

## THE CULTURAL DEGRADATION OF UNIVERSAL EDUCATION: THE EDUCATIONAL VIEWS OF ROBERT LEWIS DABNEY

BARRY D. SIMPSON

THIS STUDY INTRODUCES THE ideas of Robert Lewis Dabney on universal education. The goal of presenting Dabney's views is to add to the discussion of natural order versus democracy. Hans-Hermann Hoppe's pioneering work in this field has given libertarians a reason to question the modern notions of democracy (Hoppe 2001 and 1995). The idea of democracy is carried to the masses in America through universal education. Thus, Dabney's insights are of great importance to this area. Hoppe argues that democracy represents a backward step in the process of civilization. Dabney explains exactly how the degradation of culture is carried out through universal education. His story should ring true to any former student of the public education system. Characters such as the bully and class clown are known to all, as well as the dirty jokes that permeate our formative years. In fact, his picture of the public school is so chilling to one who has graced its supposed hallowed halls that liberal and lengthy quotations are used to convey how someone writing over one-hundred years ago could hit his mark with unerring precision.

Another result of democracy, according to Hoppe, is an increase in crime (Hoppe 1995, p. 113). He uses the idea of time preference to explain such an increase. Dabney reaches the same conclusions through his analysis of universal education. While Dabney's argument may be more sociological or psychological rather than economic, the results are the same.<sup>1</sup> Dabney writes in the late nineteenth

---

Barry Simpson is an associate professor of economics at the University of South Alabama.

<sup>1</sup>Since Dabney was, among other things, a theologian, the origins of his views may be theological. This paper, however, is concerned with what Dabney believed and the application of these beliefs to the arguments against democracy, not why he believed them or whether his theology is correct.

century, and uses statistics recent to the time period to compare crime in areas heavy with universal education to that of areas with little public education. While some would call these data anecdotal, the numbers are nonetheless startling. Universal education seems to promote crime rather than prevent it. Dabney informs his readers why this is so.

As if he anticipated Hoppe's work, Dabney compares universal education under democracy and monarchy. Although universal education under monarchy is unpleasant, the situation under democracy is even worse. Hints of what modern economists call public choice abound, as Dabney adeptly sees the party system's politicization of educational issues. The party in charge decides who teaches and what is taught. This is the real threat in Dabney's estimation, as control over education is taken out of the hands of parents. The responsibility of education lies with the parent, and any nonmarket system of education diminishes the parental role. Dabney argues that the wishes of the parents will remain only wishes and never come to fruition.

Hoppe also believes that "natural elites" will rise in a natural order to serve as guides, examples, and arbiters for the masses. Although Dabney does not use the term "natural elites," it is nonetheless through such a group that he describes the flow of culture to the masses. The influence of the natural elite extends beyond dispute resolution to music, the arts, and literature. In a hierarchical society, the masses are too busy to have an opinion on such matters, and look to the opinion of the elites for guidance. Although the statist view purports to be top down as well, in practice quite the opposite occurs.

This article begins with an introduction to Hoppe's views of democracy and natural elites. Next, Dabney's views on universal education are presented as an addition to Hoppe's work in the area of education.

#### HOPPE'S VIEW OF DEMOCRACY

Hoppe uses public choice and time preference to examine political economy. The public choice aspect of his writings underlines the assumption that politicians act in their self-interest. Once this assumption is made, a notion of the economic time horizon facing the monarchist and democratic caretaker emerges.

The monarchist rules by heredity, and may effectively pass the wealth of his country on to his heirs. Monarchy is an example of a privately-owned government. The monarch will attempt to maximize

the present value of his estate and he will increase his current income, but not at the expense of decreasing present value. Taxes occur, for example, but are not so overwhelming as to stifle economic growth. A monarchist then, is more future-oriented.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, since a system based on heredity fosters an “us versus them” attitude among the populace, the monarch must be careful not to arouse feelings of dissent among his citizens. Tyrannicide greatly reduces the chances of passing along wealth. Moreover, the “us versus them” attitude creates a healthy skepticism of government on the part of the masses. These constraints cause the monarch to exploit in moderation (Hoppe 1995, pp. 95–96).

A democratic caretaker faces a much shorter time horizon. The caretaker is elected, and in some cases—the American president, for example—may only rule for a short time period. The time horizon of the caretaker is always limited by the next election. The incentive for the caretaker is not to be concerned with the long-term capital value of the nation, but with how much wealth he can amass before he leaves office. Thus, the caretaker is more present-oriented.<sup>3</sup> The caretaker will impose taxes as high as the populace will bear, given the constraint of reelection. A democratic caretaker will also engage in more redistribution programs than a monarch, in hopes of buying votes from the more populated lower classes. While the monarch would want to populate his country with the smart and industrious, the caretaker, facing a shorter time horizon, will not care about economic growth, and seeks to populate his country with people concerned with handouts rather than the creation of wealth (p. 97).

Hoppe explains how the time horizon of the leaders of a country will “trickle down” to the citizens. The “high time preference” of the democratic caretaker leads not only to high taxes, redistribution, and peculiar immigration laws, but to more crime and general moral decay among citizens of a democracy. Moreover, the “us versus them” attitude disappears under democratic rule, and since anyone is a potential caretaker, opposition to bad economic decisions by caretakers declines (p. 97).

The process from monarchy to democracy also has an effect on society’s natural elites. Natural elites differ greatly from political elites. Political elites are either elected or appointed, i.e., they gain their position through political processes, not natural ones. These

---

<sup>2</sup>In economic terms, this is a relatively *low* time preference.

<sup>3</sup>In economic terms, this is a relatively *high* time preference.

political elites are so-called experts, and impose their expert opinions on the masses from the top down.

Natural elites, in contrast, are not elected or appointed. Their expertise is gained through experience rather than government fiat. Hoppe explains:

As the result of widely diverse human talents, in every society of any degree of complexity a few individuals quickly acquire the status of an elite. Owing to superior achievements of wealth, wisdom, bravery or a combination thereof, some individuals come to possess "natural authority," and their opinions and judgments enjoy widespread respect. . . . It is to the [natural elites] . . . with long-established records of superior achievement, farsightedness, and exemplary personal conduct, that men turn with their conflicts and complaints against each other, and it is these very leaders of the natural elite who typically act as judges and peacemakers . . . out of a sense of obligation required and expected of a person of authority or even out of a principled concern for civil justice, as a privately produced "public good." (Hoppe 1995, pp. 117–18)

By monopolizing adjudication services, monarchs were able to circumvent the authority of competing elites. Democratization then sealed the fate of natural elites. Their fortunes were confiscated through taxation, along with their "tradition of economic independence, intellectual farsightedness, and moral and spiritual leadership" (Hoppe "Natural Elites, Intellectuals, and the State," p. 4). Democracy ushers in the reign of political elites.

#### DABNEY'S VIEW OF UNIVERSAL EDUCATION

Robert Lewis Dabney (1820–1898) was a preacher, theologian, philosopher, farmer, architect, and self-appointed "Cassandra of Yankeedom" (Anderson 2001, p. 13). He was also a Virginian, serving as Stonewall Jackson's chief-of-staff while his health permitted. Dabney was a staunch Presbyterian, and his Calvinistic theology certainly colors his worldview on most matters. According to this view, God establishes the role of institutions such as church, family, and state, and any imbalance or overlap disturbs the social order (pp. 3–4). The extension of the state into the area of education encroaches on the God-given responsibilities of church and family, overturning the social order. Thus, Dabney presents the antithesis to the statist/democratic view of universal education.

Dabney offers several lines of argument against the statist view. First, he argues that the provision of universal education does not necessarily imply that people will be educated. Second, he argues that literacy does not necessarily imply an increase in the cultural

awareness of the citizenry. Third, Dabney argues that the appropriate flow of culture is from the higher to the lower classes. Otherwise, a general debasement of culture follows, lowering the culture consciousness of all classes. Fourth, Dabney presents statistics on crime to support his view that universal education is not a blessing, but a bane to the cultural norms of a nation. Finally, Dabney argues that universal education is more problematic under democratic rule than under monarchy.

*“You Can Lead a Horse to Water, But You Can’t Make Him Drink”*

Dabney’s first line of attack is to argue that universal education does not equal educated people. He is fond of the old adage that, “while one man may lead a horse to water a hundred cannot make him drink” (Dabney 1999, p. 23). A prerequisite of education is aspiration and desire. In other words, for education to be effective, a child must want to learn. Any teacher can present the material to a child, but for the material to be assimilated, however, the teacher must have a willing student. Without an appetite for knowledge, the pupil is not really a student at all, but a reluctant subject to ideas and concepts of learning (ibid.)

But this is exactly the kind of child that universal education purports to inculcate. Unfortunately, such a child is unprepared to consume the educational nourishment at hand. Dabney argues that “the parents are the real architects of their children’s destiny, and the State cannot help it” (p. 25). It is the parent, then, and not the child that needs to be changed. But the State is ill-equipped to motivate the parent; only the neighbor and the church have the means to enact a change upon the parent of the child who loathes education.<sup>4</sup>

One result of such a situation is that “that which costs nothing is never valued” (p. 24). The parents of the uneducated do not value an education for their child. Universal education, supported by the State, cannot undo this tendency. Dabney characterizes these parents as “ignorant, indolent, unaspiring, and vicious” (ibid.). The potential for education lies in the home, and the children of such parents will likely take on their parents’ characteristics.

---

<sup>4</sup>See Dabney (1999, pp. 25, 37, and 68). Dabney believes that the only way to change the parent is by the example of benevolent superiors, or through social ostracism. These methods occur in the church, neighbors, and through the flow of culture from the upper class to the lower class explained below.

This leads to a perverse consequence for universal education. Dabney states that “every experienced teacher knows that pupils educate each other more than he educates them” (Dabney 1999, p. 35). Children tend to imitate their peers. Hence, the reluctant students imbue the more studious pupils with crass moral attitudes. Rather than a climate of learning, violence and obscenity is the order of the day. Dabney cites a “thousand nameless influences—literary, social, moral—not only of the playground but of the school-room,” which will pervade the tenor of universal education (ibid.). He notes “the whispered conversation, the clandestine note, the sly grimace, the sly pinch,” which “mould the plastic character of children far more than the most faithful teacher’s hand” (ibid.).

Rather than the studious raising the level of the slothful, the characteristics of the intractable students will find willing accomplices in their decent companions. The culture of the students who otherwise could raise themselves will be dragged down by their contemptuous peers. Universal education sacrifices the duty of a parent to teach cultural mores to their children, and replaces the moral teaching of the home with the antics of the school and playground.

Moreover, some parents will not even send their children to a free school. Since these are the very parents that universal education hopes to persuade, the failure of universal education leads to calls for compulsory education (pp. 24 and 18). Under compulsory education, the situation worsens, because the very worst children become the companions of those desiring a proper education. According to Dabney, “the abortive effort will awaken other influences . . . which are likely to make the children more miserable and less innocent than their ignorant parents” (p. 25).

*Literacy is a Means to Education, Not an End*

Dabney’s second argument centers on the means versus the ends. Literacy is only a means to becoming educated, but it is not education itself. Literacy enables one to read the finer works of literature, etc., but these works must be understood within the context of other great works, and within the context of history, politics, and religion (pp. 14, 29, 57).

Moreover, literacy is not the only means of education; it is only a “modicum of the arts of reading, writing and cyphering” (p. 4). Acquiring a skill for work is part of an education; acquiring moral virtues is part of an education. Dabney explains that the worker “ennobles his taste and sentiments by looking up to the superior who employs him” (p. 29). And again, “if to these influences you add

the awakening, elevating, expanding force of Christian principles, you have given that laborer a true education" (Dabney 1999, p. 29). This true education Dabney holds is much more important and useful than "certain literary arts, which he will almost necessarily disuse" (ibid.).

Most people who learn to read forget their literary pursuits, and even discard their literacy as it becomes unprofitable. Dabney argues that American laborers do not use their education once they enter the work force. He notes that in Massachusetts, school superintendents bemoan the fact that laborers "neither know nor care anything concerning letters, for themselves or their children." (p. 28).

In Prussia at the time of Dabney's essay, more than a generation of citizens had been compelled to attend school, but many middle-aged peasants either did not read, or had forgotten how to read (ibid.). They have the means to gain an education, but are not educated. Plus, they have found that literacy is of no use to them in their everyday life.

#### *"Trickle-Down" Education*

Dabney has argued thus far that children cannot be compelled to learn, that literacy is only one of the means to acquire true education, and has hinted that universal education sullies cultural norms. The last argument takes form in his idea of "trickle-down" education.

When the mass of society is uneducated, "*influence descends*" (p. 32, emphasis in original). In the days before universal education, literature was demanded by and supplied to the educated. Hence, literature "was most decent in manner, elevated in sentiment, and thorough and just in argument, of which their society could boast" (p. 30). The mass of men, then, "reflected the opinions, sentiments, and elevated tone of the uppermost stratum" (ibid.). Dabney recalls the argument by Macaulay, who showed that even without books, the Athenian populace was extremely cultivated. He also observes the greatness of the feudal barons who were "dissociated from all 'clerkly arts'; yet they were warriors, statesmen, poets, and gentlemen" (p. 29). Dabney even goes as far as to compare African freedmen in the South to the Yankee laborer in common school, arguing that the freedmen, who take their cue by imitating "superior breeding and sentiments," portray a "higher style of man" than their Northern, white counterparts (ibid.).

Dabney compares his view with that of an engineer supplying water to a low lane or alley. The engineer "establishes his reservoir upon the topmost hill; and thence it descends, without any other force than its own gravity, to every door and every lip" (Dabney

1999, p. 32). Consequently, to influence the masses, “the wisest plan is to place the element of good at the top, that it may percolate downwards” (Ibid.). Thus, the best way to elevate the lower classes is to provide for the rise of the upper classes (or natural elites), not by giving the lower classes tools they neither want or need.

Under universal education, however, the supply and demand of literature changes form. Since literacy is only a means of education, the common school produces readers who are only partially cultivated. Such men can read, but cannot discern good from bad literature. The result is a supply of “false, shallow, sciolist literature, science, and theology, infinitely worse than blank ignorance” (p. 30). The demand of the masses supersedes that of the cultivated class, so literature, the arts, etc. is degraded and corrupted.

The new literature that develops promotes arrogance, envy, and discontent among its readers. Dabney explains:

The result is that the book and newspaper making trade has, for sordid purposes, brought down to the lower classes a multitude of speculations on the most dangerous subjects, with which no mind is prepared to deal for itself and independently, until it is very thoroughly trained and informed. That thorough mental discipline and full learning the common schools can never give to the masses. They may as well promise that, every agrarian among them shall be an Astor or a Rothschild in wealth. (Ibid., p. 31)

Therefore, not only is the attempt to educate the masses unrealistic, it is universal education that sows the seeds of social rebellion.<sup>5</sup> The new literature that is created for mass consumption “intoxicate(s) their minds with the most licentious vagaries of opinions upon every fundamental subject of politics and religion,” since the recently literate do not have the knowledge needed to “teach them their danger and incompetency” (p. 31).

To solidify his argument, Dabney appeals to the historian Heerea, who opined that the printing press would be a curse to European society. The State is unfit to provide education to the masses, it teaches them only literacy, which is not enough for them to recognize the underlying arguments of what they read.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the

---

<sup>5</sup>This is the opposite of the view of founding fathers such as Thomas Jefferson, and social reformers such as Horace Mann, that a republic and/or democracy requires an educated populace to function. On Jefferson and the founding fathers, see Liggio and Peden (1978, pp. 75–77) and Cremin (1965, p. 5). On Mann, see Filler (1983, pp. 87–88).

<sup>6</sup>Ekelund, Hébert, and Tollison argue that printing presses developed only in Post-Reformation Protestant countries. This would indicate that the Catholic Church might have agreed with Heerea. See Ekelund, Hébert, and Tollison (2002).



State only “prepares the victims for the literary seducers” (Dabney 1999, pp. 32 and 46). As literature declines so does culture, and civilization itself lies open to the whim of the barely literate masses, envious of what universal education can never give them.

*Statistics on Crime*

In order to substantiate his claim, Dabney presents statistics on crime. Contrary to the statist view, Dabney believes that universal education increases crime; therefore, rather than schools decreasing the number of jails, society will have more schools and more jails.

Universal education tarnishes culture, and drags down everyone in society. The common man gains just enough literacy to become dangerous. This situation degrades education and literature. The degraded literature fosters restlessness, the rich are plundered, the morals of children are jeopardized, and the laborers of society feel that labor is above their station (pp. 10–11). A climate of discontent among the masses results, and crime and pauperism multiply (pp. 68–69, 77).

Dabney’s first comparison is between France and Prussia. Around 1850, two-thirds of France’s population was illiterate. In Prussia, however, universal, compulsory education for all was the rule. However, serious crimes occurred 14 times more often in Prussia than France (Dabney 1999, pp. 21–22).<sup>7</sup> He continues with the observation that the “lewd women of Paris come from those departments where there is the most instruction” (p. 22). To France and Prussia, he adds the reflection of Tocqueville that crime increased in the United States in areas that had the most education. Dabney also points out that in Scotland the educated outnumber the uneducated criminals four and a half to one. He includes the remarks of the ancients that “the moral condition of the ‘Barbarians’ was comparatively pure beside that of the Greeks and Romans, and that the most refined cities were the most corrupt” (ibid.).

Dabney computes his own statistics to compare the Northern and Southern United States. The Northern States adopted universal education before the Civil War, but the Southern States had not. The North boasted a population of thirteen and a half million people, and the South nine and a half million. The North, however, recorded 23,664 criminal convictions, while the South had only 2,921. Allowing for population, this makes the North over six times as

---

<sup>7</sup>For this statistic Dabney cites Sir Archibald Alison (1839, p. 15). The data are controlled for population.

criminal as the uneducated South. In addition, the North documented 114,400 paupers, with only 20,500 in the South. Therefore, “the ‘unintelligent’ South was something more than four times as well qualified to provide for its own subsistence as the ‘intelligent’ North” (Dabney 1999, p. 22).

In America, universal education began in Massachusetts (Rothbard 1999; Spring 1986). In Boston and its surrounding areas, the number of individuals in jails, correction and refuge houses, and alms-houses was one in every 34 among whites, and one in every 16 among free blacks. In Richmond, Virginia, however, the ratio of paupers and convicts to the population was one to every 112. Thus, the economic view of education by statist, namely, that building schools reduces the need to build jails, does not ring true. According to these simple observations, universal education raises the need for jails, and increases the number of paupers unfit for work. Dabney concludes:

In the South State schoolhouses were unknown, and consequently jails and penitentiaries were on the most confined and humble scale. The North is studded over with grand and costly public school-houses, and her jails are even more “palatial” in extent and more numerous than they. (Dabney 1999, pp. 22–23)

#### *Monarchical versus Democratic Universal Education*

Finally, Dabney compares universal education under monarchy and democracy. Dabney utilizes what would today be called a public-choice view of politicians. He holds that politicians act in their own self-interest, and not with the interest of the public in their hearts.

Dabney’s approach and conclusions seem similar to those of Hoppe.<sup>8</sup> Dabney writes, “an old, stable monarchy is always infinitely more decent and moderate than a democratic faction in America rioting on the spoils of party success” (ibid., p. 38). Dabney does not elaborate on why monarchy is more decent than democracy; to him it is matter of fact. Moderns enamored with democratic ideas must look to Hoppe for a detailed explanation. But on the effect of the party system and the temporary nature of government under democracy Dabney is clearer: “For what is it on which American politicians do not lay their harpy hands to get or to keep the spoils of office”

---

<sup>8</sup>Dabney’s views are certainly different from Hoppe’s. However, Dabney’s conclusions are that public education gives the political elite power, is egalitarian in educational outlook, and aids the process of decivilization. All of these views complement Hoppe’s arguments against democracy.

(Dabney 1999, p. 38). The caretaker's time horizon is short, and he must be reelected to continue receiving benefits, hence the politician interferes with the economy in order to remain in power. Even in 1897, many examples of government intrusion in the American economy exist. Dabney cites the areas of finance, commerce, railroads, the productivity of citizens, taxation, religion, and of course, education.

Politicians grasping for temporary power are more dangerous to their citizens than men with extended power. Dabney argues that although a monarch will interfere in educational matters, such interference will not reach the level of the democrat. He states,

It is very true that this monarchy does manipulate the State schools in the interest of its own perpetuity, and in doing so inflicts on the minds of the people no little injury. But the wrong thus done is as white as snow compared with the pitch, when set against the foul perversions wrought by our demagogues in power. (Ibid.)

He concludes, "The teachings of the monarchy, if self-interested, are at least conservative and consistent; and they include a respectable knowledge of the Christian religion" (ibid.). Similar to Hoppe, Dabney sees the restraints on monarchical power thrown away in the hands of the democratic caretaker. With no restraints, education in the hands of democrats becomes subject to the political whims of the day. The schools will be "wielded by the demagogues, who are in power for the time, in the interests of their faction" (ibid., p. 37). Even worse, public education in a democracy loosens parental control over subject matter. School boards run the schools, and these boards choose textbooks. Dabney cautions that "omnipotent school boards, under the plausible pretext of uniformity of textbooks, enter into alliances with capitalists who are publishers of books" (ibid., p. 39). Here Dabney does not mean to damn the capitalists, but merely to point out that *who* demands education is important. Capitalists give people what they want. If the school boards demand textbooks, and these boards are insulated from the demands of individual parents, then the parents are left with no options to control what their children learn. Once again the flow of culture from the natural elite is interrupted.

#### CONCLUSION

Dabney's writing on education holds the modern statist view by its ankles like the school bully shaking down the bookworm for lunch money. Every possible positive argument for universal education is shown as a feint, and is countered with a blow for individualism and natural order. Effectual literacy is simply impossible, and those who

promise it are “delusive and mischievous” (Dabney 1999, p. 20). But more than an empty promise, universal education will disintegrate culture with ominous results for society.

Through mass “education” and the concomitant increase in leisure time, along with democratic values, everyone’s opinion becomes equal—the day of the “informed opinion” is gone. Thus even the most dishonorable and ignorant opinion is given credence. The egalitarian nature of universal education and democracy ceases the flow of culture downward. Culture puddles and begins to putrefy before ascending and corrupting the once noble and natural elite. The elite begin to mock the mannerisms of the masses rather than otherwise, and the most heinous of attitudes becomes the most appropriate. The hope of the political elite—to teach the masses culture and make everyone’s life better for it—backfires by degrading those whom society should naturally follow. Rich children begin to wear their pants slung low to imitate juvenile delinquents. The tables are turned; the role models become outcasts and the outcasts become role models. The result is savagery.

Some might think that natural elites and parental control would squash individualism. But parents and local elites are individuals, and as such foster this sense in the young. Dabney responds to such charges by pointing out that universal education “aims to extinguish all the diversity and independence which the young would derive from parental inculcation, and to imprint upon the whole body of coming citizens its own monotonous type of political heresies and passions” (ibid., 1999, p. 41). Cutting the parental cord lessens individuality rather than enhancing it, because parental individuality is substituted for teacher regimentation.

Dabney’s concerns on education and crime are definitely rudimentary, but some recent work seems to vindicate his claims. At least one recent study claims that increases in public school attendance are correlated with increases in juvenile delinquency (Lott 1987). Once again, Dabney looks prescient. Education and democratization are factors which cannot be overlooked when discussing crime rates. The arguments certainly ring truer than Marxist cries over alienation. For Hoppe, a rising time preference leads to an increase in violent crime. However, he also considers the depreciating effect on law of an increasing reliance on public assistance and collective responsibility. Dabney would certainly concur that public education heightens “family disintegration,” which according to Hoppe leads to the effects which depreciate law (Hoppe 1995, pp. 112–15).

The indoctrination of universal education keeps the populace humble and obedient. Again Dabney reads between the lines of the

myriad arguments for universal education. Once democracy topples the natural elite and renders society into one homogeneous blob, there is no longer us versus them. Dabney states quite succinctly that under the system of democratic, public education, the “mass will never again make tyrants tremble” (Dabney 1999, p. 11).

Hoppe’s use of time preference puts his theory of democracy on firm theoretical footing. Dabney’s view of cultural degradation through public education is more sociological, but with the same result. That the two theories lead to the similar consequences is not merely coincidence. These views are two sides of the same coin. Public education is the *sine qua non* of Statism. It is the glue which keeps the system from falling apart. It leads to unquestioning masses hungry for the dole. In short, it leads to people who *do not desire* to be free. Democracy and public education—handmaidens of Statism—extinguish the thirst for freedom. To a libertarian, losing one’s yearning for freedom may be worse than slavery. In other words, the very soul of libertarianism could be at stake.

#### REFERENCES

- Alison, Sir Archibald. 1839. *The History of Europe, From the Commencement of the French Revolution, in 1789, to the Restoration of the Bourbons in 1815*. 10 Vols. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons.
- Anderson, William P., Jr. 2001. “Neglected Cassandra of Yankeedom: Robert Lewis Dabney, Prophet of Statism and Empire.” Unpublished Manuscript.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. 1965. *The Genius of American Education*. New York: Random House.
- Dabney, Robert Lewis. [1897] 1999. *The State Free School System: Four Essays on Public Education*. Wiggins, Miss.: Apologia Press.
- Ekelund, Robert B., Jr., Robert F. Hébert, and Robert D. Tollison. 2002. “An Economic Analysis of the Protestant Reformation.” *Journal of Political Economy* 110, no. 3 (June): 646–71.
- Filler, Louis, ed. [1965] 1983. *Horace Mann on the Crisis in Education*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Hoppe, Hans-Hermann. 2001. *Democracy—The God That Failed: The Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy, and Natural Order*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- . 1995. “The Political Economy of Monarchy and Democracy, and the Idea of a Natural Order.” *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 11, no. 2 (Summer): 94–121.
- . “Natural Elites, Intellectuals, and the State.” <http://www.mises.org/etexts/intellectuals.asp>.

- Liggio, Leonard P., and Joseph R. Peden. 1978. "Social Scientists, Schooling, and the Acculturation of Immigrants in Nineteenth Century America." *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 2, no. 1: 69–84.
- Lott, John R. 1987. "Juvenile Delinquency and Education: A Comparison of Public and Private Provision." *International Review of Law and Economics* 7 (December): 163–75.
- Rothbard, Murray N. [1971] 1999. *Education: Free and Compulsory*. Auburn, Ala.: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Spring, Joel. 1986. *The American School, 1642–1885*. New York: Longman.