

#97 How Centrist Democrats Paved the Way for Betsy DeVos

Jennifer Berkshire Welcome to Have You Heard. I'm Jennifer Berkshire.

Jack Schneider And I'm Jack Schneider

Berkshire And Jack, I just want to know how are you doing?

Schneider Where are you going with this? Jennifer?

Berkshire I'm expressing human kindness and concern. I know you're juggling a lot these days.

Schneider Whoever this is who looks like Jennifer right now, I'm on to you.

Berkshire In all seriousness, Jack. I know that you have a lot going on right now. That's why it takes you so long to respond to my emails.

Schneider Oh, your, your sympathy is packaged so nicely in criticism there, Jennifer. Yes, my daughter, in fact, as we are recording is at the park by herself a couple miles away. So I am going to go pick her up soon. This is what happens when one parent is teaching in person and one parent is teaching online and the child is learning at some point online. But we're in the kind of pickle that I think lots of families are right now where we're just trying to figure out what to do with our child so that she doesn't feel ignored and is not unsafe during the day.

Berkshire Well, in addition to all of the balls that you've been juggling, you've also been coming up with great ideas for this podcast. And this episode that we're about to share with the world is no exception.

Schneider Yeah. One of the ways that I've been staying sane is by having virtual coffee with colleagues from around the U S and around the world and out there in the Pacific time zone is David Menefee-Libey of Pomona college. And we've been having coffee lately and just talking about education policy. And he said something the other day that really just made smoke come out of my ears. He was talking about the unraveling of the charter school consensus, something that, you know, we've talked about on this show and that you and I have both written about Jennifer. And he said: "What happened is that the charter school treaty was broken." And even before really knowing what he was talking about there, I knew he was onto something. And as he explained it, I thought, Oh my gosh, this totally explains what has happened with regard to the charter school movement, but it does so much more. It explains how we got Betsy DeVos. It

explains why people are so perplexed by so many of DeVos' moves. And I think it offers us a really nice framework for thinking about future policy efforts.

Berkshire Well, you can probably hear why I would be intrigued by these conversations. So let's get down to it, shall we? David Menefee-Libey is a professor of politics at Pomona College in Claremont, California. And part of the reason for his deep interest in the politics of the charter school movement is that he's had a front-row seat now in two different states that have been at the very center of that movement.

David Menefee-Libey California and Minnesota are two of the most important places for the beginnings of charters, more than a generation ago in the, in the late eighties and early nineties, California enacted the second charter law in the country in 1992, after Minnesota enacted one in 1992. And I had seen in California that there was very explicitly a kind of negotiated settlement out here to agree on that charter law in 1992. And the agreement was between the democratic majority in the state legislature and the Republican governor, Pete Wilson at that time. And then a variety of school reform factions inside the state from left to right

Berkshire Those early negotiations in California brought together Republicans and Democrats who had very different goals when it came to public education. And charter schools offered something for both camps.

Menefee-Libey On the right there were people who supported vouchers. There was about to be a voucher initiative on the California ballot. And on the left, there was support from activists that were strong supporters of what, in those days we used to call a restructuring or a site based management. And the idea then was to devolve control over a school, down to the site so that the stakeholders at the site, including teachers and parents and community members could devise school action plans or school improvement plans for that particular site. This conversation went on in California and they negotiated an agreement to, to enact charters. And that has been the sort of model in my mind ever since, that there was this sort of treaty between people on the left and people on the right or people in the Democratic Party and people in the Republican Party. And there were things that each side gained from the treaty and the things that they gave up.

Berkshire The nature of a treaty is that you don't just get stuff, you also have to give something up. And that's exactly what happened with the charter school treaty. Both Republicans and Democrats got something but they also had to make some pretty substantial sacrifices. Let's start with the Democrats.

Menefee-Libey Within the Democratic coalition, what they gained was public support for school reform and increased resources going into elementary and secondary education and support sort of nationally and credibility in school reform. And what Democrats gave up was support for teachers unions. The idea was that these charter schools would probably not be unionized.

They wouldn't operate under the traditional union contract. They would operate in some new way. You know, this goes back to Al Shanker at AFT was one of the original participants in this conversation about what a charter school might involve. So Democrats, one of the things they gave up on was sort of a union role in schooling and in controlling how schools were run. The second thing that Democrats gave up was desegregation did sort of push questions about access and inclusion off of the agenda because charter schooling was about something completely different than there would be enrollment school by school, by school. And you couldn't do systemic desegregation in that way.

Berkshire As for the Republicans, the charter school treaty delivered some substantial policy wins.

Menefee-Libey On the Republican side what they gained was a challenge to what they saw as the public school monopoly and a traditional system of state legislation and school districts and collective bargaining and unionized teachers playing a strong role in controlling that system. Conservatives had over the 1970s and 1980s, gradually lost control over most state and local education policy through that collective bargaining process. And they were able to sort of regain a purchase in that by creating a separate system, an organizational system that they could potentially control with their coalition.

Another thing that conservatives or Republicans gained was test-based accountability, which they were pushing for. There would be transparent public testing of each individual child every year. And those test scores would be visible to the public. It's hard to remember now because test scores are kind of everywhere all the time, but in the 1960s and seventies, most students took tests, but the results of those tests were private. That is that they were held by schools and parents and teachers, but they weren't revealed to the public. And one of the things that Republicans gained was this idea of test-based public accountability.

Berkshire But Republicans in California also had to give up a lot - namely the central idea that animated school reform on the right: the Milton Friedman-inspired vision of private school vouchers.

Menefee-Libey Republicans and conservatives had pushed vouchers in many places around the country, including notably Wisconsin. So in Wisconsin, we were watching an experiment with a statewide voucher program in Milwaukee play itself out, and in California there was about to be a voucher initiative on the ballot. It was Prop 174 at that point. And Republicans sort of backed off on thinking that that was a way forward in California and instead went with charter legislation to allow parents to basically take the money of their child, not to a voucher school, but to a charter school. It was similar to a voucher program, but it was still under the umbrella of the public sector.

A second thing that people in the conservative coalition gave up was religion in schools. One of the major factions inside the Republican party that emerged in the seventies and eighties was

evangelical Christians who had been fighting public schooling for decades and decades and wanting to get their children out of the public school system, which they saw as secular and godless. That was one of the major drivers of the Republican education policy coalition in the seventies and eighties and nineties. And charter schools sort of do away with that idea. That charter schools at the time in the nineties, when the treaty was set were acknowledged to be things that would operate under the public umbrella and they would be secular. You couldn't have a Christian charter school, or you couldn't have Catholic charter school or a Jewish charter school or a Muslim charter school. Religion was taken off the agenda. So that was something that was given up by conservatives in this coalition work.

Berkshire So Jack, obviously my first thought, when you told me that you had been having these conversations with David was, you know, a sense of having been left out,

Schneider Jennifer, I can't invite you to everything that would make you a roommate rather than a cohost.

Berkshire Well, I do feel like I really missed out on something. Just listening to how interesting David's take is - this is such a distinct way of viewing what happened with the evolution of charter schools than we're used to. I'm thinking back to an episode that we did eons ago. Now we called it the DNA of charter schools and we did it with a journalist Rachel Cohen. And it was sort of about how, you know, there's this founding story about charter schools, that it was really, it was a, the Democrats came up with the idea and then what happens is over the years, they sort of stray from their purpose and that that people figure out how to marketize them profit enters into the equation. And Rachel was arguing, you know, that that kind of neoliberal ingredient was there from the very beginning. And so we're getting another take on this, which is that actually both the sides that sat down, ended up having to give up some things. And that the right in many ways gave up more than the Democrats. I have to say, this is, I feel like my eyes are really being opened.

Schneider Yeah. Yeah, I have long argued that charter schools represented a compromise between the right, which had long pushed for vouchers and other forms of privatization and marketization of public education and the left, which you know, had long been in favor of traditional public schools and nothing else. And I think one thing that David is bringing to the table here is a framework for helping understand the way that a kind of negotiated compromise like this plays out, right? That it isn't simply that conservatives capitulate and give up on vouchers. It's not simply that the left decides to throw them a bone or suddenly becomes enamored with charter schools. It's actually more complicated than that. And the reason I'm so interested in talking about this is that these kinds of compromises are not permanent. That one of the points that David makes repeatedly is that these are always impermanent arrangements. And so then it becomes really important to think about who is trying to accomplish what, with regard to the creation of these.

And I think as we'll see in our conversation that conservatives who gave up so much actually may have gained more because this treaty gave them a stepping stone towards their long-term aims, whereas for many neo-liberals charter schools were an end in of themselves, right? That they were not seeking to go further than that. For them, it was a closed treaty. It was a negotiated settlement. It was detente. And it turns out that you get Betsy DeVos 20 years later, and suddenly people are wondering 'what the heck happened to detente?'

Berkshire Back to David Menefee-Libey. If you were paying close attention at the top of the show you probably caught that he is a scholar of politics. And his thinking about the charter school treaty evolved based on his observations of similar arrangements in other fields that have nothing to do with education. To help us get a handle on this whole treaty concept we asked David to give us an example of a treaty in action.

Menefee-Libey Yeah. I think that there are other treaties like that these kind of grand compromises where people gain something and people lose something. I mean the most recent one that I think your listeners might be familiar with is the idea of pricing carbon or pricing CFCs and using market incentives to reduce emissions of chemicals that are destroying the atmosphere or destroying the climate. And there were a lot of people on the right who agreed to that because it was the alternative to simply regulating a way the use of CFCs are regulating a way the use of carbon and it allowed their preference for market systems of decision making and on the left for them, it gave up the kind of regulation and fast movement on the problem at hand, whether it was CFCs in the ozone hole or whether it's carbon and climate change.

I think that's a treaty that is, you know, never been fully consummated, but it's, you know, in California we have carbon pricing and we have, that's our way of doing, I mean that wasn't negotiated under Arnold Schwarzenegger, a Republican governor at the time, and it's a very explicit kind of Democrat/Republican treaty. There are plenty of other treaties historically. They're just hard to imagine now because we live in such a polarized time that Democrats and Republicans have a hard time talking with each other about when the sun is going to come up tomorrow, much less large policy challenges or public challenges like climate change or education quality.

Schneider It seems to me that the charter school treaties satisfied and dissatisfied those on both the right and the left, right. It produced a kind of working consensus model and it didn't really make anybody happy, but allowed people to drive forward particular items that they believed in. And what I find so interesting here is that Betsy DeVos and her allies never saw this as a settled compromise. They saw it as a stepping stone to a larger aim. And it seems to me that this is the inherent problem with compromise. If you're negotiating with, with a long term ideological position, you're never negotiating a lasting peace. Those people will always be waiting for an opening to break the treaty and advance their agenda. And we can see now that the charter school treaty normalized the kind of free market thinking and the ethos of privatization that's so threatening to the entire system. And I'd love to just get your reaction to that.

Menefee-Libey I think that's well said. My colleagues in international relations will tell me and do tell me that no treaty system is permanent and no treaty system is stable. Treaties always involve compromises where people are giving up things that they hold dear. And they do it because they have to, because the, you know, the exigencies of the moment require them to engage in the treaty. That's why they do it, but it doesn't mean that their interests necessarily change. And they often don't have any commitment at all to the treaty itself. They have a commitment to that momentary sort of settlement of conflict. And so any treaty, even the international ones like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, things like that, no treaty is permanent and no treaty is entirely stable, especially if the participants get so used to the treaty, that they don't believe that they have to work at sustaining it anymore. If they, if it just becomes sort of part of the furniture and people just assume it.

And I think to some extent, that was what began to happen during the Obama Administration. Everybody assumed that the charter treaty was stable enough so that they could start trying to find their own workarounds and to get what they wanted within the bounds of that treaty, even though it made the treaty less sustainable. I think that Betsy DeVos decided to just push it as far as she could push it. And I don't know if she assumed that the treaty would, would remain in place and the Democrats would continue to come to the table. But clearly her temperament is one where she just pushes things as far as I could possibly go. And ultimately, if that leads to the breakage of the treaty, well, you know, she got what she could from the treaty as long as she could. And then, and then she stepped out.

Berkshire So Jack, I thought that that was such an interesting insight from David, that we just heard that here you have the Obama people, and they're so used to operating within this framework that when the Great Recession happens and it's time to, you know, they've got all this money that they can distribute, they just sort of decide, you know what, we're gonna kick things up a notch, and they've got a whole other agenda that they roll out. And I know I reference Arne Duncan's book, *How Schools Work* on this program constantly, but he really lays out how in their minds, all these pieces fit together, right? That, that you are going to have the Common Core. And then you were going to have better assessments. And then you were going to have teacher evaluations that were sort of tied to both, and you can see how they really, they got ahead of themselves.

But they also get ahead of the terms of the treaty that we've been talking about. And that's when we really start to see the right, getting more and more upset. And there's, you know, there's a case to be made that part of what ushered Donald Trump into the Oval Office was the outrage on the right about the Common Core. And I thought that was so interesting to think about that in terms of the unraveling of the treaty that David has been talking about.

Schneider Yeah. The treaty sets the terms for what is acceptable with regard to policies. And also with regard to the way we talk about public education or any sphere where these kinds of governance treaties policy treaties might be enacted. And so in pushing past the negotiated

settlement between neoliberals and conservatives, you know, it's not to say that Obama and Duncan were pushing a kind of radical leftist agenda. They weren't, they were just pushing a straight forward neoliberal agenda which identifies a much clearer place for government in the creation of policy that, that ultimately signaled the kind of bad faith to some conservatives. Not to DeVos, right? She was never bought into that treaty. But to the kinds of centrist conservatives who really supported this working agreement between neoliberals and conservatives that is exemplified by charter schools, right? That it involves a kind of decentralization, but it's not a complete capitulation to the market. And then you've got Arne Duncan and Barack Obama talking about essentially ramping up the use of government to promote market-like behaviors, business-like behaviors, but very clearly situated in big government. And that, that broke the terms of the treaty for some.

Berkshire Way back at the start of this episode David ran through what Democrats and Republicans got and gave up as they entered into the great charter school treaty. Well, there was an imbalance in their respective concessions. And understanding the 'why' of that imbalance is going to be essential as we start to think about what the post treaty landscape is going to look like.

Menefee-Libey There's more of a right wing on the Republican party than there is a left wing of the democratic party in the center of gravity. The democratic party probably in until very, very recently was very centrist for people like Arnie Duncan and deferred. They didn't have to give up very much to join the charter coalition, whereas people like Betsy DeVos and the Heartland Institute or whatever they had to give up a lot. I don't think that there was deep dissatisfaction among a lot of Democrats to turn their back on desegregation or to turn their back on teacher unions. I don't think that that was a big loss for a lot of centrist Democrats in the same way that getting up on religion in schools or giving up on privatization was a loss for a lot of Republicans.

Berkshire Now factor in the intense political polarization of our current moment and the fact that treaties are temporary by definition and what are we left with? Well, it turns out that the right's original commitment to private school vouchers never went away. And now that the treaty is unraveling before our eyes, the big push from the right is for the stuff they gave up when they joined the charter school coalition - like religious education. When the Supreme Court handed down its pro-voucher ruling this summer, conservative school choice advocates immediately saw an opening for publicly-funded religious charter schools. I asked David if this is an example of the right's original goals coming right back to the fore.

Menefee-Libey Exactly. So, and this is a real, that's a really good example, Jennifer, that people remained committed to the interest that they had before the treaty and when an opportunity arose for them to, to gain back something that they had lost with a treaty, they'll take it. And this that's a perfect example of that where conservatives gave up support in many cases, support for religious schools as part of the deal when they, when they joined in the charter coalition and now has been as open that up and they'll say, okay, now we're going to go for it.

And that's sort of inherent to any kind of treaty situation is when opportunity is up and up, whether or not the parties are ready to go for it.

Berkshire Or take the growing push to just give some portion of school funding directly to parents and let them spend it however they want. It's another example of a commitment on the right that has never gone away. And even as the pandemic has exposed how much we need, public systems and public solutions, it has handed a big opportunity to people who don't believe in them at all.

Menefee-Libey One of the challenges that we're seeing that COVID is laying there is that the challenges that our society faces require long-term systemic responses. If we're going to solve climate change, if we're going to become more resilient in the face of pandemics, if we're going to educate our children, we have to make long-term investments in building public institutions that are capable of doing this stuff that is not going to happen. If these institutions are at the mercy of year to year, individual family choices to move from one school to another school, you can't sustain public institutions. If they run at the whim of market forces, that's just not the logic of systems that are going to protect us from climate change or pandemics or the mass unemployment.

And I think Betsy DeVos does not care about that. That is just not the world that she lives in. Partly, she's convinced that if you subject everything to individual market choices, everything will turn out well. But second of all, she is really committed to vouchers and to injecting religion into schools and to allowing school entrepreneurs to control these systems and to dismantling the public institutions of school districts and, and collective bargaining and unionized teachers.

She's a deeply committed political actor, as I think, I mean, where I first ran into your name, Jennifer, is that piece that you wrote in Betsy DeVos, the Red Queen, which I think was a brilliant laying out of her political career and her long term systemic agenda. And now we're seeing her being in place as secretary of education. And she's pursuing exactly that career that you laid out in that piece. I don't know how many years ago did you write that?

Berkshire I wrote that not long after Davos was nominated. I went to Michigan and I motored all around and I talked to people and David I'm so thrilled that you liked the piece and Jack, I don't think I'm not sure you even ever read the

Schneider Jennifer, you know that I read what you write because you send me mean emails telling me that I need to tweet the link out to people. So yes, I read it to make sure I wasn't tweeting out, you know, like advertisements to people for some side hustle of yours. And as I think I've said on the show for several years now you know, you were one of the first people to take her seriously. People were dismissing DeVos as an airhead. And one of the points that you drove home very early on was that she doesn't know basic facts about the public education system, because she doesn't care about the public education system. It's not worth learning

because her intent is to dismantle it, not to become familiar with it so that she can manage it in some sort of responsible way.

Berkshire Well, thank you for that, Jack and I actually wanted to compliment you on a little Twitter thread that you had recently, you were commenting on a recent announcement from DeVos and the Department of Education that they would not be giving states waivers for annual testing this year, because testing is so important. And I thought, wow, this is something that's really just yanked right from the treaty era. And yet, even as DeVos is spending all of her time doing really any conceivable thing she can think of to push the movement of public money into both private institutions and into the hands of individual parents, here she is pretending that the grand compromise is still in place.

Schneider I think that's one of the reasons why it's so important to have this conversation about treaties because they aren't just a mechanism for producing a working compromise. They are also a tool that can be used by the politically savvy in order to begin moving forward a long-term agenda. Sometimes at the expense of the naive who believe that the other side is actually interested in this sort of compromise and anybody who takes Betsy DeVos set her word right now, that testing is important is exactly that naive because she's been making the case for years, that the only people who should have any say about how a school is performing are individual parents acting as private market consumers.

And so right now, what we're seeing is exactly, as you said, the enactment of a kind of informal treaty to see if anybody bites to see if anybody will join in a kind of alliance there to give her something that she wants for a short term extension of testing, which ultimately, you know, again, if you read anything that has ever said about it is not in the long-term plan for her

Berkshire And bite, they did, right? She actually, she singled out a bunch of reform organizations that are very keen on testing kids once they get back into schools and they really, you could see how pleased these groups and individuals who've kind of fallen off of the radar during the pandemic were to be cited by her, even as it's more and more clear that you know, her, her goal is not to say use testing data to steer the funding conversation in a direction towards equity.

Schneider The reason that I think this treaty conversation is so important is it now gives us some language for talking about this, right? That we can sort of shout out that this is happening. This is an impermanent treaty that is going to allow her to move one step closer to her long-term aims, right? Instead of sitting around and being puzzled or you know, pointing the finger and saying, you know, look, she's contradicting herself. It's actually more interesting. And savvier than that.

Berkshire Back to David who spends a lot of time these days trying to make the case for public systems. That's not easy when the people in charge seem committed to dismantling them. As

for the Democrats, let's just say that in the charter treaty era, they got out of the habit of defending public institutions.

Menefee-Libey The analogy that I've used with people at times is do you think that when you choose to fly from Los Angeles to Chicago, when you buy that ticket, then they go and build the airport for you. That's not how this works. I mean, you have to make the investment over a period of decades to build the airport. And it takes generations to establish systems of aviation and passenger travel here, passenger travel. You don't make those decisions on the basis of, you know, like I bought the ticket today and now you gotta go build the airport. That's not how this works. These are large complex systems that require a long-term investment and a commitment to the creation of shared public goods. And we are now being led by people who don't believe in that.

And on the left, I think they had imagined that that was no longer necessary. And I think that's the most generous way of understanding Arne Duncan and the Democrats for Education Reform is that they assumed that those public systems were already in place and didn't need defenders. And so they spent much of their time attacking school districts and attacking teacher union contracts and attacking education schools that were training teachers and feeding them into the system.

And, you know, we are now at a point where all of those large scale, long term public institutions are clearly at risk during the pandemic and the economic crash. You know, there are a lot of people that are sort of discovering that maybe these institutions won't automatically survive.

Berkshire That was David Menefee-Libey. He's a professor of politics at Pomona College and occasional virtual coffee mate of our own Jack Schneider. And Jack and I will be right back to mull over what the unravelling of the charter treaty means...and to reveal the topic of this episode's In the Weeds segment for our Patreon supporters. Here's a hint. It has to do with the scams that as one writer described it recently "are dissolving America from the inside." Now what could that possibly have to do with education?

[Music]

Berkshire Listening to David talk about the sort of airport conundrum. My first thought obviously Jack was, well, what about jet packs?

Schneider That's how we all get around now during the pandemic, right? It's a lot safer to travel by jet pack.

Berkshire But I thought that he really, he just perfectly captured the treachery of our present moment, that on the one hand you have these loud and insistent voices on the right saying, you know, just give the, just fund the parents directly. And then you have a lot of people who really should know better either going along with them or just kind of standing by, right? That we're so

used to centrist Democrats being part of the crew that beats up on public systems that now that they're unraveling, we really have very few organizations or individuals with platforms who are doing the essential work of making the case for those systems. And that really worries me.

Schneider And I think what this illustrates is something that we talked about earlier about the impermanence of these treaties. And I think, again, that, that's why it's so important to be thinking about these as a kind of conceptual device, right? These treaties can be broken at any time and too many on the left. This came as like a complete shock. They thought this was settled. They, they assumed that traditional public schools would always be there. And now they are reacting in horror to see that they shared completely different assumptions from some of their counterparts on the right. You know, as David says, the airport has to be there. It can't be built on demand, but it turns out that the right isn't committed to shared public goods, right? To extend this metaphor. They don't care if people have access to the airport, right? Get a Net Jet if that's what you want. So I think that as we reflect on this, and we think about these treaties, it's important again, to distinguish between compromise where both sides really view something as settled a kind of permanent policy moving forward, where everybody shares the same assumptions and these informal treaties where, you know, there's a chance that somebody's duping somebody else with regard to their motives and their long-term aims.

Berkshire Well, Jack, I absolutely loved getting to crash the zoom party that you and David have been having, but the conversation also gave me an excellent idea for our Patreon session.

Schneider Whatever I say, Jennifer, you are going to tell people and you are going to make them pay for access to it. And today I am not participating. I'm going to sit here and silently protest.

Berkshire This is not going to happen. Anyway, there was a great piece a few weeks ago about how one of the big problems we're having responding to the pandemic is that we're basically basically a nation of small scams, right? That every.. that that's the nature of America that you're, you know, you're a hustler trying to get rich by selling some, some phony product. We can't have effective contact tracing for example, because no one answers their phone because it's always a telemarketer on the other end. And one of the things that really got me thinking about was that the treaty in some ways, with the insistence about using test scores, as a measure also did keep the scam brigades under wraps to some extent, right? That for profit online charter schools have always been a problem. You can see that charter advocates have really struggled with how to respond to them, but there hasn't been this sort of out and out free for all where you just start selling stuff and calling it education. And I think that exploring this is a perfect topic for our In the Weeds segment for our Patreon subscribers. What say you?

Schneider Hey, you know that I want people, I want the people to have the content, Jennifer, but I also really love this topic because my dissertation advisor, David, Labaree used to go on and on about how we are a nation of hucksters and how that is the America, the true American genius. And you really see it play out in the way that we are constantly gaming our school

system. And then I'm also thinking of a great book, *Fast and Curious* by Bob Hampel who we had on the show to talk about the long history of people trying to game the education system for their own benefit. So I'm in, but let me remind our listeners that there are other ways to support the show other than becoming a Patreon member. So you can go on wherever you get your podcasts and give us a rating. It helps people find the show. We also like reading those comments. Some of them are, are really delightful. You can use the show's Twitter handle to send us some ideas. We've gotten some great episodes from your feedback there. And my favorite is always when you share episodes with people who you think might be future listeners to the show, but who you worry are not present listeners, it's an important intervention. We all need to do that work.

Berkshire And if you would like to become one of our Patreon supporters all you have to do is go to Patreon.com/HaveYouHeardPodcast and you'll see all of the cool extras you can get for sending a couple of dollars our way each month. Like a custom reading list for each episode - think how smart you'll be... And access to a subscribers-only area that we call *In the Weeds*. That's where you can hear Jack and I prognosticate on the coming hucksterization of public education. And of course you'll get our eternal gratitude.

Schneider Mine's not eternal. Mine's, mine's temporary. Like these treaties.

Berkshire On that note, I'm Jennifer Berkshire. This is *Have You Heard*.

Intro

[Jack audio 1]

Pick up at :47 “David and I”

Cut at 1:43 after “charter school movement”

David background

Intro the treaty

Giving and taking

Jack and I - on how different the concept of treaty is from how we typically think about the charter story (compare to DNA, for example)

On impermanence of treaties

Jack question

DML answer

Jack and I discuss Obama overreach

Pivot to David and religious charters

DML answer

Where we are now

DeVos

[Red Queen]

DML airports