Characterizing the Conversation: A Historical Re-view of Maria Montessori's Visits to the United States 1913-1918

Stacy Kay Zell

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Curriculum and Instruction

Thomas Hunt, Chair
Victoria Fu
James Garrison
Susan Murphy
Jan Nespor

February, 1997
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Maria Montessori, Social Foundations,
History, Teacher Education, Democracy

Characterizing the Conversation: A Historical Re-view of Maria Montessori's Visits to the United States 1913-1918

by

Stacy Kay Zell

Thomas Hunt, Chair

Department Teaching and Learning

(ABSTRACT)

This historical re-view of the events and interactions of Maria Montessori's visit to the United States between the years 1913 and 1918 begins by examining Montessori's personal history, with an emphasis on her educational background leading up to her becoming the first female physician in Italy. After discussing her scientific background briefly, the document specifically addresses several of Montessori's educational concepts. Next, this study examines specific nuances of organization, power and intent found in the educational system of the United States at the time of her visits. Particular emphasis is placed on the implications of industrialization, increasing immigration and the response of the educational establishment to these issues. Interactions and events from her visits in the United States follow. Montessori's influences on and experiences with prominent figures in the U.S. at that time are accentuated through the events that highlight her travels. After detailing each visit in the historical context in which it occurred, the piece continues with the author's discussion of how the dissertation applies to teaching history in the foundations. The piece concludes with conceptual suggestions of ways to increase diverse social awareness and encourage community-based responses of pre-service and in-service public school educators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I greatly appreciate the diverse influences of family, friends, professors, colleagues and many others whose support and encouragement helped me to complete this project. While I can not name them all here, I have chosen to highlight a few of these interactions.

First, I would like to express my genuine appreciation and deep respect to Dr. Tom Hunt, my major professor, mentor, confidant and the most zealous Notre Dame fan I have ever met. Dr. Hunt's love of learning and his energetic passion for life continue to encourage me to reach beyond the limits in my own unfolding scholarship and professional development. The extensive course work I have taken under his direction has given me a greater appreciation for the complexities of human nature and the societal conditions that have shaped schooling in the United States over the past two hundred years. I hold deep respect for the balance he maintains between family, scholarship, students and community involvements. I wish to express my deepest gratitude to him for agreeing to remain my dissertation advisor despite his move to Ohio; his influence in my life in general and on my academic maturity specifically continue to be invaluable to me.

Other committee members have contributed to my progress in many ways as well. Dr. Victoria Fu has taught me to become a better listener. In her courses, I was continually impressed at how she would generate in depth class discussions with just one well constructed question. Through course work and conversations, I was able to examine my own underlying assumptions about multicultural issues and the complexity of their societal constructions. I would like to thank her for her challenging questions and interesting readings!

Dr. Jim Garrison talked me into staying in graduate school when I didn't see many options open for myself. He introduced me to the tremendously enriching body of literature surrounding the feminist critique of science and demanded a level of academic excellence from me that I did not know at the time I was capable of achieving. The extensive course work I completed under his direction has helped me re-write many parts of my social scripting, which helped me obtain a much more productive and healthy balance in my life. His prolific scholarship and intense motivation has challenged me to keep pushing through boundaries in my own life. Through attending conferences with him, I have met many graduate students who have become good colleagues over the past few years. His friendship, encouragement, continuous support and high expectations for students have helped me achieve this current goal. Most of all, I would like to thank him for encouraging me to keep fighting!

I had the pleasure of working with Dr. Murphy during the summer of 1995 while serving on a committee to help implement a service-learning center at Virginia Tech. Her concern for classroom teachers greatly impressed me. I have enjoyed reading her comments on drafts of my dissertation as she has challenged me to look more carefully at the possible meanings of situations and societal constructs, such as gender. Her interest in narratives has opened me up to additional literature, and her knowledge of female academics living in the early twentieth century helped to challenge the way I viewed my own subject. I would like to thank her for her kind encouragement and for taking time out to share her own experiences with me. I think I finally found my metaphor!

During the spring of 1993 when I attended my first conference, an ethnography conference in Philadelphia, with Jan Nespor and several other students, I felt as though a new world was opening up to me. The courses I have taken from him were extremely challenging with reading material that was immensely interesting. His intense level of scholarship and voracious reading habits encouraged me to keep striving to read more and to articulate my thoughts more precisely. Most of all, I would like to thank him for taking risks in his teaching. His alternative forms of "texts" such as performance, poetry, video and music challenged me to re-think the definitions of "knowledge" that had become comfortable for me through my training in the sciences and have additionally challenged me to take risks in my own teaching practices.

I would also like to thank several of the people I will greatly miss from the department of Teaching and Learning. First I would like to thank Tammie Smith who has become like an older sister to me over these last few years. I would like to thank her for her terrific administrative skills as well as her encouragement, hugs, smiles, tissues, girl talk and man advice. I have greatly appreciated all the typing Michelle Griffith has done for me and her willingness to help me out of my computer glitches. Barbara Kellison has been a constant source of good cheer, reliable information and steady encouragement throughout this whole process. Susan Ariew's knowledge of electronic databases and her unique ability to help me track down obscure references was very much appreciated throughout the course of this study. Dr. Niles, Dr. Burton and Dr. Lucinda Roy, Dr. Cornel Morton and Dr. Joyce Williams-Green have all helped me to obtain necessary funding and administrative support when the going got really tough. I greatly appreciate all that each of them has done to make it possible for me to be a full time student. I would also like to thank both Liz Roth and Julie Meltzer for their encouragement throughout various parts of my graduate program - I wish both the best of luck and speedy ends to your own projects.

To many other friends I owe a great deal of appreciation. Stephanie Kimball has supported me through her close friendship and has taught me how to know when to just take a night off and toss pebbles around for a while. Dare I say, "Road trip?" To Andy Zimmerman, thanks for showing me how to see the scenery despite the fog and for encouraging me to keep climbing. Thanks to Tiffany Trent for poetry breaks, introducing me to the Orion Society and for, of course, indulging in chocolate with me. To Michael Jenkins, thanks for being there the crazy summer of Spanish exams and Dairy Queens. I would also like to thank Laura Solomon for her steadfast friendship throughout the years. To Alicia Wells, LaMont Harrington, DeShaye Terry and Ercella Wilson: thanks for teaching me how to be a more compassionate teacher and friend. Thanks to Mark Kaidy and Harry Pavlopoulos for years of encouragement and friendship. Stephen Seifert's poems, visits and e-mail messages really kept me connected to a world beyond the dissertation - including the worlds of quilting and Z mag. Steven "Red Dog" Reed, Vegas! Thanks for selecting new brew, liking Allanis, Tori and dancing. Erica Pederson, "Kind" Wednesdays have been great; good luck on your chapbook! Thanks, also, to Noelle Dijoud for all the wonderful "brain massages"; I think I can finally take that deep breath now! And to Terry Cook, thanks for all your kindness and love.

To Michael Attisano, my soul-mate-husband, I express deepest appreciation and respect for having love enough to experience all this chaos up close and personal; thanks for remaining

interested in this long term project, for your many editing suggestions, your cooking skills and your witty sense of humor which have really helped me maintain some semblance of perspective throughout the completion of this degree program. Maybe I can return the favor one day?

To the Attisano family and the "dynamite" Darvalics, thank you for your support, encouragement, family dinners and fond memories throughout this stage of my life. I have greatly appreciated your interest in my project and your willingness to help me out during illnesses, car repairs and for helping me map out my travels.

Ms. Ona Noble I thank you for continual support and encouragement throughout my many adventures over these past few years. Thanks for reading my papers and staying "tuned in." Grandma Noble has shown me perseverance and strength throughout the many hard lessons life has presented her; she has been a great source of encouragement and love throughout this project. Grandma Zell's letters kept me up to date; her notes of encouragement have been much appreciated.

To my sister Niki, I wish to thank her for all the phone conversations and the encouragement when it seemed like "Dorothy was indeed a long way from Kansas." Best of luck to her as she finishes law school. Thanks to Ed for the warped sense of humor which made me feel more normal each time I read his e-mail messages! To Francis (my favorite brother) thanks for spending some of your summer vacations with me so I wouldn't forget how to be silly or forget how to fish - Wal-Mart at midnight anyone? To Mom and Dad I express my sincere appreciation for the sacrifices they have both made so that our lives would be different. They encouraged me to pursue what made me happy even though they were afraid I would become a professional student for the rest of my life - in a way I sort of have! I would like to thank them for the calls, letters, and their willingness to try to understand and to support my career decisions. I appreciate their love and devotion to each of us. And lastly, to my great-grandma "Mema" who taught me how to make lasagna, pray the rosary and play bingo. As a child when you'd hold my face in your olive-skinned hands and smile with love in your azure colored eyes, I had no idea what you meant by, "One day, just be patient." Today I think I know. Though you are not physically here to witness this "one day," I have dedicated this work to you. Thank you for believing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

A Few Words About "History"

Historical methods, like any tool of inquiry, evolve over time. During the 1913-1918 time period surrounding the focus of my dissertation, "educational history [gave] teachers and administrators a greater sense of esprit and identity."[1] Often the telling of the history made the institution shine and glorified the goals and intents of those writing the history.[2] Thus, as in any historical undertaking, the power lies in the telling of the story. Intent and goals of writing history change from person to person and over time. In educational history there is much to be skeptical about. As Tyack points out, "If it is wise to be suspicious of historical prescriptions, it is foolish to ignore the storehouse of experience accumulated in the past."[3] With this in mind, what has been left out and what has been skimmed over in what we know as Maria Montessori's educational history in the United States? What lies just below the surface of the histories most of us have come to know as "fact?" In educational history there is much to be thoughtfully re-viewed as current historians such as Tom Hunt, David Tyack and Wayne Urban have repeatedly underscored in their work.

In recent years it has become common place to look at educational history through a much more holistic lens. Education spills over into family structure, religious affiliations, ethnic undertones, the media and many other sources which the more current historical scholars have taken into account. As one historian noted, "What historians need is not more documents, but stronger boots."[4] In addition, 20th century scholars have taken history one step further laying the groundwork for a historically based democratic activism. George Counts and R. Freeman Butts are perhaps the most widely known teacher-educators advocating increased democratic participation by our teachers in public school settings.[5]

With all this in mind, the work of Maria Montessori beckons a re-view. After having the fortunate opportunity to be involved in a Montessori classroom in various capacities for three years, I decided to look more closely at Montessori's history. Ms. Terry Cook, the directress of Montessori Children's House in Blacksburg, VA had welcomed my continual questions and offered all her reading material for me to peruse. After reading all that was there, I still could not figure out why Montessori's ideas were not embraced in the United States. On the surface Montessori seemed to have many pertinent ideas for the role of children in a democratic society and seemed to be ahead of her time with regard to her beliefs pertaining to the human rights of children all over the world. It bothered me greatly; why weren't her ideas accepted as mainstream? With this question in mind, I began to review the research surrounding Maria Montessori which led me into a deeper investigation of the historical context of Montessori's visit. Whenever possible I searched for primary sources and made a deliberate effort to understand the context of the writer's words. Montessori's main archives are in Amsterdam and at times I had to rely on secondary sources who had accessed items contained abroad. Rita Kramer was Montessori's most thorough biographer, and in the places where I have chosen to quote her, I feel confident that she is accurate. Where I have found discrepancies among references, I have explicitly made that acknowledgement. Additionally, I have paid particular attention to addressing the subject from as

many different historical lenses as was possible so as to leave the reader with many possibilities for future conversations and meanings. I have tried to order each section chronologically, however there are areas of overlap. In consideration of the reader, I have tried to make those transitions as smooth as possible.

Lastly, getting out and talking to people who had knowledge of Montessori's ideas also became a significant method of research inquiry as I worked to focus my thoughts over the last two years. Conversations with Ms. Cook are certainly woven into this piece in ways that have long since ceased to be discernable. Two librarians were particularly helpful in locating obscure resources and contributing to my method of inquiry. Susan Ariew at Virginia Tech was particularly helpful when it came to locating sources via the internet. She is a highly skilled researcher who sparked many creative leads when I became discouraged. Also, Anita Carrico at The Architecture Library at The University of Maryland, College Park was able to help me locate nearly all the references pertaining to Montessori's participation at the 1915 World's Fair. The special collections covering the Worlds' Fair were a spectacular find complete with many hand colored photos and original program guides. Conversations with both librarians were additionally insightful and are interwoven into the process of "doing history" explicated in this document.

Re-Search Framework

Many historical accounts of Maria Montessori exist; why another? Why should teacher educators, particularly in the foundations, read this document? The short answer is that I find history seducing and hope that the reader will also find something interesting in the pages which follow. A longer answer is contained in the brief conversation of historical process explained in this section. Perhaps the best answer to these questions, however, resides in your process as reader. I hand this document to each individual reader and you "author" the meaning which you take from the historical journey which I have laid out before you. How you engage in my project, then, becomes your own process of agreeing, dismissing, closing down or continuing the conversation I have only begun here. This document is written to encourage conversation about the role of history in teachers education, particularly in the foundations. Throughout the document, the process of and the power in the telling of history becomes an underlying theme. What follows then is not just merely a story telling about Maria Montessori's visits to the United States from 1913 to 1918; it is rather a work of contextualizing those visits, the interactions and the events that took place. In this way I have chosen not only to review her work, but to deliberately *re-view* it, casting a different light on the historical "facts" surrounding her visits. I have chosen to present "the whole story" in layers so that the reader may more easily see the process of history as it unfolds and overlaps. *Person, place, events and meaning* are woven as the chapters progress.

In the first chapter, the reader is presented with a brief historical account of Maria Montessori's life up to 1913. Special detail is placed on her *personal* beginnings as the first female physician in Italy. The chapter progresses to focus on her educational ideas as they were articulated by Montessori during these early years of her work. The second chapter focuses on *place*. The most common educational issues circulating throughout the educational establishment at this time in the United States are provided for the reader. These issues such as immigration, urbanization, and industrialization are set within the larger socio-historical context of their time period. The third and fourth chapters focus on the *events* surrounding the Montessori visits. By events I mean the specific moments in time in which interactions between Montessori and those around her present particularly insightful glances into the characterization of Montessori and the telling of her history in the U.S. Finally, the fifth chapter is my conclusion, my articulation of *meaning* found in the history presented. This layering and expanding process of telling the story is supported in the work of Barzun and Graff who say, "Time, place, and meaning give things their connectedness, which come out again in the report upon them."[6] The "Maria Montessori" the reader is left with at the end of this piece then is inextricably molded to and with the time and place in which she lived.[7] This connectedness to all parts of the historical character in the telling of the story can be likened to a sculpture:

> A sculptor shapes his work by adding and by taking away until the lump resembles the image he has carried in his mind's eye. He is aided by his general knowledge of how objects look, but he must use trial and error to achieve the desired likeness. The reason why research is like sculpturing from memory is that in neither there is a concrete visible subject to copy directly. The subject exists only when the object is finished.[8]

Readers also sculpt the history unfolding in the "object" that exists as this document. At the end of this document, the "subject" Maria Montessori will exist differently for each reader as seen in the clay metaphor above. Even though all students may have seen the same model, the image recalled from memory and each student's transaction with the clay will differ resulting in a diversity of final sculptures. But the project does not end with the final sculpture. It is rather connected as history is to all the other projects the sculptor has undertaken in the past and in varying degrees to all the projects of the future. With this metaphor in mind, I present my research.

Chapter One

Maria Montessori's Background: Breaking Out of Tradition

"All human victories, all human progress, stand upon the inner force."

**"If I am going up a ladder, and a dog begins to bite at my ankles,
I can do one of two things - either turn round and kick out at it,
or simply go on up the ladder. I prefer to go up the ladder!"
-Maria Montessori**

Maria Montessori was born in Italy on August 31, 1870 in the town of Chiaraville in the province of Ancona. During her youth, Montessori's parents stressed their daughter's education. Montessori's father, Alessandro, is described as "...a typical conservative of the old school, a military man, who in his time had been commended for bravery in action."[9] He was also noted as being "dignified and soldierly in his bearing, and well known for his punctilious politeness."[10] Maria Montessori's mother, Renilde, was less conservative. Renilde Stoppani was "niece of the illustrious Antonio Stoppani, the great philosopher-scientist-priest to whom the University of Milan erected a monument at his death."[11] Until her death in 1912, Renilde remained a steady source of support for her daughter.

Despite the support for her education that Maria received from her family, the late 19th century was generally an oppressive time for women. Among some of the customs that exemplified restrictions experienced by women were the cultural tradition of women needing a male escort to go out in public, the tradition of arranged marriages and the legally supported constraints preventing married women from writing a check on their own account or from giving evidence in a court of law without their husband's presence.[12] Respectable jobs for women were nursing and teaching. Tradition, however, was starting to change in the newly unified Italy. From an early age, Montessori began to challenge socially constructed barriers placed on her gender.

As a grade-school pupil in Ancona, Maria received average marks. When she was twelve, her family moved to Rome where Maria's educational opportunities expanded. At the age of fourteen, Maria became very interested in mathematics.[13] Because of this interest, she decided to study engineering. It was not socially acceptable for female children to attend technical school, but Montessori's parents pushed for their child's admission. At this point in her educational career, it was her mother more than her father who supported Montessori's non-traditional educational aspirations. After attending classes at a technical school for boys, she was drawn further into science and decided to pursue a degree in medicine in 1890. The exact process that allowed her entrance was not entirely recorded.[14] Excerpts from what is recorded reveal Montessori's tenacity:

> [She] managed to obtain and interview with Dr. Bacilli, head of the Board of Education. When *he* informed her in quite definite terms that it would be impossible for her to carry out her project, she thanked him politely, shook hands cordially, and quietly remarked," I *know* I shall become Doctor of Medicine." Thereupon she bowed and went out.[15]

Her determination did not stop there. She petitioned Pope Leo XIII who issued a statement endorsing Montessori's application to medical school.[16] Once accepted to medical school, she tutored fellow students and received some scholarship aid which supported her during her medical school years.[17] [18]

The First Female Physician in Italy

Her years at The University of Rome's medical school served to test not only her intellect but also her perseverance and character. She was sometimes isolated from peers either through gender-biased rules or by negative peer reaction to her admission to a previously all male profession. Montessori did not dwell on the negative reactions she received from some male students; however, negative peer response is documented.[19] Isolation from her peers during cadaver dissections was especially difficult. Because of cultural restrictions at the time, male and female students could not be present together in the cadaver room during dissection. The situation was as follows:

> Her practical work in the dissection room had to be done by herself; and this meant that she was obliged to pass many hours alone amongst the corpses, very often in the evening after darkness had set in. It needed a good deal of determination to carry on in such a macabre setting. Furthermore, her way was made still more difficult on account of the opposition of her father, who disapproved of the career she had chosen. [20]

Whatever opposition she received from students and her father seemed to be counter-balanced by many of the faculty who showed their support by nominating Montessori for scholarships. Montessori's devotion made an impression on many of the faculty, one who related a time when Montessori was the only one to show up to a lecture on a tremendously snowy day. He delivered the lecture to her despite her courteous suggestion to postpone it until others could make it to the University.[21]

Montessori's persistence began to pay off. At the end of their first year of medical school, all students were required to deliver a scholarly paper in front of university officials and anyone from the public who wished to attend. On the day that Maria was to deliver her paper, a friend of Alessandro Montessori persuaded him to go to hear his daughter's speech. After the speech "her father found himself the center of eager congratulations from all sides at having such a daughter."[22] After this point, the opposition by her father subsided considerably. Her medical school career continued, and after defending a thesis on July 10, 1896 she was conferred the degree of doctor of medicine and surgery. Maria Montessori, therefore, became the first female physician in Italy.[23]

Speaking Engagements: Finding a Niche

During her first year out of medical school, Dr. Montessori was chosen to represent the women of Italy at the International Women's Congress held in Berlin on September 20, 1896 where she spoke in support of the woman worker; in 1900 she attended a similar event in London where she spoke out against child labor.[24] During this time, she was also appointed resident doctor at the Psychiatric Clinic in the University of Rome where she worked with "feeble-minded"

(mentally-challenged) children. She saw the children's needs as something larger than just a medical problem to be treated clinically. She viewed the situation of these children as a social problem needing to be addressed systemically as well as medically. Through her observation of these children, she began to realize that they had nothing with which they could stimulate their minds or otherwise educate themselves. She began to speak out and advocate education for these cast-off children. Montessori's speech at a pedagogical conference in Turin in 1899 included strong statements such as "defective children were not extrasocial beings, but were entitled to the benefits of education as much as - if not more than - normal ones."[25] A state "orthophrenic" school, or school for the feeble-minded, was set up as a result of her interest in this population of children. Dr. Montessori was director of this school from 1899-1901.

In 1901, she left her position to pursue more course work and eventually to experiment with her educational ideas in a classroom of "normal" children. Montessori had wondered what was holding back the "normal" children if in some cases her class of "idiot" children were performing up to the standards set for "normal" children.[26] In order to pursue this line of inquiry, she enrolled in courses in philosophy, psychology and anthropology at the University of Rome where she was still a lecturer. During this year, she also gave birth to her son Mario out of wedlock. The events surrounding her child's birth were kept a secret, and she was astute at handling the situation in such a fashion that it did not significantly upset her public image or her career.[27] Mario was raised outside Rome by family friends. Montessori visited often, but it was against her family's wishes that the child should be publicly recognized as hers. After Dr. Montessori's mother's death in 1913, the child accompanied Montessori nearly everywhere.[28] During the early 1900's, Dr. Montessori also took more course work at the university.

Back to the University: The Method Emerges

Dr. Montessori's study between 1901-1906 began with the works of physiologists and psychologists Jean-Marc-Gaspard Itard (1775-1838) and Edouard Seguin (1812-1880). Itard is most often associated with his studies with "Victor," the wild boy of Averyon. Their work stemmed from Jacob Rodriguez Periera's influence (1715-1780).[29] Periera was a contemporary of Rousseau and founded a free school in Bordeaux in the 1750's. His work on sense-training, particularly that of touch, in the education of deaf-mutes inspired Rousseau's extension of sense-training in "normal" children. Rousseau and Periera were neighbors, and Rousseau was a frequent visitor to Periera's school.[30] Itard also studied deaf-mutes. Seguin was Itard's disciple and opened a school for "deficient" children in Paris; he later emigrated to the United States. When Montessori could not obtain an Italian translation of Seguin's work, she translated a copy of the book's French edition into Italian.[31] Since the original was over 600 pages in length, she put herself through the task in order that, "[she] might have time to weigh the sense of each word, and to read, in truth, the *spirit* of the author."[32] In 1902, she spoke of Seguin's work at a pedagogy conference in Naples. What impressed her most about his work was that he had made the connection that if working individually with "retarded" children helped their growth significantly, then a system of education that valued the individuality of "normal" children held the potential for a great human regeneration not yet realized through traditional education.[33]

Montessori's affinity for Seguin's work lay not only in their shared medical backgrounds but also in the context from which he worked. Seguin writes that his own work was a "striving for a social elevation of the lowest and poorest by all means and institutions; mainly by free education."[34] His approach to learning is described below:

> Seguin's methods began with the training of the muscular system and the senses, through a variety of exercises and activities. Then he led children from the education of the senses to general notions, or understandings, and from general notions to abstract thought. Physiological education of the senses had to precede the development of the mind.[35]

This succession of thought differed from Itard's because Itard did not strive toward abstraction in his work with Victor.[36] Further, Seguin differed from Froebel, criticizing him for stifling the child's thought processes by concentrating more on imitation rather than what was "creative in human thought."[37] Montessori extended Seguin's respect for the creative force in human thought. For Montessori life was energy; the energy found within children's spontaneous development had the potential to transform society to a more humane community.[38] She picked up where Seguin left off which was to create a scientific system of education that recognized and respected this universal energy found in children.[39] Montessori writes:

> The school must permit the *free, natural manifestations* of the *child* if in the school scientific pedagogy is to be born. This is the essential reform. . . . That concept of liberty which must inspire pedagogy is. . . universal.[40]

Extending what she saw as the potential for the regeneration of human society through children, she expanded her interests in the "feeble-minded" child to an interest of how her work and Seguin's ideas would carry over into a scientific pedagogy for "normal" children. She writes:

> To me, however, the boys from the asylum had been able to compete with the normal children only because they were taught in a different way. They had been helped in their psychic development, and the normal children had, instead, been suffocated, held back. . . . While everyone was admiring the progress of my idiots, I was searching for the reasons which could keep the happy healthy children of the common schools on so low a plane that they could be equalled in tests of intelligence by my unfortunate pupils.[41]

This inquiry became central to the focus of her work. While she did acknowledge her admiration for the work of Itard and Seguin, and the strong impact their work had on her own, she was also quick to correct reporters who tried to compare her to Frederick Froebel (Father of the Kindergarten Movement).

A *London Times* reporter once tried to equate Dr. Montessori and Froebel pointing out that both Montessori and Froebel believed that freedom in education was vital to their work. Montessori replied:

> Ah, but whose freedom? Froebel's not the child's. He came to the child with his philosophy about the child. I go to the child to get mine. He imposes his imagination on the child.... The imagination must be the child's. He must first of all see clearly. Then out of the whole world of metaphors and comparisons he may choose what he likes.[42]

She saw her own work as an extension of the potential found in Itard and Seguin's work. This genealogy of influence would serve to put her slightly out of step with many educators of the day

who were more familiar with the progression of thought of Locke (1632-1704), Rousseau (1712-1778), Pestalozzi (1746-1827), and Froebel (1783-1852).[43] As part of her responsibility to the university, she read many theses from many pedagogical standpoints as well as completed course work that covered the more common educators and philosophers; Montessori found a special affinity to the work of Itard and Senguin, however, and consistently attributed them as having the strongest influence on her work.[44]

From 1904 until 1908, she lectured in the Pedagogic School of the University of Rome. She taught anthropology in education during this appointment. In 1910, she published a volume entitled *Pedagogical Anthropology*. The basic tenet of the book states, "that the nature of education should follow from an understanding of the nature of the child to be educated."[45] Much of the book is out-dated as the field of anthropology has advanced immensely since the turn of the century. At the time, however, it was a major work in her unfolding scholarship.

At the university, she was a popular lecturer partly because of her use of props to demonstrate her point. In addition to her appointment at the University of Rome, she also occupied the Chair of Hygiene at the Magistero Femminile in Rome from 1896-1906. This was one of the two women's colleges in Italy at that time. Periodically, she also published her research in medical journals. Most of her research during this time involved nervous disorders found in children.[46] In 1906, she was appointed to the board of examiners for the degree of natural science in anthropology. During the years 1901-1906, she also practiced medicine in Rome hospitals and clinics as well as maintained a small private practice. Additionally, she served on the Italian Red Cross as a medical assistant. The years 1901 to 1906 were ones of increased educational growth for Montessori both personally, and professionally.[47]

The First Children's House Opens

All these events prepared her for the opening of the first Children's House in the San Lorenzo quarter in Rome on January 6, 1907. The San Lorenzo area of Rome was a slum. Poor nutrition, inadequate sanitation, and crime were characteristic of this area. While parents were at work, children were noticed wandering about and involving themselves in vandalism. The director of the tenement had heard of Montessori's work with the "feeble-minded" and her desire to centralize her work more fully on a population of "normal children." Much to the disapproval of some of her scientific colleagues, she took the opportunity she saw before her at the San Lorenzo tenement, devoting herself to this project to the exclusion of nearly all else.[48] From 1907 onward she actively developed the materials, environment and training courses which would collectively become known as The Montessori Method.

Fine Tuning the Method: Writing it all Down

Montessori rooted her educational pursuits on her medical background and extended her medical experience into the classroom. The method she had developed between 1913 and 1918 was a work in progress; Dr. Montessori experimented with an educational system that had personal growth, personal liberty, and community responsibility (in the form of emphasizing parental involvement) as its focus.[49] During her early years at the Children's House, she fine-tuned

three specific facets of her system. The first aspect of her work involved her perspective on the role of the child both in the classroom and, subsequently, in society. The second major focus worked out the specific role of the teacher. The third facet explored the potential for the classroom environment and was extended to include the child's family environment. For Montessori, these three constituents worked together to create an interaction conducive to a more humane society.[50]

Montessori believed that, "the first educational influence upon a child should have as its object the guidance of the child along the way of independence."[51] For Montessori, the child needed the freedom to develop at her own pace. Only in an environment that nurtured spontaneous and self-guided actions could a society move forward *from* servitude to another *into* a more rich and just association *with* one another. Montessori writes that, "where there are servants, social conditions in which we live are still servile."[52] She saw her classroom as a space where children could develop at their own pace and were presented with material to develop their own personhood, not merely their intellect. She saw that teaching children to stand in lines, to limit their activity in the classroom and the way in which they spontaneously helped one another was training for servitude. As previously quoted, Montessori believed in a need for the child to have freedom to move around in the classroom and she believed that this freedom was vital to her educational experiments. She did not discredit traditional organization, for instance standing children in line. But means of organizing had to have a purpose beyond simply confining the "spontaneous activity" of the children in the classroom. Montessori writes:

> Arranging children in lines, as is done in ordinary schools, and giving each one his own place, and expecting them all to remain still...can come later as a lesson in collective education.[53]

According to Montessori, in traditional education, as well as parenting, teachers and parents instill too much dependency in children both at school and in the home. A parent, for instance, who insists on feeding the child rather than teaching the child to feed himself, "insults the child's human dignity."[54] Both unnecessary servitude to the child and unnecessary rank and file organization in schools "place obstacles in the way of a life which is unfolding...and one who has too many servants becomes increasingly dependent upon them and eventually their slave."[55]

For Montessori, "if teaching is to be effective with young children, it must initiate them into those kinds of activities which they can perform themselves and which keep them from being a burden to others."[56] By nurturing a child's human dignity to seek independence instead of dependence, Montessori hoped to accomplish a mind set where a child may say to herself, "I do not wish to be served because I am not helpless, but we should assist one another because we are social beings."[57] Montessori envisioned a world where the fortunate would *naturally* care for the less fortunate, a world in which resources would be shared and a place where children could lead the way in the development of a more equitable society. A key to nurturing liberty in the classroom, for Montessori, included providing the space for a child to explore and develop his intellect spontaneously, according to his own pace. The teacher played a vital role in the child's learning process by maintaining the classroom's environment of freedom and choice.[58] Montessori was so completely committed to the cause of children's liberty, fair treatment and educational

growth that she and a small group of other women petitioned the Vatican for creation of a religious order devoted to "the cause of the child."[59] Their petition was rejected.

From the beginning her method recognized the spiritual development of the child as important to the entire growth of the child. Though Catholic, Montessori was not perpetuating any particular religious view, but rather an intrinsic inclination in the child to guide and develop his own internal learning process, his spirit of learning, throughout life. She saw the "energy" of the child a potent force for the transformation of humanity into a more peaceful, respectful, equal community. She writes:

> The energy that can help mankind is that which lies within the child...It is foolish to hope or even to imagine that theoretical reforms or individual efforts could fill so great a void as that which has been made in the world through the oppression of children...Within the child lies the fate of the future...A child is mysterious and powerful and contains within himself the secret of human nature.[60]

Montessori held high regard for the individual human rights of the child and felt strongly that society ought to value the child more carefully. She writes:

> The social rights of children must be recognized so that a world suited to their needs may be constructed for them. The greatest crime that a society commits is that of wasting the money which it should use for children on things that will destroy them and society itself as well....[61]

Additionally, in her writing, Montessori refers to the "mission" of parenthood as one that should focus on improving the human rights of children. She writes:

> Parents should be concerned with the great social question of the day, the struggle to gain a recognition of the rights of the child....Parents still shout at their children....Adults think they have a natural right to punish a child, and a mother thinks a slap is a duty....But is there anything so mean as to insult and beat a child? Man's conscious in this regard has certainly been dulled.[62]

Montessori's classrooms reflected her regard for the child's individual growth and the child's right to choose his own work. The child had a wide range of choices to make within the constraints of the materials offered and the need to share materials or occasionally wait for the teacher to give a lesson on a new piece of work. All furniture was child-sized, and the classroom was not gender selective. In other words, regardless of gender, each child learned how to sew, to serve lunch, to clean up and to be nurturing toward each other as well as the plants and animals in the child's environment. Montessori believed that the teacher should be well-trained in the developmental stages of the child as well as the materials present in the classroom.[63]

In addition, the teacher's role was one of a vigilant observer who watched the children working and could tell when a particular child was ready to build skills further or take on a new challenge. For Montessori, the teacher must be willing to respect the child's own learning instinct and must be flexible enough to respect the child's uniqueness. As Montessori states, the teacher was one who:

> must bring not only the capacity, but the desire, to observe natural phenomena. In our system, she must become a passive, much more than an active, influence, and her passivity

> shall be composed of anxious scientific curiosity, and of absolute *respect* for the phenomenon which she wishes to observe. The teacher must *feel* her position of *observer*: the *activity* must lie in the *phenomenon*.[64]

For Montessori, "The pedagogical method of *observation* has for its base the *liberty* of the child; and *liberty is activity*."[65]

Building on her belief that "liberty was activity," Montessori supported an internal discipline structure for the classroom. Out of respect for themselves and each other, the children would choose not to interfere in another's work or to be disruptive. The teacher was not to instill fear in the children because Montessori saw this as contrary to the pursuit of the child's personal liberty, and she also believed that this "traditional" mode of disciplining was out-dated. Montessori writes:

> It would seem to me that children are very well disciplined indeed when they can move all around in a room in a useful, intelligent, and free fashion without doing anything rude or unmannerly.[66]

As children learned to move about taking care of themselves and assisting each other, the teacher was more free to expand the boundaries of the classroom space. Montessori's program included caring for the earth and animals. Montessori believed that gardening provided many educational opportunities as well as allowed the children the opportunity to be outdoors in the fresh air. Additionally, children cared for animals as a way of teaching responsibility, compassion and respect for life.

Montessori saw the education of the child as training for life. In addition, the education of the child was to be a space where greater human potentials could be explored. Her educational ideas included the parents as well. They were invited to visit as they wished and were required to meet with the director weekly to discuss the development of their child. Montessori had a great respect for the parents and the educational development of the family as a whole; for Montessori the Children's House was "a school within a house."[67]

Entertaining Visitors: Other Points of View

Dr. Montessori's work brought much attention from all over the world as teachers visited Rome for Montessori training. Florence Elizabeth Ward of the Ohio State Teacher's College spent time in Rome witnessing Montessori's methods in practice to gather information for a summer course she was to teach in 1912. She describes the Montessori environment as follows:[68]

> Doctor Montessori recommends, first, a wholesome school environment in which are provided suitable chairs instead of spine-curving seats, fresh air and sunshine, nourishing food and comfortable clothing; broad, open spaces and earth to dig in; plants to water and pets to feed, and, since physical strength like moral fiber comes only through actual struggle, gymnastic apparatus upon which growing bodies may stretch and balance. (This includes a suspended rubber ball to push for arm development, a fence for climbing, a spiral staircase, rope ladders and swings.)
>
> Second, careful and frequent biological tests and measurements, made for the purpose of detecting and endeavoring to overcome every physical defect, thus freeing the child from handicap and protecting society against the possibility of weakness perpetuating itself through heredity.
>
> Third, the child is taught scientific truth regarding his body and given definite instruction as to its care, which develops a reverence for it and tends toward personal purity and health.
>
> Fourth, through definite training in motor control and muscular coordination, tension is removed, and poise and serenity result.[69]

Ward thought the schools in the United States could benefit from her observation of the Montessori system. She concludes that: "Our American children, with their nervous buoyancy of spirit and their fund of nervous energy, need careful attention along these lines."[70]

During the summer of 1909, Dr. Montessori began writing her methods in a book entitled *The Method of Scientific Pedagogy Applied to the Young Children in the Casi dei Bambini* which was later re-named *The Montessori Method*. Her book was translated into English in 1912, but she was already the topic of popular discussion in the United States. Five thousand copies sold in one day; 17,410 copies were sold the first year, making it a best-seller and replacing Jane Addams' book *Hull House* in terms of sales.[71] J.McV. Hunt notes in his 1964 introduction to a new edition of *The Montessori Method* that "Americans were among the first to become interested, and their interest rapidly exploded into a social movement."[72] This movement was short-lived as J.McV. Hunt illustrates with the following synopsis of Montessori's coverage by the U.S. press. He states:

> Jenny Merrill first described Montessori's work in the December, 1909, and March, 1910, issues of the *Kindergarten Primary Magazine.* The year 1911 brought six reports of Montessori's work. The number rose to 54 in 1912, and then jumped to a maximum of 76 in 1913. Then the explosion appears to have rapidly subsided: in 1914 the number of publications declined to 55; they dwindled to 15 in 1915, to eight in 1917, and amounted to less than five the year thereafter.[73]

Hunt documents the flurry of activity surrounding the Montessori visits of 1913-1918 in the passage above as he also mentions that the interest in her work rose rapidly, reached a quick

climax and then quickly subsided. As seen in this chapter, well before her visits to the United States she was already a prominent public figure. By 1911 the governments of Italy and Switzerland had adopted her methods in their public schools. Two model schools existed in Paris. England was in the process of adopting her schools and India, China, Mexico, Korea, Argentina and Hawaii were planning the opening of schools. Additionally, by 1919, Montessori's method book was translated into: English, French, Russian, German, Spanish, Rumanian, Danish, Dutch, and Chinese. In 1919 Montessori selected 250 students out of a pool of 2000 applicants for one training course in London. In an additional set of lectures, 1500 people attended one lecture series and 2700 people attended another. Her work was also placed in the Vatican library by Pope Benedict.[74]

A Summary and a Look Ahead

Early in her childhood, Montessori demonstrated hard work and determination. As her education continued, she exceeded societal expectations and became the first female physician in Italy. Upon graduation she represented her country in speaking engagements in Europe. She extended her knowledge in the medical field to the social realm and became an advocate for improved health, educational and social conditions for children. Through studying children in the slums of Rome, Montessori began to enter the field of education framed by her scientific training in observation and careful methodology. She was a physician first. She maintained a small private practice and continued course work, publishing in the field of medicine as well as education. She began teaching her methods courses, which were a work in progress during the early 1900's. Though beginning with a population of "feeble-minded" children, Montessori extended her method to the education of "normal" children. Her method at that time concentrated on three main points. First the role of the child was central to the educational process; second, the teacher was to act as a watchful observer ready to assist the child's next inquiry; third, the environment was to be prepared so as to allow the student the greatest possible freedom in which to educate himself. All these components worked together for what Montessori saw as a great educational experiment in the unfolding possibilities for the education of humanity.

As news of her experiment spread, Montessori began to receive visitors from Europe as well as the United States. Because of increasing interest in her work, Montessori scheduled a visit to the United States in 1913. This section provided a brief historical account of Dr. Montessori's life up to her 1913 visit. The next section will explore several of the lesser known nuances of the social foundations of education during this same time period. Without first describing the historical environment of Montessori's first visit, her introduction and subsequent experiences in the United States between 1913 and 1918 may seem out of context.

Chapter Two

Industrialization, Immigration and the "Need" for Efficiency: Introducing The Schools' Response

I, however, differed from my colleagues in that I felt that mental deficiency presented chiefly a pedagogical, rather than mainly a medical, problem....

The school must permit the *free*, *natural manifestations* of the *child* if in it the school scientific pedagogy is to be born....
- Maria Montessori

Into the early twentieth century, both immigration and industrialization became increasingly important issues to the school establishment, especially in cities like New York where immigrant populations were most concentrated.[75] From 1899 to 1914, there was a 60% increase in New York City school enrollment; inside the classroom it was not uncommon to find anywhere between 60-80 children.[76] The swell in population warranted a reaction from the school establishment:

> By 1900 the ethnic and religious composition of America had changed drastically. From 1891 to 1920 over 17 million immigrants and their children enrolled in the schools. They were often considered a threat to the traditional way of life; therefore, school programs were enlisted to "Americanize" the immigrant children.[77]

This swell in enrollment posed serious problems for classroom teachers' methods as well as educational administrators' issues of management and control.[78] The schools were responding not only to the need to expand language and job skill acquisition to a rapidly increasing numbers of students, but also to "elaborate its selective function because of the increasing numbers going on to some form of post-primary education."[79]

Selective conditions were affected by one's social status; "social class...exert[ed] great influence on who was selected for which job."[80] Assembly line methods became particularly important to industries, such as the rapidly expanding motor car industry, increasing the number of jobs the cities had to offer; there was however, low prestige associated with such jobs and increasingly less upward mobility for employees.[81] Organizational techniques such as "scientific management" aimed at producing the most efficient product from the most efficient methods of employee training were increasing in popularity with the schools' burgeoning bureaucracies concerned with producing loyal citizens capable of supporting the growth in industry.[82] Increasing immigration compounded an already difficult time for the schools.

Minutes from the NEA superintendents' meetings for the year 1913 identify four major goals for education namely: physical - "preparing the body for usefulness;" vocational -"preparing for useful and effective support ...related to self-support;" civic/moral - "train[ing] for effective participation in group life;" cultural - "fit[ing] the individual with effective participation in...activities...of civilized life." [83] Present at similar meetings in 1915 were businessmen who

supported collaboration of superintendents with business and aimed to more narrowly define the goals for schools at that time; one such man commented:

> The business world and the schools need to get together... for the promotion of mutual interests. It is proper to say that the schools are like factories turning out graduates, which, in turn, become employees...and may be considered the raw material of business....There are certain business ethics which may be reflected throughout school life, ...turning work in on time, making delivery to the customer at the time promised, keeping the product up to a standard degree of excellence, always endeavoring to increase sales....All businessmen should realize that they should first co-operate with the eugenists in an effort to provide the schools with sufficient grey matter to make it possible to develop the proper amount of intelligence.[84]

As stated in the passage above, outside agendas manifesting themselves in the public schools were neither value-free nor random. As described in subsequent sections, this period of time marks the rapid instigation of many issues the schools in the United States had not previously dealt with on such a large scale.

The NEA bulletins from this time period offer an overview of the topics of most concerns to administrators at this time. For instance, in the same NEA bulletin there are critiques of innovative school programs (e.g. Gary, Indiana) as not including enough "vocational training," as well as articles advocating open air classrooms in order to include anemics. Another article endorses corporal punishments for delinquents while maintaining an empathetic tone that delinquents should be better served through the schools.[85] In four years of NEA proceedings (1913-1916) there was no significant discussion questioning definitions of efficiency, business interest or liberatory democratic goals for the schools. What follows is a summary of issues found over and over in educational conversations of this time period. Highlighting key issues from this "mainstream" conversation is needed to accentuate Maria Montessori's additions to, and attempts to become a part of, this conversation.

Highlighting the Educational Conversation in the United States 1913-1918: Assimilation and Scientific Efficiency

Revolution in technology, increasing concentration of people in the cities, and the restructuring of economic and political institutions resulted in the formation of large bureaucratic agencies in business and school arenas. In light of the need for specialized training in the cities the rural "jack of all trades" was becoming obsolete. As seen in the passage from the previous section, "efficiency" was in the forefront of the minds of those governing the school establishment. The movement from folkways to "science as a pervasive source of authority" permeated the schools as well as in the community where "lay community control gave way to the corporate-bureaucratic model under the auspices of 'taking the schools out of politics.'"[86] Schooling became increasingly important "as the gateway to favored positions."[87]During the early part of the twentieth century, schools "bridged the gap between family and the organizational world beyond to create an "urban discipline"."[88]

This movement of urban discipline was not random or value free. Often reflecting many agendas at once the goals were similar: first, assimilation for the "foreign element" into loyal citizenry and, secondly, the production of the efficient, obedient workers.[89] Reformers such as Harvard's president Charles Eliot expressed open support for a system of education that would reproduce what he identified as the four classes of people he saw as needed to support a democratic society. He viewed schools as the institution that would preserve and protect this structure. Consider the following quote from his 1908 address to the Harvard Teacher's Association:

> There are four layers in civilized society which are indispensable, and so far as we can see, eternal : a thin upper one which consists of the managing, leading, guiding class- the intellectual discoverers, the inventors, the organizers, and the managers and their chief assistants: next, the skilled workers, whose numbers are growing with the application of technology to production; third the commercial class, the layer which is employed in buying, selling and distributing and finally the thick fundamental layer engaged in household work, agriculture, mining, quarrying and forest work.[90]

According to Eliot and his followers, the best classrooms of the democracy were ones where "graded classes and strict examinations [would bring] healthy uniformity, hard work, and moral indoctrination."[91]

With like-minded sentiment, influential public school administrator and Stanford professor, Ellwood P. Cubberley details the permanence of the position to which a student entered the school by saying:

> "No longer can a man save up a thousand dollars and start a business for himself worth a chance of much success. The employee tends to remain an employee; the wage earner tends to remain a wage earner."

Reflecting the need for more laborers to support factory work he continues that:

> "success is higher up the ladder now than it was a generation ago, while the crowd at the bottom increases every year."[92]

The schools were rapidly having to adjust to the increased need for differentiated labor during a time of increased immigrant population and increasing nationalism reflecting escalating tensions in Europe.

Consolidating Power: The Agenda of Boosting "Americanism"

In addition to protecting the social status of the major shareholders of the school system (i.e. the business and cultural elite), some reformers concentrated their efforts on the fear of the immigrant "foreign" presence in the United States. Advocates of compulsory attendance laws and an "Americanization" agenda of the curriculum often argued that:

> [some] families like those of the poor or foreign born were failing to carry out their traditional functions of moral and vocational training. Immigrant children in crowded cities, reformers complained, were leading disorderly lives, schooled by the street and their peers more than by Christian nurture in the home. Much of the drive for compulsory attendance reflected an animus against parents considered incompetent to train their children. Often combining fear of social unrest with humanitarian zeal, reformers used the power of the state to intervene in families and to create alternative institutions of socialization.[93]

The need to produce loyal, obedient citizens fueled some "progressive administrators" of the time who saw a homogeneous citizenry as a more productive and efficient work force adding to the stability and growth of the nation's economy.[94] If the home was not going to socialize efficiently, then the school would have to. Still other reformers of the early twentieth century had stronger economic reasons for wanting a more scientifically sound and efficient curriculum. Through the early twentieth century, leaders justified the consolidation of rural schools and the centralization of city schools in an effort to impose "ideological and organizational consensus in search for order in heterogeneous populations."[95] Professors of educational administration were instrumental as they:

> gave the stamp of university approval to elitist assumptions about who constituted good school board members and to the corporate model of school organization. They tried to develop "scientific" ways of measuring inputs and outputs in school systems as a tool of management, and to elaborate ways in which the school might rationalize its structure and curriculum to fit new industrial and social conditions.[96]

Collectively, the efforts of "elite business and professional men, university presidents and professors and some 'progressive' superintendents joined forces to centralize the control of the schools"; subsequently, small boards of "successful people," delegated experts to support "urban progressivism."[97] This movement "glorified expertise, efficiency, and the disinterested public service of elites."[98] Schools, foundational to democratic participation and upward mobility, were becoming increasing influenced by those in power, thus skewing and limiting both equality of education and opportunity for those not in a position of power or cultural privilege.

In 1893, for instance, there were 603 central school board members (an average of 21.5 per city); by 1913 there were 264 members (an average of 10.2); by 1923 the median was seven. The school called on "administrative progressives" to conduct surveys or advise as experts. Among the most sought after administrative counsel in 1913 were: David Snedden (Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts), Ellwood P. Cubberley (Stanford), George Strayer (Teachers College), and Edward Thorndike (Teachers College).[99] [100] Wage earners and women were "grossly under-represented" on these boards; in 1916 for instance, more than three-fifths of

members of city committees were male merchants, manufacturers, bankers, brokers, real estate men, and doctors and lawyers.[101] By 1918 all states had enacted compulsory attendance laws; however there were many exceptions related to work permits and local options granted to children whose parents wished them not to attend.[102] The school had also responded to the interests of the business professionals in 1918 who supported *The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* issued by the Commission for the Reorganization of Secondary Education because it stressed preparation for life (e.g. industrial and domestic skills) as the most important curricular goal. This 1918 school reform de-emphasized strong academic courses which had been the focus of the 1893 Committee of Ten Report.[103] As seen in following sections, the intersection of ethnicity, gender, creed, economic standing and one's ability to assimilate and to have equal educational opportunity through the schools had particularly complex and difficult implications for the newly arrived immigrants from Southern Europe. The sorting mechanisms developing in the schools additionally fueled these difficulties.

The Junior High Schools Play a Role

In 1910 with the formation of the junior high schools and the wide adaptation of the Stanford-Binet ability tests, curricular differentiation could be socially as well as scientifically imposed on children before high school.[104] By the time the pupil entered high school, he/she was efficiently placed into his/her proper curriculum, thus maximizing the efficiency of the high school to educate both the college track pupil as well as the masses who would be supporting the labor force with the skill of their labor:[105]

> [the junior high schools] have also been able to anticipate and therefore facilitate the differentiation process which occurs more fully in the high school. . . educationists find it difficult not to direct students, even if that direction is under the guise of advice. Furthermore if 'scientific' reasons can be put forward to justify particular kinds of advice then teachers will use those reasons and that is why testing became so important in the schools....[106]

If the mechanisms of testing and tracking were fair, that is to say a response for the school establishment to fill necessary occupational role through reasonably unbiased testing regardless of race, class or creed, perhaps it would be easier to see how these methods described above fit the model of democratic government the schools were supposedly trying to uphold. Such fairness simply did not exist masked behind veils of "scientific reasoning," "expert advice," and "guidance counseling." Schools then represented governing for the few by the few, *not* governance for the people (i.e. society at large), by the people. The work of Edward L. Thorndike and Lewis M. Terman, key leaders in intelligence testing, "provided the scientific operators of public schools with the foundation they needed for their judgement."[107] For some ethnic groups, such as Italians, the demarcation of "adolescence" as a separate entity in one's development did not fit the cultural constructs of that group; this contributed to delinquency rates as well as a lack of trust toward the school establishment by some parents who were already feeling that the schools threatened their family belief structure.[108] The intersection of ethnicity and schools will be discussed in more detail in the section on Italian immigrants.

Intelligence Testing to Support Social Efficiency and Curricular Differentiation

Intelligence testing gave the educational system the "scientific" appearance of fairness because it did not overtly differentiate according to color, class, race, creed or gender. The tests were not designed for blind fairness, however. Consider the following social view put forth by Thorndike. He writes:

> By selective breeding supported by a suitable environment we can have a world in which all men will equal the top ten percent of present men. One sure service of the able and good is to beget and rear offspring. One sure service (about the only one) which the inferior and vicious can perform is to prevent their genes from survival.[109]

Terman further supported his views by writing:

> The racial stock most prolific of gifted children are those from northern and western Europe, and the Jewish. The least prolific are the *Mediterranean races,* the Mexicans and the Negroes. The fecundity of the family stocks from which our gifted children come appears to be definitely on the wane. . . . It has been figured that if the present differential birth rate continues, 1,000 Harvard graduates will at the end of 200 years have but 50 descendants, while in the same period 1,000 *South Italians* will have multiplied to 100,000. [emphasis mine][110]

Immigrants in general were easy targets, but as emphasized above, Italians were particularly singled out. Previously Eliot's four "layers of a civilized society" were explicated. Namely, the managers, the skilled workers, the commercial class and the "thick fundamental layer" engaged in manual work. Along similar thought, Terman suggests five such classes. The five levels of society were supported by scientific tests, according to Terman, and were a natural result of one's heredity and not of social environment; further, one's level of intelligence corresponded to the level of work one was able to perform with most efficiency.[111] He writes:

> . . . an I.Q. below 70 rarely permits anything better than unskilled labor. . . . from 70-80 is preeminently that of skilled labor, from 80-100 that of skilled or ordinary clerical labor, from 100-110 or 115 that of semi-professional pursuits; and above all these are the grades of intelligence which permit one to enter the professions or the larger fields of business. Intelligence tests can tell us whether a child's *native* brightness corresponds more nearly to the median of 1) the professional classes, 2) those in the semi-professional pursuits, 3) ordinary skilled workers, 4) semi-skilled workers, or 5) unskilled laborers. *This information will be of great value in planning the education of a particular child and also in planning the differentiated curriculum here recommended.*[emphasis mine][112]

The Stanford-Binet intelligence test fit Terman's model five-class system. Information needed to do well on reflected "knowledge" acquired from Noah Webster's *Blue-back Speller*, and *McGuffrey's Readers*; the child having access to these books was at an advantage to the newly-arrived immigrant child.[113] Considering that over half the children in the United States at this time were either immigrants or children of immigrants, the discrimination built into the test was significant.[114]In addition to "developing questions that were based on presumed progressive difficulty in performing tasks necessary for achievement....[he found that] the occupational classes

fit his hierarchy."[115] The "differentiated" curriculum, then, supported by Thorndike, served to reproduce the social status as well as educational status into which a student was born.[116] Both Thorndike (above) and Terman (previously) equated lower morality with lower intelligence. Terman states:

> All feebleminded are at least potential criminals. That every feebleminded woman is a potential prostitute would hardly be disputed by anyone. Moral judgements, like business judgement, social judgement or any other kind of higher thought process, is a function of intelligence.[117]

With sentiments such as those expressed by Thorndike and Terman, it is not hard to see how a Northern European, Pan-Protestant background would be an advantage over others. As seen above, efficiency in the schools was supported by the administrative progressives who were often closely linked to industry and the needs of business. As supported above, through "scientific" testing, "particular advice" in the way of guidance counseling, differentiated curriculum and the "need to Americanize" the school establishment was able to "preserve and protect" their interests and reproduce a "natural" hierarchy of "democratic" society. Society reproduces itself both culturally and biologically. When Thorndike stated that in order to preserve society, the "inferior and the vicious" should "prevent their genes from survival," he was not making an idle threat to an isolated section of the human gene pool. He was speaking of and supporting the "science" of human Eugenics.

Purging the Gene Pool: The "Science" of Eugenics

The Eugenics movement in America began with Charles Benedict Davenport under the auspices of Carnegie Institute of Washington to support a human genetics lab at Cold Spring Harbor on Long Island in 1904.[118] Edward Thorndike served on The Committee on Inheritance of Mental Traits; another committee on Deafmutism included Alexander Graham Bell; a Committee on Sterilization and a Committee on the Heredity of the Feeble Mind also existed.[119] Together these committees took a leadership role in identifying persons who carried "defective" germ-plasm and disseminating the propaganda that became necessary to pass sterilization laws. For instance:

> . . . .Between 1907 and 1928, twenty-one states practiced eugenic sterilization involving over 8,500 people. . . . The use of sterilization for punishment reached the point where laws were introduced calling for sterilization for chicken stealing and car theft, as well as prostitution.[120]

The underprivileged and/or the newly arrive immigrants with little command of English and an inability to do well on standardized test were easy targets. Appendix I shows a handout from the Second National Conference on Race Betterment supporting a race of "human thoroughbreds." Appendix II shows forms of propaganda used to support eugenic selection. Item one is part of a standardized test in which students were asked to identify "the prettier." The correct answer according to Stanford-Binet test makers were the figures most closely representing Northern European features. The second item is an excerpt from general psychology book put forth by Henry E. Garrett who was both a student and colleague of Thorndike.[121] The item shows both the "good and the bad" heredity in a family. The "good" side is depicted as a "worthy quaker," the

"bad" is "a feeble-minded tavern girl" complete with full lips, and dark hair and offspring with horns which will lead to "hundreds of the lowest types of human beings."[122] This diagram originated with Henry Herbert Goddard, who was a pupil of then popular psychologist, G. Stanley Hall. During this time Edward Ross (a leader in standardized testing) "took a strong public stand supporting sterilization laws."[123]

Teachers Kept from Knowing the Whole Story

While the upper echelon governing the educational establishment handed down tests and curricular reforms to the teachers, often the agents of the system such as the classroom teacher or the guidance counselor were unaware of the larger mechanism at play. As will be discussed later, teachers were often removed from decision making positions and were taught to serve the hierarchy.[124] In addition, teaching textbooks were often didactic in nature lacking the basis for intellectual speculation that would lead teachers to explore the social foundations of schooling.[125] Though alternatives and critiques of the administrative progressives existed, as will be explained in a later section, they were peripheral and often not consistently linked to key strategic positions of either politics and/or industry whose agendas were well organized and mightily carried out. To orchestrate such bureaucratic maneuvering in a "democratic" system of education was certainly an interesting trick:

> ...[O]ne way to ease the dilemma (or conceal the trick) is to make the system more elaborate-but in its horizontal not vertical divisions. Another is to justify any differentiation that might occur in it by reference to 'scientific' testing. A third way is to 'massage' the pupils through the system by guiding them in what appears to them as the way they ought to go.[126]

All three of these factors "concealing the trick" operated in the U.S. schools during the early twentieth century. These factors, compounded with the threat of being accused of being a "disloyal" citizen, left little room for mass, organized protest.

The Italian Immigrant in the "American" School: Assimilation at Work

In New York in 1910, the number of Italians topped the other immigrant groups and within their own group, Italians were concentrated in New York more than in any other state. Of the 1,343,125 Italians in the U.S. during 1910, 472,201 (roughly 35%) resided in New York.[127] From 1900 to 1910, their numbers increased faster than any other immigrant sub-population except Russians.[128] In 1910, 78% of Italians in the U.S., were of the peasant or *contadino* class; most from southern Italy.[129] Of these, 64.9% were farmers or farm laborers; 22.2% were women and children with no trade indicated and 0.2% reported holding a professional occupation while in Italy.[130] Because this sub-population from Southern Europe was visually darker skinned than most of the immigrants from Northern Europe, and because these Italians were most often Catholic, assimilation was harder for this group than for the Northern European Protestant groups who had come before.[131]

In addition, assimilation policies in the schools were problematic for Italian immigrants who did not come to assimilate as much as to work for a few years and return to their country with increased wealth to distribute to their family.[132] Compulsory attendance laws were not well understood by new-comers, and often students were confronted by unsympathetic classroom experiences.[133] Largely due to irregular attendance patterns, language difficulties, and cultural test biases, Italians averaged an 85 on Intelligence Quotient (IQ) tests, giving this sub-population a 63.6% retardation rate; this was the highest for any immigrant group at that time.[134]

In addition to assimilating into "American" culture, the Southern Italian, because of his more rural, peasant familiar sense of culture, values and religion, also had increasing problems fitting into the more modern Northern Italian culture of Italy's own early twentieth century.[135] Once in the United States, these difficulties were exacerbated. The dichotomy between "old world" traditions and "new world" ways are described below:

> There was undoubtedly fear of indoctrination of alien concepts, and the peasant felt rather keenly the danger to his traditions. But the most overt area of conflict arose in the economic and social patterns of family life.... The prospects of compulsory school education for their children threatened the very foundations of orderly family life....Under the southern Italian cultural patterns, all children were useful and effective members of their families from an early age....More acute was the parental reaction where it concerned school education for girls...the separation of the girl from her customary functions within the home was...economically disastrous.[136]

The Southern Italian then was having trouble assimilating into the industrializing society at home, as well as in the United States. As seen above, the child in the Southern Italian family was expected to contribute to the economic growth of the family at an early age. Further, the female children were expected to learn the lessons of domestic duty which enabled the males to work outside the home. Compulsory attendance laws were seen as taking the girl away from her duties to family and, therefore, seen as problematic to many of the newly arrived Southern Italian immigrant.[137]

Unfavorable Sentiments Expressed Toward Italians: Assimilation or Rejection

Ill sentiment toward immigrants in the schools is demonstrated through many in the educational establishment, including Ellwood Cubberley, who had a strong influence on teachers and administrators during the first part of this century. His tainted regard for the immigrants included calling them "thrifty but ignorant, and usually wretchedly poor; ...they are often lacking in initiative and self-reliance; and they lack the Anglo-teutonic conception of government by popular will."[138] Edward Ross, a leading sociologist, described them as "cheap stucco manikins" and as "beaten breeds" who were either "elbowed aside or left behind in the swaying of the mightier European races."[139] Arguing further that given these "facts" it was no wonder why these immigrants could not "take the place of the granite men who fell at Gettysburg and Cold Harbor," G. Stanley Hall, President of Clark University, regarded the immigrant children as "an army of incapables."[140] Ross further stated that "the Southern Italian has a bent for murder."[141] Jane Addams regarded the Southern European immigrant as "primitive," "illiterate," "unskilled,"

"clannish," "simple," "credulous," and "ignorant."[142] She notes that the number of arrests of immigrant children is double that of native born.[143] She saw hope for the Italian child if the classroom teacher would begin to validate the child's culture in the schoolroom and if the parents validated the teacher's attempts to educate the child to our "American" ways.[144] Teacher's criticism of Italian children in the classroom is seen in the following quote:

> . . . Italian children were usually more crude in manner, speech, and dress than non-Italian children....It was common for Italian boys and girls to leave school to help out the family income. Parents were openly opposed to the long educational period of the elementary school.... Boys and girls were truants.... These children, especially the boys, were a source of constant irritation to teachers.... These children were disliked both by teachers and non-Italian pupils.... They created difficulties for the school.[145]

A lack of understanding of this population's family structure and work ethic permeated the "difficulties" encountered by this group. By and large, Italian children were taught at home and worked for the good of the family in order to return to Italy with increased wealth and status.[146] Little communication existed between the educational establishment and the Italian communities. The climate of the schools at that time "demand[ed] total assimilation, for Anglo-conformity, many educators went further: nothing less would satisfy them from assaulting all forms of cultural difference, than creating a sense of shame at being, 'foreign.'"[147]

This systemic mechanism of "shaming" foreigners into assimilation was both efficient and stealthy as documented by the work of journalist Adele Marie Shaw who "witnessed an outward homogenation of newcomers" in her report on her visits to twenty-five New York City schools. In a classroom near the Brooklyn Bridge built for twenty pupils she saw sixty-five children of many nationalities. Children of recent immigrants "eagerly imitated the other children." She writes:

> "I saw the small class a few days later," she [Shaw] said, "and the two were already melted into the rank and file and were losing their distinctly foreign look." Like the other children, they soon "begin to be ashamed of their [ethnic name], and will revise its spelling in deference to their friends' linguistic limitations.... Down in Marion street a dark-eyed son of Naples who came last spring as Guiseppi Vagnotti appeared in September as Mike Jones." The photographer accompanying her was startled to find that the ethnic "types" had vanished in "the extraordinary homogeneousness of the upper-grade children."[148]

The systemic annihilation of both individual expression and ethnic identity in the schools is documented by others as well, and it is beyond the scope of this project to delve into all of their findings.[149] Shaw like others observed the school establishment's systemic response of dealing with expansion in the schools both in number and ethnicity. Southern Europeans were often viewed as a threat. As we will see in the next section, the educational consequences experienced by Italians and other immigrant groups during the early twentieth century were a direct result of anti-pluralistic policy set forth by members of the dominant culture.

Collectively, these policies were aimed at attempting to assimilate the immigrant children into "good, efficient and hard-working" citizens as narrowly defined by those governing the assimilation mechanisms operating on the schools of the early twentieth century.[150] Where the children did not fit the standard, the standards were lowered or the "problems" were eliminated;

special classes with minimal opportunity for student advancement were set up to increase classroom efficiency and management procedures.[151]

In addition to policy set forth, the media fed a sensationalized, generalized fear of the Southern Italians through articles found in leading magazines like *McClure's*. One article states:

> Many of their [Northern Italians] national traits are singularly like our own, for they are honest, thrifty, industrious, law-abiding, and good natured. The Italians from the extreme south of the peninsula have fewer of these qualities, and are apt to be ignorant, lazy, destitute, and superstitious. A considerable percentage, especially of those from the cities, are criminal....They are stubborn and distrustful. They are the same as they were a thousand or more years gone by.[152]

The article continues to generalize the Southern Italians citing a few examples of just how "treacherous" the "Sicilian Mafiuso" can be. No doubt there was criminal activity during the time of this article, but the article treats all southern Italian immigrants as an organized entity. Noting this generalization of Italians during this time period, one author mentions that police kept records of those with darker skin and features that were believed to be Italian; he calls much of the newspaper accounts of Italians "alarmist."[153] The reporter writes:

> During twenty-nine years of residence in New York, I have found two causes that operate for the blackening of the Italian name in respect of crime: the sensationalism of the yellow press and the ignorance and recklessness of the police recording arrests. Almost every dark-skinned European, not speaking English, who does not wear the Turkish fez, is put down on police records as an Italian, and thus the Italian is condemned for much of the crime committed here by persons of other nationalities.[154]

Both in policy and public opinion the Southern Italian was mentioned in negative context. Little evidence was found in this study to document an honest and/or consistent effort by the school establishment to understand the needs and concerns of the Italian immigrants in New York City during this time period. Ethnic origin continued to be problematic for newly arrived Southern Italians.

Teachers, Parents and Students: Affects of "Scientific" Management of the Schools

Teachers were particularly vulnerable during the early twentieth century. Teachers were cultured to be subordinate and pass on the subordination to their charges: "Teachers will teach chiefly as they have been taught, and will manage pupils as they themselves were managed during the course of their education."[155] Though teaching was one of the few employment opportunities openly embracing women; it was not without limitations. As one writer at the turn of the century put it: "women [were] often preferred by superintendents because they are more willing to comply with established regulations and less likely to ride headstrong hobbies."[156] Women worked for nearly less than half of what men were being paid for the same job. In addition:

> Social customs required women to adopt certain roles-to be docile, perceptive of feelings rather than strong of intellect, content with subordination rather than ambitious, timid rather than adventurous-that fit them well to obey superiors in the one best system.[157]

Some districts went so far as to set forth policy barring women from joining associations that would lead to the principalship:

> Philadelphia schools created a "School of Pedagogy" limited to men and adopted a rule that only men would be hired in the top two grades of the boys' grammar school. The Commissioner endorsed a strong stand for the restoration of the element of masculinity.[158]

In a bureaucratic system where men ruled women and women ruled children, upward mobility was already difficult for the common woman. But in an increasingly bureaucratic system where "scientific" measurements of efficiency and performance were also tools in the hands of the "progressive" administrator of "expert" status and public notoriety, it was even more difficult for a teacher to take a stand against injustices imposed on her or her students.

In addition to all these conditions, the early twentieth century was a time where it was "dangerous to be a teacher whose conformity and patriotism were in doubt."[159] Reflecting the era of the "Red Scare," in 1917 Cleveland Superintendent Spaulding made recommendations to fire teachers "'whose sympathies are proved to be with our country's enemies;'" [further], a teacher did not have to express disloyalty in words, 'since teachers influenced pupils merely by the convictions and fundamental desires of the ...heart.'"[160]If it was exceedingly difficult for teachers linked to the school establishment to speak up, imagine the difficulty of immigrant children and parents to exist in such a system. Some Italian parents resented the school's right to interfere in the education of their own children; in other cases parents were ridiculed or felt that the school was taking their children away from them.[161] Perceptions of school and home's overlapping cultures continued to be a complex issue working itself out in many different complex ways. If parents supported assimilation there were programs to help aid assimilation; if parents resented the "progress" coming along with assimilation, then communication between home and school remained difficult.[162]

Immigrants, Teachers, Schools and the Courts: The Attempt to Strike a Balance

Issues of immigrants' beliefs, teachers methods and political agendas also intersected in the courts during the early twentieth century. Two cases demonstrating the types of conflict evident are the Meyer case in Nebraska and the Pierce case in Oregon. In each, the court was called in to settle a clash between what had become the differing agendas of the traditional Pan-Protestant "American" values and the "foreign" immigrant. As seen below the courts favored individual rights over the states' blanket rights to mandate the agenda of the schools:

> Nebraska had mandated that English be the language of instruction for all subjects. When a teacher (Meyer) taught German to a fifth grade boy, court action was taken. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled the teacher's action constitutional, thus reversing the state mandate.
>
> In Oregon the state legislature passed a law requiring children between eight and sixteen to attend only public schools. This was struck down in Pierce as a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment rights of the private school plaintiffs.[163]

Differences in language and religious practices were issues that the United States had not previously dealt with on such a large scale. The schools were responding in the light of intensified curricula to boost Americanization. As in the cases above, the courts were called in to strike a

balance between hard-core traditionalists and new-comers trying to preserve their culture and exist in a democracy not always willing to embrace cultural difference.

A Complex Response to a Complex Problem

In summary, the increasing urbanization and industrialization of the United States in part created a situation that was new to this country's educational system. The increasing acceptance of science as legitimated truth also compounded the differentiation processes taking place in the early twentieth century schools. Though this study concentrates on the United States, other nations such as Britain, France, Germany, and Russia were also attempting to address the burden industrialization and urbanization puts on a country's school system.[164]

As seen earlier in this section, compulsory attendance laws and the increasing consolidation of schools added to the power elite bureaucrats had over the school systems. School boards became smaller and salaries increased disproportionably for the men running the bureaucracies and the women serving it. As we have seen some boards went so far as to create policy barring female participation in organizations that would result in career advancement toward principalship. Through mandating who could serve on school boards and how teachers and students were to be judged, elite interests in the schools were preserved and protected while the common man's and woman's interest were grossly misrepresented. Immigration and poverty status exacerbated the unfair differentiation one received in the schools. During the increasingly nationalistic period of the early twentieth century, "foreign" status was particularly scrutinized as was teacher loyalty to indoctrinating proper citizens. Tensions between the Anglo-Pan-Protestant citizen and the immigrant citizen sometimes made it into the court room as in two earlier examples. In such cases the courts attempted to strike a balance between the differing groups, taking each case individually.

Further, while there were peripheral criticisms and alternatives put forth by some progressive educators and liberal reformers, the administrative progressives were operating the sorting machine. They were linked to the monetary capital necessary to support the growth of their agendas and were for the most part linked to positions of power either at the University, in the community, at a place of business or all three, enabling them access to create policy and actions to support their agendas. This is reminiscent of the university power structure today as even in the case of this project there are administrative rules governing how this work is to be disseminated. In the interest of graduation students may be coerced into following policy they are against choose to fight. But in Montessori's day, Cubberley argued it was the duty of the school to correct the immigrants' "backwards" ways; Eliot, and those of like mind, took the opinion that the social reproduction of the four classes were necessary to maintain order in a capitalist democracy. With the perpetuation of scientific efficiency, expert management, and the issue of National loyalty, the administrative "progressives'" governing bodies held the political arsenal to disperse or destroy most opposition.[165]

As discussed earlier, being female, foreign, working class, non-Protestant, or not of a "traditional" family would alone be enough to pose serious problems of access and credibility with the educational establishment during this time; however, Montessori was all of these things.

Viewing Montessori's introduction and subsequent interactions in light of the idiosyncracies found in this particular time period adds deeper context to her experiences in the United States.

Chapter Three

Montessori's First Visit to the United States - 1913: Events and Interactions Surrounding the 1913 Visit

I have seen here, men of affairs, great politicians preoccupied with the problems of trade and of state, cast off like an uncomfortable garment the burden of the world, and fall into the simple forgetfulness of self.
- Maria Montessori

Montessori's 1913 visit was orchestrated by Samuel S. McClure and the prominent Washingtonians Alexander Graham and Mabel Bell. As early as 1911, McClure had featured her schools in his magazine, *McClure's*.[166] In a thirteen page article written by Josephine Tozier in 1912, Montessori's schools in Italy are described in great detail including 12 pictures of the Montessori classroom, students, materials and one with Montessori as well. The article accents Montessori's methods of teaching self reliance to children and further explains the materials Montessori developed for sense training in great detail. Careful attention is given to the connections between the steps of Montessori's methods. Because Montessori's book had just became available in English at the time of this article, Tozier's work gives the interested a taste of Montessori's book that become a best seller in 1913. Her tone throughout the article is genuine but not overly zealous and she uses many quotes from Montessori throughout her piece. The article mentions that the didactic material was going to be available for sale that same January and that there would be a training course led by Anne George sometime over the winter in both New York City and Brooklyn. [167]

In a ten page article the following June entitled, "The First Montessori School in America," Anne George describes her interest in the Montessori school stemming from her experience as a primary teacher. She went to Italy to witness Montessori's work as described to her previously through an Italian friend's letter. After taking Montessori's eight month training course, she began the first Montessori school in the United States in Tarrytown, New York. The article describes her process of setting up and maintaining her Montessori classroom. She explains Montessori's methods throughout the article. The article is complete with pictures and explanations of the use of the materials. It is complimentary of Montessori's work and documents the success of George's classroom.[168]

In a similarly complimenting article published in 1913, Ellen Yale Stevens updates the reader about the progress of the movement in the United States and invites correspondence from readers. In addition, Stevens has included the names and abbreviated addresses of adults from the United States who were currently registered for the up-coming Montessori training course. She mentions that Miss Bagnell had assumed the position previously held by Miss George at the Tarrytown school.[169] The article does not mention that Anne George was working behind the scenes under McClure's influence in order to help secure Montessori's then upcoming December visit.

In August of 1913, an editorial written by Dorothy Canfield Fisher in another popular magazine (*The Outlook*) addresses what Fisher believes to be a reader's misunderstanding of Montessori's definition of imagination. Fisher explains that while Montessori does speak out against nonsensical, "silly" stories told to children in the form of nursery jingles that really do not make any sense; she does at the same time promote the use of crayons, blocks, colored pencils, and outside the use of sticks, stones and sand to use as the child sees fit so long as he does not interfere with other children's work or playing. In this way, the article supports Montessori's notion of purposeful imagination.[170]

Arriving on December 3, 1913, Montessori's visit was primarily a series of lectures focused around her educational ideas and methods recently published and translated into English in *The Montessori Method*. During the 1913 visit she spoke before educators, parents, educational enthusiasts and journalists. She spoke at the Masonic Temple in Washington D.C. and at Carnegie Hall twice; once she was introduced by John Dewey. During this visit she also spoke to educators in Philadelphia where she met Helen Keller. Even though this was Dr. Montessori's first visit to the United States, her work preceded her. Some, like Jane Addams, had seen Montessori's work in Europe and came to hear of recent advancements in her ideas. Writers, like Dorothy Canfield Fisher, and educators, like William Heard Kilpatrick, had added to the public opinion of her through their written reactions to her ideas. Others like Anne George, who was the first and only trained Montessori teacher in the United States, had been working on Montessori's behalf for several years. Montessori attracted interested people from diverse backgrounds and for diverse reasons.

Following the *McClure* magazine coverage of the Montessori system, the Bells' interest in Montessori's work increased.[171] Mr. Alexander and Mrs. Mabel Bell had a Montessori school set up for a small group of children including their own grandchildren at their summer home in Nova Scotia in 1912.[172] Interest expanded, and they opened a Montessori school in Washington D.C. with cooperation from Harvard's Division of Education.[173] The school was overseen by Anne George (Montessori enthusiast and translator), who was the only American teacher taught by Montessori and able, according to Montessori, to teach under the Montessori name at that time.[174]

The Graham Bells had been significant supporters of Montessori and had helped to organize and pay for an international training course held in Rome in mid-January 1913; Montessori taught this course herself in cooperation with the Montessori American Committee, which included the Bells.[175] Montessori had approved the Montessori American committee to help promote her ideas. In the spring of 1913, the Bells formed their own Montessori school and the Montessori Educational Association with Mrs. Bell as President; U.S. writer and significant supporter, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, served on the board as did Margaret Wilson, the president's daughter.[176]

In a collection of her letters, Mabel only mentions Montessori briefly. Her letters show deep concern for her grandchildren, especially in the area of education. In addition, her letters reveal a glimpse of the gender construct and the attitude toward male children that seemed a normal part of parenting and grandparenting in the Bell household. During the times of these

letters, she was very involved in the Montessori movement. She writes her son-in-law, Bert, in 1914:

> I am almost jealous of the attention Mr. Bell is giving Melville [a grandson who was living with the Bells at the time]. He did not devote himself so regularly to his own daughters but he says there is a difference- Melville is a boy. I wonder what would have happened if his own boys had lived....I wonder if you realize how deeply I am interested in my grandchildren, particularly my grandsons. All the plans, the hopes and ambitions that have laid buried in the graves of my own little sons sprang to life with the coming of each of my three grandsons.[177]

To her daughter-in-law (around the same time) she writes:

> I wouldn't interfere with Gertrude's [granddaughter] schooling if I were you. After all everybody has to fight the battles of life and I don't believe it is true kindness to try to make things too easy for one's children for it unfits them for competition with their fellows. It isn't simply fighting for one's daily bread. It is fighting for everything that makes life worth living. Instead of trying to ease Gertrude's school work, I'd try to help her in another way; don't let her do less work than her school fellows. I don't believe the spirit evolved by such indulgence would be good for her.[178]

To a friend of the family she writes:

> I want my grandchildren to be workers and if the Montessori system does not make them efficient men and women, looking on work as the noblest thing of all, I shall be disappointed. [179]

Mrs. Bell's letters reveal her expectations of schooling for her grandchildren, especially her grandsons. Hard work, "efficiency," and "competition" were looked on as important educational goals in the larger society preceding World War I and are also underscored by Mrs. Bell.

The Bells looked to and invested in the Montessori system substantially both with their time and money. Mabel Bell spoke for funding, organized and located a larger room for the school in Washington, D.C. The Montessori Education Society was formed complete with a news bulletin to publicize the group. Courses were given without Montessori's consent or consultation on content. This was the case with Myron T. Scudder (President of Scudder School for Girls) who had invited McClure, as well as faculty from Teachers College and New York University to a lecture he was going to give explicating the Montessori method.[180] This troubled Montessori because she was not convinced that the information given to the public would be accurate and, "...the fact that the method has not yet attained to its full development,... it would be premature to establish training schools which were not under my direct supervision...."[181] At the same time Montessori scheduled a visit to the United States to review the situation of the movement, Mabel Bell and her husband planned a large reception; 400 people attended to celebrate Montessori's visit.[182] She gave lectures in Washington, D.C., New York, Pittsburgh and Chicago.[183]

The movement spread in the United States throughout 1914, following Montessori's return to Europe. McClure, who had published news of her ideas since the beginning of American interest, began promoting her and showing her movies without her consent and without paying

her for their use. Montessori, who was dependent on patrons of her training and her ideas for her living expenses, felt betrayed and increasingly skeptical of the American interest in her program.[184]

Another important figure in the United States educational scene who was in attendance during the 1913 Montessori visit was Jane Addams, who had visited Montessori's Children's House in Italy between 1910-1914.[185] While in England, she was struck by the number of people living in poverty. The education of the under-privileged motivated both Montessori and Addams. Addams' biographer details Jane's reaction to the poverty which motivated her early work. Meigs states:

> The sight was something that Jane never forgot - the dark, the flaring lights, the hands - the hands upstretched everywhere in ravenous hunger for the little food which these people could afford. Here were the real poor, of whom she had so often thought and spoken, without ever fully knowing what real poverty was.[186]
>
> While in Europe, Addams visited Samuel Barnett at Toynbee Hall, the first social settlement.[187]

After this trip she began to unfold her plans which became Hull House, opened in 1889; within the first few years fifty-thousand visitors passed through.[188] Addams ideas were endorsed early on by John Dewey, who respected her work and friendship so sincerely that he named his daughter, Jane Mary Dewey, after her.[189] Committed to the plight of the poor, to better social justice, and to better access to education, Jane Addams' views overlapped many of Montessori's own concerns, however there was no significant collaboration between the two even though their concern for the poor, particularly children, remained central to their work. Interestingly, Addam's book, *Twenty Years at Hull House*, (published in 1910) was a best seller until 1912 *The Montessori Method*, topped the market.[190] In 1913 Addams met Montessori again and introduced her at one of the 1913 lectures.[191]

The quotes from both Mrs. Bell and Jane Addams reveal a glimpse of the motives behind each woman's dedication to social causes like Montessori's. Many of Montessori's biggest enthusiasts were women who were prominent, but not necessarily powerfully linked to the educational establishment. As we will see, many who did affiliate themselves with her for various periods of time, usually went on to involve themselves in their own projects. Though Montessori was not able to establish lasting leaders for her movement in the United States, she did draw the attention of a great diversity of people, including another prominent figure, Helen Keller.

During the lecture tour of 1913, Montessori met briefly with Helen Keller, who like Addams and Montessori was concerned for the rights of the poor and was looking for a systemic change to remove the suffering she "saw" around her. During a private meeting between Keller's and Montessori's in a Philadelphia hotel suite in 1913, Anne George translated Italian into English so that Anne Sullivan could translate the English into American Sign Language for Helen Keller's response.[192] This series of necessary but awkward translations made communication difficult. After a brief "conversation" in which they are said to have spoken of the promises of socialism for a better world, they embraced, and Montessori went on to New York.[193] In *Midstream:My Later Life,* Keller recalls meeting Montessori twice: once in 1913, the second during the Pan American Exposition in 1915.[194]

In Keller's *Her Socialist Years,* she writes that her "darkness had been filled with the light of intelligence and, behold, the outer daylit world was stumbling and groping in social blindness."[195] Her community and participation in that community occurred not through the actual world, but rather through a vision for the future. Expanding on this vision she writes:

> When I think of all the wonders that the hand of man has wrought, I am lifted up....Nothing on earth is so thrilling, so terrifying, as the power of our hands to keep us or mar us....With our hands we raise each other to the heights of knowledge and achievement, and with the same hands we plunge each other into the pit....The limbs of the world must first be restored....The hand of the world will then have achieved what it now obscurely symbolizes-the uplifting and regeneration of the race, all that is highest, all that is creative in man.[196]

At this point in Keller's life, much of her activity was dedicated to social causes aimed at easing the burden of the working class. This vision for progress through future generations was mirrored in Montessori's writing during that time period as well. Montessori writes:

> All forms of slavery tend little by little to weaken and disappear, even the sexual slavery of women. The history of civilization is a history of conquest and of liberation....Even as life in the social environment triumphs against every cause of poverty and death, and proceeds to new conquests, so the instinct of liberty conquers all obstacles, going from victory to victory. It is this personal and yet universal force of life, a force often latent within the soul, that sends the world forward.[197]

Montessori's vision and commitment for a more humane world was echoed in Keller's work as well as those like Addams. Many came to listen to Montessori, but unfortunately no one would emerge as a strong and consistent leader for her work in the United States during this visit.[198]

Montessori's work also attracted the attention of popular writers of the time period, such as Dorothy Canfield Fisher and Florence Elizabeth Ward, who were committed to reporting Montessori's story accurately.[199] Though not written by an esteemed "scholar" like Kilpatrick, Fisher and Ward's work was well-researched and thoroughly delivered.[200] Some interests in her work during this time had entrepreneurial undertones, others did not. The writing of Dorothy Canfield Fisher was a zealous undertaking to bring Montessori's ideas to U.S. mothers. Her style was easy to read and well liked. Mainly due to Montessori's desire for autonomy when it came to spreading her own ideas, there was, however, poor communication between Montessori and Fisher. Their lack of potentially strong collaboration is unfortunate, particularly considering that Montessori could have used an empathetic translator like Fisher to explain her methods and ideas more fully to the United States audience. As documented below, Fisher had been one of Montessori's earliest enthusiasts in the U.S. and continued to spread her interpretation of the relevance of Montessori's ideas for education in the United States.

During her winters in Rome, Dorothy Canfield Fisher began to document Montessori's first interactions with the children of the San Lorenzo tenement.[201] In the fall of 1912, she wrote *A Montessori Mother;* it was easily and widely read.[202] Her intent was to make Montessori's ideas readily available as a household book. Mrs. Fisher then published *The Montessori Manual for Teachers and Mothers*, explaining the materials and their uses.[203] Montessori rejected the book

because she felt that the ideas of her method were over-simplified, and there was also the issue of royalties she felt due to her.[204] In 1914, *Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook* appeared in print; the same year *The London Times* published a letter she wrote about how the apparatus [material] should be used.[205] This nonetheless, did not stop Mrs. Fisher from being influenced by Montessori or from continuing to write about her work directly or indirectly. Fisher viewed education as the means by which American citizens could best develop their individual potentials.[206] This underlying educational goal partially explains her interest in Montessori's system. Fisher also wrote *A Montessori Mother* (1912), and *Mothers and Children* (1914); Montessori ideas are also woven into Fisher's novel *The Bent Twig* (1915) and her well known children's book *Understood Betsy* (1917).[207] The work (*Understood Betsy)* is "the story of a pampered city girl who learns the value of hard work and responsibility when she moves to a Vermont farm."[208] Also underlying this work is Fisher's belief that "both boys and girls should be raised independent and self-reliant."[209] She later expanded these ideas of self-reliance in her 1927 work *Why Stop Learning* which promoted adult education after helping to "establish the Adult Education Association."[210]

In a collection of selected letters, Fisher writes to Sarah Cleghorn that the "American" public opinion has a tendency to react to new "stimuli" as a passing "craze." The ephemeral "fervor" with which "Americans" pick up on the latest fad and then drop it was seen according to Fisher with interest in "...ping-pong and the Montessori system."[211]

At one point in her career, Fisher was covering the Montessori story so intently that she was considering taking an agent to help her balance her writing assignments and keep up with her growing family. In another earlier letter (1912) Fisher responds to Mr. Paul Reynolds' suggestion that he be her agent. She states that the conversation about her taking an agent should remain open. She writes:

> ... my correspondence is increasing enormously, I have a great many French and Italian letters to write, in addition to my usual mails because of my connection with the Montessori movement.[212]

Her dedication to spreading news of Montessori's ideas was important enough to balance with raising children and something valuable enough to get an agent. She writes:

> My little daughter is growing larger and needs more time and attention; and life in general, as it always does as one gets older, is getting more and more complicated.... If a literary agent would be a simplifying factor, and I could afford to employ him.... If you can convince me, go ahead![213]

In *A Montessori Mother* (1916), Fisher states that the book is meant to be read by parents and that her book is meant as a simple way to understand Montessori's ideas. She writes that the book:

> is not written by a biologist for other biologists, by a philosopher for an audience of college professors, or by a professional pedagogue to enlighten school-superintendents. An ordinary American parent, desiring above all else the best possible chance for her children, addresses this message to the innumerable legion of her companions in that desire.[214]

Her passion in telling about the Montessori system was that she viewed it as an alternative to the increased bureaucratization she saw in the American schools. She writes of the government regulated school system in 1916:

> All really good teachers have always been, as much as they were allowed to be, some variety of what is called in this book "Montessori teacher." But as the State and private systems of education have swollen to more and more unmanageable proportions, and have settled into more and more exact and cog-like relations with each other, teachers have found themselves required to "turn out a more uniform product," a process which is in its very essence utterly abhorrent to anyone with the soul of an educator.[215]

To Fisher, Montessori's approach offered another vision, a fresh perspective, a more palatable way of educating children and preparing future citizens.

In 1916, four years after Montessori had rejected Fisher's *Montessori Manual*, Fisher was still expanding on Montessori's concepts for an American audience. Evidence of this can be seen in Fisher's book, *Self-Reliance*, published in 1916. She writes:

> every mother nowadays makes an effort to be patient when the fingers try clumsily to insert buttons in button-holes, and to tie strings; every magazine-reading mother knows how she shouldn't hurry these processes... further more, little wash stands and bowls in nursery school, low hooks for children's clothes, the little chairs and tables; for all this, let it not be forgotten, we have to thank the great Italian educator Dr. Montessori.[216]

Overall, Fisher complements Montessori's work in her writing making it more accessible to the "American" situation. Although Fisher was careful to consistently cite Montessori, Montessori was concerned that her methods had not been worked out enough for others to be interpreting and writing about them.[217]

Montessori would have been lucky if other writers who chose her work as their subject were as praiseworthy and careful as Fisher. They were not. From 1911 through 1913, *The New York Times* articles detailing Montessori's work contain headlines such as: 'Alienist Says They Make Their Children Egomaniacs.'[218] This is a little more eye catching title than others that appeared from time to time like: 'Training of Children.'[219] The tone of criticism from mainstream academics and writers in upscale magazines such as *McClure* and *Outlook* was of a more serious nature than some of the other articles appearing simultaneously which reported her work as a fad. Though this study focuses on the United States, it is important to note that Montessori's work did receive more thorough acceptance elsewhere at this time. In Great Britain for instance, the Montessori System had a revolutionizing impact on the education of young children primarily because in Great Britain many of her early enthusiasts were officials who directly ran the school system.[220] She did not have such connections in the United States.

In the introduction to the American edition of Montessori's book, Harvard's Henry Holmes seems to have been more concerned with Montessori's gender than her contribution to education. He writes that her work is:

> remarkable, if for no other reason, because it represents the constructive effort of a woman. We have no other example of an educational system - original at least in its systematic wholeness and in its practical application - worked out and inaugurated by the

> feminine mind and hand....[I]t springs from a combination of womanly sympathy and intuition, broad social outlook, scientific training, intensive and long-continued study of educational problems, and, to crown all, varied and unusual experience as a teacher and educational leader.[221]

After superficially describing some of the features of her work, he concludes that "none of these things, to be sure, is absolutely new in the educational world. All have been proposed in theory; some have been put more or less completely into practice." He is vague and terse, without much detail to substantiate his critique.[222]

What is interesting about Holmes' comments is that he chose to frame her work as something other than the mainstream. It was her critics that constructed her work as something from the "feminine mind." In her writing it is rare to find Montessori calling attention to her own gender. The critics in the educational establishment in the United States were in the position of power to interpret her, and to some degree dismiss her work in this way. In concentrating on her gender, critics like Holmes viewed her work as outside the mainstream thus limiting her access and influence. Without reviewing the history of feminist scholarship, Montessori's experience was not uncommon; as supported in the previous chapter, gender stereotypes were serious power tools during the time in which Montessori was introducing her work.

Dr. Holmes addressed her contributions as he further stated, "No other woman who has dealt with Dr. Montessori's problem - that is the education of young children - has brought to it personal resources so richly diverse as hers."[223] Few scholars in general could have had the unique, "richly diverse" experiences that Dr. Montessori had *because* she had to overcome and rise *above* certain male stereotypes of female intelligence in order to prove herself. Often critics did not take the time to question the subtleties lost to translation, the fine tuning of her methods in action at many Children Houses, and the larger adaptations of her methods globally. The United States was far away from the buzzing engagement the Montessori Method was receiving in Europe. It is striking that gender should be a point of such concern to her critics when she herself rarely made mention of it.

William Kilpatrick's *The Montessori System Examined* demonstrates a further example U.S. critique toward Montessori's work. In 1914 he wrote:

> Her doctrine of education as unfolding is neither novel nor correct. In the doctrine of liberty she has made no theoretical contribution; though probably her practice will prove distinctly valuable.[224]

In its entirety the critique put forth by Kilpatrick is superficial. Kilpatrick claims that John Dewey read the manuscript, though as will be seen, Dewey's interpretation of Montessori was significantly different than Kilpatrick's.[225] In the U.S. during the 1913 visit, however, the academics Holmes and Kilpatrick were less insightful and thorough than entries found in *McClure's* or *Outlook* magazine, while the newspaper accounts of her methods were often incomplete or sensational in tone.

As seen in this section, Montessori's visit to the United States in 1913 was arranged to promote her new book and her popular ideas. Though she attracted a diversity of people and was sponsored by prominent figures in the U.S. social circuit, Montessori was not strongly linked to

the educational establishment in the United States at this time. Written responses to her and her work vary. In general, upscale magazines such as *McClure,* represented her work thoroughly in the early years, often quoting directly from her in person, or from her book. Newspaper articles were inconsistent in their representation of her. Some factual articles appeared, such as a book review of *The Montessori Method.* More often than not, titles were sensational in tone and content was sparse. Response from the educational establishment, particularly from administrators and university faculty was not thorough in 1913. As mentioned previously, Kilpatrick's well read critique was not heavily referenced or deep reaching enough to aid an interested reader trying to gain an insightful discussion of Montessori's ideas and their implications for "American" education. Other sources such as Holmes' introduction diverted attention away from a scholarly discussion of Montessori's educational experiment and directed the reader's attention toward tangential discussions of gender.

As highlighted in this section Montessori's strongest supporters were often women who were working as Montessori was, for a more humane world. Jane Addams, Mrs. Mabel Bell, Helen Keller and writers such as Dorothy Canfield Fisher often travelled long distances to hear Montessori speak. Fisher remained in Italy for an extended period of time in order to follow the progression of the Montessori story; Bell invested large amounts of time, money and energy orchestrating Montessori's visit. Each interaction illustrates Montessori's diversity of appeal, except to the educational establishment. Often these women dedicated themselves to the progression of Montessori's ideas for a period of time, or as in the case of Keller, drew inspiration for her own projects through the narrative Montessori came to recount.

Thematic to Montessori's experience in the United States, a single leader working for her unyielding interest did not emerge. As previously mentioned, in other countries such as Great Britain, she was invited by high ranking governmental and educational officials. Such was not the case in the United States which no doubt affected her interactions here. Her visit was supported by high-society members who by and large wanted the best, newest educational ideas for their children, or in the Bells' case, their grandchildren. This popularity among the elite is ironic considering Montessori's system began as an educational experiment in the San Lorenzo slums.

Chapter Four
Events and Interactions Surrounding the 1915 and 1917-1918 Visits

Our children are noticeably different from those others who have grown up within the grey walls of the common schools. Our little pupils have the serene and happy aspect and the frank and open friendliness of the person who feels himself to be master of his own actions.
- Maria Montessori

The Bells and the 1915 Visit

In 1915 Montessori returned to the United States; Mr. Bell had replaced Mrs. Bell as the president of the Montessori Educational Association (MEA).[226] A number of associations had sprung up across the country, and they competed for resources and differed on political matters.[227] Montessori was steadfast that her ideas be disseminated fairly; this added to the fracture of the association's attempts to spread her ideas.[228] In an attempt to gain control of the spread of her ideas in this country she issued a memo, "General Regulations for the Formation of an Authorized Montessori Society."[229] The Bells interpreted Montessori's actions as a lack of trust and were confused by Montessori's sudden need to secure autonomy, because they had been her longtime supporters. It was the Bells, after all, who had secured 700 members to the Washington group and had printed a monthly bulletin about the group's progress; Montessori did not want the bulletin sent out until she inspected it.[230] Because Montessori was often travelling, the Bells felt that Montessori needed to let them decide whether or not the bulletin was ready to be sent. Montessori disagreed.

At the same time, people like McClure had recently shown her movies and given talks without her consent and was drawing profit from these events. Montessori who was now supporting not only her son, herself and her assistants was also supporting an elderly father. Language barriers and the open market system of doing business in the United States made Montessori increasingly skeptical of the authenticity of U.S. interest in her. Montessori's 1915 visit was a time of attempting to establish tight control of the movement. Her worst fear was that someone other than herself would begin to teach training courses in the United States. As stated earlier, Montessori continued to see her method as a work in process, an experiment, one in which only she could train the teachers accurately. Additionally, she continued to approach her process of education as one would experience in a religious order, so she had no interest in sharing her power, position and "calling" as "mother superior" with anyone less qualified than herself. During this visit she went so far as to issue a statement that the only teachers she would recognize as official Montessori teachers would be those who took the training course from 1913 onward; this excluded many, including Anne George, whom she feared had become too loyal to the Bells.[231]

While all this activity was happening on the east coast of the United States, Montessori's primary focus during the 1915 visit was to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Conference (the World's Fair) in San Francisco, California. While her participation in the World's

Fair is the topic of the next section I mention it here to show how hectic this visit was for her. She wanted to spend as little time as possible on squabbles over power, money and resources. Her answer was to re-affirm her autonomous position on the dissemination of her ideas. In an effort not to have to fight control battles again she, additionally, established The National Montessori Promotion Fund (herself as president; Helen Parkhurst, her classroom assistant and confidant, to be in charge of the New York chapter); this new association had direct links to the company supplying materials and to additional funding sources.[232]

Before the circumstance with the Bells, Anne George or Helen Parkhurst could be worked out, and while Montessori was attending the Panama-Pacific International Conference in 1915, Montessori received news of her father's death and returned to Italy, leaving her son Mario in charge of her general business in the United States.[233] This would only serve to make an already frustrating time more difficult for both Montessori and her enthusiasts in the United States.

In summary, Montessori's experience with the Bells echoes her larger reception in the United States. Where people were interested in her method, they usually had their own ideas about how her ideas should be adopted. Money and power were seemingly always factors in the early introduction of Montessori in the United States. Further as mentioned in chapter one, Montessori regarded the child's learning process as universal. She was not interested in tailoring her methods to fit any particular national idiosyncracy. With her science background, Montessori believed that such tampering would "taint" the experiment. These attitudes of hers limited the application of her method in the United States. Additionally, the movement seemed to swell in the United States before Montessori had trained enough teachers to support the expansion. As in the Bells' case, when the Montessori method was first introduced it was with strong female support; as seen above, often the women were not a central part of the educational establishment. Often the men interpreting her work had not taken the training, assisted with Montessori, nor did they take the same time the women did to get to know the person behind the ideas. The trend was for the women to do the ground work, as in the case of Mrs. Bell's fund raising and in the case of Anne George travelling to Italy to act as a liaison between the Bells and Montessori; the men took the leadership and directed it in ways seemingly incongruent to the groundwork of the women.[234]

Even though relations with Montessori continued to become more strained, Mrs. Bell still remained very active in the Montessori system throughout 1916 when she decided to join the board of trustees of Montessori's National Montessori Promotion Fund (known as "the Fund") which was put in place to protect Montessori's own interests in the United States. With Montessori as president of the Fund, she remained in direct contact with the manufacturer of the materials used in Montessori classrooms. Mario assumed leadership of the Fund after Parkhurst's split from the Montessori movement in 1917. Mrs. Bell had sent Anne George to Italy in 1916 to clarify the relationship between the Bells and Montessori's decreasing support of the MEA, which was heavily funded and headed by the Bells. As time progressed communication between the Fund, with its direct link to the manufacturer of Montessori's materials and additional resources, and the Bells' MEA had become more strained as the MEA was experiencing difficulty acquiring necessary classroom materials. As a result of George's visit, the MEA was dissolved, and Mrs. Bell joined the board of trustees of the Fund. Mario, in his early twenties by 1917 became more

protective of the organization's direction, and U.S. participation dwindled in the years that followed.[235] Meanwhile, the movement spread elsewhere (e.g. India, Holland, New Zealand) and Montessori ceased to collaborate with her supporters in the United States; after 1917 she did not return to the United States except to visit family.[236]

The Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915

Montessori's course during August through October at The Panama Pacific Exposition was announced in *The New York Times* as, "the most complete ever given by Dr. Montessori, will open for observation by eminent educators from all parts of the world." [237] The committee which brought Montessori to the exposition included Dr. David Starr Jordan, then president of the NEA and Chancellor of Stanford University, and Margaret Wilson, the president's daughter.[238] The conference opening on February 20, 1915 was heavily attended with the gathering at the opening day reaching 250,000.[239] In a time of turbulence abroad, many found the exposition a renewing time. Characterizing the feeling of the event two visitors write:

> Whatever the Panama- Pacific International Exposition has accomplished or may accomplish will not be found in the products of science and literature ...that have crowded its spacious buildings, but in the great life currents that have been brought through national channels into touch with each other;...these currents of life have found like interests and sympathies and aspirations that have crystallized into lasting fraternalism, and have contributed to a deepening sense of brotherhood....
>
> But more than all, I was consoled by my visit to the Exposition just at the time when this frightful war was raging abroad, to realize our happy remoteness from the scene and the causes of quarrel, and, by contrast, the multiform blessings of peace. That this Exposition, so successfully brought to a close, may leave on the mind of the people an enduring prepossession in favor of peace, is my earnest wish.[240]

Many people writing about the fair expressed similar sentiments of "human-bonding" and collegiality. The exposition was the twelfth held in history at that time and the third to be held in the United States. The fair occupied 635 acres on the southern shore of San Francisco Bay. The exposition was marked by three main groupings: one for the main hall and the exhibits; the second included pavilions from the 28 foreign nations represented as well as the U.S.; and the third cluster housed amusements. The cost of the fair was reported as $50,000,000. Building of the fair grounds began in 1911 with a ground-breaking ceremony by President Taft. The exposition was dedicated to the commemoration of the discovery of the Pacific Ocean and to the construction of the Panama Canal.[241] The commemorating poster "The Thirteenth Labor of Hercules," depicts both themes as a large muscular figure pushes apart two immense cliffs and in the background the Pacific ocean and the fair grounds can be seen.[242]

Maria Montessori's classroom was housed in the "Palace of Education." Her classroom exposition ran from August through November when she left unexpectedly to attend to her father's funeral. Montessori's exhibit is described a few years later by historian Frank Morton Todd. He writes:

> Every child was encouraged to develop spontaneously, through natural expression. She chose the exposition as the best method of conveying her method to the largest number of interested people in the shortest space of time....About 35 tots of three to six years, unspoiled by machine pedagogy, were admitted to the little glass-walled school room, outside which sat dozens of fascinated parents and other spectators....Miss Helen Parkhurst, of the Wisconsin Normal School at Stevens Point, who had studied under Dr. Montessori at Rome, conducted the school for the Docttoressa, who had not yet mastered sufficient English....Coordination, control, judgement were evolved. At the end of 36 days, many of the children were writing and composing words. Unruly children took on a business-like air of occupation. It was intended to produce, not a repressed and standardized child governed from above, but an individual child self-governed.[243]

While the World's Fair of 1915 marked a positive time for Montessori's method, it was also a time of personal frustration and loneliness:

> She [Montessori] had given up her practice and her university position, and [had been] supporting herself, her father, and her son on the proceeds from her books, her training courses, and the materials. She dreamed of an institution in which to carry on her research with children and her training of teachers, but everyone who offered to help seemed to want a share of the control as well as the profits. And she was not always the best judge of character.[244]

Again timing would prove to be unfortunate for Montessori. To compound the difficulty, she lacked a professional community of peers. Mario was beginning to assume some of the responsibility for her work, yet at eighteen he was a follower not an equal. Montessori had tremendous respect and high hopes for Helen Parkhurst who was invited after the fair to continue her association with Montessori. Montessori's association with Parkhurst is described in more detail in the following section. Before she could settle leadership concerns in the United States, her father died and she returned abruptly to Italy leaving Mario in charge of her business.

Parkhurst Leaves to Pursue Her Own Interests

Montessori's abrupt departure from the United States further separated her from Helen Parkhurst who had been a strong support for Montessori. In addition to teaching free of charge, Parkhurst (with the help of a few other close followers), would receive money from their families to help Montessori pay the bills. Helen Parkhurst had been in attendance at Montessori's first international training course in mid-January 1913 and soon became a key player in Montessori's organization.[245] As mentioned in the section above, after taking the course, Parkhurst left her position at Wisconsin's State Teacher's College and travelled closely with Montessori and she assisted Montessori in San Francisco setting up and demonstrating Montessori's classroom surrounded by glass walls through which many observed during the Pan-Pacific Exposition in 1915.[246] Despite the hard times and internal frustrations of Montessori and her followers, when the exposition ended the Montessori class received the only two gold medals awarded in education.[247] Due to Montessori's difficult personality and the fact that her whole life revolved around her educational involvements, Montessori was a difficult person to live and work with.

At the end of 1915, Montessori left Parkhurst in charge of the Montessori system in the United States.[248] As time passed and the job of managing the movement here became more overwhelming, Parkhurst left to develop her own system; in 1917, *The Dalton Plan*, surpassed Montessori's book on the best-seller list as well as gained notoriety in the U.S. as the "newest focus in child education." [249] Similarities exist between Parkhurst's Dalton plan and Montessori's ideas, as one might expect. The similarities include freedom for each child to work at a comfortable pace which Parkhurst describes as "independent assignments" and "a laboratory" for each subject through which children moved freely and consulted the "'specialist' teacher as needed."[250] These latter two components of Parkhurst's work resemble Montessori's stations in the classroom and the non-invasive role of the teacher.

Despite the fact that Parkhurst spent over four years working closely with Montessori, she only mentions her briefly in the introduction of *The Dalton Plan*. Kramer makes note of this point stating, "Parkhurst mentions Montessori in passing, but nowhere indicates the extent of her debt to the older woman's thinking."[251] Montessori's biographer points out that although methodologically the methods differ, the "liberty base" for Parkhurst's method "is Montessori's."[252] Though the educational ideas specifically with the use of the prepared environment differ significantly, Montessori's influence was perhaps more significant than Parkhurst acknowledged. Dr. Parkhurst's departure marked yet another obstacle for Montessori since Parkhurst was being groomed by Montessori to be the leader she needed to carry out her program in the United States.[253] The fracture in American interest and leadership in 1915 through 1917 marked the end of the first wave of interest in Montessori in the United States.[254] [255]

Other Interactions During the 1915 Visit: Montessori and Keller Meet Again at the Fair

Among others in attendance during the 1915 visit was Helen Keller. At one of Montessori's lectures in California she shared the stage with Keller's own teacher that made more of an impact on her [Keller] as expressed in the following excerpt from *Midstream....*Keller writes:

> I met Signora Montessori on two occasions while she was lecturing in America. The first time in Boston, the second in San Francisco during the Pan-American exposition when a great meeting was held to celebrate educational achievement. Signora Montessori and Mrs. Macy [Anne Sullivan's married name] and many others spoke, and Signora Montessori talked with charming vivacity in Italian and a lovely young lady interpreted what she said. She was interested to learn that her system and Mrs. Macy's were much alike....She spoke of the attitude of the church in Italy towards education and freedom of thought, and the blighting effects of poverty upon childhood. She declared that school life should be an adventure, the child's spirit must be free. "I would not bind it even to the feet of God."[256]

As seen through the lapse in years from the actual event and the telling of it, both women recall the event as significant. Even as translated through sign, Montessori was remembered by Keller as a dynamic and inspirational speaker. Though Montessori's ideas were diffused though the diversity of people who took interest in her in the United States, she did have an effect on the

people who came to know her. Montessori's words were inspirational and overlapped Keller's own project of improving worker's rights mentioned earlier. Parkhurst's, association with Montessori made an impact on her own professional development. Still others addressed her work in their own writing; it was during her 1915 that John Dewey published his own critique of her work.

John Dewey's Critique of Montessori Appears in 1915

John Dewey, who had introduced Montessori during one of her two Carnegie Hall lectures in 1913, addressed her work carefully in 1915 in his essay 'Freedom and Individuality.' Though Montessori and Dewey did not share reflections personally, his perspective on her work in 1915 is significant because it presents the most balanced critique of Montessori's work by an American academic educator at that time.[257]

In examining Montessori's scholarship, Dewey credits Montessori for the merit in her work and her insight into education, particularly the role of liberty in education. He does however differ from Montessori in three main ways. Dewey's first critique of Montessori's work involves the emphasis she places on the materials she uses for sense training. Secondly, Dewey places a more directive role on the teacher's participation in the classroom than does Montessori. Thirdly, Dewey differed with Montessori regarding the degree to which children's learning processes are innate and unfold "naturally" in the course of education.

Regarding materials used by Montessori, Dewey was concerned that situations in the Montessori classroom were "contrived," and he questioned the role of her materials and their relationship to "real world" circumstances. Mainly, he was concerned that her emphasis on the the training of individual senses would not build on one another as Montessori suggested they would. Additionally, because Montessori emphasizes the individual's use of the materials over shared experiences, Dewey was skeptical that this lack of peer interaction would foster the type of social interactions needed to improve society. For Dewey, the classroom materials should be applicable to circumstances the child would find outside the classroom and the classroom should foster the social interactions children needed to get along in the world outside the classroom.

Montessori at that time had just finished documenting her work with very young Italian children. She believed that materials aimed at refining eye-hand coordination and other sensual development would make it easier for children to learn more complex tasks in the future. During this time, Montessori was also adjusting the materials and the method from use with "feeble-minded" children with whom she focused on self-reliance skills (e.g. buttoning, zipping, tying) to "normal" children with whom she focused on more complex tasks (e.g. size-ordering exercises, tracing of numbers and letters, etc.). Montessori built many of her early lessons out of the young child's need to explore with senses such as taste and touch could be developed by interesting them in more complex tasks.

She had, for instance, a series of alphabet cards made on which each letter was outlined in sand. To a young child of two or three, the card was interesting, and because the child could feel the letter it became a concrete image for the child. Another example Montessori used is that of the now familiar childhood toy in which one shape corresponds to one hole. At first the child learned

which piece went where, and over time, this was expanded to naming the shape. Most of the children Montessori had worked with up to the 1915 visit were pre-school to early primary students thus accounting for some of Dewey's concern about the "contrived" nature of some of Montessori's classroom activities for young children.

Dewey believed in direct training of the child for real world problems. He writes that the "material should not be limited to training the discriminations and comparisons of a single sense."[258] Dewey does note, however, that the use of the material depends on the age of the child one is teaching. For Dewey the "materials should be varied enough to offer typical problems calling for the kind of comparison and discrimination used in ordinary life-situations."[259] Underlying both educators' view on materials was the common goal of liberating the mind of the child so that society could further progress toward a more humane society.

Secondly according to Dewey, future citizens needed more teacher-directed training than Montessori's method allowed. He writes:

> "Most American educators think that the training of the pupil to habits of right thinking and judgement is best accomplished by means of materials that present him real problems, and they think the measures of reality are found in connection with the experiences of life outside of school."[260]

Further, it is the job of the teacher to train "the special impulses of action to be developed through their use in preserving and protecting life in the social and physical conditions under which it goes."[261] For Dewey, education needed to emerge from practice in everyday situations and problems. He does recognize that young children, like the ones Montessori had just finished writing about, do need activities that help them master their senses. He also recognizes that young children may not yet be ready for the extended group cooperation that was, for Dewey, vital to classroom participation.[262] For Dewey, growth was a matter of balance and exchange between what the child brought to the experience and what the experience offered the child.

For Montessori, "liberty is activity," and as the child develops his or her intellect, the teacher must interfere as little as possible; rather, this child directs her own movement in learning. Given the freedom and a selectively prepared environment, the child's own learning process develops, or unfolds, through the stimulation of the classroom environment. Both educators placed an emphasis on the child's individuality in the classroom; each educator explored the subject of balance between the teacher and the child's role in the classroom relationship. They did differ where to place the philosophical fulcrum between student-directed education and teacher-directed learning. Montessori's view on the role of the teacher differed as the teacher was to only interfere when the child needed a new lesson or was in a circumstance of harm. Her suggested role for the teacher is inextricably linked to her insistence on the liberation of the child's learning process and is discussed at greater length in the section on liberty.

The third main point of Dewey's critique was related to Montessori's belief that children had "innate faculties" to be unfolded through a process of sequential exercises that would build on one another. Montessori suggested that in her classroom because the child learns to move rather than sit still as he picks and chooses materials, "he prepares himself not for the school but for life."[263] The discipline then necessary for this unfolding of the intellect is fostered in the child's

character and mannerisms in the classroom and in the interaction with others. This instinct for liberty, for spontaneous activity which drove the child's own learing process was for Montessori, "a personal yet universal force that sends the world forward."[264] To Montessori, preparing an environment in which children learned to become more self-reliant would help them become more responsible citizens building a more equitable world. If children were given the room for their education to unfold in a stimulating environment, then the teacher would become less of a director and more of a resource. For Dewey, the learning process was a social interaction in which senses could not be as easily isolated as he believed Montessori asserted.

Dewey's interpretation of Montessori's approach to education was limited because of the fact that only one book and a few of Montessori's pamphlets were translated into English by 1915. In addition, their backgrounds in education were different. As the first female physician in Italy, Montessori had come to education through science observing children medically thought to be "retarded." She believed that more than anything else they were misunderstood and very bored. From the beginning, her materials came from her scientific "experiment" designed to stimulate interest of the child and to help the child learn simple everyday skills needed for self-reliance. Her methods and ideas originated in a different country with different cultural nuances.[265] Further as Dewey notes, they were each working with different populations of children both in age and mental capacity. Lastly, language barriers contributed to the problem of understanding what Montessori might have otherwise been able to explain in person (e.g. how she might apply her ideas to older children's needs). Despite these differences in their educational beliefs, they were perhaps most closely alligned on their high regard of liberty as a main educational objective.

Dewey and Montessori: On Liberty

One of the richest connections in Dewey's and Montessori's work pertains to liberty and the child. The type of discipline described by both authors exemplify this. Building on her belief that "liberty is activity," Montessori supported an internal discipline structure for the classroom. Out of respect for themselves and each other, the children would learn to choose not to interfere in another's work or to be otherwise disruptive. The teacher was not to instill fear in the children because Montessori saw this as contrary to the pursuit of the child's personal liberty, and she also believed that this "traditional" mode of discipline was out-dated. Expanding on her interpretation for liberty in the discipline of learning, she writes:

> It would seem to me that children are very well disciplined indeed when they can move around in a room in a useful, intelligent, and free fashion without doing anything rude or unmannerly.[266]

Dewey echoes this in saying that the child needs room to move and stretch, to exercise muscles and rest when tired. The schools highlighted in *Schools of To-morrow* (e.g. Gary, Indiana) allowed the students choice of activity and materials to work from. Choice within the limits of the prepared environment allows the student in both cases to become master of his or her own learning processes.[267]

Describing the liberating aim for education Montessori writes:

> The child because of the peculiar qualities with which he is born, and because of his qualities as a social individual is circumscribed by *bonds* which *limit* his activity. An educational method that shall have *liberty* as its basis must intervene to help the child to a conquest of these various obstacles. In other words, his training must be such as shall help him to diminish, in a rational manner, the *social bonds*, which limit the activity.[268]

Reflecting the need to maximize the liberty of the child to move around the classroom freely and choose her own materials, Montessori favored materials that were mainly self-correcting as in the shape exercise mentioned above. These materials were self-directed, allowing the child to move freely throughout the classroom with little teacher intervention. By allowing the child a chance to develop her psyche on her own, Montessori believed that together these children would work more efficiently toward building a more harmonious adult world with one another. As she expanded her curriculum to older children, the pupils were given more opportunities to work together. (A list of Montessori's original educational innovations or ideas which she developed significantly can be found in the appendices.)

Both educators emphasize, in their views on liberty for the child, the importance of individual growth as well as peer interactions where the student is free to experience the social limitations present in community living. Further, it was also important for children to develop skills for themselves at their own pace. Dewey states that:

> "Liberty for the child is a chance to test all impulses and tendencies on the world of things and people in which he finds himself, sufficiently enough to discover those things which are harmful, and develop those which are useful."[269]

Likewise Montessori believes that education ought to allow ample freedom for the child's character to unfold in relation with others.[270] Additionally, both educators support the idea that children need the freedom to be children. Liberty to be a child, to experience the "peculiarities" of childhood, as Montessori called it, is a necessary part of democratic education.[271] Dewey states, "there is much that is 'natural' in children which is also naturally obnoxious to adults."[272] Nonetheless, freedom to be a child, to experience childhood, should be a natural part of a child's education. Both believe the spontaneous activity of children as Montessori called it should not be harnessed; guided yes, but not squelched.[273]

Lastly, one of the most progressive ideas both Dewey and Montessori share is the connection of the outside world to the learning experience. Both educators extend the concept of a liberatory "classroom" out into the surrounding environment and suggest ways to provide the opportunity for children to experience the natural world as integral to the educational process. For Montessori, tending gardens, having children care for animals and even taking their work outside was all part of the daily routine.[274] Likewise, Dewey states that by having children learn nature, they obtain a "sense of the beauty of nature."[275] And further, these types of activities can be used to "teach humanness" and a general sympathy for animal life."[276]

Dewey's work at this time appears complementary to Montessori's, in many respects, especially in the area of liberty. He notes in the end of the piece that:

> "her insistence upon touch associated with muscular movement as a factor in learning to read, is a real contribution to the technique of elementary instruction and.... that she has

> become an important factor in the popularizing of the gospel of liberty as indispensable to any true education....[further] he recognizes Montessori as "the voice most influentially identified at the present time with the ideal of liberty in education."[277]

Dewey's balanced and specifically documented critique is an interesting contrast to Kilpatrick's critique of Montessori. Where Dewey supports Montessori's view of the central role of the child's liberty in the classroom, Kilpatrick dismisses her work as being neither "novel, nor correct, stating further that, "In the doctrine of liberty she has made no theoretical contribution."[278] In her scholarly work, *The Montessori System and The American School*, Florence Elizabeth Ward of Ohio State Teacher's College made the interesting connection between Dewey's and Montessori's work in 1913. She writes:

> There has probably been no aspect of work like that embodying the ideas of Dr. John Dewey at the Elementary School of the University of Chicago which has received as caustic criticism as has the idea of giving the child the privilege of being the active agent in his own education. Doctor Montessori exhorts teachers to a policy of self-effacement that has much in common with the views presented by such experimental schools.[279]

Though Kikpatrick neglected to see the connection Florence Ward points out, it is important to keep in mind that Kilpatrick's book widely available in 1915. Dewey ideas though more grounded and complementary were receiving mixed reviews at the time as supported in the quote above. Dewey ends his essay in a tone of respect for Montessori's work, writing that:

> "[educators in this country] welcome her efforts to secure that degree of freedom in the schoolroom which will enable teachers to become acquainted with the real powers and interests of the child and thus secure the data for scientific methods of education."[280]

Though at this point in their work they differed on the method most suitable for the child, they did agree that careful attention should be placed on the child, the teacher, the materials and the environment of freedom they both valued. In fact on the subject of liberty, many interesting similarities occur. Though he does have points of critical reflection in his reading of Montessori, Dewey remains collegial, valuing very similar academic sentiments for the role of education in a democratic society.[281]

The 1917 and 1918 Visits

The 1917 visit by Maria Montessori was primarily a family event centered around her son Mario's first marriage in California. Her only public speaking engagements were to small audiences of Montessorians. She spoke once in New York at The Child Foundation which was a Montessori training center and she taught a small course in Los Angeles prior to the wedding. Her work in this country was supported by a smaller following than she had seen in previous years. Her son Mario was appointed to oversee her work in the United States. She visited once more in 1918. This was an unannounced visit to see family and a few close friends. After this trip, she concentrated her efforts elsewhere, particularly in India and was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize three times before her death in 1952.[282]

Overview of the 1915-1918 Visits and Patterns in the Interactions

The 1915 visit marked the climax of Montessori's early visits to the United States. The accounts of her interactions during this time period characterize the diversity of interactions throughout many facets of the educational climate in the United States. As supported earlier, the classroom she set up and the training course she taught at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition was the best advertisement and largest audience her method would ever receive in the United States. Though a time of personal difficulty for Montessori, many previously mentioned accounts recall the event as a successful one.

In a complex series of events documented in this chapter, leadership for her method in the United States remained problematic throughout this visit. In addition her method was not without need of tailoring to the "American" political and social environment. At this time Montessori was rigid about the control and dissemination of her ideas reflecting both her training in science and her belief that the energy and impulses of childhood were universal. Additionally, she was dependent on revenues from her lectures and courses to support herself, her son, her assistants, her aging father, as well as her work. As seen throughout this section though her method was not wholly adopted in the U.S. at the time of her visits and her interactions with key players in the United States educational establishment were inconsistent. Though her influence is documented in several instances I have chosen to highlight here, there are many more I have not included.[283]

The patterns of her interactions with people in the United States seemed to fall into three general categories. Many found her a source of interest and inspiration. Montessori's interactions with Helen Keller in 1913 and 1915, and her interactions with writers such as Dorothy Canfield Fisher demonstrate this inclination. Secondly, as in the case of Helen Parkhurst, educators came to spend time with Montessori to learn her ideas and then go on to apply them or follow their own creativity. As documented earlier Montessori viewed such progress as a betrayal. Knowing that Montessori had dedicated herself to her work as one would dedicate herself to a religious calling probably contributed significantly to Montessori's feeling of betrayal when her confidants left her. Thirdly, there was the academic critique of her work. Within the academic critique there were either those that dismissed her often without ever engaging in her work at length or those like Dewey which gave her work a careful read.

I make this distinction in the academic "conversations" surrounding Montessori's work because often in the literature Eliot, Snedden and Thorndike were considered part of the Progressive Education Movement synonymously with John Dewey and William Kilpatrick.[284] In his writing Dewey opposed practices such as standardized testing, tracking, large bureaucratic control of schools, etc. and should not be linked indeterminately with the work of "progressives;" as supported above, Dewey's work is, in many ways, more closely linked with Montessori, an "outsider," than with "colleagues" like Thorndike (et.al).[285]

As demonstrated above, there was no simple definition of a "progressive" and Montessori's difficulties in the U.S. were more multi-faceted than just simply the rejection of some "progressives." Both Montessori and Dewey exhibit freedom of expression and liberty in their classrooms at a time when such practices were not commonplace. Further, their ideas for classroom community were also well matched as were their emphasis on increasing the human

rights of the child. Because of cultural differences and age-group selection, their ideas on materials and the role of each individual child's internal learning processes vary. Central to both educators' work at this time was a liberating classroom discipline, with freedom to choose work, to develop individually, to cooperate and respect others, to interact with the community and the natural world outside the school. Lastly, it is interesting to note that both Montessori and Dewey use the word "happy" to describe children in classrooms where liberty is valued and learning is made relevant, a goal Eliot, Snedden and Thorndike neglect to include in their "production" of an "efficient" educational "system."

Chapter Five
Conclusion

The truth at times appears to be made up of apparent contradictions....
The human personality is shaped by continuous experiences;
it is up to us to create for children, for adolescents,
for young people an environment, a world that will readily permit
such formative experiences.
- Maria Montessori

The history of Maria Montessori's visits to the United States between the years 1913-1918 mark an interesting sculpture of events, interactions and possible meanings. Entering the "American" educational scene at this particularly socially turbulent period of time, Montessori and her educational method, or experiment as she herself called it, were odd. This character of oddity manifested itself in many of the interactions documented in this work.

First and foremost she was headstrong and independent with a deep sense of mission in her dedication to the child. Secondly, her methods were extensions of educators outside the most accepted western interpretation of educational philosophy most common at that time. In addition, she wrote from her vision for the possibility of education, rather than from a point of reforming what was already there. Though differing significantly in focus and method, other prominent people, such as Jane Addams and Helen Keller, also worked from an internal vision of possibility rooted in activism. This way of interacting in the world of ideas is perhaps best supported in more modern academic writing, such as the body of literature surrounding the work of feminism. In an age where standardization, tracking, testing, curriculum differentiation, "Americanization" and eugenics were popular topics among the most sought after educators, Montessori and those working from a vision of possibility like hers were most definitely out of place and farther removed from conversations driving the educational bureaucracy of the early twentieth century.

Not only did Montessori experience the world significantly different than most she encountered, she also wrote about her ideas in a much less academically accepted style. Though she had mastered academic writing early in her career as a researcher and doctor, she deliberately chose a different style for her writing pertaining to her own educational ideas. There was, as is commonly referred to in the literature, "a mysticism" about her writing. When she spoke of the spirituality of the child, the unfolding education of the child, she was often vague, and many of her critics found fault in her lack of definition with regard to the child's "spirit." Montessori, feeling no need to explain, replied that the only way to understand her work is to see it in action. Her written words were symbolic expressions of the classroom experience. As mentioned earlier, her whole educational movement reflected a sense of mission, (similar to participation in a religious order) to Montessori.

In addition to her idiosyncracies, style and tone, she chose to keep moving forward rather than occupying herself in battles. In the progression of her ideas in the U.S. as well as other countries, her implied attitude seemed to rest in the self-assurance that if one conversation closed down another one would open up for her. Once she was asked why she did not respond to the

criticism of Kilpatrick. She responded, "If I am going up a ladder, and a dog begins to bite at my ankles, I can do one of two things - either turn round and kick out at it, or simply go on up the ladder. I prefer to go up the ladder."[286] This type of perseverance, though stubborn and in retrospect can be seen as somewhat short-sighted, characterized her personality.

Though particularly frustrating to the historian attempting to document the hearsay or journal entries of those around her, Montessori consistently remained a very private person throughout her life despite her world-wide significance. Though highly protective of her methods, she was humble in her fame. Though patient, caring and forgiving in her work with children, she was neither as tolerant nor as tactful with adults. She was an odd character in an odd time of history. To be a strong-willed female, an unwed parent, Italian, Catholic, and a non-English speaker would mean something different in another time and place. But Montessori visited the U.S. during a time when these issues, both socially and politically, were especially charged. For instance, it would not be until 1920 with the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States that women in the U.S. would be secured the right to vote. Additionally, in an age of prejudice against Southern Italians, against non-Protestants, and to varying degrees against the working class poor, Montessori's background as well as her emphasis on liberatory education, especially for the "abnormal," enriches a historical conversation centered at the intersection of gender, ethnicity, class, creed and the specific time and place of their interactions in a character's life.

The historical narrative I have presented to the reader in this work is literally one of arguably infinite narratives to be authored. I do not believe that I have told *the* truth, rather *one* of possible truths to be told. This one holds significance to me particularly as I think of the pre-service and in-service teachers I serve in my foundations courses. As in any historical account, the power is in the telling. But there can only be power in the telling if one claims authorship for the project. For many of the conversations indicative of the foundation's classroom, history can act as a contextualizing lens.

Through a wider view of history and the repetitions of struggle indicative to the human condition, students are given a chance to see that authors writing today are not reporting isolated incidents of injustice, inequality and inhumanity. At the same time, highlighting the biographical sketch of someone like Montessori who worked amid turbulent times shows that difficult times are not entirely crippling. Additionally, through looking at the experiences of a historical figure, classroom dialogue centers around the complexity of choices and consequences experienced by the highlighted individual instead of becoming polarized discussions of opinion. Re-viewing history and challenging students to see alternative possibilities in re-current educational themes can be practiced in classroom experiences. To see "fact" as choice rather than as finite truth is one way to activate the study of history in foundation's classroom. As seen in this document, many of the difficulties inherit in today's educational discourse reflect, "dysfunctions of the vast bureaucracies created by the administrative progressives."[287] Challenging students to engage in a study of history in such a way that allows them to explore alternatives and discuss the consequences of a particular period of history may create enriching dialogues about the possibilities of schooling. Looking into someone else's alternatives, such as Montessori's, and the

interactions that ensued during her visits in the U.S. can help students visualize different interactions, examine short-sightedness and discuss alternative outcomes. In such discussion students can practice democratic participation looking through various lenses of plurality. As Tyack mentions, this requires imagination:

> To create urban schools which really teach students, which reflect the pluralism of the society, which serve the quest for social justice - this is a task which will take persistent imagination, wisdom, and will.[288]

"Persistent imagination, wisdom, and will" are respectable qualities for any educator. But actively engaging in a historical project of re-view and re-form also requires deliberate choices made with arduous consideration for possible consequences. Positioning the learner in a classroom context, which encourages exploration of imagination, wisdom and will, connects the history of the past with "the history in the making." The practice of authoring one's history with regard to choice and consequences is a powerful way to present the possibilities of schooling of pre-service and in-service teachers. Further, extending the goals of education beyond state mandated curricula, students may choose to actively re-shape their educations and see their professional interactions as vital to democratic conversation into the 21st century. Among his suggestions for teacher education curriculum, R. Freeman Butts writes:

> [The] goal of civic education for the American school is to deal with all students in such a way as to motivate them and enable them to play their parts as informed, responsible, committed, and effective members of a modern democratic political system. This can be achieved in a number of ways but should include these three basic aspects; political values, political knowledge, and the skills of political participation needed for making deliberate choices among real alternatives.[289]

For the pre-service or in-service teacher, such a historically active approach to a foundations course could enable her to see the intersection of gender, creed, ethnicity, class, etc. more explicitly in the lived experiences of a historical "character." The complexity and interconnectedness of all these social traits builds a deeper context for subsequent topics such as "multiculturalism," "moral accountability," "vocational education, etc." Through the examination of another's time and place, a classroom teacher may have a more broadly based understanding of the historical context of issues and social attitudes that are with us today. By examining the system of education in the early part of this century, students may have the opportunity to review how other educators dealt with similar problems in an effort that we in our own time may keep moving forward instead of repeating limited responses to complex societal challenges. Additionally, through looking at the historical narrative of a character significant in a student's chosen field, he may choose to look at his own historical narrative differently and quite possibly choose to become increasingly empathetic to those for whom the struggle of social mobility has historically been more difficult. With introspection he may actively seek to make "deliberate choices among real alternatives."

Through re-viewing history, relations of power and privilege are seen operating on a character's life as simultaneously the character responds in a complex web of events and interactions. Teacher educators might use a history such as Montessori's to increase dialogue

surrounding what it means to be an educator in a democratic society; a complex society; a place where power, access and privilege are often layered just below the surface of the histories that are most familiar to us. Letting go of the familiar involves both risk and the challenge of change. In the way that we present what I would like to call "the pre-service canon" to our students, I am suggesting that we ought to present history as a story in progress, complete with infinitely seducing possibilities. If given the chance and an inviting case students may choose to ask the critical questions about the policy and history being written today and may become active leaders in authoring "the telling of the story" where it originates; in the way they teach the texts they are given, in the questions they ask their students, in the conversations they choose to have with colleagues, in the organizations they join and in their thoughtful participation in the many overlapping communities in which they will negotiate the meaning(s) of their own, authored lives.

Works Consulted:

Addams, J.: 1912, 1964, *Democracy and Social Ethics*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Addams, J.: 1910, 1968, *Twenty Years at Hull-House*, The Macmillan Company, New York.

Addams, J.: 1985, *Jane Addams on Education*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Andersen, M. and Collins, P.H.: 1992, *Race, Class, and Gender An Anthology*, Wadsworth Publishing, Belmont, CA.

Antin, M.: 1912, *Hale House*, Hale House Associates, Boston.

Bachelard, G.: 1964, *The Poetics of Space*, Beacon Press, Boston.

Barzun, J. and Graff, H.F.: 1992, *The Modern Researcher*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Fort Worth.

Benedict, B.:1983, *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama - Pacific International Exposition of 1915*, Scolar Press, Berkeley.

Best, J.H.(ed.) et al.: 1983, *Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda*, American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC,

Betts, G.H.: 1913, *New Ideals in Rural Schools*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

Betts, G.H.: 1914, *Better Rural Schools,* The Bobbs Merrill Company, Indianapolis.

Block, F.: 1990, *Postindustrial Possibilities: A Critique of Economic Discourse*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Butler, N.M.: 1904, *The Meaning of Education*, The Macmillan Company, New York.

Butts, R.F.: 1973, *The Education of the West*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

Butts, R.F. et.al.: 1983, *Civic Learning in Teacher Education*, Published by the Society of Teachers of Education, Minnesota.

Callahan, R.E.: 1962, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. (This is dedicated to George S. Counts)

Campbell, D.N.: 1970, *A Critical Analysis of William Heard Kilpatrick's The Montessori System Examined,* Doctoral Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaigne.

Chattin-McNichols, J.:1992, *The Montessori Controversy*, Delmar Publishers, Albany.

Cherryholmes, C.: 1988, *Power and Criticism*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Cordasco, F. and Bucchioni, E.: 1974, *The Italians*, Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, Clifton, NJ.

Culter, H. and Stone, J.: 1913, *The Rural School,* Silver, Burdett and Company, Boston.

Davis, A.: 1973, *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Dawkins, R.: 1989, *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Delamont, S.: 1992, *Fieldwork in Educational Settings*, The Falmer Press, London.

Dewey, J.: 1979, *John Dewey, The Middle Works 1899-1924* (Volume 7: 1912-1914), Southern Illinois University Press, London.

Dewey, J.: 1979, *John Dewey, The Middle Works 1899-1924* (Volume 8: 1915), Southern Illinois University Press, London.

Dewey, J.: 1979, *John Dewey, The Middle Works 1899-1924* (Volume 15: 1923-1924), Southern Illinois University Press, London.

Dewey, J.: 1991, *John Dewey, The Later Works 1925-1953* (Volume 13: 1938-1939), Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.

Drost, W.H.: 1967, *David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. (This is dedicated to Professor Krug)

Eliot, C.W.: 1905, *Educational Reform:Essays and Addresses*, The Century Company, New York.

Ewald, d. and Clute, P.:1991, *San Francisico Invites the World*, Chronicle Books, San Francisico.

Fine, M.: 1995, *Dispruptive Voices*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Fisher, D.C.: 1912, *A Montessori Mother*, Henry Holt and Company, New York.

Fisher, D.C.: 1913, 1966, *The Montessori Manual*, Robert Bentley, Inc., Cambridge.

Fisher, D.C.: 1916, 1920, *Self-Reliance*, Henry Holt and Company, New York.

Fisher, D.C.: 1930, *Learn or Perish*, Liveright Publishing Corporation, New York.

Foucault, M.: 1977, *Power/Knowledge*, Pantheon Books, New York.

Foucault, M. (Stephen Ball ed.): 1990, *Foucault and Education:Disciplines and Knowledge*, Routledge, New York.

Franklin, J.H.: 1993, *The Color Line*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, Missouri.

Freud, A: 1967, *The Writings of Anna Freud*, vol.I, International Universities Press, Inc., New York.

Freud, A.: 1967, *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, vol.II, International Universities Press, Inc, New York.

Gesell, A.: 1948, *Studies in Child Development*, Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York.

George, D. and Trimbur, J.: 1992, *Reading Culture*, HarperCollins Publishers, New York.

Giroux, H.: 1988, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Giroux, H.: 1992, *Border Crossings*, Routledge, New York.

Goodman, J.: 1992, *Elementary Schooling for Critical Democracy*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Greene, M.: 1988, *The Dialectic of Freedom*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Gross, M.J.: 1978, *Montessori's Concept of Personality*, University Press of America, New York.

Heath, S.B. and McLaughlin, M.W. (eds.): 1993, *Identity & Inner-City Youth*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Hunt, T.C. and Silliman, J.G.: 1975, *The American School in its Social Setting*, Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, IA.

Hunt, T.C. (Ed.): 1979, *Society, Culture, and Schools: The American Approach,* Garrett Park Press, Garrett Park, MD.

I Ching, (Translated by, Rudlof Ritsema and Stephen Karcher):1994, Element Books, Great Britain.

Karier, C.J. et.al: 1973, *Roots of Crises: American Education in the Twentieth Century*, Rand McNally, Chicago.

Keller, E.F.: 1985, *Reflections on Gender and Science*, Yale University press, New Haven.

Keller, H.: 1967, *Helen Keller: Her Socialist Years*, International Publishers, New York.

Keller, H. : 1930, *Midstream, My Later Life*, Doubleday, Doran & Company, New York.

Kilpatrick, W.H.: 1914, *The Montessori System Examined*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

Kilpatrick, W.H.: 1927, *Educating for a Changing Civilization*, The Macmillan Company, New York.

Kliebard, H.M.: 1986, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Boston.

Kozol, J.: 1991, *Savage Inequalities*, Crown Publishing, New York.

Kramer, R.: 1976, *Maria Montessori*, Putnam's Sons, New York.

Krug, E.: 1961, *Charles W. Eliot and Popular Education*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Krug, E.A.: 1966, *Salient Dates in American Education*, Harper & Row Publishers, New York

Lave, J. and Wenger, E.: 1991, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Legacy of the Exposition, (The): 1916, Panama - Pacific International Expostion Company, San Francisco.

Leys, W.A.: and Rao, P.S.S.R.: 1969, *Gandhi and America's Educational Future,* Southern Illinois Press, Carbondale.

Living Bible, The: 1976, (Catholic Edition), Tyndale Press, Wheaton, Il.

Loeffler, M.H. ed.: 1992, *Montessori in Contemporary American Culture*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.

Madigan, M.: 1993, *Keeping Fires Night and Day: Selected Letters of Dorothy Canfield Fisher*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Martin, J.R.: 1992, *The Schoolhome*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Marx, K. (translated by Rodney Livingstone and Gregor Benton): 1992, *Karl Marx: Early Writings*, Penguin Books, New York.

Massachusettes at the Panama - Pacific International Exposition, Wright & Potter Printing Company, Boston.

Meigs, C.: 1970, *Jane Addams: Pioneer for Social Justice*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston.

Merchant, C.: 1983, *The Death of Nature,* HarperCollins, New York.

Merton, T.: 1965, *Gandhi on Non-Violence*, New Directions Publishing Corporation, New York.

Meyer, J.W.: 1975, *Diffusion of an American Montessori Education*, The University of Chicago, Chicago.

Montessori, M.: 1912, 1964, *The Montessori Method*, Shocken Books, New York. (Translated by Anne George with the introduction by J.McV. Hunt)

Montessori, M.: 1912, *The Montessori Method,* Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York. (Translated by Anne George with the introduction by Henry Holmes of Harvard University)

Montessori, M.: 1913, *Pedagogical Anthropology*, Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York.

Montessori, M.: 1966, *The Secret of Childhood*, Ballantine Books, New York.

Montessori, M.: 1967, *The Discovery of the Child*, Ballantine Books, New York.

Montessori, M.: 1973, *To Educate the Human Potential*, Kalakshetra Publications, India.

Montessori, M.: 1973, *From Childhood to Adolescence*, Shocken Books, New York.

Montessori, M.: 1946, 1989, *Education for a New World*, Clio Press, Oxford, England.

Montessori, M.: 1976, *Education for Human Development*, Schocken Books, New York. (This book is by Mario, not Maria)

Morgan, R.(ed.): 1984, *Sisterhood is Global*, Doubleday, New York.

The Portable Nietzsche, (Edited and Translated by Walter Kauffman): 1982, Penguin, New York.

Nietzsche, F. (translated by R.J. Hollingdale): 1983, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Orem, R.C.: 1966, *A Montessori Handbook,* Capricorn Books, New York.

Parkhurst, H.: 1922, *Education on The Dalton Plan*, E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York.

Popkewitz, T.: 1991, *A Political Sociology of Educational Reform*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Radice, S.: 1920, *The New Children: Talks with Dr. Montessori*, Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York.

Rambusch, N. M.: 1962, *Learning How To Learn: An American Approach to Montessori*, Helicon Press, Baltimore.

Report on the Conference on New Ideals in Education: 1915, New York State Library, New York.

Rose,M.: 1989, *Lives on the Boundary*, Penguin Books, New York.

Russell, B.: 1932, *Education and the Social Order*, George Allen & Unwin, London.

Sigmund, P.(ed.): 1988, *St. Thomas Aquinas on Politics and Ethics*, W.W.Norton & Company, New York.

Spring, J.: 1991, *American Education*, Longman Publishing Group, New York.

Standing, E.M.: 1962, *Maria Montessori*, New American Library, New York.

Standing, E.M.: 1962, *The Montessori Revolution in Education*, Schocken Books, New York.

Strayer, G.D. and Norsworthy, N.: 1918, *How To Teach*, The Macmillan Company, New York.

Steedman, C.: 1990, *Childhood, Culture and Class in Britain: Margaret McMillan, 1860-1931*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Steiner, R.: 1919,1976, *Practical Advise to Teachers*, Rudolf Steiner Press, London.

Taylor, D. and Dorsey-Gaines, C: 1988, *Growing Up Literate:Learning From Inner-City Families,* Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.

Teacher's Encyclopedia (The): 1966, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Thayer, V.T.: 1928, *The Passing of the Recitation,* D.C. Heath and Company, Boston.

Thorne, B.: 1994, *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Timmons, G.: 1988, *Education, Industrialization and Selection*, Routledge, London.

Todd, F.M.: 1921, *The Story of the Exposition*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

Toward, L. M.: 1984, *Mabel Bell: Alexander's Silent Partner*, Methuen, Toronto.

Tozier, J.: 1915, *An Educational Wonder Worker*, The House of Childhood, Inc. New York.

Tyack, D.B.: 1974, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Ulich, R.: 1968, *History of Educational Thought*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York.

Ulich, R.: 1940, *Fundamentals of Democratic Education: An Introduction to Educational Philosophy*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.

Urban, W. and Wagoner, J.: 1996, *American Education: A History*, The McGraw-Hill Company, New York.

Van Maanen, J.: 1988, *Tales of the Field*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Vygotsky, L.S.: 1978, *Mind in Society*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Ward, F. E.: 1913, *The Montessori Method and the American School*, The Macmillan Company, New York.

Weis, L. and Fine, M. (eds.): 1993, *Beyond Silenced Voices: Class, Race and Gender in United States Schools*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Weisband, E.: 1989, *Poverty Amidst Plenty*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Wertsch, J.V.: 1991, *Voices of the Mind*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Williams, T.T.: 1994, *An Unspoken Hunger*, Vintage Books, New York.

Woock, R.: 1970, *Education and the Urban Crisis,* International Textbook Company, Scranton, PA.

Zukin, S.: 1991, *Landscapes of Power:From Detroit to Disney World*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Articles/Pamphlets:

Association Montessori International, 170 W. Scholfield Road, Rochester, New York, 14617

American Montessori Society, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10011.

Addams, Jane. "A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil," *McClure's Magazine*, November, 1911.

A.M.I. Study Conference - August 1982 Held at Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands. Association Montessori Internationale (AMI), August 1982.

Bauch, Jerold P. and Hsu, Heui-hsin, Joyce. "Montessori: Right or Wrong About Number Concepts?" *Arithmetic Teacher*, February, 1988.

Clifford, Geraldine. "Education: Its History and Historiography," in Lee S.Shulman (ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, (4) 1976.

Cohen, Deborah. "Montessori Method in Public Schools." *Education Digest*, September, 1990.

Cohen, Sol. "Maria Montessori: Priestess or Pedagogue," *The Record - Teachers College*, December, 1969.

Cohen, Sol. "The History of the History of American Education, 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past." *Harvard Educational Review*, August 1976.

Communications, AMI, number one, 1996.

Counts, George. "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" Arno Press, New York.

Cushman, Kathleen. "The Montessori Story." *Parents' Magazine*, January 1993.

Department of the Interior List of References on Maria Montessori and Her Methods, Washington, DC, 1914.

Ellson, Douglas. "Improving Productivity in Teaching." *Phi Delta Kappa*, October 1986.

Farrer, Frances. "Exploring the Alternatives." *Times Educational Supplement*, January 14, 1994.

George, Anne. "The First Montessori School in America," *McClure Magazine*, June 1912

Hagedorn, Julia. "Room for Courtesy and Fine China." *Times Educational Supplement*, September 10, 1993.

Hunt, Thomas. "The American High School in Crisis: A Historical Perspective." *The Education Forum*, Novmeber, 1974.

Hunt, Thomas. "Public Education and Americanization: 1890-1920." *Review Journal of Philosophy and Social Science*, Fall 1976.

Hunt, Thomas. "The Schooling of Immigrants and Black Americans: Some Similarites and Differences." *The Journal of Negro Educaiton*, Fall 1976.

Hunt, Thomas. "Religion, Moral Education and Public Schools: A Tale of a Tempest." *Religion and Public Education*, Spring 1986.

Hunt, Thomas and Bellefeuille, Barabara. "The Bible in the Schools: The *Edgerton* and *Schempp* Decisions Revisited." *Religion & Public Education*, Summer 1988.

Isaacs, Susan. "Say It With Silence." *Parents' Magazine*, March 1989.

Kliebard, Herbert. "What is Knowledge Base, and Who Would Use It If We Had One?" *Review of Educational Research*, Fall 1993.

Montessori, Maria. "Disciplining Children," *McClure's Magazine*, May 1912.

National Education Association Bulletin. "The Mother and the Child," 1915.

National Education Association Bulletin. Volumes One and Two, 1913/14.

National Education Association Bulletin. December, 1913.

National Education Bulletin. "The All Day Trades Schools," May, 1915.

National Education Bulletin. "Secretary's Minutes," May, 1916.

National Education Association Bulletin. December, 1917.

National Education Association Bulletin. April, 1918.

New York Times. "Films Show Montessori Method." July 13, 1913.

New York Times. "Alienist Says They Make Their Children Egomaniacs." July 24, 1913.

New York Times. "Training of Children." August 1, 1913.

New York Times. "Mme. Montessori Tells of the Spread of Her Teachings." 1913.

New York Times. "The Montessori Method." August 10, 1913.

New York Times. "Dr. Montessori at Exposition." July 22, 1915.

Official Guide: Panama - Pacific International Exposition, San Francisico 1915, The Wahlgreen Co. Publishers.

Rambusch, Nancy McCormick. "Montessori as an American Public School Alternative," *The Constructive Triangle*, Spring 1976.

Rohrs, Herman. "Robinson Crusoe Goes to School: Six Pioneers of Modern Education." *UNESCO Courier*, May, 1983.

Schapiro, Dennis. "What if Montessori Education is Part of the Answer?" *Education Digest*, March, 1993.

Stevens, Ellen Yale. "The Montessori Movement in America," *McClure's Magazine*, March, 1913.

Tozier, Josephine. "The Montessori Apparatus," *McClure's Magazine*, January, 1912.

Train, Arthur. "Imported Crime: the Story of the Camorra in America," *McClure's Magazine*, 1912.

Endnotes:

1. Tyack,D.:1974 *The One Best System*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, p.9.

2. Ibid, p.3-12.

3. Ibid, p.8.

4. Tawney, R.H. quoted in: Barzun, J. and Graff, H.: 1992, *The Modern Researcher*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, Fort Worth, p.38.

5. For a detailed look at the possibility of Counts' and Butts' work for teacher educators in foundations, please see: Zell, S.K. "Teacher Education in the Foundations: 'Whose Twilight?'" (currently under review *Educational Foundations.*)

6. Barzun, J. and Graff, H.:1992, *The Modern Researcher*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, Fort Worth, p.16.

7. In saying this I wish to acknowledge my awareness that my own inquiries into Montessori's work are shaped by my own time and place and the process of historical wanderings I have taken through the thousands of pages, photos, diaries, etc which have become woven throughout this work. I do not see myself as outside or positioned as a disconnected "objective" author, but rather connected to the history told in this document.

8. Ibid, p.18.

9. Standing, E.M.:1962 *Maria Montessori*, Hollis & Carter, New York, p.21.

10. Ibid, p.21.

11. Ibid.

12. Kramer, R.:1976, *Maria Montessori*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, pp.29-31.

13. Ibid, p.23.

14. Both Standing, E.M.:1962 and Kramer, R.:1976 detail the events surrounding Montessori's educational experiences in great detail, it is beyond the focus of this project to include them here.

15. Standing, E.M.:1964, p.24.

16. Reported in Kramer, R.: 1976, p.35,393.

17. Standing, E.M.:1962.

18. Through correspondence with Dr. Helene Leenders in The Netherlands, I have learned that "a painting [hangs] on the wall in the head-office of the international Montessori movement...." The popes "blessing is handwritten below his picture." The pope in the picture is "Pope Benedictus XVI and is dated 21 November 1918." She further reports that there is nothing to either confirm or deny the authenticity of the picture in the Vatican Archives. (personal correspondence dated January 20, 1997)

19. Kramer, R.:1976 and Standing, E.M.:1962.

20. Standing, E. M.:1962, p.25.

21. Ibid, p.27.

22. Ibid, p.27.

23. Ibid, p.48.

24. These events are documented in Kramer, R.:1976 and Standing, E.M.: 1962.

25. Ibid, pp.29-58.

26. Montessori, M.:1912, pp.38-9.

27. See: Kramer, R.:1976, pp.92-93.

28. Montessori was an extraordinarily private person. Judging from the media articles I have read as well as interviews and impressions from writers who documented her work, she drew a stiff line between her private and public life. Thus some details such as her access to medical school, and the events surrounding the birth of her son are still well hidden. Standing, E.M.:1962, was able to document many of the details I have included in this introductory section through conversations with Montessori as well as being privy to several of her diary entries, letters, and other archival pieces. Kramer, R.:1976 supports Standing in the issues I have included in this section. Kramer, R.:1976 was able to confer with the adult Mario as well as peruse many of Montessori's letters and diaries. Because the Montessori archives are in Holland, I trust that the details I have included in this section are accurate and serve to lay the groundwork for introducing Montessori to an unaccustomed reader before I enter in to the subsequent chapters which are more central to my focus.

29. Standing, E.M.:1962.

30. Kramer, R.:1976, p.62.

31. Gaspard Itard is perhaps most known for his book, *The Care and Education of the Wild Boy of Aveyron.*

32. Montessori, M.:1912, p.41.

33. Reported in Standing, E.M.:1964, p.33.

34. Steedman, C.:1990, *Childhood, Culture and Class in Britain*, Rutger's University Press, New Brunswick, p.194.

35. Ibid, p.195.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. For a more thorough look at the overlapping areas of Seguin and Montessori's work see: Montessori, M:1913 and Steedman, C.:1990.

40. Montessori, M.:1913, *Montessori Method,* Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, p.15. The rest of the previous paragraph concerning Montessori's educational beliefs is from chapter one of *The Montessori Method.*

41. Montessori, M.:1912, pp.38-9.

42. Ibid, p.176.

43. Standing, E.M.:1962, p.59.

44. Montessori, M.:1912, 1964.

45. Kramer, R.:1976, p.97.

46. Standing, E.M.:1962, p.33.

47. Kramer, R.:1976; Montessori, M.:1912; Standing, E.M.:1962.

48. Montessori, M.: 1912. Montessori describes the events surrounding her work at the San Lorenzo Tenement in chapter one.

49. Montessori, M.:1912.

50. Montessori, M.: 1912, 1964, particularly chapter one.

51. Montessori, M.: 1962,1967, *Maria Montessori: The Discovery of the Child,* New York, Ballantine Books, p.56.

52. Ibid, p.56.

53. Ibid, p.54.

54. Ibid, p.57.

55. Ibid, p.58.

56. Ibid, p.57.

57. Ibid.

58. Montessori, M.: 1917,1965, *Spontaneous Activity in Education,* New York, Shocken Books, pp.194,196.

59. Cohen, S.: 1969, "Maria Montessori: Priestess or Pedagogue," *The Record*, Vol.71, No.2. Additionally, Kramer reports that a small group of women surrounding her took vows despite the church's rejection of her proposal. Kramer, R:1979, p.179.

60. Montessori, M.:1966, *The Secret of Childhood*, p.207-09.

61. Ibid, p.214.

62. Ibid, p.213.

63. Montessori, M.:1966, pp.149-153.

64. Montessori, M.:1912, p.87.

65. Ibid, p.56.

66. Montessori, M.:1962, p.54.

67. Montessori, M.:1967, *The Discovery of the Child*, New York, Ballentine Books, p.40.

68. Ward, F.E.:1913, *The Montessori Method and The American School*, New York, The Macmillan Company, pp.x-xi.

69. Ward, E.F.: 1913, p.222.

70. Ibid, p.222.

71. Kramer, R.:1976, *Maria Montessori*, New York, Putnam's Sons, p.137.

72. Hunt, J.McV. in Montessori, M.: 1912, 1964, p.xii.

73. Ibid.

74. Radice, S.: 1920, *The New Children: Talks With Dr. Maria Montessori*, Stokes, New York. See appendices.) and Kramer, R.: 1976, p.155.

75. See: Curti, M.:1978, *The Social Ideas of American Educators*, Little Field, Adams & Co., Ottawa
Hunt, T. C.: 1974, "The American High School in Crisis: A Historical Perspective," *The Educational Forum*, November, pp.49-60. Kliebard, H.B.:1986 *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958.* Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston.
Tyack, D.B.: 1974, *The One Best System*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

76. Ibid, p.230.

77. Hunt, T.C. and Bellefeuille, B.K.:1988 "The Bible in the Schools: The Edgerton and Schempp Decisions Revisited," *Religion & Public Policy*, Vol. 15, No.3, p.327.

78. Ibid.

79. Timmons, G.:1988 *Education, Industrialization, and Selection*, Routledge, New York.

80. Ibid, p.63.

81. Ibid, p.65.

82. Ibid, pp.63-85.

83. Snedden, D. and Cooley, E.: 1913, quoted in "Vocational Education," *The N.E.A. Bulletin*, Vol.II, no.2, p.60.

84. W.L. Chandler, Assistant treasurer for Dodge City Sales and Engineering Company, Mishawaka, Indiana, quoted in: *The NEA Bulletin*, Vol.III, No. 6., May 1913, p.71-73.

85. The preceding article topic summaries come from " Proceedings of the Department of Superintendence, *The NEA Bulletin*, Vol.III, No.6, February, 1915.

86. Edward Eliot (administrative, progressive reformer) stated that the charter of new smaller boards would serve the purpose of " taking the schools out of politics... and to persuade, " men of standing and position in the community to accept this duty as a public trust." Tyack, D.:1974, p.5, 158.

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid.

89. Tyack, D:1960, 1974.

90. Ibid, p. 129.

91. As early as 1874 we see the seeds of increasing standardization and bureaucracy taking hold of the developing school system in the U.S.: "Leading American city and state school superintendents and college presidents signed *A Statement of the Theory of Education in The United States*, written to explain educational practices to Europeans. In this outline, they justified bureaucratization in matter-of-fact rather then crusading language. "The commercial tone prevalent in the city," they said, "tends to develop in its school quick, alert habits and readiness to combine with others in their tasks. Military precision is required in the maneuvering of classes. Great stress is laid upon 1) punctuality, 2) regularity, 3) attention and, 4) silence, as habits necessary through life for successful combination with one's fellow-men in an industrial and commercial civilization."Tyack, D.B.:1967 "Bureaucracy and the Common School: The Example of Portland Oregon, 1851-1913." from, *The American Quarterly*, Volume 19, Number 3, pp.166,169.

92. Ibid, p.189.

93. Tyack, D.B.:1976, "Ways of Seeing : An Essay on the History of Compulsory Schooling," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.46, no.3, p.363.

94. Ibid.

95. Ibid.

96. Ibid.

97. Ibid, p.7.

98. Ibid.

99. In 1885, the Philadelphia Educators Association passed a resolution (remaining intact for over twenty years) to abolish local school boards, and remove teachers from school board participation. Tyack, (1967), p.184 (1974).

100. Ibid, p.137.

101. Ibid, p.141.

102. Hunt, T.C.:1975, p.238.

103. Timmons, G.:1988, pp.84-86.

104. Ibid, p.87.

105. By 1923 three fourths of 150 city schools surveyed were using 'intelligence' tests to assign students to curricular tracks; from Bowles and Gintis in Timmons, G.: 1988, p.88.

106. Ibid, p.87.

107. Hunt, T.: 1979, "An Historical Overview of American Schooling," *Society, Culture, and Schools: The American Approach*, Garrett Park Press, Garrett Park, Maryland, p.14.

108. Cordasco, F. and Bucchioni, E.: *The Italians*, pp. 480-565.

109. Ibid, p.14.

110. Karier, C.:1973, *Roots of Crisis*, Rand McNally, Chicago, p.119.

111. Ibid, p.121.

112. Ibid.

113. Ibid, p.122.

114. Ibid.

115. Ibid, p.120.

116. Karier, C.:1973, *Roots of Crisis*, Rand McNally, Chicago, p.112. Signifying the widespread use of standardized test during the early half of the twentieth century Karier states that 1.7 million men were classified according to their performance on standardized tests in the U.S. military during WWI.

117. Ibid, p.115.

118. Ibid, p.112.

119. Ibid.

120. Ibid, pp.112-13.

121. Ibid, p.115-16.

122. Ibid, p.117.

123. Ibid, p.113.

124. Timmons, G.:1988; Tyack, D.:1974.

125. Strayer, G.: 1918, *How to Teach*, The Macmillan Company, New York. Strayer, G., et.al:1936, *Principles of Teaching*, American Book Company, New York.

126. Ibid, p.91.

127. Cordasco, F. and Bucchioni, E.: 1974, *The Italians*, Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, Clifton, pp.39-44.

128. Ibid.

129. Ibid, p.513.

130. Covello, L: 1974, p.512-13.

131. Ibid.

132. For a comprehensive look at the experiences of the Italian immigrant in the United States see: Cordasco, F. and Bucchioni E.: 1974, *The Italians*, Sentry, New York.

133. Ibid, pp.483-563.

134. At this time in history, retardation was defined as, "One who is 2 or more years older than the normal age for his grade, using 6 years as normal age for kindergarten." in Tyack, D.:1974, pp.242-3.

135. Covello, L.: 1974, "The Influence of Southern Italian Family Mores Upon the School situation in America," *The Italians*, Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, Clifton, pp.511-565.

136. Ibid, pp. 524-28.

137. Ibid.

138. Tyack, D.:1974, p.22.

139. Ibid.

140. Ibid, p. 243.

141. Karier, C.:1973, p.54.

142. Ibid, p.73.

143. Addams, J.:1908, 1985, "The Immigrant Child," *Jane Addams on Education*, Lagerman, E.(ed.), Teachers College Press, New York, pp.136-142.

144. Ibid.

145. Cordasco, F., Bucchioni, E.: 1974, pp.519-20.

146. Ibid, pp.194, 524-26.

147. Tyack, D.B.:1974, p.235.

148. Ibid, pp. 230-31.

149. Fine, M.: 1992 *Disruptive Voices: The Possibilities of Feminist Research*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor. Fine, M.:1994 *Beyond Silenced Voices: Class, Race, and Gender in the United States Schools*, State University of New York Press, Albany. Hunt, T.C.:1976 "The Schooling of Immigrants and Black Americans: Some Similarities and Differences." *The Journal of Negro Education* vol.65, no.4, p.423-31. Hunt, T. C.:1974 "The American High School in Crisis; A Historical Perspective." *The Educational Forum* vol.39, 49-60. Smith, T.L.:1969 "Immigrant Social Aspirations and American Education, 1880-1930." *American Quarterly*, vol.XXI, no.3, pp.523-43. Tyack, D.:1974, *The One Best System*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

150. Ibid, pp.180-81.

151. See Tropea, J.L.:1987, "Bureaucratic Order and Special Children: Urban Schools, 1890-1940," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol.27, no.1,.

152. Train, A.:1912 "Imported Crime: The Story of The Camorra in America," *McClure's Magazine.* Vol.XXXIX, pp.83-94.

153. D'amato, G.: "The Black Hand 'Myth'," *The Italians*, Clifton, Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, pp.337-343.

154. D'Amato, G.: 1974, p.340.

155. Tyack, D.B.:1974, p.59.

156. Ibid, p.60.

157. Tyack,D.: 1974, pp.60-62, reports the following pay inequalities:

Year	Men	Women
1870	$35	$12
1880	31	12
1890	33	13
1900	32	14
1910	36	17
1920	61	36

Average salaries of women and men reported in a 1905 NEA study of 467 city systems are as follows:

	Women	Men
Elementary teacher	$650	$1,161
Elementary principal	970	1,542
High School teacher	903	1,303

158. Ibid, p.63.

159. Ibid, p.234.

160. Tyack, D.: 1974, p.234.

161. Covello, L: 1974, pp. 524-44.

162. Cordasco, F. and Bucchioni, E. (eds.): 1974, *The Italians*, pp. 217-18, 289-99, 301-07, 321-31, 489-501, 503-09.

163. Hunt, T.C. and Bellefeuille, B.K.:1988 "The Bible in the Schools: The Edgerton and Schempp Decisions Revisited," *Religion & Public Policy*, Vol. 15, No.3, p.327.

164. Timmons, G.:1988, p.89. Timmons also notes that the system put forth by the United States had significant influence in Germany, France, Britain, and Russia after WWII.

165. Tyack, D.:1974 uses the term "ethnocultural conflict" to refer to the turbulence at this time in educational history.

166. Tozier, J: 1911, "Montessori Schools in Rome," *McClure Magazine*, The McClure Publications, Inc., Vol.38, pp. 122-37.

167. Tozier, J.: 1912, "The Montessori Apparatus," *The McClure Magazine*, (January) New York, The McClure Publications, pp.289-302.

168. The summary in this section is based on George, A: 1912, "The First Montessori School in America," *McClure Magazine*, (June), The McClure Publications, Inc., New York, pp.177-87.

169. Yale Stevens, E.: 1913, "The Montessori Movement in America: A New McClure Department," *McClure Magazine*, (March), The McClure Publications, Inc., New York, pp. 223-24.

170. Canfield Fisher, D.: 1913, "About the Montessori Method," *The Outlook*, Lyman Abbot (ed.), Vol.104, (August), p.1012-1013.

171. Kramer, R.:1976, pp.160-64. Mrs. Bell was deaf. Kramer mentions that the Bells knew Helen Keller, who was very interested in Montessori. It is speculative, however, if Mrs. Bell's deafness, or her and Alexander's association with Keller added to their interest in Montessori.

172. Ibid, pp. 165-6.

173. Ibid, p.166.

174. Ibid.

175. Ibid, p.177.

176. Ibid, p.180.

177. Toward, L.: 1984, *Mabel Bell: Alexander's Silent Partner*.p.180.

178. Ibid.

179. Ibid, p.185.

180. Ibid, p.181. Also, Myron Scudder (1860-1935) was a prominent educator in New York. He had been educated at Adelphi Academy in Brooklyn, Rutgers and Yale Universities. In addition, from 1899-1908 he was principal at State Normal School in New Paltz, New York. In 1911 he became president for The Scudder School For Girls. He was a lecturer for New York University from 1903-1904. He was also treasurer and director of Camp Fire Girls of America. He is listed as a Republican, Presbyterian, Mason and served as treasurer of the National Board of Review for Motion Pictures. Condensed from: *Who's Was Who in America*, Vol 1, 1897-1942, Chicago: A.N. Marquis Company, p.1098.

181. Ibid, p.181.

182. Ibid, p.186.

183. Ibid, p.201.

184. Ibid, 182-185.

185. Kramer, R.:1976, p.154.

186. Meigs, B.:1970, p.37.

187. Ibid. p.43.

188. Ibid, pp. 45-6.

189. Lagemann, E.C.: 1985, *Jane Addams on Education*, Teachers College Press, New York.

190. Addams, J.:1907, *Democracy and Social Ethics*, Belknap Press, Cambridge, p.xii and Kramer, R.:1976, p.167.

191. Ibid, p.202.

192. Kramer, R.: 1976, pp.195-96.

193. Ibid.

194. Keller, H.: *Midstream: My Later Years*, Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., New York, pp.273-75. Keller recalls the first meeting to have taken place in Boston; Kramer, R.:1976 documents the meeting as being in Philadelphia using a newspaper reference and is most probably correct.

195. Keller, H.:19, *My Socialist Years*, p.42.

196. Ibid, p.42.

197. Montessori, M.: 1912, p.23.

198. Leadership for the U.S. branch of the Montessori system would be a recurring problem. As documented in a subsequent section, Montessori had spent many years grooming Helen Parkhurst for a leadership role for her schools in The United States. In 1918, Parkhurst left Montessori to work out what would become The Dalton Plan. Eventually her son Mario took charge of Montessori's interest in the U.S. scene.

199. Florence Elizabeth Ward (?-1934) was a graduate of National Kindergarten College in Chicago in 1903. She was professor in charge of The Kindergarten Training College at Iowa State Teachers College from 1906-1914. In 1908 she visited Europe under the auspices of National Civil League to study the problems of women abroad. She was professor of vocational education at State College of Washington from 1914-1915 and was in charge of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in 12 eastern states for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1913 she went to Europe again to study child care. Condensed from: *Who Was Who in American Education*, Vol.1, 1897-1942, Chicago: A.N. Marquis Company, p.1098. (note: Ward (1913) lists this last trip to Europe as taking place in 1912.)

200. While others such as Fisher, and Ward spent significant time observing Montessori in Italy, and took time to study her method in great detail, Kilpatrick gave her work only a brief overview. Fisher wrote volumes on Montessori's work; Ward's book was a heavily researched and cross-referenced 243 pages. Kilpatrick's book was half the size and not well-referenced or researched. Yet because of his connection to Teachers College and the access he had to teachers and administrators his book had more influence during the years surrounding its publication in 1914.

201. Kramer, R.: 1976, pp.110, 134.

202. Ibid, pp.173-74.

203. Ibid, p.174.

204. Ibid.

205. Ibid.

206. Madigan, M.(ed.): 1993, *Keeping Fires Day and Night*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, pp.1-3,19-21.

207. Ibid.

208. Ibid.

209. Ibid.

210. Ibid.

211. Ibid, p.72.

212. Ibid, p.39.

213. Ibid, p.39.

214. Fisher, D.C.: 1916, p.x.

215. Ibid, p.232.

216. Fisher, D.C.:1916b, p.18.

217. Ibid, pp.140-41.

218. *The New York Times*, July 21, 1913.

219. *The New York Times*, August 1, 1913.

220. Similarly her method was adopted by the educational establishments in Italy, Holland and Spain as well. From: Kramer, R.:1976, pp.235-45.

221. Ibid, p.169.

222. Ibid.

223. Holmes, H., in Montessori, M.:1912 *The Montessori Method* The Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, p.xviii.

224. Kilpatrick, W.H.:1914, *The Montessori System Examined*, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, p.66.

225. For a complete review of Kilpatrick's critique of Montessori see the thorough discussion in :Cambell, D: 1970, *A Critical Analysis of William Heard Kilpatrick's, The Montessori System Examined*, (Dissertation thesis), University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

226. Kramer,R.:1976.

227. Ibid, p.222.

228. Ibid, p.223.

229. Ibid, p.224.

230. Ibid.

231. Ibid.

232. Ibid.

233. Ibid, p.225.

234. The progression and implication of leadership in the MEA is documented in Kramer, R:1974 and Rambush, N.:1977, "The 'American Montessori' Experience," *The American Montessori Bulletin*, Vol.15, No.2, pp.1-28.

235. Ibid, p.226.

236. Ibid, p.226.

237. "Dr. Montessori at the Exposition," *The New York Times*, July 22, 1915.

238. Ewald, D. and Clute, P.: 1991, *San Francisco Invites the World*, San Francisco, Chronicle Books, p.73.

239. *Souvenir Views of the Panama - Pacific International Exposition San Francisco California*, Pacific Novelty Company of San Francisco, 1915.

I would like to thank Ms. Carrico at the Architecture library at The University of Maryland at College Park for helping me access the rare collection of photographs, pamphlets, books and other documents well preserved in her care. As I peered into the beautifully hand colored plates documenting the magnitude of the Panama - Pacific Conference and flipped carefully through photographs, Ms. Carrico remained patient and helpful. Lastly, she was very kind to extend library hours for me and I am grateful to her and all the librarians that helped me throughout this project.

240. The first quote is from Perry S. Allen, president of the Presbyterian minister's fund from Philadelphia. The second quote is from Dr. Felix Adler, chairman of the National Child Labor Committee from New York. Both appear in a book of people's quotes reflecting their perspective on the exposition: *The Legacy of the Exposition*, The Panama Pacific International Exposition Company, San Francisco, 1916 pp. 6-7.

241. Unless otherwise noted, all information in this paragraph is excerpted from: *Official Guide Panama Pacific International Exposition San Francisco*, The Wahlgreen Co. Publishers, 1915.

242. Burton, B.: 1983, *The Anthropology of the World's Fairs*, Berkeley, Scolar Press, p.114.

243. Morton Todd, F.: 1921, *The Story of the Exposition*, Vol 4, New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, pp.65-71.

244. Ibid, p.219.

245. Kramer, R.:1976 p.177-78.

246. Ibid, pp.215-16.

247. E.M.:1962, p.64.

248. Ibid, p.221.

249. Ibid, p. 295.

250. Kramer, R.:1976, p.295.

251. Ibid, p.295.

252. Ibid, pp.295-96.

253. Ibid, pp. 214-22.

254. In the 1960's because of her writings on peace (later in her life), Montessori's ideas again became popular on the American educational scene.

255. Ibid, p.220.

256. Keller, *My Later Years*, pp.273-4.

257. It is interesting to note that in this essay he highlighted several schools which to him were exemplary of his ideas of democratic schooling, most of which were either rural or private. He was not, as supported above, advocating the same schools other "progressives" (e.g. the administrative progressives) were master - minding.

258. Dewey, J.:1915, 1964, p.308-12.

259. Ibid, p.312.

260. Dewey, J.:1915, 1964, p.309.

261. Ibid, p.311.

262. Ibid, p.311-12.

263. Montessori, M.:1912, p.87.

264. Ibid, p.23.

265. Montessori, M.:1912, p.48-71.

266. Maria Montessori, *The Discovery of the Child*, [New York: Ballantine Books, 1962] 56.

267. Dewey, J.:1915,1964, p.203-352.

268. Montessori, M.:1912, p.95.

269. Ibid, p.297.

270. Montessori, M.:1912, p.360-70.

271. Ibid.

272. Dewey, J.:1915, 1964, p.275.

273. Montessori, M.:1912, p.366-67. See also: Montessori, M.:1917,1965 *Spontaneous Activity in Education*, Shocken Books, New York.

274. Ibid, 149-66.

275. Dewey, J.:1915,1964, p.670.

276. Ibid, 271.

277. Ibid, 313.

278. William Heard Kilpatrick, *The Montessori Method Examined*, 66. The superficiality of his arguments is thoroughly discussed in: David Campbell *A Critical Analysis of william Heard Kilpatrick's* *The Montessori System Examined.*

279. Ward, F.:1913, p.212.

280. Ibid, 312.

281. Many thanks to Professor Garrison at Virginia Tech who read an earlier version of this part of the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions reflected in my revisions here. Additionally, I wish to thank Michael Attisano for helping me clarify my writing in this chapter.

282. Though public interest in Montessori's ideas ebbed after 1915, the movement surged again in the 1960's largely influenced by Montessori's writings on peace during the thirties continuing to her death in 1952.

283. Among those whose addressed Montessori's work in their own were: Anna Freud (in her work on child psychology), Arnold and Beatrice Gesell (psychologists and educators), Ella Flagg Young (superintendent of Chicago schools) and Margaret Wildrow Wilson (the President's daughter). From Kramer, R.:1976 as well as Freud, A.:1967, *The Writings of Anna Freud*, vol. I, International Universities Press, Inc., New York, p.176-186.

284. In stating this observation I do not want the reader to assume that Kilpatrick, Snedden and Thorndike are synonymous either. A detailed source for connections between the social efficiency proponents, and particularly Snedden's views is: Drost, W.H.:1967, *David Snedden And Education for Social Efficiency*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

285. Kramer, R.:1976, p.227, 232. Kramer links Dewey and Kilpatrick synonymously with the progressives without attention to the major differences in their perspectives. Additionally, Charles Eliot also varied on his views related to the social efficiency movement. In *Charles W. Eliot and Popular Education*, by Edward Krug, Eliot denounces many of the goals of the social efficiency movement and endorses instead freedom of choice and broad democratic ideals.

286. Standing, E.M.:(1962), p.86.

287. Tyack, D.:1974, p.291.

288. Ibid, p.291.

289. Butts, R. F. quoted in: Burnett, J.: 1983, "The Revival of Civic Learning: A Response to R. Freeman Butts," *Civic Learning in Teacher Education*, Society of Professors of Education, University of Minnesota.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Stacy K. Zell

Office Address

300 War Memorial Hall
Dept. of Teaching and Learning
College of Human Resources and Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0313
(540) 231-5598
email: szell@vt.edu

Home Address

613 Clay Street
Apartment 6
Blacksburg, VA 24060
(540) 953-2627

Educational Experience: *(Doctorate expected May, 1997 **major:** Social Foundations)*

Year	*Institution*	*Degree*
1993	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	M.A. - Education **Major:** *Curriculum & Instruction*
1990	University of Maryland at College Park	B.S. - Biology **Major:** *Biological Sciences - Microscopy*
1989	Montgomery College	
1987	Trinity College	

Research Areas: *Educational Foundations, the Work of Dr. Maria Montessori, Service-Learning, Mentoring, Multicultural Education, Ecofeminism*

Professional Experience:

Teaching Experience

1996 *(summer session)* Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Blacksburg), ***Adjunct Summer Instructor***. Responsibilities included course development, film as text in the foundations, and undergraduate instruction in the social foundations of education.

1995 - Present Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Blacksburg), ***Graduate Assistant.*** Fall and Spring. Responsibilities have included, course development, undergraduate instruction in the social foundations of education. Topics included: equality of educational opportunity, history and education, class, gender, creed and race issues in education.

1994 - 1995 **Part-Time Faculty Member**, Department of Black Studies, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, Instructor for original pilot course ***Professionals in the Practice of Community***. Topics included mentoring, race relations, educational equality.

1993 - 1995 Part-time **Teaching Assistant** Montessori Elementary School, Blacksburg. Duties included assisting in classroom management as well as leading small groups on nature walks, identifying area wildlife and helping students set up individual nature journals.

1992 - 1994 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, ***Course Instructor/Graduate Student***. Responsibilities have included developing and piloting ***Women and Minorities in the Professions*** an undergraduate Service-Learning course including mentoring techniques for science-related, elementary school proteges. Mentoring included both rural female and inner-city minority populations.

Leadership/Management

1993 - 1994 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Blacksburg), **Creator and Director of mentoring program**, S.M.I.L.E.S! (Student Mentoring Involvements Linking Education and Service) serving both urban and rural areas.

1993 **Co-Creator/Treasurer** for B.O.O.M. (Black Organization of Mentors) serving inner-city Roanoke youth.

Independent/Consulting

1995 **Reviewer** for International journal *Science & Education*.

1995 **Reviewer** for International journal ***Philosophy and Education.***

1994 *(summer)* **Independent Curriculum Specialist** Contracted to develop comprehensive curriculum for new alternative school K-12, TEKOA, in Floyd County, Virginia.

Grants/Awards:

1994 **Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching** Teaching/Learning grant to develop pilot course ***Professionals in the Practice of Community.***

1994 Participant/Co-recipient of a **State Council of Higher Education in Virginia** grant to subsidize travel for student mentors.

1994 Inducted into Kappa Delta Pi (Honorary)

1993 - Present College of Education **Interdepartment Fellowship Scholarship recipient**.

1993 Recipient of **Corning Foundation Grant** for supplies needed to run B.O.O.M.

University Committees:

- **Service-Learning Project University Board of Directors**
  Responsibilities included project planning and implementation, presentation to University president Paul Torgerson for Administrative endorsement.

- **University Diversity/Service-Learning Grant Writing Workshop Group Leader**
  Responsibilities included organizing group interests and implementing combined project proposal.

- **University Service-Learning Faculty Advisory Board Member**
  Responsibilities included workshops for development and compilation of faculty service learning handbook, mission statements and suggestion guide.

Courses Created/Taught:

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
- 1996 - present *Social Foundations of Education*
- 1995 - 1996 *Social Foundations of Education*

• 1994 - 1995 *Professionals in the Practice of Community* (original)
• 1993 - 1994 *Women and Minorities in the Professions* (original)

Professional Affiliations:

• American Educational Research Association (A.E.R.A.)
• American Educational Studies Association (A.E.S.A.)
• Virginia Educational Studies Association (V.E.S.A.)
• Kappa Delta Pi International Educational Honorary

Publications:

Academic Publications *(refereed)*

• Zell, Stacy, (under review) "Higher Education in the United States: Whose Twilight?," *Educational Foundations*.

• Zell, Stacy, (forthcoming) "Ecofeminism in the Science Classroom: A Practical Approach," *Science & Education.*

Newspaper Articles

• Mentoring Program Featured in: "Tech Opens Doors To Area Youth," Tech Independent, Monday, April 18, 1994.

• Quoted in: "Students Giving Something Back to the Kids," The Roanoke Times & World News, Sunday, May 2, 1993 (New River Valley Current Edition, p.18).

• Quoted in: "Awareness Fair Sponsored by Tech," The News Messenger, Friday, April 16, 1993, front page.

Conferences:

State and Regional

• 1996 Annual S.A.P.E.S. (South Atlantic Philosophy of Education Society), Blacksburg, Virginia; **Paper Presentation**, "Maria Montessori and John Dewey: Liberty and the Child."

• 1996 Annual S.H.O.E.S. (Southern History of Education Society), Columbia, South Carolina; **Paper Presentation**, "Dr. Montessori: Ideas and Interpretations."

- 1996 Annual S.E.P.E.S. (South Eastern Philosophy of Education Society) conference, Tallahassee, Florida; **Paper Presentation**, "John Dewey and Maria Montessori" also served as a **Session Chair.**

- 1995 Annual S.A.P.E.S. Conference, Spartanburg, South Carolina; **Paper Presentation**, Ecofeminism in Social Foundations: *Play*ing with our *Class*rooms" also **panel participant** "teaching in the foundations."

- 1995 Virginia Educators Association forum on teaching in the Foundations Fredricksburg, Virginia (in attendance).

- 1995 AESA Conference, Cleveland, Ohio (in attendance).

- 1994 Virginia C.O.O.L. (Campus Outreach Opportunity League); **Session Leader and Paper Presentation**, "The How To's of a Successful Mentoring Program."

- 1994 Annual AESA Conference, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; **Paper Presentation**, "Ecofeminism in Educational Foundations."

National

- 1997 Annual A.E.R.A. (American Educational Research Association), Chicago, Illinois; **Paper Presentation** "Seeking the Eye of the Storm: The Montessori Visits to the United States 1913 - 1918."

- 1994 A.E.R.A. Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Louisiana (in attendance).

- 1993 Fourteenth Annual University of Pennsylvania Ethnography in Education Research Forum, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (in attendance).

International

- 1996 A.E.S.A. Annual Meeting, Montreal Canada, **Paper Presentation,** "Revisting the Work of Maria Montessori,"

Guest Speaking:

- Spring 1997, "Feminist Perspectives on the Curriculum" a presentation and discussion to graduate students enrolled in Elementary School Curriculum."

- Fall 1996, "Surviving Graduate School" a talk to Masters students enrolled in a departmental professional seminar.

- Fall 1996, "College Education as an Open Book" a talk to college Freshman English students.

- Fall 1995, 'Ecofeminism & Educational Theory and Practice' sponsored by the Department of Foundations and The School of Education at East Carolina University.

- Fall 1995, "The Possibilities are Limitless" a talk to freshman English students about choosing and framing their educational experiences over the next four years.