

A Key Heroic Assumption about [‘the Blob’](#): A Willingness to Compromise

John Merrifield
April 28, 2014

Substantial opposition to major changes in school system governance and funding policies does not depend on policy specifics. Much opposition is visceral self-interest of organizations (not necessarily rank-and-file members) that depend on the status quo. Compromise does not weaken their opposition. Certainly, there will be a pretense of compromise to minimize the scope of what might be enacted, and to plant ‘poison pills’; for example, low-income or ‘failed school’ targeting, exclusion of for-profit schooling providers, provisions that voucher amounts must be accepted as full payment. The latter creates devastating price control in the name of equity, though [it actually exacerbates inequity](#).

For example, the original [Milwaukee voucher program’s](#) litany of major restrictions made it ‘designed to fail’. Despite those restrictions and the resulting absence of key market conditions, the Milwaukee policy still became a [poster-child for imagined market-based reform](#) in part because of the rhetorical and political battles to preserve or slightly expand it in the face of all-out political and litigious assaults. That’s basically the same story for every charter law, tuition tax credit, and tuition voucher proposal; weaken with poison pills, oppose passage, and then if that fails pursue repeal and ‘spin’ the results to make the case that choice doesn’t work.