Abstract

This paper attempts to describe how John Dewey and Homer Lane might have discussed problems about educational theories and practices. The author uses a fictional dialogue between the spirits of Dewey and Lane as a means to explain some of the major disagreements that are hinted at in the works of these two men. It is argued that Dewey and Lane disagreed about how to answer basic educational problems such as, "Should students be allowed to be personally responsible for deciding their own school curriculum?"

Ronald Swartz*

John Dewey and Homer Lane: The "Odd Couple" Among Educational Theorists

Only those unfamilar with Dewey's work can believe that he rejects the active role of the teacher in planning the classroom experience by properly organized subject matters. The teacher must have, he writes, "a positive and leading share in the direction of the activities of the classroom community."

Sidney Hook

Homer Tyrell Lane . . . was, as he phrased it, "on the side of the child." It meant . . . trusting children to grow in their own way without any pressure from outside, save that of communal self-government. It meant putting learning in its place — below living.

A.S. Neill

Preliminary Remarks on Schooling and Responsibility

John Dewey and Homer Lane are indeed an odd pair of educational theorists.[1] Whereas both of these American educational reformers developed some of their more important ideas during the first two decades of this century, Lane and his work have not been noticed by most professional historians and philosophers of education. On the other hand, it would indeed be a very strange contemporary educational scholar who did not know about Dewey and his efforts related to schooling in democratic societies. And yet, during the same decade in which Dewey wrote his now famous *Democracy and Education*, Homer Lane was developing his peculiar educational views while he was the superintendent of a reform school in England. Although A.S. Neill and some of Lane's other devoted disciples consider Lane's work at the Little Commonwealth reform school to be extremely important for understanding Lane's educational philosophy, little has been written about Lane's thoughts on schooling. Unfortunately, Lane was *not* a scholar and during his short life of nearly fifty years he spent a small amount of his time as a writer; the only book which bears Lane's name was published posthumously by a few of his students.[2]

Lane's only book is called *Talks to Parents and Teachers;* this book appeared in print in 1928 after Lane had been dead for about three years. Moreover, Lane's book, which is a collection of some of his lecture notes, can in no way be compared to Dewey's monumental work *Democracy and Education*. Lane was not a good writer and his one book lacks organization, a clearly defined theme, and any sense of the historical roots of the problems which are discussed. But Dewey's writings

*School of Human and Educational Services, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

almost always had superb organization and a sense of the historical underpinnings of a problem situation. Thus, it is wrong to assume that Lane and Dewey are intellectual equals, but they both were educational theorists who wished to create new ideas about how to organize schools.

When Lane's book appeared in print Dewey was nearly seventy years old; by this time in his life Dewey was firmly established as an internationally famous American philosopher. It would have indeed been unusual for Dewey to have even heard of Lane or his obscure book on educational matters. Regrettably, Lane's work has not been recognized as intellectually worthwhile by most twentieth century educational theorists. But with the growing popularity of A.S. Neill's work at his school Summerhill, Lane's educational views may yet receive some attention.[3] As it turns out, Neill always remained a devoted admirer of Lane; in his autobiography, which was published in 1971, Neill said the following about Lane:

> The tragedy of Lane's life was his being associated with social scandal, rather than being renowned for the great work he did with problem children. Scandal cannot kill a man's work forever, but it can ruin his life.[4]

It is wrong to say that Lane developed an educational philosophy in the same sense that Dewey did. At best, Lane's work gives hints about his thoughts on schooling and the educational process. But in spite of the tremendous ambiguity associated with Lane's educational thinking, it appears that his ideas are significantly different from Dewey's educational theories. Specifically, Lane and Dewey seem to disagree about how to answer a question such as, "Should students be allowed to be personally responsible for deciding their own school curriculum?" This question, which I will refer to as *the educational problem of student responsibility*, was answered in the affirmative by Lane. In regard to student responsibilities in a school Lane once said:

> The relationship between teacher and child should be pure democracy — the child should not be on the defensive, but should be free to ask all questions . . . self-government must be given, both in the team play of games and still more in team play made possible for work . . . We must give responsibility for, say, history and get the class to discuss the syllabus and the allotment of time to the parts of it, and to assume responsibility for getting through it.[5]

The above quote, and others like it, have led me to conclude that Lane would offer an affirmative answer to the educational problem of student responsibility. In addition, Lane's answer to this problem led him to endorse an educational policy such as the following: All school members, students included, are fallible authorities who should be personally responsible for deciding their own school activities and many of the policies that govern a school. This statement, which I will label *the policy of personal responsibility*, was never clearly argued for or stated in the scattered writings of Homer Lane. Nevertheless, throughout this essay it will be my claim that the policy of personal responsibility is an idea that can be inferred from Lane's ideas on schooling. Also, I will label an educational program that endorses the policy of personal responsibility a self-governing school.[6] Moreover, the endorsement of the policy of personal responsibility makes the learning of academic subjects optional; at a self-governing school such as Summerhill students decide if they wish to attend classes and teachers are *not* responsible for determining what students learn during the school day.[7]

Despite Dewey's desire to give students some responsibility for deciding what goes on in a school, it seems that he wanted teachers to have a primary role in the determination of the school curriculum. In regard to how Dewey viewed the responsibilities of teachers, it is worthwhile to note that he once said the following:

> Unless a given experience leads out into a field previously unfamiliar no problems arise, while problems are the stimulus to thinking . . . it is part of the educators responsibility to see equally to two things: First, that the problem grows out of the conditions of the experience being had in the present, and that it is within the range of the capacity of students; and secondly, that it is such that it arouses in the learner an active quest for information and for production of new ideas.[8]

Dewey wrote the above remarks in his well-known book *Experience and Education* which was first published in 1938. By this time Dewey had been writing about educational problems for over four decades; although his ideas developed through the years, it seems that Dewey always maintained that professional educators should be the ones who were primarily responsible for determining what is learned in school. For Dewey, the teacher was a behind-the-scenes authority who should help students learn those ideas and values which society considered to be important. As early as 1902, in his essay "The Child and the Curriculum," Dewey was arguing for the notion that teachers should be responsible for determining school activities when he said:

> the value of the formulated wealth of knowledge that makes up the course of study is that it may enable the educator to determine the environment of the child, and thus, by indirection, to direct. Its primary value, its primary indication, is for the teacher, not for the child. It says to the teacher; Such and such are the capacities, the fulfillments, in truth and beauty and behavior, open to these children. Now see to it that day by day the conditions are such that their own activities move inevitably in this direction, toward such culmination of themselves.[9]

Since Dewey was such a prolific writer during ;his long life of ninety-three years, it is difficult to use two small quotes as an indication about how he might answer a complex question such as, "Should students be allowed to be personally responsible for deciding their own curriculum?" However, it does seem that throughout his educational works Dewey consistently thought that a problem such as the one on student responsibility should be answered *negatively*. Moreover, unlike Lane, Dewey probably would not wish to endorse the policy of personal responsibility. Thus, it should be obvious that there are significant differences between Lane's educational views and those of Dewey. In a sense, both Dewey and Lane are the founding fathers of two distinct twentieth century educational reform movements. Dewey, of course, is the founder of the progressive educational reform movement which includes people such as William H. Kilpatrick, Sidney Hook, and Jerome Bruner. On the other hand, Lane is the father of the reform movement that includes A.S. Neill, Paul Goodman, and a number of lesser known individuals.

No doubt, there are many significant differences between the educational views of Dewey's and Lane's followers. But at this time so little is known about Lane's work that it is both foolish and intellectually irresponsible to claim that Lane's solution to the educational problem of student responsibility should be preferred to Dewey's solution to this problem. What is now needed is a beginning understanding of the debate that Dewey and Lane might have had if Lane had been an educational philosopher who understood the value of intellectual confrontations. Unfortunately, Lane was an insecure, self-destructive, and extremely independent person who was unable to discuss his ideas with anyone who disagreed with him.[10] Unlike Dewey, who had the courage to have intellectual confrontations with such giant minds as Bertrand Russell, Lane never understood the value of having dialogues about alternative solutions to problems.[11]

What we now need is an understanding of some of the issues and problems which divide educational theorists such as Dewey and Lane. Whereas Lane's achievements will never be able to claim the historical or intellectual significance of Dewey's monumental work, it is possible to make some conjectures about what these men might say in an interview with a contemporary educational theorist who is familiar with both of their works. Thus, in order to begin the process of contrasting the educational views of Dewey and Lane, I have often had imaginary meetings with the ghosts of these two men. The time is past midnight and I am in my study alone. This is what happens in my fantasy.

II. A Fantasy

Swartz: Is that you again Homer? When are you going to leave me alone so I can get some rest?

Lane's Ghost: Swartz, why don't you stop writing about educational reforms and do something worthwhile like start a self-governing school?

Swartz: I have told you over and over again that the world does not need another self-governing school in order to create a social movement for these educational alternatives. What is needed now is a better theoretical understanding of these schools. Your disciple and friend A.S. Neill ran a self-governing school for over a half a century and most Western educational institutions have not been affected by his example. Also, like you, Neill did not adequately explain the theoretical aspects of his views on education.[12] Thus, in the last few years, I have tried to demonstrate that self-governing schools are viable educational alternatives which have their historical roots in the work of Socrates as he is described in Plato's *Apology*. In addition, I have tried to argue that the liberal political philosophies of people such as Karl Popper, Bertrand Russell, and John Stuart Mill can help us understand the theoretical basis of a self-governing educational philosophy.

(At this point in my fantasy the ghost of John Dewey appears.)

Dewey's Ghost: Professor Swartz, why have you spent so much of your time writing about a self-governing educational philosophy?

Swartz: Oh, Professor Dewey, I am so flattered that you have come to visit me again. As for your question about my interest in self-governing schools, it is not easy for me to summarize my many reasons for trying to understand the educational philosophy behind these schools. Nevertheless, I can say that my interest in self-governing schools is not a passing fancy; ever since my days as a high school student in the early 1960's I have been interested in finding out how educational programs might provide students with the opportunity to have a greater say-so in determining what an individual learns in a school. As it turns out, I have come to the surprising conclusion that adults are far too ignorant to determine what all students should learn. And as I see matters one of the greatest evils of most contemporary educational programs is that they have given adults far too much power to control the lives of children. Although I realize that adults have an extremely important contribution to make in relationship to the education of young people, I have argued that teachers, as well as students, should be viewed as fallible social authorities. Moreover, I have claimed that the policy of personal responsibility allows students to have an effective way of checking the potential misuse of a teacher's authority. Following the liberal political philosophers such as John Stuart Mill, I have tried to develop educational policies that make it possible to check all social authorities.

Dewey's Ghost: Swartz, you are going much too fast and what you are saying here needs to be explained in great detail. And from what you have said here it seems to me that your ideas will lead to irresponsible actions on the part of teachers. I wish to point out that I was for having educational programs that allowed children to have a great deal of freedom; in my book *Experience and Education* I explained that freedom in education should be more than just the freedom to move physically around the classroom. But your views seems to suggest that schools should give students the option of not learning academic subjects. Now that is going much too far! In many of my books I tried to remind people that my educational philosophy demanded that teachers indirectly guide students to learn those academic skills and ideas that are necessary for maintaining democratic societies and institutions.

Swartz: I have read your chapter on freedom in *Experience and Education* many times. But you do *not* seem to emphasize the fallibility of teachers and educators as much as I consider to be necessary and desirable. In regard to developing a fallibilistic educational perspective, I have come to the conclusion that you should have emphasized the fallibility of educational authorities somewhat more than you did.

Dewey's Ghost: What you are saying here about how to develop a fallibilistic philosophy that is different from mine needs much explanation and elaboration. Whereas I am sure that we disagree with one another about many issues associated with schooling, I think it is important for every generation of scholars to rethink the relationship between democracy and education. I hope you keep up your work and I wish you luck in developing an educational philosophy that surpasses the one I spent a lifetime trying to explain.

(At this point Lane's ghost interrupts Dewey.)

Lane's Ghost: John, why do you always try to get young people to write more and more about their educational philosophies. Theory and thinking are *unimportant* — its only actions that matter. The best thing an educational reformer can do is to start a school. People should not clutter up their minds with too much academic rigmarol. What we need are more experimental schools like the ones I started in the United States and England.

Dewey's Ghost: Who is this man? Doesn't he know I was one of the most action oriented philosophers of my generation? Is this man so ill informed that he does not know about the Laboratory School I started at the University of Chicago in 1896?

Swartz: Oh, Professor Dewey, this man here is Homer Lane. Homer was an educational reformer during the first quarter of this century, but he did not write much and he never could hold a job for very long. And furthermore, although some say that Homer heard you speak once or twice, he probably never studied your educational writings because he was extremely independent and he wanted to start his own educational reform movement.

Dewey's Ghost: Doesn't this Mr. Lane know that it is helpful to study the work of one's contemporaries and predecessors? Does Mr. Lane think that it makes sense for all people to rediscover everything for themselves without the help of others?

Swartz: A major problem with Homer's written work is that many people have found that they do not understand the little he has done.[14] Also, the primary reason I became interested in Homer's ideas is that he is one of the few twentieth century educational reformers who saw the need to greatly diminish the amount of power and authority given to teachers and other adult educational experts.

Dewey's Ghost: So what you are trying to do is suggest that Lane's experimental schools can be seen as historical examples of self-governing educational programs.

Swartz: That's it, Professor Dewey! You see, I began my work in the philosophy of education after I read your book *Experience and Education* in an undergraduate sociology of education course. However, the more I studied your numerous written essays, the more I saw that I did not agree with you about the idea that it is reasonable for teachers to encourage children to use inductive principles as a means to verify that scientific ideas are warranted by experience. On the contrary, after reading Karl Popper's views on the scientific method, I decided that his falsificationist methodology was more satisfactory than your inductivist methodology. And furthermore, I slowly began to see that Popper's work hinted at the development of a liberal educational philosophy that emphasized the fallibility of knowledge a bit more than your pragmatic educational philosophy. I really don't think I have the time to explain in detail the difference between your ideas and Popper's, but let me conclude my discussion on fallibilism and the scientific method with the following quote from Popper:

> Falsificationists (the group of fallibilists to which I belong) believe . . . that we have also discovered a way to realize the old ideal of distinguishing rational science from various forms of superstition, in spite of the breakdown of the original inductivist of justificationist programme. We hold . . . that the

> rationality of science lies . . . in the *critical approach* — in an attitude which, of course, involves the critical use, among other arguments, of empirical evidence (especially in refutations) . . . We are not interested in establishing scientific theories as secure, or certain, or probable. Conscious of our fallibility we are only interested in criticizing them and testing them, in the hope of finding out where we are mistaken; of learning from our mistakes; and, if we are lucky, of proceeding to better theories.[15]

(At this point Lane's ghost enters the conversation in a state of anger.)

Lane's Ghost: Swartz, I have been sitting quiet for a long time and I must say that I am quite upset with you. This guy Popper you have been writing about has used my ideas without giving me the credit I deserve. As for Popper's ideas about learning from mistakes, I advocated such a learning theory in my lectures when I said the following:

> . . . in my opinion . . . the duty of the parent . . . is this: To encourage all experiments of the child and assist him in reaching such conclusions as he will adopt as his own, so that he may, by the process of elimination, discard futile and false ideals.[16]

Swartz: Now Homer, don't you start up with one of your tall tales! Popper did *not* steal your ideas because as far as I know he has never heard of you. Popper studied with Alfred Adler in the early 1920's and both Adler and you suggested that mistakes were important for learning.[17] Also, Professor Dewey here has emphasized the importance of mistakes in the learning process, but it seems to me that Popper is one of the few philosophers who wish to claim that mistakes and refutations are a central part of learning, rather than a preliminary step in the learning process.[18] Moreover, like the rest of us, Popper was affected by the "climate of opinion" of his day and no one can claim to be the originator of the idea that we "learn from our mistakes". This is a cliché or slogan that has very little intellectual significance; what is important is the meaning or interpretation one gives to the notion of learning from mistakes.[19]

Dewey's Ghost: Popper's ideas about learning from mistakes don't sound too different from some of my views on learning. In addition, if you read my educational essays again you will see that I am for allowing a bit more self-government than I think you have given me credit for.

Swartz: I agree with you Professor Dewey that there are some similarities with your views on inquiry and those of Popper. Nevertheless, following both you and Popper, I think that much can be gained by contrasting alternative and competing ideas. Furthermore, the differences between Popper's philosophy and your's are important enough to lead to very different educational problems and policies. Remember, you believed that induction and pragmatic truth are important for understanding science and Popper has *not* incorporated the ideas of induction and pragmatic truth in his philosophy of science. On the contrary, Popper's noninductivist philosophy of science suggests that falsification and the quest for absolute truth are important for understanding growth of scientific knowledge.[20] And finally, as for Lane's ideas about self-government being consistent with your educational philosophy, it is important to note that the self-governing educational philosophy that has evolved from Lane's work suggests that schools should make the learning of academic subjects optional and it may be the case that some students might decide not to learn conventional subjects.[21]

Dewey's Ghost: Once again I must remind you that I think some of Lane's veiws sound very irresponsible to me. Is it possible that Mr. Lane was unaware of the fact that children in a democracy must be taught certain basic skills and information if we are to sustain and maintain a democratic society?

Swartz: I must remind you once more that Homer did not write too much and he never adequately explained his ideas. But don't you think there is something extremely intriguing about creating schools that are liberal democratic communities which view students and teachers as social and political equals? If it can be shown that these schools can become effective learning situations, then

perhaps democratic societies such as the United States and Canada will allow for *some* self-governing schools on an experimental basis.

Dewey's Ghost: I am sure you know I was for educational experimentation, but such experimentation is a dangerous business and it has to be done in a responsible manner by responsible people. In regard to educational experimentation, I once wrote the following:

> A series of constantly multiplying careful reports on conditions which experience has shown in actual cases to be favorable and unfavorable to learning would revolutionize the whole subject of educational method . . . It requires candor and sincerity to keep track of failures as well as successes and to estimate the relative degree of success obtained. It requires trained and acute observation to note the indications of progress in learning, and even more to detect their causes . . . Yet the progress of a science of education depends upon the systematic accumulation of just this sort of material . . . Solution of the problem of discovering the cause of learning is an endless process.[22]

Swartz: That quote of yours about recording failures as well as successes is excellent and perhaps you are more of a fallibilist than I once thought. However, I wish to point out here that educational reform, as with scientific experimentation, may take many unexpected turns. Specifically, in the "endless process" of trying to discover the causes of learning, some educators may decide that the ideas associated with self-governing schools are reasonable. Of course, I do not claim to be a prophet, but if educators do begin to study the historical roots of ideas like the policy of personal responsibility, then Homer Lane's educational experiments may provide us with some important information about how to organize a school.

Dewey's Ghost: What I want to emphasize before I leave is that you must be very careful with how you go about trying to reform education. Sometimes our dreams turn into nightmares and educational reformers may end up doing more harm than good if their ideas are indeed used in our schools.

Swartz: I agree wholeheartedly with you that social reformers have to be very careful when they use innovative ideas in the real world. One of the major aims of my academic research program is to try to explain that at least in *theory* it is possible to imagine that meaningful learning can take place in self-governing schools. I once wrote an essay called, "Responsibility, Reading, and Schooling" which explains how students in a self-governing school might learn to read.[23]

Dewey's Ghost: It is good to see that you are trying to work out your ideas in detail. Also, I am pleased to hear that you have spent some of your time writing about the teaching and learning of such important skills as reading. But from what you have said so far it appears to me that you have your work cut out for you. It is very difficult to start educational reform movements; although I was fairly successful in my day, I do not think I had a great impact on the way most children are educated. But I did work hard and I enjoyed my work very much.

(At this moment Dewey's ghost fades into the woodwork and I am left in the room with only the ghost of Lane.)

Swartz: Homer, when are you going to learn to behave yourself? It was so kind of Professor Dewey to come visit me. I'm sure he has more important people to talk to besides us.

Lane's Ghost: Listen, Swartz, I am a busy man too, and it's not every day that the distinguished ghost of Homer Lane comes to visit you. By the way, when are you going to write that essay about me which you have been talking about for so long?

Swartz: I think I remember that you once said it was silly to write about educational theories and experiments.

Lane's Ghost: Well, if the essays are about me, then perhaps they will be worthwhile. You know I was given bad press reviews in my day and people never understood my genius or greatness.[24] If I

were you Swartz, I would write about Homer Lane and the great things he did in his lifetime. Tell your readers the famous gold watch story — that one always got my audience going. I like that story a lot and it was a favorite of mine. It goes like . . .

Swartz: Yes, I know that story about how you helped to reform one of your students by giving him the opportunity to break your lovely gold watch. Everyone who has ever written about you mentions that story.[25] I am surprised so many people seem to believe that you could reform a person overnight by giving him the opportunity to vent his anger. I am not saying you lied when you told that gold watch story, but you know you had quite a reputation for "coloring" the truth.[26] Moreover, I can imagine that some delinquent children would have smashed your lovely watch to smithereens. You know, it really is ludicrous to try to build an entire philosophy of education from one encounter with a student. As far as I am concerned you would have been better off if you had done some serious studying, rather than going around England and the United States telling your silly stories.

Lane's Ghost: My stories were not silly and they helped to explain my educational philosophy. For example, the gold watch story illustrates my important idea that teachers and adults have to be "on the side of children."[27] That is, adults have to let children know that we want to help them rather than harm them. I always said that a major problem with most schools is that they are run by fear. I always advocated that adults should act as one of the "gang."[28] It is only when children see that adults are their equals that they will be willing to listen to what we have to say.

Swartz: Homer, I must confess that I have never felt that I had a good understanding of your idea that teachers should be "on the side of their students." The more I hear about this idea the more confusing it appears to me. And this idea about adults joining the "gang" sound ridiculous to me. I think you should never have used such words as "gang." That word is really quite explosive and it helped to make people think you were some kind of anarchist; you should have emphasized that all your schools were working liberal democratic communities which were governed by rules and regulations that the students and the teachers jointly created.

Lane's Ghost: I never said children should be allowed to do anything they wish. All of the schools I was associated with had some rules. And Neill's school Summerhill followed in this tradition by having a very sophisticated legal system which made all school members accountable for their actions.[29] But I still say that teachers and adults must be one of the gang in order to let children know we love them.

Swartz: There you go again with that gang stuff. As I see matters, adults should *not* join the "gang" as you suggest, but they should respect a child's right to be a child. In other words, schools would be better places if they did not pressure children to grow up so quickly. I think we need to have schools that allow children to learn at their own rate the things which they consider to be important. But even though I endorse the idea that children should be allowed to act like children, it does not follow that adults should also act like a child in order to show young people that we are — as you say — "on their side." I really wish you would have explained your ideas in a better way.

Lane's Ghost: Swartz, you are like the rest of them. Even Neill used to try to tell me how to run my life and do my work. I did what I had to do and if the truth be known I enjoyed my life immensely. Of course, I made some mistakes, but who doesn't make mistakes?

Swartz: I apologize for trying to tell you how you should have run your life; although I wish you had done your work in a different manner, I must admit I am pleased that you did make some efforts to bring about educational reforms. You know, I owe a great deal to you.

Lane's Ghost: That's better. My time is running out now, but I'll visit you again soon. Take care and don't forget to tell the gold watch story.

(At this moment my fantasy ends and I am left in my study with my books and the other material objects of the real world.)

III. A Concluding Remark

My fantasy about an encounter between Dewey and Lane helps us see that there are a number of significant differences between Dewey's educational philosophy and the ideas hinted at in the work of Homer Lane; my intent here has *not* been to offer convincing arguments which would explain why Lane's views on self-governing schools may be reasonable and perhaps even an improvement upon Dewey's educational philosophy. What I have tried to do here is not settle a debate, but instead demonstrate that a debate exists in regard to whether or not democratic societies should have some schools that are liberal democratic institutions which would allow students to be personally responsible for determining their own learning activities. If I have done nothing more than to arouse interest in contrasting Lane's views on schooling with those of Dewey's, then this essay has indeed been successful.

Notes

[1] The quotes which appear at the beginning of this essay are from the following: Sidney Hook, "John Dewey and His Betrayers," *Radical School Reform*, (ed.) Cornelius J. Troost (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973), p. 64; A.S. Neill, "Homer Lane: A Personal Assessment," in Homer Lane, *Talks to Parents and Teachers* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 5. At this time I would like to thank Joseph Agassi, F.J. Clatworthy, Susan Swartz, and C.L. Steffens for the help they have given in relationship to my ideas about Homer Lane's views on schooling. Although these individuals do not necessarily endorse any of the arguments in this essay, I am grateful for the time they have spent discussing and criticizing the ideas I develop throughout this paper.

[2] See Homer Lane, *Talks to Parents and Teachers*. For a beginning list about educational writers who have recorded facts about Lane and his work see the following: W. David Wills, *Homer Lane: A Biography* (London, England: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964); E.T. Bazeley, *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969); A.S. Neill, *"Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!"* (New York City: Hart Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 183-196; A.S. Neill, *The Dominie Books of A.S. Neill* (New York City: Hart Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 325-328; Ray Hemmings, *Children's Freedom: A.S. Neill and the Evolution of the Summerhill Idea* (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), pp. 23-32.

[3] For references which give accounts of Neill's educational views see the following: A.S. Neill, *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing* (New York City: Hart Publishing Company, 1960); A.S. Neill, *Freedom — Not Licence* (Hart Publishing Company, 1960).

[4] A.S. Neill, *"Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!"*, p. 188.

[5] Homer Lane, *Talks to Parents and Teachers*, p. 109-110.

[6] For accounts of my ideas about how the policy of personal responsibility is important for understanding self-governing schools see the following: Ronald Swartz. "Toward a Liberal View of Educational Authorities," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 78, No. 4 (May 1977), pp. 431-434; Ronald Swartz, "Authority, Responsibility and Democratic Schooling" in Ronald Swartz, Henry Perkinson, and Stephenie Edgerton, *Knowledge and Fallibilism: Essays on Improving Education* (New York: New York University Press, 1980), pp. 131-148.

[7] See A.S. Neill, *Summerhill*, p. 5.

[8] John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970), p. 79.

[9] John Dewey, *The Child and the Curriculum and the School and Society* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 31.

[10] See A.S. Neill, *"Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!"*, p. 186.

[11] A summary of Dewey's views on the value of discussing competing ideas can be found in John Dewey, "Experience, Knowledge and Value: A Rejoiner" in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, (ed.) Paul Arthur Schilpp (New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1951), p. 607.

[12] See Ronald Swartz, "Toward a Liberal View of Educational Authorities," pp. 430-436.

[13] See John Dewey, *Experience and Education*, p. 88.

[14] See A.S. Neill, *The Dominie Books of A.S. Neill*, p. 224.

[15] Karl R. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*, (New York: Basic Books, 1962), pp. 228-229.

[16] Homer Lane, "Early History" in E.T. Bazeley, *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth*, p. 51.

[17] For Adler's views on mistakes see Alfred Adler, *The Science of Living* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969), p. 20.

[18] A discussion about some of the differences between Popper's philosophy of science and other views of science can be found in the following: Joseph Agassi, *Science in Flux* (Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1975), pp. 51-91; Ronald Swartz, "Introduction: Toward a Fallibilistic Educational Perspective" in Ronald Swartz, et al, *Knowledge and Fallibilism*, pp. ix-iv.

[19] See Ronald Swartz, "Mistakes as an Important Part of the Learning Process" in Ronald Swartz, et al, *Knowledge and Fallibilism*, pp. 13-26.

[20] See the reference cited in footnote fifteen. Also, see Karl R. Popper, *Objective Knowledge* (London, England: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 191-205.

[21] See Ronald Swartz, "On Granting Academic Freedom to Students," *The High School Journal*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (Nov. 1977), pp. 70-91.

[22] John Dewey, "Progressive Education and the Science of Education," *Dewey on Education*, (ed.) Martin S. Dworkin (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), pp. 125-126.

[23] See Ronald Swartz, "Responsibility, Reading, and Schooling" *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 77, No. 1 (September 1976), pp. 5-11.

[24] For accounts of Lane's difficulties with the press see W. David Wills, Homer Lane: *A Biography*, pp. 152-242.

[25] Information about Lane's gold watch story can be found in the following: E.T. Bazeley, *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth*, pp. 47-51; W. David Wills, *Homer Lane: A Biography*, p. 143.

[26] Ibid., p. 62.

[27] See A.S. Neill, "Homer Lane: A Personal Assessment," p. 5.

[28] See A.S. Neill, *The Dominie Books of A.S. Neill*, p. 325.

[29] See A.S. Neill, *Summerhill*, pp. 45-55.