

SHOULD KIDS WEAR UNIFORMS?

Name: Oneil McQuick, Class: ENC1101, Major: Graphics Technology, Date: July 2004, School: BCC
Task: Ask to write a Research Essay, with the above suggested topic, did this as a back up and turned it in.

After reading this essay, any rational thinking person will come to the conclusion that uniforms are necessary. All the good points will be brought out, but also, all the alleged disadvantage will be dissipated. Though our economy had flourished without its relative enforcement, we need it more than ever – as our children are getting out of control and rebellious violations are running rampant. This and the resistance to uniforms are simply a result of the humanist manifesto – to remove godly attributes and discipline and replace it with individualism and humanism. It is my desire to see a great nation mandate this needed policy nation-wide.

HISTORY

“School for most children is the major experience with the world outside the home. About a third of the day is spent at school and about half of a child's waking hours.” So attire is not a subject easily overlooked and should be properly put in place by uniforms. “Uniforms were first instituted in 16th Century England at the charity schools for poor children. It was not until the 19th Century that the great English public schools began instituting uniforms and even later for them to be widely accepted at state schools--especially state elementary schools.” History also teaches us that uniforms are the wise choice and anything less, especially recanting, is disastrous. One source noted about uniforms in England, “It was the widespread youth revolt of the late-1960s that had the greatest impact...A few public schools abolished uniform altogether. Most later regretted it.”

PRO'S AND CON'S

In assessing the matter of school uniforms, we must take in consideration actual words or pro's and con's of the public. From them we can solidify the opening thesis. These are the main ones:

PRO 1: School uniforms would save parents money. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: No argument about “Hidden Costs” of uniforms can change that. No matter how much uniforms cost, it will never cost as much as casual clothes. Moreover, any report of high uniform cost is either distorted or made up. One source said, “Today in many countries without uniforms, buying school clothes has become a late summer ritual, considered a symbol of privilege. This has, however begun to change. Simplified school uniforms began to be seen as a way of limiting school clothing expenses.”

PRO 2: School uniforms would save parents time. Kids in the morning would not have to make up their minds on what to wear. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: That is true, but a weak point; for a tardy person will always be a tardy person.

PRO 3: Kids, whose parents would not or could not buy them the newest fad, would not be embarrassed or harassed because of their clothes. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: Plus there's no distinction between the rich and poor; “class” is dropped and togetherness encouraged. This is even a good way of teaching our kids not to be prejudice.

PRO 4: Kids social standing would be based more on individual character and less on their economic status. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: Good point.

PRO 5: Lots of gangs use cloths to identify themselves and other gangs. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: Hence reduces this sort of gang related affair and adversely affects gangs in general.

PRO 6: Some kids use baggy cloths to hid weapons and drugs. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: A good example is the columbine school shooting and others. Trench coats were often used; as in the famous herald, "The Trench Coat Massacre." Though a 'weakish' point, for weapons can still be carried in bags, it nevertheless helps. It lessens it and the imitation influence from television gun slingers and villains.

PRO 7: It is my opinion that school is in the 'business' of learning. School is the place where the next lawyers, bankers, CPA's and Doctors are given the fundamentals of working in this economy. One of the basics of our culture in the working world is conservative dressing, dress code, or even uniforms. What is wrong with sending our kids the message that they are in 'the business of learning' by enforcing dress codes, or even ascribing a uniform? - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: Moreover, clothing gives off a mood, that's why certain jobs have them. Wearing baggy jeans and a tank top is not conducive to working in a corporate environment and lessens productivity in the individual. It's also psychological, you perform the way you dress, if you're particular about dressing – everybody. Similarly, most clothes doesn't foster the mind set of learning in a child and even detract from it. Leave the casual clothing for the casual time; it will be more appreciate there.

PRO 8: Uniforms make it easy to identify kids who belong in the school and those that don't. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: Also, teenage intruders on school property can easily be identified.

PRO 9: Boys in school uniform are in fact walking advertisements for a school, giving an impression of the school for good or for bad throughout an entire town or city. Many believed the uniform to be an accurate reflection of a school's discipline standards and discipline. - HBC

My comments: Good point for school to want it. Plus, it holds the schools responsible to the students. That is, seeing that the students are advertising the schools, it is in their best interest to make sure the students are not indiscipline off-campus, to bring the school in shame. Hence, schools are forced to instill discipline in the students so they behave properly away from school. While at K.C, my high school, boys were reprimanded for incidents they committed at the bus stop, miles away from school: Because they were in their school uniforms. I remember an incident while at high school. We were visiting an underground game arcade downtown, Kingston, in our uniforms. The vice-principal got a whole of that information and on one occasion, suddenly made surprise visit, to our reprimandment. He did it to protect the school name and probably cared for the students. Nevertheless, many boys simply take off their tie, which was our identification, for future mischief. To

mirror that now, that would be carrying a change of clothes. This can hardly go unnoticed by the parent/guardian, and if they become involved, the student knows the punishment is worse.

PRO 10: Most people are not educational experts, but a smartly uniformed schoolboy can be noted by all but the blind. – HBC

My comments: Good point. It demand respect; a thing many student lack in most areas, especially if you're of the minority. You could equate it to an official. What if the President made an appointment with several other nations and showed up bare footed, shorts and sleeveless shirt. He would get no respect and everything he says or does would be treated with disdain.

PRO 11: Some scoff at the importance of discipline, but as any school teacher can tell you, discipline is critical to the functioning of any school. No school can function effectively without a disciplined student body. A disciplinarian is not necessarily a good teacher, but unless a teacher can control his class room, it will be impossible to teach no matter how learned he is. -HBC

My comments: Can I say more.

PRO 12: Uniforms in the early 19th century were adopted by some of England exclusive private schools to prevent boys competing with each other with outlandish styles and colors. –HBC

My comments: This competition causes a great number of problems and basically causes them to be distracted from the purpose to which they came to school – to learn. If so, it defeats the purpose of school and needs to be done away with.

PRO 13: To reduce the appearance of class differences. - HBC

My comments: Much needed in an already diverse nation.

CON 1: Clothes don't make the man, but education does. – Anonymous

My comments: Clothes are not the issue, but the intent behind the cloths – discipline, order, money-savings, etc. If you give a man an academic education without correct character training, like discipline, you're defeating the purpose of education. It's like giving a gun to a man off to war without showing the man how to use the gun. Though possessing the weapon he'll be at lost and jeopardy to himself and others.

CON 2: It tyrannical (one person said "sartorial tyranny"), communistic, fascist and therefore not conducive to a democratic state. The very notion of mandatory and enforcement resonate this. - Devil's advocate

My comments: On the counts of tyranny, fascism, overt use of federal power, communistic or other such things used against uniforms, be it know that Nazi Germany didn't have uniforms for schools; the most tyrannical of all communists sect. Thus, if it was tyranny or some means of evil control or evil use of power, they would have definitely implanted it. But they didn't for it has no such ties. The rebellious for lack of words and to glorify their defense say these things.

CON 3: Teachers should then wear uniforms too, to lead by example. – B. Wilson

My comments: Teachers are the workers, and like any job, attire themselves professionally. Their attire distinguishes them loudly, even from intruders off the street. Teacher uniform is not necessary.

They have surpassed the child-learning stage and have progressed into responsible adults, who are hired to do a job. If mandatory, it would be like diapers on a 20 year old man. What might be good is a school name tag.

CON 4: Followers wear uniform. Leaders Don't. – Mount Carmel Area School District Protestors

My comments: This is the reason uniforms are needed. For the sentiment behind this statement shows the state we are in – disobedience, self-aggrandizement, rebellion and devilishly out-of-order. How can you lead, if you can't first follow? How can you first give commands, if you cannot take commands? This is what things like uniform prepares our children for – real leadership. Instilling in them discipline by first following, to lead to true leadership. Each leader had to first submit before leading. If they cannot, you might be raising a tyrant. Everybody is under some authority; therefore, everybody has to follow at some time. If not, you're not fit for this life and worthy to be cast out. Moreover, everybody can't be leaders. There's one Queen in England out of millions of people. There is only one President out of some 250 million Americans.

CON 5: Why not simply remove the gang members from the schools and place them in an alternative learning environment like a boot camp? - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: This cost money, your tax dollars. Plus it's only relocating the problem, rather than dealing with it. One would rather disenfranchise others at your own expense (tax dollars), rather than wear a 'measly' uniform. You see that loose dressing is seeded in selfish individualism; the cornerstone of the humanist agenda. Any personal discomfort felt by mandating uniforms in all public schools should be tolerated for the greater good; until it has settled in our society.

CON 6: School Uniforms are expensive and have no use out side of school. - Anonymous, yourdebate.com

My comments: See Pro number 1

CON 7: School uniforms will do nothing but cut down on a student's individuality. A uniform is not the way to cut down on school violence. the only thing that will cut down on school violence is if parents would pay attention to their children and keep their children out of trouble and give them consequences when they disobey and not to let them run wild. Submitted by Danyelle C. Swain, yourdebate.com

My comments: Individuality!? Up until my post-secondary studies, I had to wear uniforms with tie, yet no one is more individually oriented as I am. A uniform cannot stifle your individuality; only teach you how to control it, by discipline. Whereby the bible said, "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit that he that taketh a city" (Prov. 16:32). "He that hath not rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down, and without walls" (Prov. 25:28). This person also said, "if parents would pay attention to their children and keep their children out of trouble." This is most encouraged, especially if biblical; but in a sensitive work treadmill society, majority of the parents won't achieve this always.

CON 8: School is also the place where the next actors, writers, artists, politicians, inventors, designers and musicians are trained. School uniforms send a clear early-life message to students that [3] conformity is important and creativity is not, that authority is allowed to abuse its power and constrain our [1] constitutional right to free speech and expression. Students learn from uniforms that their [2] individuality, political opinions and religious rights are unimportant, as is their education: students are regularly suspended for non compliance to the uniform code even if their school work is

excellent. If uniform-requiring schools were actually in 'the business of learning' this would not occur. –T. Maginnis, Ph.D.

My comments: For [1], this is ridiculous, plus we really don't have this right; it's a mistake we have enjoyed and abuse it. For [2], If it was that important, they would be allowed to vote and wouldn't have parents and the "inherent powers" to guide them. Guidance to the point of obedience – uniforms; which is teaching them to make their own voice be heard at the right time. A calm before the storm, discipline before power and control before expression. All these things are good, but when the individual has no control over his own self, how can he be effective? He would be a raw actor, writer, artist, politician, inventor, designer and musician who has never exploited his true potential. For [2] and [3]: Uniforms, therefore, helps the individual better exercise these rights and expressiveness by instilling needed discipline – as against the violent rebellious characters that now plague us.

CON 9: Not everyone should be punished for other people's crimes! Submitted by gurl552004@hotmail.com

My comments: To response to this might be stupid. See also CON # 5

CON 9: I am totally AGAINST school uniforms! One reason, of many, is Safety of the Students. For example: During a natural disaster (God Forbid) Earthquake, Tornado, etc... How would a Parent I.D. their child? By the clothes that they were wearing, when they left home. What if a Senior decided to attack a 9th -or- 10th grade student? How would the victim describe the attacker? Let's see, Khaki Pants - Navy Blue Shirt - Brown Shoes. You get the picture. This was, is, and will ALWAYS BE a VERY BAD idea. Submitted by Randy

My comments: Responding to this might also be stupid. How does the parent do the same thing on graduation when everybody is not only in gowns, but a hat? As I've said, I've been in a school system under uniform until post secondary studies, these and other "CON's" are non-existent. While in it, like most, we hated uniforms and wanted to show off our name-brand clothes – to the point we tried this in bag packs, shoes, belt and even tie-pin. Even that caused many problems – theft, fights, etc. It's after finishing post-secondary studies and now an adult, I realize how brilliant and blessed uniform was!

GENERAL ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINSTS

Having dealt with the pro's and con's, arguments for and against can be formalized with the following summation from HBC. They either add to the arguments already mentioned or arouse new solidification to the opening thesis. However, most often, "The debate over school uniform can take on an importance far beyond the issues involved."

The Case for School Uniforms

Those that believe school uniforms are beneficial generally make the following arguments:

Promotes good discipline: Many feel that school uniforms help a school in maintaining discipline. Many school systems report uniforms help to reduce discipline problems. Some schools report dramatic declines, although opponents question some of these reports. Children today are lacking in self discipline. Many parents simply refuse to discipline their children. This makes it much more difficult on the teacher who has to deal with a class of 20-30 children throughout the day.

Reduces fighting and violence: School uniforms reduce violence by eliminating fights and disruptions over fashionable clothes. Children invariably tease those who do not have trendy clothes. Poor children are often very sensitive about their clothes. American inner-city schools facing serious gang violence believe that uniforms help to ease the problem.

Business like: Some say that a child in a uniform is more likely to take school seriously. Putting on the uniform signals that he is going to school just as dad dresses up for work. When students were dressed in "learning clothes" rather than "play clothes" some schools report that students took a more serious, scholarly attitude towards their studies.

Appearance: Many parents and even some children generally believe that student wearing uniforms looked nicer and that a uniform policy ensured that children would come to school in appropriate clothing, avoiding distractions such as fads considered outlandish or overly revealing. A HBC reader in the U.S. writes, "I read a book showing how children dress for school in the U.K. and showed it to my mom. She said those boys look neat clean and disciplined. I also think the same the saying goes, 'If you look nice you are going to act nice like a gentleman. Kids today cannot accept those kinds of disciplinary clothes they want to wear those ugly baggy things and they are ugly looking clothes! My mother said it's a fad and they will grow out of it, but I myself don't think its going to happen. I know our school district puts millions of dollars for soccer fields and other sports. I spoke with a school board member about getting school uniforms for the kids the answer was, 'We don't have the money.' I showed him a photo of the way the kids dress in Papatoe High School in new Zealand he said its probably a fake photo. Can you believe that!"

Focus on academics: No morning confusion. Many parents in schools with uniform policies indicated that they no longer had the morning debate over "what to wear." Some students have turned school into an unending fashion show. This is embarrassing to the children who can "keep up" and it detracts from the focus on academics. There is no doubt that some children spend more time selecting their wardrobe then doing their home work.

Values: School uniforms stress that individuality and self-expression are not determined by designer clothing or the latest fashion fad.

Safety: The school uniform readily identified students as a member of that school and increased student safety on and off campus. Uniforms readily identify who belong on campus and who does not. Unfortunately this is a matter of increasing concern in our modern age.

Reduces distractions: Proponents say that uniforms allow students to concentrate on their studies instead of the latest fashion trends. The idea is to promote a better atmosphere for learning and help children concentrate on the academic program. Peer pressure appeared to take a back seat to learning.

Equity: School uniforms help to eliminates social distinctions. Children from low-income families need not be embarrassed by not being able to afford the latest fashions or designer clothes. Many schools report that school uniforms do help to reduce socio-economic differences.

Low cost: Uniforms are a good bargain. They are cheap and getting cheaper. They are getting less expensive than any other clothes. Proponents say that uniforms are economical. Compared to buying designer clothes this is undoubtedly true. Some children pressure their parents to buy very expensive clothes--even in elementary school. Some parents report that uniforms appeared to be more durable since they are made for repeated wash and wear. Often schools have used uniform shops, further reducing costs.

School spirit: Some feel wearing a uniform help builds school spirit. They believe it instills a feeling of belonging. Parents and students in schools with successful uniform policies often indicate that there was an improved sense of school pride and spirit.

Individuality: Regimentation and suppressing individuality is the most frequently cited objection to school uniforms. Some educators argue that an academic program encouraging children to pursue individual thought is much more important than what they wear. The fact that students object more to fashion concerns than to school academic programs discouraging free thought is a good indicator of why the use of uniforms to reduce concern with fashion may be beneficial.

The Case Against School Uniforms

Those that believe school uniforms are not beneficial generally make the following arguments:

Inhibits creativity and self expression: Self-explanatory

Individuality: The opponents of school uniform maintain that students should be allowed to choose their own clothes and they shouldn't be forced to conform. The opponents feel that the inability to choose ones clothes causes children to lose their individuality. Interestingly, many who feel strongly about this are not nearly as concerned over the insistence of many schools to avoid controversial issues. Different societies have place varying emphasis on conformity. In Japan it has been a strongly held goal. In America society has placed a much greater emphasis on individuality.

Causes discipline problems: Some students object to any rules. Rules about their clothes are particularly objectionable to some. They alter their uniform by lengthening, shortening, widening or tightening them. Tension between students and teachers sometimes occurs, as teachers try to enforce the school rules, and students resist them. My comment: This is a foolish argument compared to having no uniforms; students will attempt to resist any rule. HBC records, "School uniform remains an issue between pupils and school authorities. It would be odd indeed if this were not the case. But it is wrong to imagine that the adolescent rebel really wants uniform to be abolished or that abolition would put a stop to the arguments. Most American schools have dress codes. Often parents and students participate in setting the code. But that is not to say there are fewer disagreements over clothes at American schools than at British schools. In fact, far from reducing disputes about what could or could not be worn, the dress code was open to more conflicting interpretations than the uniform regulations had ever been. Enforcing a uniform is a relatively simple matter compared to the constant small issues arising from a never ending decisions that have to be made on the never ending appearance of new clothing styles and looks."

Little or no relationship to academics: Opponents insist that there is no creditable evidence that uniforms improve school discipline or result in superior academic achievement. The principal evidence offered here is that some good students are scruffy dressers. There is no doubt that children can learn even if they dress as they want. The question not addressed is to what extent fashion, and the tendency of modern children to focus on fashion, distracts from the academic program. This issue is generally avoided by those who argue that dress is unrelated to academics.

High cost: Some say that uniforms are excessively costly. As they are generally available from one supplier some of the market action limiting prices may not work well. **My comment:** Untrue, uniforms are inexpensive and proven to be so. See Pro #1.

Emphasizes social distinctions: The uniforms worn by affluent children going to private schools help to emphasize class distinctions. My comment: What private school does is out of the hand of the public. They can wear what they feel or mandate what they feel, that's why it's private - you pay greatly to send your child there, thus parents and staff have an anarchy of what they do. Nevertheless, their uniforms are still affordable in America; even over the fad-fashions.

Dowdy styles: Children generally feel that their uniforms are dowdy and not attractive or stylish. **My comment:** If this emphasis is placed on children, what on earth would we be instilling in the future America? They would be shallow. Moreover, giving the child the ultimate freedom to dictate on matters like these is spoiling the child, a far more adverse societal effect.

Absenteeism and truancy: Often Absent from school. **My comment:** This is too ridiculous to even ponder a rebuttal. If casual dressing ostracizes certain student, hence truancy, then the opposite must happen under a uniform policy. Only on the shaky foundation of Empiricism can such a fallacious claim be made.

CASE STUDY

I download and read an essay or article by Darlene Williams; I must say she really was crafty with words and reasoning. She gave the best devil's advocacy and used many cases and Empirical data. I'll cite her arguments briefly. It can be read at <http://www.gate.net/~rwms/UniformDWilliams.html>

She cited a good result of mandatory school uniforms and how effective it can be:

In Long Beach, California, the first district to have a widespread mandatory uniform policy in the public schools, the initial reports concerning drops in crime and discipline were astonishing. Assault dropped by sixty-seven percent, vandalism by eighty-two percent, and robbery by thirty-five percent. Overall crime was reduced by seventy-three percent the first year the policy was in place ("K-8" 1).

I lauded her for that. But then she made a fallacious statement:

So, while uniforms were the most visible change, the improvements were more likely attributable to the other programs which included, among other initiatives, a \$1 million grant from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation for the improvement of teaching methods (Brunsma and Rockquomore 16).

This is utter foolishness to try and discredit uniforms. For instance, a better way to improve how a teacher teach math can't reduce crime that dramatically. It's like saying three puny men were trying to push Arnold Schwaganegeger (terminator) and a fourth man came, HULK; then Arnold fell. We know 2 ton Hulk pushed over Arnold, but the anti-HULK fan would say it's a contribution of all the men. Please.

She then cited another school that followed long beach and said they didn't have the same results: Like two person weight lifting will have the same results:

The results were, at best, disappointing and, at worst, alarming. The elementary schools with mandatory uniforms saw a slight decrease in discipline problems.

Any decrease in crime is welcomed, especially by an initiative that has numerous other benefits. She went further to say on the matter:

Unfortunately, the high hopes held by the district for immediate, significant improvement in discipline were not realized.

Mandatory uniforms is not an over night magic wand for a country that avoided it. It takes a process; long beach is one of the many exceptions. She then lamented against one of the benefits of uniforms with her data:

The summary further states that while some safety violations declined at mandatory uniform schools, the same problems were reduced at no uniform schools as well (1). **Empirical data** does not support the anecdotal accounts of discipline and safety improvements cited by uniform proponents.

In studying economics, I learnt a great deal about all data in all fields of study. They are all assumptions and making comparisons is not more accurate with the use of Empirical data over her claim of “anecdotal accounts.” Reason being, the comparison are made with all things held constant or a few variables; what my teacher refer to as a “real world” case cannot be gained easily or at all. For instance, if planter 'A' uses fertilizers this year and planter 'B' doesn't, it means planter 'A' crops will be better. But it didn't happen because of a deadly drought. Empirical data would show fertilizers don't work better than no fertilizers: When in fact other variables are involved. It would only be true if all things are held constant. This example is clear, but others are not that simple. Mandatory uniform policy can be said to have inherent intangible benefits.

She then gave some facts from the Manual on School Uniforms and other data to say:

"A mandatory school uniform policy without an opt out provision could be vulnerable to legal challenge"

Opt-out clause gives the right for some to wear casual clothes. Having an opt-out clause is defeating the purposes of uniform altogether; and even shows partiality, bias and elements of a weak governing body. You don't need an opt-out clause for a Muslim to wear her shawl or someone with a sickness to wear special clothing. That is an inherent use of discretion. Opt-out fosters abuse of the policy by the rebellious and ultimately overthrows the uniform policy itself. This should be dismissed by any court, for if you take away the power of the school to administer what it deems disciplinary and necessary, what are they left with. The parents and students would be the boss and we wouldn't need a school. It's better said by this supreme court ruling, “We are not anarchists, and recognize that society can only function by having rules of conduct and behavior. However, when the government restricts the activities of its citizens, it must show just cause for such restrictions. Should not the standards be even higher for the government to dictate what actions its citizens must perform?” Dictate doesn't mean Nazism, but exercising inherent powers in the best interest of the people.

She then gave incidents that occurred while implementing the uniform policy, mainly Polk County Florida. This was done to disapprove the policy. She ended those incidents with this statement:

We cannot afford to allow our schools to be used as laboratories and our children to be used as guinea pigs for new questionable fads founded in vanity and based on supposition.

Uniforms are not new; it ranges from the 16th century and based on centuries of establishment, as against this allegation of vanity and supposition. America and few other countries have long rejected it, but later came to realize its importance. If it hadn't been successful for many years, it wouldn't even have been considered. What has happened in Polk County, and will happen across America, is that a

new seed is breaking the ground and with that seed, or change, comes difficulty. Nothing good is done in comfort. No real change is left without pain and eruptions – a mother delivering a baby, a bulldozer plowing at asphalt or even the surgery of a patient. Jefferson himself was frank and related this notion. He stated that the tree of liberty is manured by the death of the faithfuls - He spoke of the war of independence, as learnt in my history class (97-99). In other words, implementing this relatively New Mandatory Uniform Policy will have confrontations, but like all good things, prove to be the best choice in the long run.

IMPLEMENTATION

Based on this essay thus far, school uniforms can then be implemented. England began instituting school uniforms at the elementary stage, that's where it should begin in America, nation-wide. Start in Kindergarten even. It's kind of difficult to put it in at the high school stage, when that generation has been going casual. Though waiting for the right time will avail no time. Nothing should stop it, but tact should be used. For instance, mandate all elementary schools to institute it, when that class moves to the next stage, then mandate it for all schools in that stage; and so on. Over a period of time, with much difficulty, it should be in full effect for all schools at all stages. Students will always resist uniforms, just like how children will always resist vegetables. Should we listen to children and let them eat only ice-cream and donuts, especially when you, the parent, are paying for it and their consequential medical bill? Therefore, their voice in this is of little importance, as well as the rebellious "children" who claim to be parents. Hence, it must be mandated. That shouldn't sound harsh, for such power would be exercised in the best interest of the people; as parents have over a child.

In my research, I've not seen one teacher protest uniforms, mostly parents and their rebellious siblings. It seems the teacher welcome it because they can relatively teach their class with ease; having focused students. The mere fact that teachers welcome it is enough to implement it. Yet these parents want to drop off their untrained child to these pitiable teachers, who finally (or would have finally) got some help with these "generation of vipers."

It would be good if the schools sell the uniforms to the parents. This would be even more feasible if they could buy it in bulk at a school discount from wholesalers; and even further, subsidized by the government. Then set price ceiling/floors to regulate the same selling price across all schools that sell it. This will prevent stores and mega malls from fluctuating prices to benefit themselves, knowing parents have to buy it. Even so, stores wouldn't hike it above affordability, knowing it's for the kids. All in all, uniforms will never be beyond affordability either sold by the market or schools. School uniforms may even vary and cost differently, but subsidization and wholesale favors should be able to still be obtained. All schools should strive to wear the same uniform and use either a tie, coat of arms, crest or logo for differentiation; all with the school name. To make it also cheaper, special materials, special colors and patterns should be avoided. It should be so basic that parents could make it; yet worth the wear.

Discretion and wisdom should be used, for in all things there is little "ironing out" to do. For instance, someone might ask, "should school uniform code extend to underwear color?" It might sound ridiculous, because based on the purposes of uniforms, THE UNDERWEAR SHOULDN'T EVEN BE VISIBLE, that's the code. Despite all things, implementation is possible, necessary and should be done.

CONCLUSION

No other essay has put together such strong and blunt inherent reasons for uniforms in America. And no other time than now should it be implemented. It takes a bold nation to make a long term decision with such controversy as this. But it takes an even greater and bolder one to have it mandated for the benefit of all. America has long since possesses such qualities; it should then live up to that reputation and use its inherent powers, through legislature, to enact a nation-wide mandatory school uniform policy. Along with “godly” exploits, it’s the only way to push forward and dig our education system from the ditch it has fallen into.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Walsh, Mark. Court Throws Out Lawsuit in Uniform Fracas.

<http://www.educationweek.org/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=04uniform.h22>. Downloaded July 2004.

Williams, Darlene. School Uniforms: The Raging Debate.

<<http://www.gate.net/~rwms/UniformDWilliams.html>> Downloaded July 2004.

Wilson, Barry. E-mail responses for a school debate on uniforms.

<<http://www.rag.org.au/school/debate.htm>>.31 May 1999. Downloaded July 2004.

Debates. <http://www.youdebate.com/DEBATES/school_uniforms.HTM>. Downloaded July 2004.

Opposition to Mandatory Public School Uniforms. <<http://www.schooluniforms-not.org/>>. Downloaded July 2004.

School Uniforms. <www.geocities.com/school_uniforms/> Downloaded July 2004.

The Debate Over School Uniform. [Historical Boys Clothing \(HBC\)](http://www.histclo.hispeed.com/schun/schun.html).

<www.histclo.hispeed.com/schun/schun.html>. Downloaded July 2004