just two aspects – which means that the Kindergarten-Uprising is still on.

Key words here is collective activism/collective response, alliance with the parents, media coverage and clear, articulate messages to the public (media) about what needs to change – how the current politics of ECEC effect the children – and how it will be differently with the changes suggested by the Kindergarten-Uprising.

The Scandinavian speaking might get more details and information by reading/watching some the media coverage. Just google barnehageopprør and/or foreldreopprør.

With Hope, Kari Eide, Eide Consult | Supported by Emancipation Solutions Group AS