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PREFACE

The title of my dissertation is "The Ambivalence of American Education," and undoubtedly it is surprising. Why? Because of the psychological connotation of the term "ambivalence". However, the use of this concept in this dissertation intends to establish other meanings. To understand this let me explain how the term came to my attention and how later it was developed.

Approximately two years ago, as a student I was struck by assumption made by Professor Keith Tyler that the American make-up is somehow ambivalent. That, in other words, Americans are moved by contradictory forces. Americans are frugal and thrifty, Dr. Tyler said, pragmatic and idealistic, conservative and yet very progressive, localists and universalists too. Although at that time I took the declaration as a part of the old rationale that being young implies, to some extent, being ambivalent, which is the case of American culture, later this assumption still puzzled me. First, what Dr. Tyler called ambivalence evoked to some extent the Faustian drama, and also the Renaissance man, who, in spite of an old cliche, was not only a well-rounded person, but also a person torn between ambivalent tendencies. Secondly, this type of man, "ambivalent", seems to belong only to certain periods of time; in particular, he seems to emerge at the end of the Middle Ages in Europe. The bourgeois character has quite a bit to do with it, as was made clear by Hermann Hesse in
one of his novels where he marvelously depicts this character. In *Steppenwolf*, Hesse writes that:

> Now what we call "bourgeois", when regarded as an element always to be found in human life, is nothing else than the search for balance. It is the striving after a mean in between the countless extremes and opposites that arise in human conduct. If we take any one of these coupled opposites, such as piety and profligacy, the analogy is immediately comprehensible. It is open to a man to give himself up wholly to spiritual views, to seeking after God, to the ideas of saintliness. On the other hand, he can equally give himself up entirely to the life of instinct, to the lusts of the flesh, and so direct all his efforts to the attainment of momentary pleasure. . . Now it is between the two, in the middle of the road, that the bourgeois seeks to walk, (*Steppenwolf*, Bantam Books, 1963, p. 59.)

Trying to correlate these two aspects and also trying to define the ambivalence of American character and American education, little by little I have developed the whole schema of my dissertation.

In brief, this schema contains the following basic ideas. In the first chapter, entitled "Theoretical Foundations", I have started with the assumption, otherwise very common, that unlike the other beings in the universe man has changed and continues to change. So far, the question of what human is has two kinds of answers; an empirical one and a teleological one. According to, let us say, the empirical discourse, the human being is a biological organism, an evolved ape, a social organism, a homo faber, or whatever the sciences try to prove man to be. According to a teleological approach, the human being is a divine creature, a predecessor to super-man (Nietzsche), a rational creature, etc. The first approach deals primarily with the question "What is man?" whereas the second tries to answer the question of what man "ought to be".
As a third alternative to this big question, "What is man?" we propose an analysis from the standpoint of how man related to the world. Or in other words, how man exists. Following this new approach we distinguish basically three modes in which man has related to the world: (1) a holistic mode, (2) a dualistic mode, and (3) an ambivalent or scientific one. The main paradigm of the first mode is man exists both "in" and "as" a part of the world and nature. This distinction between him and the world or nature around him is only superficial. Even today, for example, the Jainists in India share the belief that man and nature are cosubstantial and that the plants and the animals are human beings, too, or have the same qualities. This is a perfect example of a holistic approach.

The dualistic approach is basically based on the relationship man-god, or in other words the relationship man-world turns to the relationship man-god. God is the creator of everything although he remains transcendent, absolute and eternal. His city, the City of God, as St. Augustine called it, is the real city, the "righteous" one, and not the terrestrial one. Hence a kind of tension between real and ideal, between natural and supranatural, became an integral part of the dualistic approach. Later, this distinction was stressed by the continuing mathematical and logical developments of the Platonic philosophy. Man as a result was also caught in between. As a flesh and blood being, as a fallen creature, he had to strive and toil in the realm of natural existence. On the other hand, as a spiritual being, as God's son, he aimed at eternal life and happiness. As a matter of fact, in this dualistic approach we can find the very characteristic of western mentality. Whereas, for example, in Islam, Judaism or Buddhism, the individual is
absorbed into one mighty God, in the western mentality, no matter how much the realm of god and transcendent is stretched out, there is still a piece of natural land for human endeavor and profanity. At first Prometheus rebelled against God, then later Pelegias, whom B. Russell loved in particular, advocated the free will of the individual to save himself; Luther and Calvin later carried out a similar theme.

The third kind of relationship between man and the world develops in a kind of desacralized universe. As a result, the relationship man-god would become this time a relationship between man and nature, man and society, man and state, or man and job. Basically this time man will relegate the transcendent to a very large extent and would return to nature. However, this return is in many respects a paradox, because although man acknowledges again that he is a natural being, a part of nature, and in this way he redisCOVERs the holistic relationship with nature, at the same time he sees himself outside nature, an agent who acts upon nature. John Dewey termed this type of relationship "trans-actional." Therefore, although today man is in nature or society, he is in himself. This is what we call ambivalence in a large philosophical perspective.

Today undoubtedly human behavior is shaped by natural facts and laws. Our cities, our jobs, our food, our cars, our watch, all operate according to some natural laws. However, all the time there is that unidentifiable "i" which manifests itself all the time in all these, who enjoys or suffers, who is happy or lonely, something which from time to time says plainly "I".
And so, although today the relationships man-nature, man-society have brought about a tremendous emphasis on science and politics, there is, especially in literature and philosophy, and existentialism is a very good example, in reaction against this overwhelming determinism. Moreover, we think that if for a large amount of rules and laws which shape our life we have to look in nature and follow nature, for a very few we have to rely on ourselves. If there is a natural law justifying why our heart beats 67 times a minute and why our blood is red, there is no justification why something inside us rejects the ugliness, coercion, and brutal imposition. This is perhaps why the proposition "do not step on the grass" should be not only an environmental warning, but also an act of good will. As a matter of fact, if we were fish we would not care about grass.

Another chapter of my dissertation deals with the development of American democracy. Going along the same lines we have drawn before, we see the development of American democracy as a by-product of the replacement of the principle of absolutism which governed the dualistic world with the naturalistic principle which became predominant in the man-nature world. Democracy is in our view a form of government according to which the individual is "in" and at the same time "out" of the political system. In other words, democracy implies a kind of ambivalence. The emergence of political parties as well as the separation of powers is only an instrument to maintain this political game and to assure this "in" and "out" ambivalence.
A chapter in my dissertation is also dedicated to the American character, a hard thing to talk about especially when you are a foreigner. However, we dared, and after we presented the different foreign visions of American character and different foreign accounts about American culture which more or less converge toward the idea that the American character is pragmatic, we took a step farther. What we tried to define this time, following the same major theme of ambivalence, was the point that American pragmatism is only superficially congruent, that in fact, at its very core this "character" is a continuous struggle for equilibrium and harmony.

Debarked, in the beginning, on a new land which was both generous and hostile, the American freed himself from the past, from the old community bonds, but at the same time he faced the challenge of freedom, of empty spaces, of morganatic boundaries. Thus, the American was from the very beginning terribly free and terribly limited; as a result, he believed in himself and in God. He tightened his Protestant ascetic coat very close to the ground, but at the same time expanded grandiosely his spiritual expectations up in the sky to the level of a new Zion.

Once he rounded out his farm and gained his independence, he began to move to try to catch the white whale, as Captain Ahab did. He embarked to build a new civilization. No parameters were set for this new enterprise. Therefore everything he has done was an experiment and he himself was part of it. Violence and love, intellectual calculation and sheer action, individual detachment and social involvement, the search for freedom and the quest for equality, chaotic error and guess, on the
one hand, and tremendous success and confidence on the other hand, were all part of his developed character. Dewey's fight against dualism is nothing else than an attempt to balance these opposite forces, which somewhere underneath move the American mind.

As far ad education goes, it follows the same pattern. First, you have an ambivalence between central and local administration. Then, at the level of each school district, as well as the level of the whole country, there is a kind of ambivalence between different "political forces" such as teachers, parents, administrators, and even students. This kind of very subtle swing, this time in a historical perspective, between a conservative and a liberal orientation, between a child-centered education and a social-centered education, is also pursued in a chapter on politics and education.

Before we close this introduction we feel bound to thank Dr. Robert Sutton for his warm and insightful guidance, and for his deep understanding of youth's paradoxes and perplexities; Dr. Paul Klohr for his discreet and subtle scholarly touch, for his jovial and also serious detachment; Dr. Philip Smith for his laborious assistance and Dr. Seymour Kleinman whose teachings and phenomenological searches enlarged my "rationalistic prejudices."

I would also like to acknowledge the cooperation and help of my curmudgeonious colleagues from 400, J. Holton, S. Rosenstock, C. Kridel, and T. Moenjak, and to express my gratitude to those innumerable people and encounters which I have met and which constitute that unique American life.
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CHAPTER 1
THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Man is the only being, as far as we know, which not only exists, but which also becomes. As a result, man suffers a permanent crisis of identity. He tries to grasp himself, but he changes with every sunset, and with the turning of every historical cycle. What then does "Ecce homo" mean? Is he the sublime Christian who gives up everything material and ephemeral to praise God and to extend human brotherhood? Is he the cold severe Jacobin whose limitless confidence in human reason and human justice calls for law and order by fire and sword? Is he the detached humanist who praises the folly of mankind, its stupidity, selfishness and vanity, but who also believes that education and rationality can build a better life? Is it the bold outrageous power of a Coriolan who defies everything and tries to subject the whole world to his will and his appetites? Is he Beranger, the common man who refuses to turn into a rhinoceros? Is he the little child whose life is play, or the socialized adult who strives for money and glory?

It is hard to say what Ecce homo means simply because man is a protean and wondrous being. As Saint-Exupery puts it, unlike plants man is unhappy because he does not have roots and therefore he wanders around.¹ This happened because man sneaked out of nature and entered history, and as a result he developed the peculiar capacity to exist in

¹
the world and in correlation with the world, in a kind of dialogue with it. Therefore what we will try to do is shed some light on the way man has related to the world. While so far the study of man has dealt primarily with what is or with what ought to be, we shall be primarily interested in "how," in other words in a modal dimension of man, in how his relation with the world has manifested itself.

Throughout his history, man, we think, has developed basically three ways or modes by which he related to the world: a holistic, a dualistic, and a scientific (or ambivalent) mode.

The Holistic Relationship: Man-World

The first type or mode of relating to the world, and perhaps the oldest, the holistic mode, purports an identification of man with the whole world. Thus man has perceived himself from the very beginning as a part of nature and the cosmos. At the dawn of our civilization, man was close to nature so that he acted and identified himself with it. The holistic man, as Hegel said, was "buried in nature:" he was never alone but always a part of nature. Nature was present in every aspect of his life and he was in nature. The sun was his eye, the wind was his breath, the stones were his bones, the grass was his hair, and even the soil and the sky were the mother and the father of the world. In a twelfth century hymn the Virgin Mary is glorified as "ground not to be plowed which brought forth fruit" (terra non arabilis quae fructum partuit). From another point of view this is a superb example of a transfer of the holistic approach within Christianity.
The difference between holistic man and the world around him was very thin and so was his consciousness about his identity. The very characteristic of the holistic approach, therefore, seems to consist of a kind of unity between man and the world around him. Man sees himself in the holistic approach, "in" and "part" of the world. The animism, as well as the panpsychism which flourished in so many religions and philosophies, is only a by-product of this holistic approach. The old Indian, or the member of an African tribe, could dance with the wind, cry with the weeping willow, talk to the trees, because between him and the world around him there were no boundaries. Nature was not something alien, it was his mother. Between man and the world around him nothing interfered. This kind of communion, man-world, or man-nature, is so pervasive that for psychologists it was viewed as a transfiguration of the lost womb (paradise). It did not escape also the Marxist interpretation in which it was seen as a characteristic of agrarian economies. Yet the holistic approach did not die with the agrarian cultures, and it is not only a kind of nostalgia after a lost paradise. Today when the scientists talk about eco-systems they, in one way or another, return the man to the world, and to a certain extent revive a holistic relation between man and nature.

There are therefore deeper reasons within the man and within the world for this type of relation. First, the holistic relation man-world seems to respond to some deep existential problems such as the need for stability, harmony, and continuity, and second, it seems to meet also some profound human needs too, such as the need for involvement, for
relating, for existing 'with' and 'in' and for social coexistence. To illustrate this point, let us pick up one or two examples from the Greek and Roman world, which in many respects are cultures based on a holistic relationship between man and the world. The pagan cosmos for example, was a closed and self-contained, especially a harmoniously designed world. Here is how it is described by Plato in his Republic:

And from the extremities stretched the Spindle of Necessity, by means of which all the circles revolve. The shaft of the Spindle and the hook were of adamant, and the whorl partly of adamant and partly of other substances. The whorl was of this fashion. In shape it was like an ordinary whorl; but from Er's account we must imagine it like a large whorl with the inside completely scooped out, and within it a second whorl, and a third and a fourth and four more, fitting into one another like a nest of bowls. For there were in all eight whorls, set one within another, with their rims showing above as circles and making up the continuous surface as a single whorl around the shaft, which pierces right through the center of the eighth. The circle forming the rim of the first and outermost whorl (Fixed Stars) is the broadest; next in breadth is the sixth (Venus); then the fourth (Mars); then the eighth (Moon); then the seventh (Sun); then the fifth (Mercury); then the third (Jupiter); and the second (Saturn) is narrowest of all. The rim of the largest whorl (Fixed Stars) was spangled; the seventh (sun) brightest; the eighth (Moon) coloured by the reflected light of the seventh; the second and the fifth (Saturn, Mercury) like each other and yellower; the third (Jupiter) whitest; the fourth (Mars) somewhat ruddy; the sixth (Venus) second in whiteness. The Spindle revolved as a whole with one motion; but, within the whole as it turned the seven inner circles revolved slowly in the opposite direction; and these the eighth (Moon) moved most swiftly; second in speed and all moving together, the seventh, sixth and fifth (Sun, Venus, Mercury); next in speed moved the fourth (Mars) with what appeared to them to be a counter-revolution. Next the third (Jupiter) and slowest of all the second.

The Spindle turned on the knees of Necessity. Upon each of its circles stood a Siren, who was carried round with movements, uttering a single sound on one note, so that all eight made up the concords of a single scale. Round at equal distances were scattered, each on a throne, the three daughters of Necessity, the Fates, robed in white with garlands on their heads, Lachesis, Clotho, and Atropos, chanting to the Sirens' music, Lachesis
of things past, Clotho of present, and Atropos of things to come. And from time to time Clotho lays her hand on the outer rim of the Spindle and helps to turn it, while Atropos turns the inner circles likewise with her left, and Lachesis with either hand takes hold, as soon as alternately.

This is not a cosmos designed for rockets and spaceships, but is a perfect piece of architecture. In such a world man felt secure and at ease. The earth was in the center of the cosmos and it was his home. Partly imagination, partly empirical observation built the Greek cosmos. Yet it perfectly met the deep needs for communion of man with the world which will be so much refused by the coming cold and impersonal cosmologies. In the same way worked the social system in the Greek polis. If Solon should be praised for something it is that he designed a political system in which every citizen of Athens became part of the city. That this took a democratic form was only incidental. At the bottom the quest was for a kind of regime which would meet the holistic aspirations of the Greeks. "The essence of this new democracy," says W. Miller in his Greece and the Greeks, "consisted in constituting the 'entire body of citizens an assembly, the Ecclesia, with final powers in practically all matters legislative and judicial."

In this assembly should be sought the strength of the Greeks, and for that holistic mode of being in which the individual was a part of the community. The pagan world designed a government which involved and included all citizens, not only to avoid oligarchy, but to make social life more congruent and more balanced. In a certain way Socrates and Jesus Christ died because they both undermined this holistic approach, which kept the individual within the natural cosmos, and within the bounds of the polis.
Moreover, it was not only the cosmos and the polis, the big spheres, which self-contained the world and circumscribed the life of the pagan, but also his very idea about life and necessity. Destiny, for example, was well-accepted and played a central part in Greek theology. Moires, or the Goddesses of fate were, in fact, the supreme goddesses, and not Zeus. In other words, the life of man as well as the life of gods was somehow programmed and run by fate, by Moires. This was possible because the whole cosmos behaved according to an intricate logos. Therefore the existence of everything was purposeful. Hence the acceptance of the oracle of Delphi, who merely had a short glimpse into this pre-programmed destiny. The Greek hero tried, of course, to read his destiny or to overcome it, if it was miserable. Oedipus challenged it, Ajax rebelled against it, Prometheus defied even Zeus. However, all ended up defeated. Why? Because they turned against their fate and were irreverent; they committed "hubris". Fate is a kind of iron law. The holistic approach to the world implies, then, the fundamental belief in destiny, in an organized self-contained universe in which logos and fate are the main forces. In this respect the scientific view or approach of our day bears some of the characteristics of the holistic relationship between man and the world. However, the ethic which arises from the holistic mentality is not one of resignation; that will be a later development of Christianity. On the contrary, in the holistic world man is supposed to live fully and wisely. He does not have control in writing his destiny, but he has full control in playing and performing it. That is why the holistic man is not unlikely to be a hero. Achilles as well as
Alexander checks their oracles, but this does not alter their lives. The holistic relation, we must bear in mind, implies this communion between man and the world, and sometimes man may become a God. Alexander will stop at Memphis to get an answer to a question which had been troubling him from childhood: whose son was he? Nobody knew the answer, but the priests of the holy place greeted him by the name of "son of Amon."

The holistic is the most perfect world possible because in it man, gods, plants, living creatures exist in a kind of communion. And with this we reach the key issue of the man-world relationship in the holistic world, namely that this relationship implies a kind of continuity, a continuity which is not inert or rigid but very alive. In his *Nichomachean Ethics*, Aristotle wonders to what extent the mere act of living is shared by plants and by man. In other words, the Stagirite cannot help noticing that life is a vast flux which flows through herbs, flowers, trees, birds, fish, and man. Aristotle declares:

> In the great majority of animals there are traces of physical qualities or attitudes, which qualities are more markedly differentiated in the case of human beings. For just as we pointed out resemblance in the physical organs, so in a number of animals we observe gentleness or fierceness, mildness or cross temper, courage or timidity, fear or confidence, high spirit, or low cunning, with regard to intelligence something equivalent to sagacity.4

In the light of this statement we have a kind of fraternity between man and nature, and in this lies the humanism of the holistic relationship of man to the world.

This relationship did not exist only in the pagan world. It is true it fully bloomed in this culture, but from time to time it has appeared as a response to some fundamental human needs. It is present
in Rousseau's cry for naturalism, in the lyrics of Walt Whitman, in the very recent movement of the environmentalists.

The pagan world was a holistic one, as we have seen, and man was "in" and "as" part of the world. However, as Toynbee points out, the unified pagan culture was divided politically, and this is true. Pagan holism did not include politics for a long time. Yet at its crepuscule there was Zeno who said "All men are citizens of the world," and Alexander who destroyed the Greek city and extended it far in the world, who ceased to distinguish between Greeks and barbarians, and in this way opened the doors for the fraternity which will become a keyword in the next centuries. So from communion with the world, which was the very seed of the holistic man-world relationship, man turned to communion with man. However, something happened in this move and man lost this holistic dimension and entered a divided and dualistic world.

The Dualistic Relationship: Man-World

Unlike the holistic view, the dualistic relationship of man to the world promoted a kind of separation between man and nature. Although Descartes passes as the father of dualism, a certain dualistic approach begins to loom with Neoplatonism and with the Christian movement.

The first dualistic approach may be detected in the Old Testament where it is said that man is the only creature who possesses the Holy Spirit. So, while nature and other creatures are material, man is the only spiritual being. In other words and with a different intellectual apparatus, Neoplatonists will reach the same conclusion. Both these
two movements will merge and as a result of this union a new kind of relationship of man to the world will develop. This new approach will imply among other things (1) a split of the holistic pagan world into natural and supra-natural; (2) a division of human beings into body and mind; and (3) a process of reduction of the physical and natural to ideal and spiritual. This distinction, this schismatic movement did not occur suddenly, but developed gradually with the Platonic distinction between real and ideal; it was also carried by Christianity, and finally came fully to bloom in St. Augustine's conception of the City of God. Although the Hellenistic mind had already developed the idea of mundus, which embraces the heavens, the constellations and God and his angels above the orbis terrare, it was Saint Augustine who made this distinction clear.

According to St. Augustine, there are two cities, the civitas Dei and the terrena civitas.\textsuperscript{5} Needless to say, the city of God is the eternal city, the city of the righteous. Once this distinction is made and accepted, man will live in a kind of dualistic world and will be torn between two different tendencies, between the transcendent and the immanent. It looks as if the primordial egg of the holistic world was split in two, and so was the relationship of man with the world. To some extent the whole of medieval culture is based on this tension between civitas Dei and terrena civitas, body and spirit, nominalism and realism.

Therefore, when Descartes separates the two substances he only tries to establish a kind of positivistic balance between two worlds
which had been delineated already. According to Descartes, the whole world had been divided into two different substances: "res extensa" and "res cogitas." These two substances are more or less separated and no inferences can be drawn about their connection. Descartes' thinking ego substance is different from the res extensa. "I think, therefore I am," was for Descartes the supreme argument of the independence of mind from matter. Undoubtedly, in comparison with the holistic view, the dualistic approach clears the road to the establishment of a two-dimensional universe, in which nature is the object of the mind, of the active subject. And this subject is related to its world in a very special way: "... la nature est mise sous le signe de l'homme actif, de l'homme enscrivant la technique dans la nature."\(^6\) This dualism is a late dualism emerging from a positivistic mind. However, dualism operated sometimes in the form of Manicheism or in the more refined form of dialectic. Yet what seems to be the main characteristic of the dualistic approach is the acceptance of two kinds of relationships with the world. The dualistic approach is also responsible for the effort to pull man to the sky in a kind of transcendental transfiguration. The pagan gods, who lived in Olympus and very often intermingled with the people, were now raised up in the sky in a super world. As a result, man opened the Pandora's box of the transcendental, of universals and of a priori knowledge. Likewise he began to make a distinction between what is and what ought to be, between immanent and transcendent, between transitory and permanent.

The dualistic world was also carried to the level of the individual, and as a result the dualistic man was a divided man. As a desendent of
Adam he was condemned, a sinner. As a creature of God he had the will and the power to absolve himself and reach eternal happiness. St. Augustine says:

Of these two first parents of the human race, then, Cain was the first-born, and he belonged to the city of men; after him was born Abel, who belonged to the city of God. For as in the individual the truth of the apostle's statement is discerned, "that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual," whence it comes to pass that each man, being derived from a condemned stock, is first of all born of Adam evil and carnal, and becomes good and spiritual only afterwards, when he is grafted into Christ by regeneration: so was it in the human race as a whole. When these two cities began to run their course by a series of deaths and births, the citizen of this world was the first-born, and after him the stranger in this world, the citizen of the city of God, predestinated by grace, elected by grace, by grace a stranger below, and by grace a citizen above. By grace,—for as far as regards himself he is sprung from the same mass, all of which is condemned in its origin; but God, like a potter (for this comparison is introduced by the apostle judiciously, and not without thought), of the same lump made one vessel to honour, another to dishonour. But first the vessel to dishonour was made, and after it another to honour. For in each individual, as I have already said, there is first of all that which is reprobate, that from which we must begin, but in which we need not necessarily remain; afterwards is that which is well-approved, to which we may by advancing attain, and in which, when we have reached it, we may abide. Not, indeed, that every wicked man shall be good, but that no one will be good who was not first of all wicked; but the sooner any one becomes a good man, the more speedily does he receive this title, and abolish the old name in the new. Accordingly, it is recorded of Cain that he built a city, but Abel, being a sojourner, built none. For the city of the saints is above, although here below it begets citizens, in whom it sojourns till the time of its reign arrives, when it shall gather together all in the day of the resurrection; and then shall the promised kingdom be given to them, in which they shall reign with their Prince, the King of the ages, time without end.7

Therefore the city of god and the terrena civitas are not only two exterior entities, but also two inner worlds. If the Freudian typology might be somewhere recognized, it can be easily traced in this type of
dualistic man. Suppression was not only a part of man's psychology but the very key of his salvation.

Undoubtedly the dualistic approach met some of the human spiritual needs, such as the need for brotherhood, love, and peace, and principally the primordial need for the absolute and for eternal life. In this respect the answer given to the problem of death by the dualistic approach was much better than by the holistic approach. However, for one reason or another the dualistic approach will cease to be prominent. It will not disappear as some may assume, but it will definitely not be a primordial part of the social consciousness of the modern man entering the industrial era. Once the industrial revolution has started man will turn back to earth. The city of God and the longing for absolutes will be more or less relegated as a religious affair, as a Don Quixote's dream. Even God himself will be proclaimed dead.

The new approach, the scientific one, implies a new relationship between man and the world. In a paradoxical way this new scientific mode will include two terms; the first term will again relate man to the world and to the cosmos in a way which can remind one of the holistic approach, and the second term will set man apart from the world in a kind of dualistic approach. So this new paradigm would establish a kind of ambivalent relationship between man and the world.

It is not unlikely that the term "experience" in pragmatism in the United States and the term "praxis" in European philosophy became key words during the industrial era. Both words are important not only because they integrated the scientific approach, but also because they
provided a kind of liasc between the inner and outside, between man and the world, and in this way made possible a new kind of man-world relationship. We call this, in the absence of a better word, an ambivalent relationship.

The Ambivalent Relationship: Man-World

As we have seen, so far man related himself to the world in two main modes. First, he perceived himself as a part of the world; he identified himself, in other words, with the whole world and existed as a part of it. Secondly, man saw the world as a dualistic reality of matter and spirit, and perceived himself as a spiritual entity and therefore a superior being. He was God's creation, or a thinking substance above the natural order.

Although these two modes explained different aspects of human behavior and of reality surrounding man, and established a kind of link between man and the world, once man entered the industrial era he developed a new kind of relationship with the world. With this new pattern man is in the world as a part of the world, but at the same time he is out of the world as a subject which changes the world. In a paradoxical way man belongs to the world but at the same time he doesn't. Moreover, even the world exists in this kind of double dimension. So, for example, it is known that light, the Appolo of the pagan world, became in modern physics a dual and ambivalent phenomenon; it is wave and matter at the same time. Moreover, the world, the whole cosmos seems to be constituted of two substances, as in the dualistic approach, but in a paradoxical way
these two different entities complement each other; they exist together. Reality seems, from this point of view, to exist and manifest itself in an ambivalent mode, as matter and energy. That is why Bertrand Russell might be right when he talks about an "overlap between physical and mental".

So, if someone tries to answer the cosmogonic question, What is reality? he can at most point out that reality is something which exists in the same time as matter and energy, as physical and ideal or psychic. This is, of course, a paradox and a puzzle, but as Max Planck and Niels Bohr pointed out, between these two realities there seems to be a relationship of complementarity. That the term ambivalence can be used to describe this peculiar aspect of our existence is a matter of vocabulary.

As in the realm of cosmology where we are faced with a paradox, in the realm of epistemology we encounter a similar situation. As Alfred North Whitehead indicated in *Nature and Life*, it seems that the world is in the mind and the mind is in the world. Philosophers since Kant have tried to wrestle with this double aspect of the process of knowing, but the problem seems insurmountable. Knowing is at the same time a product of our mind and of the world around us. It is a subjective penetration of our mind in the world and an objective and material encompassing of the mind by the world. For traditional dualism, the mind was somewhere outside of the world as an objective observer, and for subjective idealists such as Berkeley, the world was a creation of our mind.
However, neither of these two approaches seems to explain the process of knowing simply because knowing is something in-between. It is an ambivalent process which results from two sources, from the mind and from the world. Dewey, in his *Theory of Inquiry*, wrestles a great deal with this problem. For him experience was reflective and empirical, hence two-fold. If the empirical experience was the one which furnished the problem, or marked the discontinuity between environment and man, the reflective experience was the one which solved the problem and re-established the continuity between man and his environment. To put it simply, we have here the old Kantian distinction between sensual experience and intellectual translated in the modern functional terms of problem-solving. However, as we mentioned at the beginning, the most pertinent attitude is to recognize that knowing is an ambivalent process which depends both on subject or observer and on object or the world.

As we said before, it is quite likely that from the very beginning man identified himself with the world, or the world with himself. He existed as a part of the world and not as an individual. However, there was a moment in the history of man when he opened his eye not only to look outside, but also to look inside. When this occurred, man discovered himself as an individual apart from nature or the world. The first glimpse of this sight was, of course, caught by Socrates with his emphasis on knowing oneself. However, the full development of individual consciousness as individual occurred during the Renaissance in Italy.

During the Middle Ages, as Burckhardt stated, man was conscious of himself only as a part of the race, people, party, family, or corporation.
Now in Italy with the Renaissance an interesting phenomenon happened: the separateness of the self from the rest of reality. For us this division is important to support the thesis that we can talk about a certain kind of ambivalence between individual and society as a condition of the emerging industrial society and as a characteristic of the scientific relationship between man and the world. Beginning with the Renaissance the individual possessed a double consciousness, a consciousness of himself, a subjective consciousness, and an objective consciousness of the external world. Although there have been many attempts to bridge this odd relationship in which modern man is caught up, an answer has not been found.

The extreme individualistic position adopted by anarchism, which resents any institution above the individual, as well as extreme organicism developed by certain societies which absorb the individual in society, seem only to worsen the problem rather than to solve it.

In these terms we can see also the difference between east and west. Whereas the west tends to emphasize the first term of this ambivalence, the freedom of the individual and competition, the east emphasizes equality and social cohesion. Therefore we can talk about a kind of ambivalence even in these terms. It is sometimes said, half seriously, half jokingly, that capitalism needs communism in order that it can work, and vice versa. The joke might catch some of the hidden meanings of our world.

As far as the place of man in the cosmos is concerned, the scientific approach places man in a kind of opened cosmos. Thus, the cosmos is
infinite and though it is governed by laws which might be comprehended by man, it remains in many respects mysterious and detached. That is why for the scientific mind the term universe, which means a plurality of cosmos, or possible cosmos, is more appealing. However, this scientific universe is co-substantial, desacralized, which is to say that matter and the laws are the same everywhere, unless we accept the hypothesis of an anti-universe. Determinism and scientific laws govern this universe so that the scientific man believes in his power to control the world as he believes in free will. As a matter of fact, this seems to be the main characteristic of the scientific mind, of the man placed in a scientific relationship with the world. He is free and perceives himself free, as the actor and the author of his own drama. As Mircea Eliade says,

Modern nonreligious man assumes a new existential situation; he regards himself solely as the subject and the agent of history, and refuses all appeal to transcendence. In other words, he accepts no model for humanity outside the human condition as it can be seen in the various historical situations. Man makes himself, and he only makes himself completely in proportion as he desacralizes himself and the world. The sacred is the prime obstacle to his freedom. He will become himself only when he is totally demythicized.10

This freedom makes him unique and sets him apart from the world. So, if the universe seems to be infinite and opened, so is the man who swells in this universe. Therefore between "I" or "Self" and the world there is a kind of complementarity. Both man and the universe are open systems, infinite worlds. That is why the relationship of man to the world has a kind of ambivalent characteristic and existential value. Man changes the world around him, but at the same time he changes himself. This is a blessing and a curse. This new mode of relating to the world started in
Western Europe centuries ago with the mechanical loom, and was carried over the Atlantic. Here it came to full bloom, as a part of the Protestant Ethic, at the beginning, then as an effort to reconcile man with god, and later as a deliberate effort to build a harmonious world and to reach reasonableness.
CHAPTER 1

FOOTNOTES


9. "Our experience of the world involves the exhibition of the soul itself as one of the components within the world; yet in one sense the world is in the soul... The world is included within the mental occasion, and the occasion in the world in another sense." *Nature and Life*, p. 40.

CHAPTER 2
THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

America was at the beginning a new continent, then a new colony, and finally a new civilization. This new civilization started as an extension of European civilization, but very soon it developed its own original pattern and identity. What are the features of American civilization, and what are the characteristics of the American spirit or mind, which has fostered and maintained this civilization? For, if material things and achievements are important it is because there is a will and an intangible force to manage them. Henry Steele Commager writes:

What is, in the end, of decisive important are the intangible factors that we call character, the things that are done and the things that are not done, the attitude toward the individual human being, the sense of responsibility toward society, the relations of the military and the civilian, the position of women and of children, the role of school and the church and of courts, the concepts of justice and fair play, the ideals that are held up to children and the pattern of conduct that is fixed for them, the moral standards that are accepted and the moral values that are cherished.

This American character came out through a strange alchemy in which inheritance, environment, and experience worked together; the first who tried to define it were Europeans. This curiosity which Europeans manifested toward America, from the very beginning was manifold, but basically they were intrigued about what was going on on the other side of the Atlantic. It was like a challenge which the New World addressed to
Europe, that had to be counteracted. Like Athens, Europe strove to fight against alienation of its own sons who ran away. Trying to find out what happened on the other side of the Atlantic was part of this fight.

**How Europeans Have Seen America**

The ways America has been viewed by Europeans vary, and there is a long spectrum of images and cliches about America which have circulated in Europe.

America is, for example, the country of industry and mass-production, of television and cars, of Mark Twain, Lincoln and Hemingway. We have the American Yankee; America as the country of democracy; America, the country of capitalism and free enterprise; America, the country of football and baseball; America, the country of the man who first stepped on the moon. The series can be extended, but the problem which arises is: what does America really look like, or what image best fits it?

One of the first images about America which appeared in Europe was that of an exotic place and fabulous land. This was the image brought back by the first explorers of the new continent, whose imaginations were excited by the discovery. This was not even America, but the promised land of India which was the dream of Columbus.

It is very likely that the romantic searches for purity and naturalism of European spirit, weakened by a refined but decadent aristocratic culture, on the one hand, and undermined and sapped by religious movements, on the other hand, saw in this early image of America a
configuration and an harbor. "La bonne sauvage" of Montesquieu is the citizen of this regained paradise, and Chateaubriand's novel *Atala* is also placed in this world. America was at this time the symbol of a possible regained naturalism, and the replica of Rousseau's cry for a way back to nature.

Later, with the American colonies developed, and the War for Independence came a new image of America. This time America surprised Europe by its social and political adventure. The successful war and the new political and social arrangements on which the rebellious sons of Europe embarked, drew the image of America as the country of democracy, freedom, and justice. A very vivid picture of this early America is provided by Michel-Guillaume de Crevecoeur in his *Letter from an American Farmer*. "Americans are," he wrote in 1780,

> the western pilgrims, who are carrying along with them that great mass of arts, science, vigour and industry which began long since in the east: they will finish the great circle. . . . The American is a new man, who acts upon new principles: he must therefore entertain new ideas, and form new opinions. From involuntary idleness, servile dependence, penury, and useless labor, he has passed to toils of a very different nature, rewarded by ample subsistence. This is an American.

The echoes of a Europe still caught up into a feudal system reverberate with bitterness in de Crevecoeur's letters.

From almost the same period of time came one of the classic analyses of American democracy—*Democracy in America*, written by Alexis de Tocqueville, another Frenchman longing for new political horizons and disenchanted with the European scene. De Tocqueville was sent to the United States in 1831 to investigate the penitentiary system and, ironically, ended up by writing one of the most comprehensive books about
democracy. Convinced that democracy was bound to spread, de Tocqueville intended to explain as much in detail as he could the functions and the implications of the American experiment. He is rather objective than apologetic and his analysis points out the strength and the weaknesses of the American democracy.

I confess that in America I saw more than America: I sought there the image of democracy itself, with its inclinations, its character, its prejudices, and its passions, in order to learn what we have to fear and to hope from its progress.

Coming from a highly centralized country, such as France, de Tocqueville could not help observing the advantages of a democratic system in which the people share to a large extent the responsibilities of the government. So, for example, he would note that:

Democracy does not give the people the most skillful government, but it produces what the ablest governments are frequently unable to create: namely, an all-pervading and restless activity, a superabundant force, and energy which is inseparable from it and which may, however unfavorable circumstances may be, produce wonders. These are the true advantages of democracy.

De Tocqueville also warned against the unlimited power of the majority, and against the dominance of power over justice, when he said together with Madison that the end of government is justice.

In my opinion the main evil of the present democratic institutions of the United States does not rise, as is often asserted in Europe, from their weakness, but from their overpowering strength; and I am not so much alarmed at the excessive liberty which reigns in that country as at the very inadequate securities which exist against tyranny. . . . In America the majority raises very formidable barriers to the liberty of opinion: within these barriers an author may write what he pleases, but he will repent it if he ever steps beyond them. Not that he is exposed to the terrors of an auto-da-fe, but he is troubled by the slights and persecutions of daily obloquy. His political career is closed forever, since he has offended the only authority which is able to promote his success. Every sort of compensation, even that of celebrity, is
 refused to him. Before he published his opinions he imagined that he held them in common with many others; but no sooner has he declared them openly than he is loudly censured by his overbearing opponents, whilst those who think without having the courage to speak, like him, abandon him in silence. He yields at length, oppressed by the daily efforts he has been making, and he subsides into silence, as if he was tormented by remorse for having spoken the truth.5

By the end of the century, it was the turn of an Englishman, the British Ambassador James Bryce, to produce an outstanding account about America. His The American Commonwealth (1888) is a sort of replica of de Tocqueville's book in British culture. But Bryce has the advantage of time, and his book about America is a more refined description of the faults and strengths of American democracy. Like de Tocqueville, Bryce points out that American democracy suffers from a lack of leadership.

Since democracy means the rule of numerical majority,

we find that the direct government of the multitude may become dangerous not only because the multitude shares the faults and follies of ordinary human nature, but because it is intellectually incompetent for the delicate business of conducting the daily work of government,6

i.e. of choosing and corning out with vigour and promptitude the requisite executive means. Although a part of his British political heritage transpires in this political analysis, J. Bryce is objective most of the time. What bothers him is not the idea that masses are the best judge of what will conduce to their own happiness, but the problem of who is the best qualified to select the means for the accomplishment. The problem is present for Bryce as it was present for Plato. But in spite of these contradictions which have faced all democracies, Bryce could not help observing the strengths of American democracy. He mentions, for example, the stability of American government, the simplicity of the
political ideas and the courage of the people to carry them out in practice. "It is a great merit of America," he says in another place, "that it relies very little on officials, and arms them with little power of arbitrary interference."\(^7\)

With de Tocqueville and Bryce, Europeans got an idea about America's social and political enterprise. The veil of mystery was raised and through these two books the American experiment became part of European consciousness and experience. Consequently, in the next century the European mind would be less interested in the political achievements of Americans and more in other aspects of their culture.

As we moved from the 18th century to the 19th century, there was a shift in European interest from the political domain to the economical one. By now democracy had become a common experience for Europeans too; and consequently, the interest in the American experiment had diminished. Moreover, it was in the 19th century that the economy and industrialization became the main forces of social life. The industrial revolution, which started in England with the mechanized loom, reached its highest level in America. Therefore it was in America that the idea of industrialization was for the first time fully embodied. As was expected, American industrial progress intrigued Europe, and the question of why the United States moved forward so rapidly arose almost automatically. Although the rationale provided by Hugo Munsterberg does not convey all the aspects of such a complex question, it provides one explanation of why America had developed so fast.
For Munsterberg, who came from Germany to America as professor of psychology at Harvard University in 1892, the fabulous development of the United States stems not from the abundance of natural resources of the country, but from the make-up of the American character. And this American make-up, or character, which set in motion a tremendous economic flywheel consists of the instinct for "free self-initiative." Munsterberg wrote:

The colossal industrial success, along with the great evils and dangers which have come with them, must be understood from the make-up of the American character. Just as we have traced the political life of America back to a powerful instinct for free self-determination, the free self-guidance of the individual, so we shall here find that it is the instinct for free self-initiative which has set in motion this tremendous economic flywheel.\(^8\)

Capitalism and free initiative have been associated from the very beginning and one cannot exist without the other. Yet, Hugo Munsterberg talks about free initiative more in psychological terms than in economical ones. Adam Smith's rhetoric about the wealth of a nation is translated into ethnological language in Munsterberg's book. Americans reached the fullest economic development, Munsterberg argued, page after page, because "the true American despises anyone who gets money without working for it."\(^9\) Unlike the Europeans, who seem to prize money for itself, the American prizes money as an indication of his ability to make it. The average European, caught up in his old culture and longing for lofty spiritual accomplishments, looks upon intense economic activity as upon an unbounded greed, whereas the American, freed from the desire for higher culture, chooses money and works for it with undisguised and shameless greed. Therefore the barbarity of his soul, Munsterberg
concludes, "gives him considerable economic advantage"\(^{10}\) over others who have some heart as well as feelings inclined to the humane.

Whether or not Munsterberg is entitled to explain the economical success of North America from a few facts, it is obvious that a Bible of Industry cannot be written without the idea of work and free-initiative. Industry, unlike agriculture, is a creation of man. And a man who does not have free initiative and is not hard-working cannot ripen an industrial crop. Within the capitalist system these traits have been fed and educated by the process of money-making and profit, and when Munsterberg locates the economical development of the U.S. in free-initiative and in the passion for money, he undoubtedly hits one of the crucial points of the capitalist economy.

But the people who created an industrial economy in North America, no matter how free they were, reached a point where industrialization in its turn influenced them. It shaped and conferred some dimensions to the American spirit which have been taken for granted as the very characteristics of it.

For Richard Muller-Freienfels these characteristics consist of the mechanization and technicalization of life, and the fact that in America quantity is valued. Let us start with the last: "As the first characteristic of external image of America," the author says, "I laid stress on the massive gigantic nature of this world."\(^{31}\) Everything tends to be big in America in comparison with Europe. The country, the newspapers, the cities, the rivers, the railroads, all are much bigger than in Europe. It seems that for America, magnitude is value. Since from
the beginning the American people were confronted with rich resources, their culture was more material than formal. Only now does pollution and the depletion of natural resources turn the American mind to the old concepts of moderation and equilibrium. When Muller-Freienfels made his analysis at the beginning of this century, the belief in unlimited expansion had not come under scrutiny.

As far as the technicalization or mechanization of life is concerned, the German professor could not help remarking that "the average American sets an absolute and positive value on technique," and that "nowhere is it so obtrusive as in America." Consequently, whereas the European still values organic and artistic life, the American is much more rationally and practically oriented. And at this point Muller-Freienfels reaches an idea which was destined to be seen as a major characteristic of the American mind—the pragmatic character of this mind. He does not use the term, which, at the time he elaborated his reflections, was known only to a restricted group of people who listened to a foe like Ch. S. Peirce, but the idea is the same. In a language which might remind us of William James, Muller-Freienfels talks about the concentration of the intellect on the practical, useful and efficient, and about the fact that that rationality, in the U.S., is a form of thinking and will, which expresses itself in construction and machines.

Mechanization has some consequences which, to a European mind, are particularly unpleasant. It brings uniformity, likeness, and it kills individuality. No matter where you shop in the United States, things
are the same because they come from the same pattern. But what is worse, the people tend to fit into one standard. "The most remarkable thing," Muller-Freienfels says, is that "even people impress one as having been standardized." All clean shaven men, as well as all the girls with their doll-like faces, seem to have been produced somewhere in a Ford factory, he contends. Here we are far from that Renaissance where every individual was eager to develop his own personality. Chicago is not that Florence where, as Burckhardt said, every person was different even in the way they were dressed. This especially bothers Muller-Freienfels, who, nurtured by the Renaissance spirit, has an aversion to standardization.

In 1935, two Soviet writers visited the U.S., and their findings are particularly interesting since they approached America from another perspective. Ilya Ilf and Eugene Petrov, the authors of the *Little Golden Calf*, looked, perhaps for the first time, upon the United States from a socialist perspective. Like Muller-Freienfels, the Soviet writers saw money and the process of money-making as the main mechanism which moves America forward. Everything that brings money, they say, develops, and everything that does not bring money degenerates and wilts away in the United States. The process is contradictory. It creates wealth, but at the same time it brings alienation. By the time the Soviet writers visited the United States, the country was in the midst of depression. Therefore their image about America, "which simultaneously horrifies, delights, calls forth pity, and sets examples worthy of emulation, which is rich, poor, talented and ungifted," is
contradictory. The dialectic is at work here, and reveals the divergence between wealth and happiness, between labor and capital. America is to the socialist writers a paradise and a hell. They acknowledge its great material achievements, but they point to its spiritual poverty. America is for them not only another culture, but also a different mode of production and another ideological reality. Yet, perhaps for the first time, two people drew a bridge between the United States and the Soviet Union, and tried to establish an understanding between two major cultural and ideological poles. There are things which separate these two countries, but there are also things which they can share. In a certain way, a philosophy of detente "avant la lettre" transpires in their pages about America.

Pragmatism and the American Character

There is little doubt that when the Europeans tried to analyze or define the American character, they defined and expressed to some extent their own character; a comparison is almost always implicit in their analysis. They look upon American culture, but their eyes are French, English, German, or Soviet. If, for example, an African had written, or given an account about the United States, then the image we would have had about the United States would have been different. Therefore it is not unlikely that they would have seen in the United States things that the average American doesn't see. Thus sometimes Americans have recognized themselves in the analysis made by Europeans and sometimes not. It was John Dewey who, in his Individualism Old and
New responded on behalf of his fellows to the European interpretations of the American mind.

He does not deny the existence of some of the characteristics mentioned by European analysts of American culture, but at the same time he does not share the idea that these characteristics belong only to the American life. Such traits as quantification, mechanization, and standardization are a result of industrialization, and they may be found wherever this process takes place, Dewey says. The United States happened to enter the machine age earlier than Europe, but in a while Europe will be faced with the same problems. Therefore the real issue is the technique which brings about these symptoms, rather than its consequences. And as far as technique is concerned, Dewey argues that those who blame the domination of the American spirit by technique forget that the world "has not suffered from absence of ideas and spiritual aims anywhere as much as it has suffered from absence of means for realizing the ends which it has prized in a literary and sentimental way." Here in the United States, Dewey says, we have developed the means, whereas Europeans have insisted especially upon the ends. Therefore when Europeans criticize Americans they overlook the importance of means and technique. In other words, we have again the eternal equation: humanism and industrialism, aestheticism and pragmatism, idealism and materialism, Renaissance and Reform, Romans and Greeks, Europeans and Americans.

In spite of these dialogues and these differences, which to some extent are fruitful, can we distinguish an American character or spirit,
not only according to some European or foreign standards, but also to some native criteria? Can we describe some of the characteristics of the American mind, if we admit there is such a thing?

There are many accounts about the American Character, but most frequently people have referred to it as to a pragmatic one. This term, very deceiving in itself, has at least two major denotations. It refers, on the one hand, to a whole philosophical school which sprang from the American soil, and this is its lofty technical meaning. On the other hand, it denotes a type of life, a particular attitude toward the world, a specific way to handle everyday problems—in other words, certain values and behaviors which make the American life different and unique. Needless to say, between these two meanings there is as close a connection as between life and philosophy. In many respects, pragmatic philosophy has only refined and conceptualized what is intrinsic and spontaneous in the American life. Therefore let us share the idea that existence precedes essence and begin the analysis of the American pragmatism with its existential dimension. What does pragmatism mean at this level, and how is it perceived in everyday life?

The term pragmatism is part of our common language, and it is usually used in such constructions as, "Try to be pragmatic and understand this," or "don't be pragmatic." "Pragmatic" is for the layman an adjective which describes certain human behaviors. Being pragmatic might be equated with being realistic, practical, in possession of common sense. In a negative way, pragmatic seems to be opposed to romantic, idealistic, and speculative. This is why being "pragmatic" means
sometimes, in a derogatory way, being too limited, lacking a humanistic and artistic horizon, being too factual. A pragmatic person is a daytime person, interested more in immediate consequences then in remote causes; his mind is operative rather than speculative, and it relies more upon common sense than upon metaphysical premises. For him, thinking is a form of activity and a continuation of living. This is why he feels at home within nature and society, and does not have the nostalgia of another paradise. But more than anything else, a pragmatic person believes that he can work and accomplish his hopes and alleviate his sorrows.

That this type of person has developed primarily in the United States is not unlikely. Here some conditions have been met which have fostered such a character. First of all, as Richard Hofstader says, "from the beginning the American people were confronted with rich resources. . .Their culture came to set a premium on practical achievements, the manipulation of material reality, and quick decision." America was for a long time an open land, and the people who came here had to work hard to make a home and to raise a country. With a few exceptions, most of the people were farmers and manufacturers. So we did not have in America a leisure class, an aristocracy such as we had in Europe. Therefore the American culture was primarily a material culture, and so was the mentality of the people who raised this culture.

At the beginning the passion for land, and later, as industrialization was underway, the passion for money, constituted the principal motive force of American economy. To achieve, you had to work hard, to
toil, so that work and thrift became the main values of the Protestant ethic. A marvelous presentation of this epic was provided by Henry Clew as he gave some fatherly advice to Yale students in 1908:

You may start in business, or a profession, with your feet on the bottom rung of the ladder; it rests with you to acquire the strength to climb to the top. You can do so if you have the will and the forces to back you. There is always plenty of room at the top. . . Success comes to the man who tries to compel success to yield to him. Cassius spoke well to Brutus when he said, 'The Fault is not in our stars, dear Brutus, that we are underlings, but in our natures.'

But America was not only an "open frontier" but also an open culture. Those who came here had to dump into the ocean many of the taboos and inhibitions which operated in their old cultures. For a long time, perhaps, such immigrants had the same feeling of relief and fresh joy of life which Noah's family had after the deluge. The idea of "a new life" was for a long time not only a dream but a real experience for most of the people who came to America. And this fresh beginning must have been a tremendous psychological force and release of energy, since people have started innumerable revolutions to achieve it. Although Americans gained their independence in 1776, the colonists had gained their spiritual independence as soon as they reached the new continent. The old ties with the old culture were most or less cut off once they stepped on the new continent. Here the idea of a new life had ceased to be only a myth and become a reality.

As we move forward and as American culture became more structured, this force has diminished. This is one of the reasons why the people who come today to the United States lack that genuine psychological force which moved and sustained the settlers who came centuries ago.
This does not imply necessarily an organic Spenglerian view about culture, but rather says that the psychological and ideological factors play a very important role in the constituency of American character. We should remember, for example, that the Puritans who came around 1640 to New England sincerely believed that their mission was to build another Zion. John Winthrop, the leader of the new community, struck a keynote of American character when he preached to his fellows that they should be as a city upon the hill.

The same strong belief of superiority accompanied by a sense of destiny and mission will transpire later, this time in patriotic terms, when Jefferson called his country the world's best hope, and Lincoln, "the last best hope of earth." This ethnocentricism has fostered the American character, so that from the very beginning a certain confidence and optimism have become marks of the American character. This dimension is often overlooked by those who look at the American character only from a materialistic point of view. Yet, a culture does not grow if the people who raise it don't have psychological strength and a capacity to transcend their environment.

But this forwardness and spiritual dynamism was, in the case of the American character, balanced by common sense and by a practicality which has protected American character against an excessive egotism or sterile idealism. Therefore, even though the American character is not alien to a certain transcendentalism, as we have seen, it still remains deeply ingrained in the American soil. The American character does not worship absolute gods or high metaphysical concepts, and it is rather suspicious
about what cannot be tested or experienced. "Theories and speculations," Henry Steele Commager says, "disturbed the American, and he avoided abstruse philosophies of government or conduct as healthy men avoid medicine."¹⁵

The lack of cultural tradition, on the one hand, and the need for work on the other hand, kept the American character away from the pure speculation of idle spirituality. Americans never had an aristocracy of mind such as Athens and Europe; the idea of thinking for the sake of thinking is far remote from the American mind. In a way, the American mind is still operating in a pre-Socratic era. It is still faithful to nature and industry as the pre-Socratics were faithful to water, earth, or fire. Hence the American passion for what is concrete and visual, skyscrapers, production records, machines, and giant corporations. Therefore the American reaction to most situations is practical and utilitarian.

An open culture nurtured also a high mobility and a searching inquisitiveness. Whereas in Europe the class structure and cultural stratification tended to emphasize the inertia or the status quo, in America for a long time change and progress were most highly prized. The whole march of American civilization, from its earliest settlement to its capitalis triumphs, has fostered this sentiment of uninterrupted progress, which found expression in Jefferson, Emerson, Whitman, and Dewey's optimistic outlook, George Novak says in his Pragmatism versus Marxism.¹⁶ Because of this situation, the American character has been preeminently a subject of action and practical achievements. This
activism was present in the early work and endeavors of the pioneers, and it is not unlikely that an adventurer like Mike Fink, the boatman on the Mississippi, liked to think that "it is good to be shifty in a new country." Ford's and Edison's inventiveness, as well as the policy of the New Deal, stem from the same spiritual pattern. Moreover, as one of the founders of America used to say, the American government was not conceived as a perfect government, but as a workable one. Pragmatism is therefore inherent in the American character and it can be seen at different levels or different manifestations of American life.

Yet, by the turn of the 19th century, this spirit which up to that time was implicit and substantial began to be expressed more and more coherently in an explicit form. Americans became aware of their identity and a whole new philosophy came to life. The term "pragmatism" was used now for the first time, and Charles S. Peirce was the great master who authored it.

Pragmatic Philosophy

As Peirce says, he framed the pragmatic theory as a conception, that is "the rational purport of a word or other expression lies exclusively in its conceivable bearings upon the conduct of life." Like Descrates, Peirce hoped "to make the ideas clear," but unlike Descartes, who found certainty in the realm of the conscious, Peirce sought certainty in the realm of experience. In Kantian terms, which were very familiar to Peirce, who "learned philosophy out of Kant," pragmatic was the opposite pole of "praktische", that is to say, transcendental or
a priori. Therefore, when Peirce called his philosophy pragmatism, or as later, pragmaticism, he expressed certain nominalist tendencies which were brought up by science and industrialism.

The scientific method was for Peirce the great method destined to provide sound beliefs and to increase reasonableness. Yet, as he points out in his essay *The Fixation of Belief*, the scientific method is not the only method by which people try to "fix their beliefs." The a priori method, the method of tenacity, and the method of authority have preceded the scientific method in the quest of man for certain beliefs. The a priori method "promised to deliver our opinion from their accidental and capricious element, and to place the believer in a stable and immutable world, the world of eternal and a priori ideas."\(^1\)\(^8\) The method of tenacity concerns primarily the individual's beliefs, the man feeling that "if he holds to his beliefs without wavering, it will be entirely satisfactory."\(^1\)\(^9\) The method of authority rests on authority, and as Peirce says in a sociological analysis which reveals another aspect of his philosophy, too often presented only as a logical enterprise, "has from the earliest times been one of the chief means of upholding correct theological and political doctrines, and especially, it has been practised from the days of Numa Pontus to those of Pius Novus."\(^2\)\(^0\) Obviously, these methods cannot "fix" beliefs to guide human activity for a long time, because they are still subject to the personal or social impulse, on the one hand, and they are not connected with practice and natural causes, on the other hand. Therefore a new method of settling opinions must be adopted. Peirce contends, a method
which "gradually develops belief in harmony with natural causes." This method is the method of science, and it consists, as Peirce put it, in his famous pragmatic principle: "Consider what effects that might conceivably have practical bearing; you conceive of those effects as the whole of your conception of the object."\(^{21}\) In other words, the pragmatists assert that the meaning of a concept or a theory is contained in an affirmation that would be true under given experiential circumstances. For example, the whole conception of "hard" lies in its conceived effects. In the absence of a test there is no difference between hard and soft objects. Likewise, the idea of weight depends upon its conceived effects. We cannot say that an object has weight if it does not have the tendencies to fall.

In 1895 William James gave a lecture at the University of California entitled "Philosophical Conception and Practical Results." In this conference he quoted C.S. Peirce's statement that "the sole meaning of thought is...the production of belief...Beliefs, in short, are really rules for action; and the whole function of thought is but one step in the production of habits of action."\(^{22}\) In other words, like Peirce, James argued that we can make our ideas clear by determining the conceivable practical effects. Yet, there are some differences between Peirce and James. So, for example, James stated that truth is a property of our ideas and that truth is not a static relation, a relation between our ideas and reality; rather, truth is made, or constructed, by man. "The truth of an idea is not a stagnant property to an idea. It becomes true, is made true by events. Its verity is in
fact, an event, a process, namely, of its verification itself; its verification, its validity is the process of validation." Moreover, he argued that the truth or falsity of an idea is determined by its successfully leading to new experience. Therefore, in his view the criteria of satisfactoriness govern the attribution "true" to opinions and beliefs which lead our action. Later James found the term Humanism, as introduced by Mr. Schiller, suited for his epistemology, and in this way he wanted to emphasize the human element which pervades our thinking.

The theory of the "will to believe" is perhaps the best example of his humanism. According to James we hold beliefs which satisfy our action. But sometimes some beliefs may create their own verification. So, for example, the satisfactoriness of a belief is judged by such criteria as the demands of future experience, old beliefs, and the needs and interests of the inquirer. This interpretation bothered in particular C.S. Peirce, who did not want to relate the truth with "satisfaction," and in an article entitled "The Essentials of Pragmatism," he redefined his philosophy with the term pragmaticism, and argued that "pragmaticism does not make the summum bonum to consist in action, but makes it to consist in that process of evolution whereby the existent comes more and more to embody those generals which were just now said to be destined, which is what we strive to express in calling them reasonable." Therefore, according to Peirce the truth is not a matter of "success" or an idea which works but "an explanatory hypothesis... to enable the mind to grasp into one a variety of facts, but which seeks to connect those facts with our general conception of the universe."
Whereas Peirce sees the truth as objective and general, something the people agree upon, James moved toward an individualistic and romantic kind of pragmatism in which a man will listen not only to the commands of reason but also to those of the heart.

With John Dewey, pragmatism entered a new phase, the phase of big industrial society. Thus for Dewey pragmatism is a philosophy of the industrial society, for an individual operating within a network of associations, seeking, in common with his fellow men, some truth that has meaning to the community. While James looked backward to 19th century liberalism, Dewey searched the future and tried to define the new "corporate society" of the 20th century. He, more than any other philosopher, put philosophy at the service of society, and with science, education, and aesthetics he opened a new battle for human happiness. As for Peirce, truth was for Dewey a general and community subject, something which is achieved by cooperation and action. That is why, in an essay entitled "The Development of American Pragmatism", Dewey defended what was called, sometimes with a pejorative connotation, "pragmatic philosophy", as a result of many misunderstandings. "For pragmatism," Dewey said, quoting Peirce, the meaning of "every proposition lies in the future. . . .But from the myriads of forms into which a proposition may be translated, the true one is that which is more applicable to self-control under every situation and to every purpose."25 More than his predecessors Dewey made the effort to place pragmatism on a solid base and to enlarge its perspective. Philosophy in his view "has to criticize the habits of mind which stand in the way; to focus reflection
upon needs congruous to present life; to interpret the conclusion of
science with respect to their consequence for our beliefs about purposes
and values in all phases of life."

Perhaps nowhere better than in Individual Old and New did Dewey lay
down his hopes and his philosophical perspective about the destiny of
man:

To gain an integrated individuality, each of us needs to cultivate
his own garden. But there is no fence about this garden; it is no
sharply marked-off enclosure. Our garden is the world, in the an-
gle at which it touches our own manner of living. By accepting
the corporate and industrial world in which we live, and by thus
fulfilling the precondition for interaction with it, we, who are
also parts of the moving present, create ourselves as we create
an unknown future. 26

Besides the humanistic message which transpires in these words, we have
also one of the central themes of Dewey's thought: the effort to bridge
dichotomy and dualism. The individual and society form a unity as well
as the mind and the body, nature and culture, or child and curriculum.
This was a part of his revolt against formalism and metaphysics, and an
expression of the new germinative forces at work in Darwinism and Hegel-
lianism. Although, as Morton White says, "Dewey did not solve the prob-
lem of a priori knowledge, he remains one of the great philosophers who
shaped the naturalistic and democratic view of the 20th century." 27

In an era in which many disruptions occurred and when the world
machinery was over-heated, Dewey fought to maintain a rational balance.
He believed, like a son of his century, in reason and science, but at
the same time, like an old Greek he despised the hubris, the "undeter-
mined situation", whatever breaks the equilibrium of man and nature.
Through John Dewey the American character reveals itself as a dynamic
product of a newborn civilization, rational and optimistic oriented, naturalistic and irreverent toward metaphysics and the transcendental. In pragmatism, and especially in Dewey's pragmatism, we can easily recognize the love for activity and the faith in the power of man to cope with his destiny, so deeply rooted in the Puritan spirit of the New World. But more than anything else, Dewey celebrated a kind of scientific humanism. It was his deep belief that man can live intelligently in the universe and by experience he can find truth and beauty.

The Ambivalence of the American Spirit

Although, as we have seen, the American spirit has found its full expression in pragmatism, there is at least another aspect of American character which has been less explored—the ambivalence, or the duality of the American spirit.

The assumption that the American character is pragmatic, though true to a large extent, does not cover the whole "geography" of American spirit. As a matter of fact, the American character is pragmatic in the same way as the French character is rationalistic, British empiric, or German idealistic. However, if we check these affirmations we will find that they don't tell the whole truth. The British had Carlyle, Coleridge, and a whole romantic school which does not fit into the traditional British empiricism. The French produced the Encyclopedists, who were sensualists and materialists, and Bergson was an advocate of the unconscious and irrationalism. Germany is also not only the country of Hegel and Kant, but also the country of Marx, Feuerbach.
and Geothe. It is therefore, I think, risky to identify completely the American character with pragmatism. Undoubtedly pragmatism remains one of the definitive aspects of American culture, but it is not the only one.

Even early in James' philosophy we can find the key of what we will call the ambivalence of American mind. It is known, for example, that in his lecture James talked about two prevailing tendencies in philosophy, "tender-minded" and "tough-minded". The "tender-minded" includes idealistic, monistic, religious and free-will attitudes, and the "tough minded" comprises materialism, sensationalistic, irreligious, fatalistic and skeptical attitudes. What he tried to do, and this is very important, was to conceive of his pragmatism as a medium way between these two tendencies. We have here, in a refined way, an ambivalence which opens a new perspective about the American spirit. On the one hand we have the "tender mind", the idealistic, humanistic, religious, and free-willistic type of character, and, on the other hand, we have the "tough" mind—the materialistic, positivistic, and deterministic kind of mind or character. These two are parts of the same culture and they work and fight together. Translated into geographical terms we can say that we have here the ambivalence between West and East, between North and South, between city and country. In political terms that means the tension between equality and freedom, so proper to American democracy; in sociological terms it means the polarity between individual and community. These are only some aspects of the ambivalence of American character, and of course we don't want to imply that we have not had before a
dialectic of contraries. Heraclitus was the first to grasp this dynamic and to interpret the nature in a dialectic way. Yet, the American culture is one of the first big cultures in history, we dare to say, which operates on the basis of an ambivalence of values. In general, the human community has tried to avoid contradiction and to elaborate a common and homogeneous set of values. What was contradictory was changeable and therefore considered wrong.

But for the new colonists who settled in the New World, this pattern proved to be wrong. They learned very soon that they had to have faith in God and transcendental links, but at the same time they understood that they had to rely on themselves and believe in their own capacity if they were to survive. Later they had to fight for liberty and to overthrow the government, but very soon they realized that freedom without order is wrong, so they created their own government. They started, most of them, as farmers and sons of the earth, so that they learned from the very beginning to love nature and to appreciate the natural order, simplicity, endurance, hard work and austerity, but in a brief span of time most of them became industrial people, sons of the city who believed in a technical order, who developed the cult of machines and inventiveness, who appreciated comfort and a sophisticated style of life, and who are free of any transcendental nostalgia.

As the nation has grown bigger, this ambivalence between urban and rural has developed too. So, as a result we have a tendency toward a cosmopolitan type of life, toward internationalism, and globalism, on the one hand, and another tendency toward localism, ethnicity, and
particularism, on the other hand. Even at the level of everyday life the American character is marked by ambivalence. There is an American culture, a definite materialistic orientation to achieve material wealth, like money, cars, house, jobs, and stocks; but there is also a spiritual tendency present in the effort to promote such humane values as love, brotherhood, friendship, altruism, etc.

We have today in the United States a world of computers, numbers, compulsions, a world governed by the principle of reality; but we have also a world of music, colors, laissez-faire, governed by the principle of pleasure. During the 1960's when these two worlds clashed, thinkers like Marcuse thought that the principle of reality was at its crepuscule and that the world of reason and compulsion would collapse. This did not happen, simply because the American character is still nurtured by an ambivalence of values. The Hegelian negation of the principle of reality by the principle of pleasure envisioned by Marcuse did not occur, and in the next decade, on the contrary, we witnessed a revival of traditional values. As a matter of fact, this ambivalence of American character is older than some may imagine. In an interpretation of Moby Dick, D.H. Lawrence ventured to ask if the ship Pequod whose hull was built in American, and whose masts were cut in Japan, is not indeed "the ship of the soul of an American." 28

Will and Fate, West and East, both govern the destiny of the Pequod, the ship which sails the oceans to hunt the white whale. The white whale could also be interpreted, as Conrad Aiken says, as "the Puritan's central dream of delight and terror, the all-hating and all-loving,
all-creating and all-destroying implacable god. . .who must be faced and fought with on the frontier of awareness with the last shred of one's moral courage and despair. Man against God."29

The assumption, therefore, that the American character is a kind of mercantile, tailored and uniform, does not stand. The great dilemmas of human spirit have emerged in the American character too, and it could not avoid the great problems which puzzled, for example, the Greek tragedians. That it is so is proved by a whole literature carried by Fitzgerald, Dos Passos, Wolfe, Hemingway, Miller and others. Here the contradictions and the ambivalence of American character are fully alive; we have individual and society, spiritual values and material values, love and death.

If, as we have seen, the American character is based on an ambivalence, the problem which naturally emerges and requires an answer is what relationship there is between pragmatism on the one hand and the ambivalence of the American character on the other. We would dare to say that the pragmatic philosophy was in many respects an effort to keep a balance between contradictory tendencies which are ingrained in the American spirit and eventually to transcend them.

We should recall, for example the fight Peirce waged to reach a synthesis between nominalism and realism. In his essay, "The Essentials of Pragmatism," which contains one of his last formulations of pragmatism, he said that

A theory which should be capable of being absolutely demonstrated in its entirety by future events, would be no scientific theory but a mere piece of fortune-telling. On the other hand, a theory
which goes beyond what may be verified to any degree of approxi-
mation by future discoveries is, in so far, metaphysical gabble. 30

James dealt with the same demon when he tried to reach a harmony
between "tender-minded" and "tough-minded", and as far as Dewey is con-
cerned, the motive of unity and harmony goes through his whole philo-
sophy. The "undetermined situation" and dualism have been his great
enemies, and to recapture a state of equilibrium was his great dream.
So, while the American character moves restlessly between God and man,
between "all-loving and all-hating, between all-creating and all-des-
troying," American philosophy has endeavored to transcend this ambiva-
ience, which fosters the American character, and to look for unity. But
the logic of life is not always the logic of mind, and who knows if in
this contradiction does not transpire another aspect of the ambivalence
of the human mind, this time on the American continent.
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America is a democracy and many things have been said about this fact, both favorable and unfavorable, through two centuries. Time and again those who have written of American democracy point to prominent characteristics: it operates on the basic idea of the balance of powers and political forces.

Like many other governments, a democratic government seeks to preserve its continuity, but at the same time, unlike other forms of government, it seeks to make change possible and compatible. Hence, we have an ambivalence between continuity and change built into the American government, between political power and social changes and demands. In these respects, American democracy reflects something of the ambivalence of the American character and of the new emerging mentality of western industrial societies. This will be clearer if we take into consideration the grounds which brought democracy into existence.

The Decline of the Absolutist Principle

The first country to institute a democratic government in our industrial era was England. Democracy in England was among other things a revolt against the principle of absolutism represented by king and church. Philosophically and politically, throughout the middle ages mankind lived and suffered under the fascination of the absolute. The
absolute was sought in metaphysics by Thomas Aquinas, in religious devotion by mystics like Boehme and Luria, in the Gregorian chant and Bach's music, in Gothic and Byzantine architecture. But this was not enough; the principle of the absolute touched even the unruly and mercurial domain of politics and government.

Since there was an eternal city, the city of God, the terrestrial city tried to, or at least endeavoured, to be a reflection of the eternal city, which was perfect and eternal. The absolutism of church and kings throughout the Middle Ages stemmed from this metaphysical longing for absolute and eternal order. Plato fixed very well this state of mind in his Republic, which in many ways represents the archetype of an "autarchic" (absolute) state. In other words, a perfect state is no longer subjected to changes, good or bad.

However, by the turn of the 17th century this mentality was eroded by new discoveries in science, by new achievements in philosophy, and by new technological and economical inventions. As a result, the belief in an eternal order began to fade, and the people lost faith in the absolute and immutable. Louis Fourteenth was the last great monarch who tried to save this myth and to build a perfect sublime state machinery. It was as if before dying the principle of absolutism had shown one more time with all its intensity and splendor. But this was not only the light of triumph, but also the crepuscule of the sunset.

In the 17th century we witnessed in the Western world the gradual shift from the transcendental to the immanent, from realism to nominalism, from the principle of belief to the principle of verification.
other words, absolutism, which meant the belief in the existence of "universal" general concepts in philosophy, and the belief in the divine power of the king in politics was replaced or paralleled by the principle of naturalism. As a consequence, Deism and empiricism emerged in philosophy and democracy in social life. Democracy is therefore a form of government which operates wherever in a culture the principle of absolutism is replaced or limited only to religious life and institutions. In these terms we can understand why democracy operated in Athens and Rome long before the British experiment, and not in Egypt or India. The Greek and, later, the Roman culture functioned for a long time, based on a naturalistic principle, and therefore their polytheism in religion and democracy in government were reflections of this principle. Whereas, for example, India, Egypt and other Eastern cultures have been obsessed with the idea of transcendence and eternity, the ancient Greek, as well as European cultures, have seemed to be contented with the barbarity of our natural existence.

But this shift from the principle of absolutism to the principle of naturalism, from the autarchic state to democracy, was not smooth. This shift produced a kind of crisis of consciousness. Whereas before man lived approximately secure under the great seal of teleology and cosmogony, he now suddenly saw himself debarked on a small planet in the universe, destined to forge his own life. This crisis was well reflected in the radicalized theodicy of Jewish and Protestant mysticism.

As Habermas points out in his Theory and Practice (Between Philosophy and Science: Marxism as Critique), the "God of Origin, a quite
candid and playful God, became external to himself" in Isaak Luria's
or Jakob Boehme's mysticism. He goes in a sort of exile within Himself,
"emigrating into the darkness of his own bottomless." Therefore God
surrenders and loses control over Himself so that at the end of his pain-
ful creature-like process of restitution Adam can thrust Him from His
throne. So, according to this myth man is left to himself alone in
history to confront the work of his redemption. Hegel reinterpreted
this myth into the dialectical logic of world history as crisis.

Whether or not you go along with this myth and Hegel's interpreta-
tion, the fact remains that the freedom of man from the principle of
absolutism embodied in the bourgeois freedom from the bounds of feuda-

tism created a separation of ambivalent forces. Up to that time history
was understood more or less as an immobile wheel, or a linear process.
Once the industrial age emerged, history was perceived more and more as
a man-made product, as a product of competing forces. The new principle
of merit brought by the bourgeois and the new system of representation
was only an expression of this new mentality.

Thus the emergence of democracy in the United States and in other
parts of the world is the result of the great upheaval against the prin-
ciple of absolutism which occurred in Europe during the 17th and 18th
centuries. This upheaval was carried by reform in religion, by Deism
and empiricism in philosophy, and by democracy in politics. Yet, at the
bottom of all these movements lay the newly discovered principle of
naturalism.
Theoretical Grounds of Democracy

Although the American republic emerged as a revolt against British domination, its theoretical foundations are to be found in Europe. Locke provided one of the first philosophies of democracy in his attack against the principle of absolute government on the grounds of natural rights of people. In his second Treatise of Government, published in 1690, he expounded such ideas as: Before government was established, all people living in a state of nature possessed certain "natural rights." These rights were inherent in the very order of nature and consisted principally of the rights to life, liberty, and property. Life in the state of nature was not satisfactory because there was no superior force to enforce the law of nature, which is a body of rules governing men's conduct in such a way as to ensure the equality of all men and every man's enjoyment of his natural rights. He said, for example,

The natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but to have only the law of nature for his rule. 2

In his Social Contract, published in 1762, Rousseau in a similar way contended that all the rulers of the earth are mere delegates of the people, who, when they are displeased with the government, have the right to alter or abolish it. In the same time, Montesquieu, concerned with the prevention of absolutism in government, elaborated the famous principle of the separation of powers in government. "When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or in the same body of magistrates," Montesquieu said, "there can be no liberty,
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regardless of size. The small states feared that they would be "swallowed" by the big states, so that they did not endorse the Virginia Plan.

Likewise a conflict arose between the agricultural South and the commercial North. Finally the deadlock between these ambivalent forces was broken and a compromise was reached. The large states got satisfaction by representation on a basis of population in the lower house, or House of Representatives, and the small states were given equal representation (two members to be elected by the state legislature) in the upper house or senate. The Bill of Rights, which is another cornerstone of the American Constitution, sprang from the same interplay of political forces. It is less known that in Massachusetts, Virginia, and New York, only the promise of the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing a number of rights and liberties made ratification of the Constitution possible. Initially the authors of the Constitution had omitted a Bill of Rights on the grounds that it would not be necessary. That is why John Adams used to say that "the Constitution was extracted from a reluctant people by a grinding necessity."

Finally, by June 21, 1788, nine states out of 13 had ratified the Constitution and it went into effect. North Carolina ratified the Constitution in November 1789, and Rhode Island remained outside the Union until the spring of 1790.

The Constitution and the Government

As Alfred Grosser points out, "In the United States the Constitution is considered the sacrosant charter of the national life, quite literally
the fundamental law. Such appreciation is not extravagant, since in almost 200 years the United States Constitution has not only provided the fundamental law for the country, but also has done this job without suffering any major changes. This stability is due, of course, to many factors, but it lies also within the Constitution itself. Let us then examine the main pattern of the Constitution.

The Constitution has a preamble which states the purpose for establishing the Constitution. These purposes are: "to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." Articles one, two and three provide the framework of national government. These articles set, as a matter of fact, the structure of the United States government. It is very important that in these articles is also stated the principle of separation of powers, which, we have seen, was formulated by Montesquieu. According to this principle, each branch of the government, legislative, executive, and judicial, has its special powers and duties outlined. Moreover, the framers of the Constitution established what has been called a system of checks and balances which tries to institute a kind of feedback between these three branches of the government. In other words, each branch of government, as we can see in Figure number 1 depends upon another, and none of them can act without the others. These two systems built within the United States government—the division of political powers, and the system of checks and balances—reflect something of the ambivalence of American character and the effort of
the founders of the United States government to eliminate or to limit
the absolute tendencies within the political system. This structure is
also responsible, to some extent, for a kind of flexibility and mobility
which is very characteristic of United States politics and which is, for
example, less present in European democracy, which has concentrated
leadership and responsibilities in a Cabinet drawn from the members of
the parliament.

According to the Constitution, "the legislative power herein granted
shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist
of a Senate and a House of Representatives." The members of the House
of Representatives are chosen every second year and the number of re­
presentatives "shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand" but each
state shall have at least one representative." Since, in the inter­
vening years after 1788, the population of the United States has grown
tremendously, this ratio has been changed, and after the 1970 census,
the ratio is one representative for approximately 480,000 persons.

The Senate of the United States is composed of two members from each
state, elected for six years. Representatives and senators are paid by
the Federal government and have the power to set their own pay. They
may be arrested for violations of law, but not for civil suits while
Congress is in session. They may also not be sued for anything they
say in Congress. Section eight of the article indicates specifically
what the powers of the Congress are. The Congress has such powers as
"To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts
and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United
States, but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Likewise the Senate has the sole power to try all impeachments of federal officials.

Article two of the Constitution deals with the executive branch of the government. "The executive Power," the Constitution states, "shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." The President holds the office four years together with the Vice-President. Both the President and Vice-President are elected. This election is not direct, and as a matter of fact, when the people vote for President they are really choosing a set of electors. These electors are picked out in what is called the primary campaigns which take place before the convention of the parties.

The President is the commander-in-chief of the army, navy, airforces, and of militia. He has also the power with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, to appoint ambassadors, consuls, judges of the federal courts, and to grant pardons. The President from time to time informs the Senate about the state of the Union and recommends "to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary." The Judicial Department is the third branch of the United States government. The judicial power of the United States "shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." The judicial power covers all "cases in law and equity" arising under the Constitution, as well as
treaties and controversies between two or more States. Now, for example, the Supreme Court is asked to make a decision about segregation. As we mentioned before, there is an inter-connection between these three branches of government, a kind of very subtle feedback which maintains an equilibrium and an interplay of political forces which are in action. For example, the President has the power to appoint judges of the Supreme Court but these judges have to be approved by the Senate. The Congress has, as we have seen, the power to pass the laws, but the President can veto these laws. Yet, in case the President vetoes a law, as for example, President Ford did a couple of times in 1976, the Congress may try to override the veto by two-thirds vote, which sometimes is really difficult to do, since the President is the leader of his party too.

Historically there has been a shift in the distribution of political power between these branches. Initially the Congress had more political power. Yet gradually the executive branch developed and concentrated more political power. So, for example, during the period of the New Deal, the executive branch almost eclipsed the other two. However, under the next Presidents and especially under Nixon, the Congress regained much of this political power. In general it is recognized by the common American that this check and balance system has saved the country from revolution and other political disruptions.

But the Constitution even from the beginning was complicated by what is known as the Bill of Rights. If the Constitution frames the government and its powers, the Bill of Rights came to frame the rights
of the individual. Primarily the Bill of Rights states that the Congress may not set up an official church, or pass laws limiting worship, speech, the press, assembly, and the right to petition. "Congress," the Bill of Rights states, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise or the right of people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." The Bill of Rights places certain restrictions on the Federal Government and in this way a kind of ambivalence between freedom and law, which is so ingrained in the American character, is explicitly framed. Since 1788, when the Constitution was adopted, it has not suffered any major changes. Some 2700 amendments have been introduced into Congress, but only about fifteen have been adopted since the passage of the Bill of Rights. This stability is due to the fact that the framers of the Constitution left many details to be decided by Congress. Moreover, the so-called "elastic clause" gives Congress the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution." Under this clause Congress has done many things, such as chartering a national bank and issuing paper money, without the specific mandate of the Constitution. The strength of the Constitution, therefore, lies in the fact that it does not tell what to do, but how to do. As far as the Constitutional changes are concerned, the Federal courts are required to interpret them. The Supreme Court, for example, has the power to declare the acts of the Congress or of the state legislatures unconstitutional, although this was not mentioned in the Constitution.
Today, as in the past, there are two schools about the interpretation of the Constitution: the strict constitutionalists, who tend to hold that the constitution must be obeyed to the letter, and the loose constructionists, who contend that the Constitution must be interpreted by meaning.

Perhaps no one better than Thomas Jefferson defined the relationship between the Constitution and future generations. "Some men look at the Constitution with sanctimonious reverence and deem them...too sacred to be touched," Jefferson said. "These ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than humans, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I know that age well, I belonged to it...But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind."

The United States Government

Once the Constitution was finished, the government and the state apparatus was tailored according to it. Thus at the beginning was the word and the word was Constitution. Washington was the first President and the first to accomplish the difficult task of translating the provision of the new document into practice. By the time he took office the Union was still divided between Federalists, or Nationalists who wanted a strong central government and localists who did not support such an idea.

Washington, who understood the necessity of a central administration, appointed strong friends of the Constitution to office. In this
way he laid down the basis for the "spoils system" in national administration. The Department of Treasury was given to Alexander Hamilton, a strong nationalist. Governor Edmund Randolph, another supporter of the Constitution, was appointed Attorney General. The War Department was entrusted to General Henry Knox, who shared the same beliefs. Thomas Jefferson was the only exception, because, while he was a strong supporter of the Constitution, he at the same time wanted to make certain that the rights of the states and the common people were not abridged by the new federal government. In these respects Thomas Jefferson is a perfect representative of the ambivalent spirit which we tried to define in one of the previous chapters.

With Jefferson the first Cabinet was complete. It included four heads of the executive departments, secretaries of State, Treasury, and War, and the Attorney General. From time to time as the government has developed, new executive departments have been added. So, for example, the Navy was added in 1798, the Interior in 1849, Agriculture in 1889, and Commerce and Labor in 1903. In 1947 the post of Secretary of Defense was created. It combined the work of the Departments of war, Navy, and Air Forces. The Department of Health and Education and Welfare was added in 1958, the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1965, and the Department of Transportation in 1963.

In the newly created administration Hamilton, according to his beliefs, worked for a powerful central government "that would increase national wealth and prosperity." In many respects he was the central figure and the originator of most of the sound programs undertaken under
Washington's presidency. He was only thirty-five years old in 1789 when he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury, but he had the genius to foresee what should be done. He put the finances of the country on a sound basis, created the first National Bank, and advocated the development of American industry. For example, in his Report on Manufactures, sent to Congress on December 5, 1791, he recommended levying duties high enough to guarantee the growth of American industries. But the policy promoted by Alexander Hamilton had another effect, which was not envisioned by him; it led to the division of the country into two big political parties. On one side were the farmers, shopkeepers, small businessmen, who did not have money to buy the government bonds or Bank stocks. They were opposed to the central government and to Hamilton's policy. They also objected to the power the central government was assuming at the expense of the states. They also feared that the rich would use the Constitution to protect property and not to develop the general welfare. On the other side, the prosperous merchants, manufacturers and financiers who made profits under the new order supported the new government. Finally the followers of Hamilton were called Federalists, and socially they represented "the rich, well-born, and able," as John Adams used to say, and the Antifederalists took the name of Democratic-Republicans, and their chief strength was in the South. Their faith was in the common man and in the mass of the people, and their leaders were Jefferson and Madison. Antifederalists wanted primarily strong local government which will resist any centralizing tendency. In
this way the American political parties came to life, and the American political arena was divided into two big parties and two major political orientations. Yet, it would be wrong to see these two orientations as completely separate, because the United States parties have never been totally polarized. Rather they operate as two complementary political forces, as a check and balance system, and as manifestation of the ambivalence of American character which moves and exists in complementarity and separation, conflict and consensus at the same time.

Republic or Democracy

As Sidney Hook mentions in an article with the same title, at the beginning the United States was a republic, or more exactly, as he puts it "if anyone had asked whether the United States is a republic or a democracy, he would have received the almost universal answer that our form of government was a republic." In those times the term democracy was not a good one. Hamilton, for example, detested democracy as a form of government, and so did others in this time. Democracy was viewed by many as the rule of mob, and therefore not a trusted form of government. Only later under Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt did the democracy become an acceptable term and a principle of government. But in spite of these changes the question about what form of government the United States government is remains.

The Constitution does not give a clear answer to this question because nowhere in the Constitution is it mentioned explicitly what form of government it will bring about. The only place where something is
mentioned in this respect is in Article Four, section four, where it is said that "the United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion, and an application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence." An ambiguity remains even if we take into consideration the meaning of the words democracy and republic. Democracy, as it was developed in its original form by the Greeks, means government by the people. In Athens, for example, the people were so concerned with a democratic form of government that the mayor of the city was elected for only one day, and in Sparta the leaders (basileus) were elected by the shouting of the community members gathered together. Democracy means therefore the rule of people, and it was developed as a form of government against tyranny and it operated at its best in small communities in which each citizen could directly cast his vote.

The republic, on the other hand, is a form of government in which the chief executive is elected and in which the power is exercised by officials elected by voters. The word in Latin means "the business of the people" (res=thing or business, and public=people). The republic was directed in particular against monarchy. Romans, for example, after the royal period established the republic. The main difference between the democracy and the republic seems to lie, then, in the way the executive branch is elected. In a democracy the executive is elected directly by all the people (citizens) and in a republic the executive is indirectly elected. So, for example, in the Roman Republic, the Senate
had the power to elect the consuls and other executives, and the people had the right to elect the senate. Therefore both democracy and the republic are forms of government which believe in the representative principle of government; the only difference lies in the extent to which the principle of majority rule should be decisive in settling questions.

Now if we try to define what form of government the United States government is, bearing in mind this distinction, we shall be compelled to admit that the United States government is both. There are some aspects of the United States government which indicate that it is a democracy, especially at the level of the state, and others which plead for a republic. This ambiguity is not unlikely, since the government itself is a product of two schools and two political tendencies—democratic and republican. The democrats, as we have seen, believe in the power of the people to control the government and they fear the tyranny of government and a minority not controlled by the people, and the republicans believe in the freedom and power of government and fear the tyranny of the majority which may abridge the fundamental rights of individuals.

According to Arthur S. Link's analysis of United States history, The Growth of American Democracy, there has been a movement from republicanism toward democracy, especially in this century. However, what seems to be very characteristic of United States government is the effort to strike a balance between such insurmountable polarities as: freedom and equality, individualism and corporatism. But to see this requires that we leave the solid land of history and adventure in the uncertain realm of philosophy.
With a few exceptions the Federal Government is duplicated at the level of the state. There are fifty states today in the United States, each with its own administration. In the majority of states we have a legislative branch, an executive branch, and a judicial branch, in the same way as at the level of the federal government. The executive power is represented at the state level by the Governor; the legislative powers are vested in a House of Representatives and Senate, and the judicial powers are held by the Supreme Court of the State. The state, for electoral purposes, is divided into senatorial and representative districts. In Ohio, for example, according to the population and districts, there are 33 senators and 99 representatives. The representatives are elected for two years and the senators for four years.

Administratively each state is subdivided into counties, and some of them in townships. At the level of county and township we have an administration which consists of a board of commissioners which are elected by the people. In general these commissioners run and manage the county and township. They may appoint, for example the sheriff, the treasury commissioner, and other administrative officers. Yet there are differences from state to state so that a rule is difficult to establish.

The United States Government in Perspective

In many respects the United States government is an experiment and an invention. Inventions do not occur only in science and technology, but also in the social realm. So, for example, the family, education, the city, the kibbutz, the planned economy have all been social inventions.
There are social experiments which last and social experiments which fail. The American social experiment belongs in the first category. Not surprisingly, the forefathers of the United States government had total confidence in their enterprise. The Great Seal of the United States contains the caption Novus Ordo Seculorum, which in English means "A new order of the ages." What they aimed at was an everlasting republic which, unlike the Roman Republic, would not degenerate into a dictatorship. Incidentally, we should mention the existence of a Roman spirit which underlies many of the political and cultural settings of the United States republic. You do not have to be a specialist to recognize that in Washington a certain "Roman style" transpires even in the architecture and the symbols of the United States institutions. Today the United States senators wear business suits and have bourgeois manners, but Lincoln sits like Lorenzo Magnifico on the other side of the White House, surrounded by Roman columns.

Although British and Germanic in its perpetual and sometimes barbaric fight for individualism and freedom, the United States political system longs for comprehension and stability as the Roman did. Maybe this is only the impression of a descendant of the people who somewhere between the Danube and the Carpathian Mountains fought against and for Romanity, but the widespread version that the United States political system originated in England is too correct to be true.

Since approximately 200 years have passed since the United States constitution and government were established, the people have begun to scrutinize the future of the experiment started by their forefathers.
If the United States government is to last as the framers believed, then it is almost certain that it will undertake certain changes in the future. So, for example, there had been nearly thirty amendments to the Constitution, but only a few have affected the structure of the government and only a few more its operations. Yet, as we enter a new era beset by great mutations, the question of what direction the United States government will move appears more and more often.

The Future of the United States Government: Toward the 200th Year is one of the books which tries to answer these questions, by the collective judgment of scholars of politics. As Harvey S. Perloff points out, one of the changes will affect the idea of the "natural rights of man," which is the keystone of American political philosophy. This concept has proved to be too narrow as a base for the relationship between government and citizen "in a nation no longer concerned single-mindedly with economic expansion." In particular, it does not provide enough weight for the well-being of the disadvantaged. Therefore Perloff suggests that in the future there "will surely be movements to establish the right to a job, the right to a minimum income, and the right to maintain a sense of human dignity." In other words, the concept of "natural rights" will be enlarged and include ethical and spiritual needs of the individual. "As we approach the 200th year," Perloff says, "we should move away from a partial view of man toward an appreciation of his wholeness." Very interesting, but the idea of wholeness or the holistic view is a major issue in the reconceptual program in education. Therefore the future society will have to take into consideration not
only the total Gross National Product, but also the aim to provide full opportunity for every individual, Perloff says.

Another concept of traditional political philosophy which will be changed in the future is the notion of individual freedom. The traditional notion of freedom is equated with certain civic rights like "freedom of speech." Yet, as Perloff indicates, "There is an enormous difference between the view that freedom is crucial to human development and the view that freedom must be subordinated to the maintenance of a moral climate measured by a judicial thermometer." 21

In the future as others among the authors point out, the crucial issue will be to reach a kind of balance between individual freedom and social order. The government, according to Norton Long, is "an ecology of games" and its business is to provide a framework for many social interests and to accommodate as many individuals as possible into the game. Freedom should be therefore understood in the future as the increase of liberties of individuals and social groups to permit a kind of "multimedia order", as well as the increase of obligations which are the inevitable counterparts of increased individual and group rights.

As far as the structure and the functions of the government are concerned, the authors are almost unanimous that in the future a kind of built-in flexibility should be attained. Likewise the theme of decentralization seems to be one of the future programs which will bring about changes in the United States government.

The President, Rexford envisions, in his "The Shaping of the Constitution for 2000," would be relieved of many executive duties and the
government will consist also of six branches instead of the traditional three: the Political, the Presidential, the Legislative, Planning, Internal Affairs, and the Judicial. The Planning branch is supposed to assess the nation's capabilities and to make recommendations to the Senate. The Internal Affairs branch will be destined to supervise the many agencies which now are in existence. The Legislative would be elected for longer terms and would serve in one People's House, R.G. Tubwell says. The other house would be a revised Senate. Members of this branch would be chosen by the President and by the Chief Justice from panels selected by their associates.

Whether such changes will take place or not, it is a matter of time, but what can be said now is the fact that many of the changes some theorists think will occur in the future remind one of the European political systems. Maybe it is a simple coincidence, or the so-called theory of convergence is more than a theoretical speculation. Hopefully, time, in politics as in arts, is the supreme judge.
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CHAPTER 4
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Beginning

The history of the United States and American education began with the founding of the English colonies in America in the seventeenth century. The so-called colonial era was an adventurous period in which fortune, the flight for existence, and hard work were prominent characteristics of life.

The first attempt to plant a colony overseas was made under Elizabeth's reign by one of her favorite courtiers, Sir Walter Raleigh, who in 1585 sent a hundred men to the New World. Unfortunately this attempt failed and after a short period of time the colonists deserted and sailed home on one of Drake's ships. A second attempt made by Raleigh ended even worse when all the members of the expedition disappeared. However, since during Elizabeth's reign and especially the reign of her successor, King James, many people found life in England so unbearable that the idea of immigration to another land was frequently embraced. This was the period, we should remember, when the sheep ate the man, as Thomas More put it, and when economic and religious pressures made many people unhappy with life in England. For example, the separatists, or levellers, as they were often called, had withdrawn from the Church of England and formed an independent congregation. The Puritans
formed another religious group. They were Protestants and they wanted to purify the Church of what was considered to be "Romish". Both the Separatists and the Puritans were disenchanted with life in England, so that it is not very unlikely that the New World began to exercise an attraction and to beckon to them.

The first English settlement on the New Continent was in 1607 and it consisted of three small ships which arrived at the Capes of Chesapeake where they established the first permanent English settlement. This colony was an economical enterprise operating under the rule of the Virginia Company, which was granted a charter by King James.

The second colony, which was destined to become a symbol in American history, was a religious and spiritual enterprise. A group of the Separatists "harried" by King James left England and fled to Holland. Yet, the exiled in Holland were unhappy so they decided to look for a new life in the New World. They embarked on a small ship called the Mayflower on September 16, 1620, and they first stepped ashore on November 21 on what is now Provincetown. While the ship was lying in the harbor, a group of forty-one men gathered in the cabin of the ship and signed the famous "Mayflower Compact". In this document they pledged allegiance to the King and bound themselves to obey "whatever laws . . . should be thought most meet and convenient for the general guard of the colony." This voluntary pact was the first instance of self-determination initiated by settlers, in American history.

After these two successful attempts, the population and the flux of colonists expanded very rapidly and by the turn of the seventeenth
century there were about 250,000 people in the thirteen English colonies. After English people, Germans, French, Swedish, Scottish, Dutch, and eventually Polish, Italian, Chinese, and others came to join what was called the melting pot of American culture.

In its origins, then, American culture is an extension and transplantaion of European culture over the ocean. It comprised from the very beginning people who looked for land and economic security and people who also desired freedom, justice, and equity, such as the Puritans. The first became especially active in the economical field, whereas the second got involved also in religious and educational affairs.

**Education in the Colonial Era**

Although today the United States is one of the most industrialized countries in the world, the beginning of American life lies in agriculture. Approximately 95 per cent of the colonists in the seventeenth century and 90 per cent in the eighteenth made their living from the soil. As far as social structure is concerned, we had in the colonies an upper class, or aristocracy, which included wealthy merchants from Boston to Savannah, and a large population of farmers who owned and worked their own land. As might be expected in such a traditional society, the demands for education were small. With some exceptions the colonists were satisfied with a moderate degree of education and the real frontiersmen, like the unskilled laborer and most women, were likely to be illiterate. As Robert Middlekauff says, "schools in the first years of the settlement were scarce in all the colonies...and education in schools was largely a
temporary, even sporadic affair."

Yet it would be a mistake to disregard completely the educational effort made during the colonial period and to dismiss the educational achievements realized in this period. As we mentioned before, the colonists were attracted to the New World not only for its economical advantages, but also for the idea of building a "new life in the New World." Moreover, as Good observed, although the colonists were "seriously dissatisfied with their religious, political, and economical opportunities, but for the schools of their mother country they expressed the sincerest admiration by imitating them and attempting to transplant them to the new soil." So, from the beginning American education has been under European influence, and this influence would last with a few exceptions until the Progressive Movement.

What Education was Like

As in Europe, education was, in the British colonies in the last sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries a 'traditional enterprise serving the needs of a homogeneous and slow-changing rural society. Consequently education was more an informal than a formal affair, dispersed in the life of family and community. Its main function was the preservation and the reinforcement of the existent cultural pattern. Therefore to educate meant to socialize, and the transmission of tradition, the cult of hierarchy and authority were looked after in society as well as education.

Family accomplished most of these goals; church and community usually came to reinforce them, and only peripherally did an instruction in the
three R's gradually develop. So strong was the role of family in the
colonial community that almost all the colonies passed laws demanding
obedience from children, and in Connecticut and Massachusetts laws
existed allowing capital punishment for filial disobedience. Moreover,
as in England, apprenticeship laws were passed in the British colonies.
These laws subjected the parents to a fine if they failed to teach their
children a trade and to give them instruction in religion and reading.
However, once life became more complex in the colonies, and once the new
society developed, it became obvious that the needs for education could
not be met only by the informal instruction given in the family or com-

These increased needs for education were met partially by the effort
of different religious denominations which opened schools and provided
formal instruction for the children. So, for example, in 1631 the Virginia
statute required the clergy to instruct the youth in catechism and the
Book of Common Prayer. In Philadelphia an energetic denomination sup-
plied the city with schools too. But more than anybody else, the
Puritans "deliberately transferred," as B. Bailyn says, "the main func-
tion of the family to formal instruction in tuition, and in so doing not
only endowed schools with a new importance, but expanded their purpose
beyond pragmatic vocationalism toward vaguer but more basic cultural
goals."5 The Puritans came to the New World imbued with a sense of mis-
sion and soon they realized that their success depended on an educated
community. Therefore, only six years after the Great Migration, the
Massachusetts General Court decided to compel towns to assume the
responsibility of education. Towns of at least 50 families, it was declared in 1647, must maintain a reading and writing master, and those with at least 100 families a grammar master. Sooner or later the other states followed the Massachusetts example. In this way education changed from a spontaneous and diffuse enterprise to an organized process and an act of will. This process was carried farther by the establishment of the colleges. Four colleges operated in the New England colonies: Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, and Brown; four in the Middle Colonies: the college of New Jersey, now Princeton; King's College, now Columbia; the College of Philadelphia, now the University of Pennsylvania, and Queen's College, now Rutgers; one operated in the southern colonies, William and Mary at Williamsburg, Virginia. The curriculum of these colleges was a mixture of subjects taken from the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Reformation, and almost forty percent of the graduates of these colleges during the colonial period became ministers. However, once the industrial and scientific process got underway, these colleges would drastically change their curriculums.

The Common School

After the United States won independence in 1776, the need for education became greater. On the one hand, the formation of the new nation made the school an important social agency, and on the other hand the rise of industry and the development of the cities called for the creation of a system of education. These increased needs for education were met by the English monitorial plan, which was introduced in all
cities along the coast. Of course education was still a feeble enterprise in this period, in the United States as in other parts of the world. Routine, rigid organization, and a mechanical instruction prevailed. Likewise the number of those who could afford to get an education was much smaller than of those who were left out of school. A writer in the Mechanics Free Press mentioned that illiteracy was common and that only one sixth of the youthful textile workers of Pawtucket and Philadelphia were able to write their names.

However, progressive movements were at work. First, the idea of public education began to develop and to get more and more credit. Although neither the Declaration of Independence nor the United States Constitution mention education, an ordinance of the Congress providing for the organization of the Northwestern Territory in 1787, stated that "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall ever be encouraged." This ordinance provided also that one-thirty-sixth of each township in the new territory be set aside for the maintenance of schools. Likewise Thomas Jefferson prepared a bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge, and in 1814 he advocated in a letter to his nephew, Peter Car, a system of Public Education. He wrote:

The mass of our citizens may be divided into two classes - the laboring and learned. At the discharging of the pupils from the elementary schools (after three years of schooling) the two classes separate--those destined for labor will engage in the business of agriculture, or enter into apprenticeship to such handicraft arts as may be their choice; their companions destined to the pursuits of science will proceed to the College.
In the next decades the idea of public education grew stronger, and finally it was realized that if the New Republic was to last, then the people would have to be educated to become knowledgeable citizens. This process was speeded up also by an influx of reports on Prussian and French educational reforms. Finally, Governor Edward Everett of Massachusetts recommended to the legislature session of 1837 that a Board be created to further the cause of education in the state; the first appointed head of this board was Horace Mann. Yet it would be a mistake to think that in this way education became centralized as in Europe. The local community continued to play the major role in education, as in politics, and to resist central tendencies, and the number of those who criticized Mann were perhaps as numerous as those who applauded him.

Mann worked for twelve years in this position, his ideal being to establish a "public common school" which would reach every child in the commonwealth and which would fashion a new American character out of a maze of conflicting traditions. Here we have the Jacksonian Democratic ideal and the Republican National program. Under his leadership a wide program of education was carried forward. Pestalozzian influence was brought into schools in the same period, and love and intuitive teaching came to replace harsh discipline and mechanical memorization. G. F. Bereday talks, for example, in his Methods of Comparative Education about this period in American education as a period of borrowings, and to some extent he is right. Horace Mann, William T. Harris, and others were familiar with and influenced by what was happening in Europe at that time, and in many respects they met the American demands for education with
adopted European ideas. Harris, for example, was a Hegelian, and Mann in his seventh Annual Report (1848) praised the school achievements in such countries as Scotland, Holland, Germany, Belgium, and France, which he visited in 1843. "I never saw a child in tears," he said in his report, "or a sharp rebuke given, I never saw a blow struck...I heard no child ridiculed, sneered at, or scolded for making a mistake." If the United States moved away from Europe in the realm of politics after Independence, it still remained attached to Europe in the domain of education.

A National System of Education

As American society moved forward, education became more widespread. Between 1870 and 1890 almost half of the states of the Union enacted compulsory attendance laws. In this way the United States system of education emerged as a nation-wide component. It freed the individual from the bounds of the family, religion, or tradition, and permeated all of American society. By the end of the nineteenth century the American system of education was practically complete, in its modern form. It consists of kindergarten (present especially in the cities), a universal elementary school, a widespread public secondary school divided sometimes into junior and senior school, and a large number of private and state colleges and universities.

As a result, the Federal Department of Education, later called the Bureau, was established in 1867 to promote education at a national level. Yet, unlike the Ministry of Education in Europe, the United States Bureau of Education has little administrative power. Also in contrast
with Europe, the American forces opposed to centralized education have been strong and are still active. Free enterprise is a part of the education system as it is a part of the economical system. Hence, the American system of education is the product of central and local forces, of national integrative tendencies, and of ethnic and individualistic aspirations. This would be more obvious if we examine the way the American system of education looks today and look to its inner forces.
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CHAPTER 5

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

The spectrum between central and local authorities is so large in the United States that the term "system" can be applied only as a courtesy to American education. As a matter of fact, what we have in the United States is a pluralism of systems and subsystems of education.

The Structure of the System

In spite of its diversity and de-centralization, the structure of the United States system of education is rather simple. It usually consists of an elementary school and a comprehensive high school. However, there are differences in this broad pattern. In some districts we have the so-called 6-3-3 pattern: an elementary school of six years, a junior high school of three years, and a high school of three years; in other districts we have the 8-4 pattern. Occasionally we find the 6-2-4 pattern, which comprises an elementary school of six years followed by two years of junior high school and four years of high school. (figure 2)

According to some estimates, approximately adds to two-thirds of the school districts are organizes on the 6-3-3 principle or pattern, one-fourth on the 8-4 plan, one-third on the 6-6 pattern and only one-sixth on the 6-2-4 pattern. In general, in the last thirty years the tendency in school organization has been toward 6-3-3. Consequently, in
this period of time we have had a dramatic increase in junior high schools. In many respects the junior high school performs the same function as the "cycle d'orientation" in France; mainly it gives the student the opportunity to try out certain subjects, to explore and discover his or her own talents and interests, and to think about a future career.

Unlike most secondary schools, the American high school is comprehensive. In other words, it provides common learning for all categories of students, gifted, slow learners, and mentally retarded. Therefore its curriculum includes both academic and practical programs.

The elementary school is usually composed of a kindergarten and an additional six or eight grades. The kindergarten enrolls children 4 or 5 years old for one or two years, before they enter the first grade. It is estimated that approximately 84.1 percent of the five-year-olds in the population are enrolled in kindergarten (table 1). Historically, elementary school comprised grades one through eight and the secondary school grades nine through twelve. In the districts where the 6-3-3 plan operates a six year elementary school is followed by a junior high school of three years, and a senior high school of three years, but the program of the school still reflects the historic 8-4 pattern.

Regardless of the structure, a pupil usually finishes high school at the age of 17 or 18. After graduation the student can go to a variety of schools. In general, almost 60 percent of the students who finish high school choose to go to a university or to an institution of higher education (table 2,3). Higher education in the United States includes a
large variety of schools and institutions, such as the community college, the technical institute, the professional school, the four-year college, or the undergraduate division of the university. Some institutions are private; others are controlled and funded by the community in which they are located, most of the largest institutions are state-controlled, and very few (mostly military academies) are funded by the federal government. There is also great variety in the programs these institutions offer and no direct comparison with European institutions can be drawn.

The public community college is usually a two-year college, supported and controlled by the community in which it is located, and offers a variety of academic programs. The technical institute is organized as an independent institution of post-secondary education of two or four years. It usually offers two, three, or more terminal programs in such fields as health, mechanics, electrical engineering, business or construction. The four-year college offers in general a curriculum in the liberal arts and science and usually confers the bachelor's degree after four years. A student may begin specialization at the undergraduate level, and he is entirely responsible for the courses he takes, a situation quite different from Europe. A college may be independent or only an undergraduate division of a university. Independent colleges sometimes offer advanced degrees at Master's and Ph.D. levels. At least one year of study beyond the Bachelor's degree is required for the M.A. degree, and three years beyond baccalaureate for the Ph.D. (table 4).

The university usually includes a college of liberal arts and sciences that awards either a B.A. or B.S. degree, one or more professional schools,
and a graduate school that offers opportunities for advanced study and research. Most universities are authorized to confer the Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's degrees in liberal arts, professional and scientific fields. However, no single standard designates an institution as a university, and therefore "university" is a part of the name of some colleges or other institutions that do not offer doctorates.

The professional school is either a major division of a college or university or is an independent institution for study and research in professional or technological fields, such as architecture, business, education, engineering, law, medicine, and technology. It offers programs that lead to degrees and fulfill academic requirements for certification or licensure in a specialized profession. Depending on the specialty selected, the entrance requirements vary, from secondary school graduate to completion of a pre-professional curriculum in a college of arts and sciences.

The Administrative Structure

The United States does not have a national system of education administered and controlled by a department or ministry of education, as most of the European countries have. In accordance with the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which says that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people," each state legislature is responsible for the organization and control of education. However, the federal government does have certain responsibilities. In
general, the federal government is supposed to provide encouragement, financial support, and leadership as appropriate within constitutional constraints. Basically the Congress of the United States has constitutional powers to allocate funds for education, but in most cases it has no direct control over it. Besides the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, several other departments, such as the National Science Foundations, allocate funds for a variety of programs in education.

In 1972 a new structure in the organization of the education programs was adopted. According to this new structure a Division of Education was established within HEW. This Division includes the Office of Education (OE) and the National Institute of Education (NIE). The head of the Education Division has the title of Assistant Secretary for Education and coordinates the activities of OE and NIE. The Assistant Secretary's Office includes the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE), which financial assistance to encourage reform and innovation at the level of secondary education. Besides the Office of Education, which is primarily responsible for administering educational matters at the federal level, the National Institute of Education was created to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry into the educational process. NIE functions include the administration of educational research contracts as well as the development of materials and ideas to deal with the strengthening of the scientific foundations of education.

At the level of each state the educational authority is represented by the department of education, which usually consists of a state board of
education, a chief state officer and his staff. Among the most important
duties of the state board of education are the distribution of state or
federal funds, certification of teachers, curriculum development, develop­
ment of general policies in education, and the supervision of building
construction, and student health and safety.

The chief school officer is in a certain way the key figure and the
person who carries out the educational policies. His main duties include
the general supervision of schools, the interpretation of school laws,
the submission of reports to board and legislature about the status and
the needs of the school, and the preparation of the budget for the next
year as well as other financial needs.

Although the board of education and the chief executive are in charge
of the general educational policy, the local school district is responsi­
bles and has the real authority for the day-to-day operation of the school.
There are approximately 40,000 school districts in the United States,
each a political entity. As a matter of fact, as in England, the school
district in the United States is responsible for educational policies and
stands as a symbol of local autonomy. This autonomy is one of the promi­
inent characteristics of American education. Thus, for example, in any
given county there are marked differences between schools from one district
to another. And these differences concern not only exterior aspects of
education, but such characteristics as curriculum, school program, books,
and administration. The differences stem from the fact that each dis­
trict and sometimes each school has a great amount of freedom in choosing
one or another educational program. And here, I think, is one of the
cornerstones of American education, because this freedom not only assures a variety of educational opportunities, but also encourages the experimentation and the innovation which are so essential in education.

Undoubtedly this school autonomy raises certain questions concerning the quality of education, the effectiveness of the school and its contribution to the democratization of American public education. But the concept of school as a reflection of the local community is so engrained in the American society that the pattern of American schools is still going to be propelled by the ambivalent forces of local and central administration.

The typical American district school board includes about five members who are from both sexes and various professions and religions. In most districts, school boards are elected through nonpartisan election, but at least one board in seven is appointed by city administration. Approximately 15 per cent of school districts pay a nominal salary to their school board members, but others are unpaid.

As far as the duties of the board of education are concerned they are stated by laws as follows: (1) to carry out the directives issued by the state legislature and state board of education; (2) to formulate policies and rules in conjunction with school management; (3) to interpret school policies and decisions on crucial issues; (4) to adjudicate cases concerning grievances, appeals, or teacher and pupil dismissals; (5) to evaluate school practice and identify problems; (6) when necessary, to function in an administrative capacity. However, the main task of the board is to elect the chief executive officer or superintendent of the
school, who has an intermediary position between the representatives of the people and the school staff.

The Superintendent is an important figure in United States education because he controls and supervises dozens or even thousands of teachers and personnel and to some extent the whole course of education depends upon him and his decisions. Although he is accountable and can be removed, he performs a number of important functions, such as (1) to nominate new administrators, teachers, and employees, (2) to recommend suspension of teachers whose performance was not satisfactory, (3) to supervise curriculum revisions, (4) to supervise the maintenance of the schools. Besides these important functions or duties, the superintendent is also a key person in the relationship between board and teachers. This is an extremely delicate job which requires tact and ability on the part of the superintendent. This job is sometimes harder than it seems since between the board, which is supposed to formulate the policy and the rules and regulations on the one hand, and the teachers on the other hand there is not a clear cut pattern, and there are many divisions in the community to all of which the superintendent must be responsive.

At the school level the principal operates as the chief executive. In a large school, he is usually helped by the vice-principal who shares with him the responsibilities of day-to-day school policy. The main duties of the principal and vice-principal consist of supervision, and some researches show that on the average a principal spends 65 per cent of his time with tasks which are related to supervision.
As we said before, the Bureau of Education, now expanded into the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, was created in 1867 as a national agency to deal with educational problems. In the Department, an Office of Education operates as a dissemination center. In general the power of the Office of Education is limited. Primarily it initiates programs and studies about the state of education in the United States and distributes the funds to support particular programs at the state level. So, for example, under the National Defense Educational Act of 1958, the Office of Education funded and launched programs to strengthen mathematical, science, foreign language, and guidance programs.

In the United States education is also influenced by other agencies, such as the Supreme Court, College Entrance Examination Board, National Merit Scholarship Corporation and the National Science Foundation. The Supreme Court decision in 1954, for example, that separation of schools and facilities on racial grounds is unconstitutional has laid the legal foundations for school desegregation. The National Merit Scholarship Corporation also plays an important role in education. It selects every year the top students in the high schools and awards scholarships from private foundations to those who prove to be outstanding. The selection is based on a test which is given on a national scale and includes both humanistic and scientific questions. It should be noted that of the four agencies listed, one is a governmental body (the Court), one is funded by the federal government but is largely autonomous (National Science Foundation), and the other two are private institutions without government support, but serving a public function. It is generally admitted that in
the last few years under these organizations, United States education was changed in such aspects as (1) improved programs in science and foreign languages, (2) improved guidance programs, (3) major external testing programs, (4) college admission practices, (5) school architecture.

Expenditure in Education

As far as expenditures in education is concerned, the United States system of education reflects the same basic ambivalence between local and central government. In local school districts, approximately 40.2 per cent of the total school revenue comes from state sources and 56.1 per cent is derived from local sources. The rest, 3.7 per cent, is provided from federal funds. The cost of higher education alone was about 5 billion dollars. In the same year military spending reached the amount of 50 billion dollars. In 1973-74 the United States exceeded 56 billion dollars during the school year as shown in table 17 (table 5). This represents an increase of one-sixth over the 48 billion dollars expended two years earlier. The same tendencies to increase the expenditure was registered as far as per-pupil ratio is concerned. The current expenditure per-pupil in average daily attendance in 1973-74 exceeded $1,000 and the total expenditure including current expenditure approached 1,300 per pupil (table 6).

As it results from the tables (table 5) the per cent expenditure in education compared with the gross national product (GNP) has increased also over the past 45 years. Educational expenditures are estimated at 100 billion during the school year 1973-74, an amount equal to 7.7 per
cent of the GNP. Preliminary estimation indicates that the expenditure in education may exceed 100 billion in 1975-76.

As far as the balance of the expenditure for all education is concerned, in 1973 the Federal Government contributed 16 per cent of the money allocated in education and the remaining 84 per cent came from state and local sources.

In general the school budget is prepared by the school superintendent and his staff and is submitted to the local school board for approval. The school budget is widely publicized to the community and members of the community express their views about it. This practice is dictated by the fact that a good portion of the educational funds are derived from local-school district taxes. This aspect has some bearing on education. First, since a large part of the funds of the school are provided by the local community, the school's funds vary from community to community. The school in a rich community will have more money, whereas the schools in poor areas have less. Secondly, since the community carries out an important part of the financial responsibilities of the school, the school is more a local institution than a national one. Moreover, the citizens of a local community have the full authority to set up their own private school if they have financial and cultural power to do it. Hence, a rich community is very likely to have private or parochial schools. The private schools play a very important role in the United States system of education because, on the one hand the private schools, in many cases, have higher standards of education than the public schools, and consequently more prestige, and on the other hand, very often they are engaged in
educational experiments. In the Columbus area, however, I had the chance to visit in a suburb alternative school (public) which had a very open approach to education and in another section of the city a private Catholic school which in many respects is what is known as a traditional school. This is another aspect of the ambivalence of the United States system of education.

How Does the System Operate

There are four major groups which control and influence the course of education in the United States: parents, students, teachers, and school administrators. These interested parties make up the school community and determine the way the schools work. Earlier in the century, the administrators were the group which had the power and consequently dictated the course of education. However, lately a major change has occurred within the American system of education, and teachers and parents have emerged as key participants in the decisions affecting school policies.

So, for example, teachers have already demonstrated their political capacity and strength. Today two major teachers' organizations, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers (a member of the AFL-CIO), have tremendous political power. The main tool used by teachers to gain more power is collective bargaining. As Marlo Fontini says in The People and Their Schools: Community Participation.

Through carefully worded legal contracts covering terms and conditions of employment, teachers have begun to translate some of their concerns into school policy. Such items as pupil-teacher ratio, number of supervisors, length of school day have been decided through such contracts.
Now many school districts have a "balance of powers" in which school boards, school administrators, and teachers' organizations share authority. But in other school districts and especially during times of reform, as was the case in the 1960's, a split in responsibilities and authority occurred. Therefore a collision course is also possible and to some extent is always potential within the United States system of education. Ambivalent forces are at work all the time and this is very characteristic of the American educational scene. Moreover, as in the case of the political system, in education we have the same cluster of ambivalent forces which compete and work together in a subtle political balance.

Instead of a central authority and unique set of values, as is the case in most European systems of education, the American school, like a ship, is moved by competing and cooperative forces. Thus the American school lacks clear cut and long-term programs, but it has in exchange a diversity and richness which sometimes is confusing.

As David Reisman observes in Constraint and Variety in American Education, "the responsibilities for education is greatly de-centralized among thousands of school boards, PTA's, teacher associations, text-book lobbies, state education departments, teacher colleges." In this situation, as a matter of fact, lies one of the strengths of American school and education--its mobility and its creativity. If the school is supposed to change the world and to create a counter-cycle then the presence of people who think otherwise, radical reconstructionists, is necessary. If the United States got in 1976 all the Nobel prizes awarded, this is an indication, among other things, that education in
the United States is in spite of many deficiencies still a very productive enterprise.


As Henry Steele Commager says, the major turning point in America's history was in the nineteenth century. "The decade of the nineties," he wrote, "is the watershed of American history."

By 1900 modern America was already well engaged in great changes. Science, technology, trade unions, bureaucracy, urbanization and corporations were the most prominent shaping forces. However, at the same time another force and institution emerged and claimed a role in American society: education. Americans have had faith in education throughout their history, but only now did education come out as a powerful and well-articulated force. It played such an important role in the 20th century that it became a major factor in the political arena. And since policy moved between a conservative and liberal line, education followed, with a few exceptions, the same pattern.

The beginning of the century was marked by the political program launched by Roosevelt in 1912 on the Progressive or "Bull Moose" party platform. The program basically proposed to safeguard "human resources through an enlightened measure of social justice." Like Lincoln, Roosevelt felt that human rights should not be subordinated to property rights. He advocated therefore a powerful central government through which social and economic justice would be achieved.
Although he did not win the election, his opponent, Woodrow Wilson, pursued almost the same political program.

During this period of time, the school came under scrutiny too. Challenged by industrialization, commercialism, and urbanization, the education system was open to new pressing demands. The progressive movement in part was a response to these new challenges.

**Social Orientation**

In 1918 when the first World War broke up in Europe, the National Education Association appointed the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. This Commission once again came to analyse the social dimension of Education. This social dimension had a long tradition in American education, which goes back to the Puritans. Later, Horace Mann sought to use the schools to inculcate the sober moral attitudes necessary for democracy and for commercial advancement. Dewey in the same manner emphasized the social role of school in his *Democracy and Education*.

In accord with the whole political program launched by Woodrow Wilson, the Commission came once more to reemphasize the social function of the school and education. According to the report presented by the Commission, the major objectives of education include health, command of the fundamental processes, worth home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure time, and ethical character. To a certain extent in this program we can see the utilitarian and social objectives of education initiated a century before Spencer. The program
acknowledged, as Dewey put it in his work, *Individualism Old and New*, a movement from the "old type of individualism, to a social one." "To gain an integrated individuality, Dewey said,

> each of us needs to cultivate his own garden. But there is no fence about this garden; it is no sharply marked off enclosure. Our garden is the world, in the angle of which it touches our own manner of being. By accepting the corporate and industrial world in which we live, and by thus fulfilling the precondition for interaction with it, we, who are also parts of the moving present, create ourselves as we create an unknown future.\(^2\)

This shift was quite important if we bear in mind that American society was primarily individual-centered, and that the rights of the individual were guaranteed even by the Constitution in the Bill of Rights. However, the development of industrialism brought a new type of relationship between individual and society in which the individual was included more and more in a social structure. This new corporate society, as Dewey named it, meant among other things the acceptance of collective social democracy. Due to such social changes it became obvious that education had to be turned to the new social environment. Therefore it is not surprising that the report enunciated that, "The purpose of democracy is...to organize society that each member may develop his personality primarily through activities designed for the well-being of his fellow members and society as a whole."\(^3\)

The accent was placed on community; according to this view, education should develop in individuals interests, ideals, habits, and powers which will enable him to live in a kind of harmony with the society. However, it would be a mistake to think that the other dimension of education--the individualistic one--was completely blurred.
The Child Orientation

Like the social dimension, the child-centered orientation was also very present in American society. It might be viewed as a derivative of the old individualism, as Dewey said, or as an expression of the new orientation in psychology. Regardless of the origins, child-centered pedagogy operated along with the social orientation as a term of what we have called the ambivalence of American education.

Early in the century, G. Stanley Hall as a proponent of child-orientation argued that the school should be based on the natural growth and development of children. In other words, the so-called social or economical growth has to be originated in the natural growth and natural development of the child. A very perceptive insight, if we think that most of the politicians of the 20th century tended to overlook this fact. However, G. Stanley Hall overemphasized this aspect when he claimed that since children are different and have particular backgrounds, natures, and needs, school should adjust to the child and not the reverse.

The child-centered tradition grew stronger in the 1920's and was reinforced by the work of the Progressive Education Association, founded in 1919. We do not have to forget that at the same time in Europe we witnessed a similar movement. In 1900 Ellen Key, in Sweden, published a flamboyant book entitled *The Century of the Child*, in which she declared that the coming century is going to be the century of the child. Unfortunately, these beautiful predictions were not entirely confirmed by the subsequent social events. Yet the movement for a child-centered
education was carried on, and in Italy M. Montessori opened a new front which later influenced the whole world.

PEA moved in the same direction; it declared that each child is a law unto himself. This idea very soon became a slogan under which the progressive movement launched a new battle. Ann Shumaker and Harold Rugg found also the sense of progressivism in a kind of aesthetic protest against the superficiality and commercialism of industrial civilization. The key to the modern creative revolution, they argued, was the triumph of self-expression in education as well as in art. Hence, as Lawrence A. Cremin says, "in creative self-expression they found the quintessential meaning of the progressive education movement." The 20's were the post-war years and the prosperous years for the United States. Therefore the socio-political context favored acceptance of a child-centered pedagogy. Progressivism as a social and political force lost much of its middle class support and declined as an effective agent of national reconstruction. Conservative opinion dominated the nation at that time, and in the Presidential election of 1920 the overwhelming victory of the Republican candidate Warren G. Harding over the Democratic nominee, James M. Cox, indicated the desire of Americans to turn away from a troubled world. Under these circumstances, as Edgar B. Gumbert and Joel H. Spring point out in their book, *The Superschool and the Superstate: American Education in the Twentieth Century, 1918-1970*, the doctrine of the child-centered orientation was associated with the whole conservative movement, because in a way it drew attention away from needed social changes.
This is to some extent a paradoxical result because in general child-centered pedagogy has been most often associated with the revolutionary tendencies in society. Remember, for example, Rousseau. However, the '20s were for the United States post-war years and in general prosperous years. The country was moving well and as Herbert Hoover used to say, "the sole function of the government was to bring about a condition of affairs favorable to the beneficial development of private enterprise." Under these circumstances it was in a way expected that the educators turned from the social dimension of education to its natural component, from the society to the child. This orientation toward the child was also supported by developments in psychology. Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon had the idea to measure the intelligence of the child. For this they elaborated a scale of intelligence. The idea caught on and it was embraced over the ocean too. Terman popularized the idea of the Intelligence Quotient and then later Thorndike and his students used it in their own work. The technique was so widespread that when the National Society for Study of Education published its yearbook on the Measurements of Educational Products, Walter S. Monroe described over a hundred standardized tests to measure the intelligence. However, the calm and prosperous years did not last very long and in 1929 the great Wall Street would occur. As a consequence, the economic and political problems would dominate the social arena and education would again become social-oriented.
Again to Social Orientation

The great Wall Street Crash meant the beginning of the Great Depression from which the country would not recover until the growth of war industries.

Before the depression, conventional wisdom was that the people would be served if industry were furthered. This point of view was well expressed by Hoover in his proposals for ending the depression. His program was based on the assumption that business should be helped in order that the economy could recover. Faithful to his credo, Hoover pursued this policy. He helped business and gave the money not to the people at the bottom of society, but those at the top. His program did not work and the country continued to struggle in the midst of the depression. As a result, during that period of time the whole ethos of capitalism was challenged. Left wing movements and intellectual radicalism flourished when in 1933 Roosevelt took office. Many progressiveists such as G. Counts, Sidney Hook, and H. Rugg looked for an answer to the East, in the Soviet Union's new experiment or in Marxism. However, confusion and pessimism cominated. The romantic and old beautiful times were more or less over and this was clear for everybody. Under such drastic circumstances education underwent drastic changes too. The concept of a social-centered education emerged again and the main slogan in this period of time was "education for reconstruction."

People like Dewey, Kilpatrick, Counts, Child and others elaborated an educational policy they thought would meet these new conditions and eventually help to get the country out of depression.
In 1933 they published *The Educational Frontier*, edited by Kilpatrick. In it they claimed that education was to prepare individuals to take part intelligently in the management of social life, to bring them to an understanding of the forces which are moving, and to equip them with the intellectual and practical tools by which they can themselves enter into direction of these forces. They also expressed the idea in this programatic study that

(1) any educational philosophy which is to be significant for American education at the present time must be the expression of a social philosophy and that (2) the social and educational theories and conception must be developed with definite reference to the needs and issues which mark and divide our domestic, economic, and political life in the generation of which we are part.5

Even Rugg's initial Rousseauism shifted under the pressure of the depression. In *Culture and Education*, for example, published in 1931, Rugg developed a theory of school as an agent of social transformation. In this book, as in *Life and the School Curriculum* (1936), Rugg advocated an educational policy which would lead to intelligent changes. In a kind of all-encompassing vision, Rugg saw each agency of the community--family, neighborhood, press, church, government and industry--becoming part of a new "school of living" that would lead in the business of intelligent social change.

The era of laissez faire was more or less over, and the educators joined the policy of the New Deal launched by Roosevelt. The social reconstruction philosophy or view was largely embraced and in 1934 the Commission on the Social Studies in the School appointed by the American Historical Association mentioned in its final recommendations that
"the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging."^5

But the most vigorous plea for a reconstructionist program in school was addressed by George S. Counts, who in a series of pamphlets, Dare Progressive Education be Progressive, Education Through Indoctrination, and Freedom, Culture, Social Planning, Leadership reunited later in a book called Dare the School Build a New Social Order criticized child-centered pedagogy and progressive education which "wishes to build a new world but refuses to be held accountable for the kind of world it builds." Therefore the main "weakness of Progressive Education lies in the fact that it has elaborated no theory of social welfare, unless it be that of anarchy or extreme individualism."^7

The solution was, Counts contended, in a language which fits perfectly the spirit of the New Deal, to recognize that the progressive movement must emancipate itself...face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish an organic relation with the community, develop a realistic and comprehensive theory of welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become less frightened than it is today at the bagias of imposition and indoctrination. In a word, Progressive Education cannot place its trust in a child-centered school.8

G.S. Counts wrote these flamboyant programs in 1932 when the economic crisis forced more and more intellectuals to search for new ideas and new programs. Counts visited Russia in 1929 and seemed to be pleased with what Mr. Lunacharsky, Commisar of Education, told him and showed him about education in the new Soviet Republic. Moreover, his views
about education fitted a certain Marxian outlook about the crisis of capitalism. However, Counts remains a left-oriented progressivist, because all he wants is an active role of school and education in shaping American future and overcoming the crisis.

Like J. Dewey, Counts wants a reaffirmation of democracy through education, and in this respect he sees himself as a descendent of Jefferson and Lincoln, rather than Marx. Like Lincoln, Counts affirms the rights of man and not of property when, in his *The Schools can Teach Democracy*, published in 1939, he says that

> the touchstone of democracy is an unqualified devotion to the preservation and realization of that sublime ethical conception which has marked man's rise from savagery and barbarism, the conception of the essential equality, brotherhood, dignity, and moral worth of all men.  

In these respects Counts did not differ very much from Roosevelt's idea that government can correct social inequalities by appropriate public action.

As Governor of New York, Roosevelt had said "aid must be extended by government not as a matter of charity but as a matter of social duty," and later as President in the summer of 1935 he would pass legislation that was designated to help those underprivileged groups. Both Roosevelt and Counts wanted to use, one school, the other government, to maintain democracy as an institution.

Although the program advocated by Roosevelt as well as by Counts was largely criticized from the left and from the right, it laid down for the first time in a clear manner the social function and social responsibilities of both government and education. Their impact was so
strong that the New Deal tradition survived even after the unexpected death of Roosevelt on April 12, 1945.

Move to the Right and to the Left

After World War II, production and economic expansion largely replaced poverty and social justice as the main issues of national debate. In a certain way the post-World War period brought back the conventional wisdom of the 1920's. Economical and social pressure diminished and as a result social-centered education was less appealing. However, the launching of the Russian Sputnik in 1957 disturbed to some extent this laissez faire, and the school again became the central subject of public debate. National survival was at stake and therefore something had to be done. Arthur Bestor and Admiral H. Rickover and others opened a large campaign against progressive education.

For Admiral Rickover, for example, education is the "first line of defense," and if the United States is supposed to maintain its technological superiority then "our school," he contends, "must return to the traditional task of formal education." His views about education are quite traditionalist, if we can use this term, and what he wants is an emphasis on intellectual standards in United States schools. The European system of education seems to beckon to him and he definitely supports the idea of formal education "that brings the mind into form." His rationale is quite simple and quite convincing. The strength of a nation, he says, depends more and more on its national brain. The higher this is developed, the better it is. "Europe is a mere spot on
the map of the world," Rickover says,

but even today mortally wounded by two fratricidal wars
this small continent possesses wealth and influence all
out of proportion to its size and natural endowment. Her
economic and political power has always rested on her su­
premacy in matters of the mind, especially in science.
Formal public education, public libraries, universities,
highly trained 'professions' with rigorous ethical codes
—all these are European inventions.10

In 1958 the National Defense Education Act was issued as a post-
Sputnik reaction. It strengthens science, mathematics, and foreign lan-
guages and as a critic it places the accent on academic disciplines.
Vocational programs were stimulated and counseling and guidance services
introduced in schools.

Moreover, in 1960 the White House Conference on Children and Youth
talked about individual differences and about diversified programs for
both bright and slow learning students. James B. Conant reflected these
tendencies and in his The American High School Today he advocated a com ­
prehensive type of school within which the individualized programs for
bright students will exist along with vocational and commercial programs.
In a certain way, Conant took the middle road. He went along with tra­
ditionalists, but also tried to preserve the progressivist heritage.
His major idea was that equality of opportunity can be best achieved in
a comprehensive, multipurpose school instead of in separate institutions,
which had been the case in Europe.

As Edgar B. Gumbert and Joel H. Spring show, "the tension between
the poles of liberty-equality and individual-community have been solved
in both cases in favor of the former." Throughout the mid-1959's
economical prosperity on the one hand, and the needs for talents, on the other hand, made the elitist interpretation possible. The Presidential election of 1960 brought the Democratic nominee John Kennedy. The country was prepared for change and a kind of romantic spirit was at work. The myth of Camelot swept the country and Kennedy strived to "get America moving again." The quality of life was the main issue, and not economical growth. A new generation was entering history, the generation of the post-war period. It challenged many of the traditional values of the industrial world. In a certain way society as well as education were again involved as in the '30's. The different critics like J. Hall, P. Goodman, E.Z. Friedenberg, J. Kozol, etc., began to critique education and society, to reassess its function.

Like Dewey, but in a less philosophical manner, Paul Goodman expressed concern that in the post-industrial society the school had attempted to take over the activities of the family as a result of its collapse in urban centers. In his words, the school became a kind of "baby-sitting service during a period of collapse of the old type of family" and "an arm of the police, providing cops and concentration camps paid for in the budget under the heading Board of Education."

The increased social function of the school, according to Goodman's critique, had detracted school from its true purpose or aim, getting "one out of his isolated class into the one humanity."

This humanity existed, according to Goodman, in the Greek polis and that is the reason he considers himself a kind of neo-Aristotelian. In *Growing Up Absurd*, Goodman makes this idea clear when he says that
in the Greek polis "the community functioned to help the man to achieve full, mature humanity." This superior function of community no longer exists in modern American society, and this is why young people become either resigned or cynical.

As a remedy for this situation, Goodman makes some proposals which are quite radical. Among the most important ones we list: dispense with the school building for a few classes; have teachers and students use the city as a school, its streets, cafeterias, stores, movies, museums, and factories; use unlicensed adults of the community—the druggist, the storekeepers, the mechanic—as the proper educators of the young into the grown-up world; abolish compulsory class attendance; decentralize urban schools in small units, 20 to 50 in available storefronts clubhouse.

Another romantic, John Holt, directed his attack also against the established educational system. His views are similar to those of Goodman, Friedenberg, or Kozol. In his most famous book, *How Children Fail*, which appeared in 1964, Holt reaches a very touchy subject. He contends that the authority of the teacher destroys a child's intelligence. In other words, as H.J. Perkinson put it, "dependent upon the teacher as the complete intellectual authority for what is right, true, good, and proper, the child becomes habituated to looking to authority for correct answers."

In his *Free School* Jonathan Kozol presents his efforts and experiences in setting up a new school, a free one in which the children grow again and in which he tried to establish an organic type of relationship
with the students. A free school, according to Kozol, has the following characteristics:

(1) is outside the public education apparatus; (2) is outside the white man's counterculture; (3) is inside the cities; (4) is in direct contact with the needs and urgencies of those among the poor, the black, the dispossessed, who have been most clearly victimized by public education; (5) is as small, decentralized, and localized as we can manage; (6) is as little publicized as possible.  

Finally he changed completely the traditional way of doing things and began to explore new ways to teach. He brought loads of stuff into the classroom: books, magazines, records, tapes. In the class kids started playing chess, checkers and jacks. They played records and danced. They also learned to write and to communicate. They wrote about their own life and what they were interested in. They learned to explore and invent. They wrote autobiographies, stories, novels, myths, and fables. Unfortunately, the interference of authorities closed the school.

A similar experience is described by George Dennison in his *The Lives of the Children*. Dennison opened the First Street School in New York City. The first street school was a typical free school similar to those founded by Tolstoy and A.S. Neill. As Dennison states in the very beginning of his book, the subject of the book is not a critique of the school, "which is extensive and can hardly be improved, but the children of the First Street School; twenty-three blacks, whites, and Puerto Ricans in almost equal proportion, all from low-income families in New York's Lower East side.  

The children were the center of this new setting and curriculum, and what Dennison tried to create was "a better way of saying..."
the business of a school is not and should not be, mere instruction, but the life of the child.\textsuperscript{16} His main concern was to create or develop an organic community, based on the natural authority of adults and needs of the children because, as he says:

This is especially important under conditions as we experience today. Life in our country is chaotic and corrosive and the time of childhood for many millions is difficult and harsh. It will not be an easy matter to bring our beserk technology under control, but we can control the environment of our schools. It is a relatively small environment and has always been structured by deliberation. If, as parents, we were to take as our concern not the instruction of our children, but the lives of our children, we would find that our schools could be used in a powerful re-generative way.\textsuperscript{17}

In this school Dennison abolished tests and grades, lesson plans and homework. In other words, he abolished all the trappings of institutionalized authoritarianism, creating what Dennison calls an internal order—a structuring of activities based upon the child's innate desire to learn. In this kind of school children became alive again; they began to grow and flourished. This experience made Dennison affirm that the hope for a new spirit in education lies outside the present establishment, simply because "education is par excellence a human affair."

All these romantic experiences are not very original, at least from the perspective of history. Moreover, Goodman as well as Friedenberg might recall to some extent Rugg's romantic orientation from the early '30's. The pendulum in its ambivalent swing hit again the romantic sphere. Friedenberg, for example, displays a kind of distrust in formal education and, in Rousseauistic manner, feels uncomfortable with the school institution which would rather socialize than develop when
he claims that teaching is a kind of "subversive activity", that school is what it is, because we made it that way. "If it is irrelevant, as Marshall MacLuhan says, if it shields children from reality, as Norbert Wiener says, if it educates for obsolescence, as John Gardner says, if it does not develop intelligence, as J. Bruner says...it must be changed." 18

Definitely people like Goodman, Friedenberg, Holt and Dennison want a child-centered school. They are like Rousseau, disenchanted with society and school because of its abuse of authority, coercion, and repression of children. What they want is to humanize society by designing a new type of education centered around such values as love, freedom, justice. However, their efforts lacked a realistic approach to education, and they did not sufficiently consider the socialization function of education. They expressed an unlimited faith in the good nature of the child but did not see the cultural forces behind the educational process.

As a result their altruistic and humanitarian attempts did not change education as they hoped. It is true that their efforts have had an impact on American education. As a result of this neo-romantic movement many alternative schools have been established in different parts of the country. However, at the same time a kind of reaction against this romantic movement developed. This reaction claimed that the new education did not educate, but only indulged the young students in recreational activities. The lack of discipline, the low scholastic achievements, the promiscuity of drugs and laziness were among the few accusations which the supporters of traditional education directed
against neo-Romantics. So while some go along with the neo-Romantics' experiments, others, on the contrary, turn back to the fundamentals. This might be confusing, especially for a European eye used to perceiving education as uniform. Yet, if one wants to understand American education he has to accept this "corsi and recorse", this ambivalent swing which in many respects constitutes the very peculiar characteristic of American education.
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CONCLUSION

I have been in the United States for more than three years and I have begun to love the country; to love it with my heart and with my mind. The love of my heart is the love of its people and the love of the mind is the love for their accomplishments. I love the American people for their openness and frankness, for their naturalism and ingenuity which makes them so unique and so unforgettable. If there is somewhere a place for Buffon’s affirmation, "l'homme est le style" then this place is the United States. And this is not only because Americans are resentful of exterior etiquette and style, but because Americans trust themselves more than the laws and the norms imposed on them. That is why in the United States more than in any other country you will come across a tolerant and lack of discipline, a kind of "holy barbarian" spirit...But although less disciplines than other people, Europeans for example, Americans know how to put things together, and a spirit of order and efficiency is somehow intricate in their life style. The expression "one thing at a time" reflects not only a business-like mentality but is also very characteristic of a technological behavior, a behavior which, as R. K. Merton says, "is deliberate and rationalized" as opposed to spontaneous and unreflective. And this behavior is a part of American culture which keeps its huge production and institutional life going. It also transpires in the way Americans organize their life, in the system of
transportation, in architecture, in their super-stores, in the way
different products are designed. Order, rather than discipline, con-
stitutes the American pattern. Order seen as a sequence of activities
which leads to a result, a rational outcome. Thus the bible was
translated in the United States into a taxonomy. Technology has become
the main God of this new catechism and so far it has been a generous
god. As a result, today Americans live, with a few exceptions, in a kind
of affluent society. Production and consumption has expanded so much,
especially since World War II, that a kind of pantagruelic and healthy,
almost frenetic, pleasure in satisfying human needs has resulted. Sleep-
ing, eating, learning, working, leisure, all these fundamental human
needs are met by an enormous series of instrumentalities and devices, by
a high technological apparatus. To some extent this may remind us of
what John Kenneth Galbraith called "maximizing the goods that supply the
wants." And this is true. The United States economy, which operates
along the theory of consumer demands, not only satisfies the human needs,
but keeps continually creating others. Where this is going to lead no
economist can tell. It is a mystery of industrial society as the
immaculate conception was a mystery of the Middle Ages.

Like DeTocqueville, I could say that "in America I have seen not only
America, but I have seen true Democracy." However, since DeTocqueville
visited the United States, it has changed tremendously. The wealth and
the power have increased, and its distribution has changed. Moreover, as
C. W. Mills points out, the technology has created a technocratic elite,
a group of people who make decisions having major consequences and who
That these people and the corporations behind them have more power in determining the course of policy there is no doubt. This is a part of democracy as freedom. However, there is still in the United States a democracy of equality, or equal opportunity. This is still a part of the 18th century slogan, "government for, of, and by the people," but it is also an expression of the need for balance in the democratic game, of equality as opposed to freedom. As a result of this search for balance today you have in the United States economy capital and labor, stock owners and unions, as counterparts; in education you have administrators, but you have also teachers and parents; in government you have the Congress but you have also the President and the Supreme Court; in industry you have production, but you have also consumption. As a matter of fact, this aspect has a more important significance than it seems to have at first glance. It is responsible not only for a kind of equilibrium you have in the United States in the last two centuries, but also for the very progress the country has registered. When the forefathers designed the administrative structure of the country they did not know anything of Hegel's idea of unity of contradictions which may be cited at different levels in the United States structure, and which is responsible, we think, for the dynamic and tremendous progress the country has made. Of course, this does not mean at all that other factors such as natural resources, secure boundaries, abundant labor, did not play an important role in the development of the country. However, as you can have a slow and stagnant mind in a beautiful and well fed body, in the same way you can have a dormant culture in a beautiful
and rich country.

From this point of view, the development of United States culture seems to prove rather the Hegelian idea that development is a result of some inner contradictions, than Toynbee's behavioristic concept of the growth of civilizations as a result of some outer challenges.

In spite of all long and interminable theories, projects and movements, education in the United States is not shaped by teachers, state or governmental agencies. Education in the United States is, more than in other places in the world, an outgrowth of the parent-child relationship. And since the average middle-class American parent loves to have children but does not want to father them too much, the school and education is the ideal kind of tutor he can provide for his children.

That is why, unlike Europe, in the United States the school is more an extension of the family than of the state, of the community more than of the society. As a result, a community and parents control the school, and try to make life for their children as rich and pleasant as they can in the schools. Therefore, while learning and teaching is a part of the school life, a very important part is also played by the social activities, lunch programs, and sports and games. As a matter of fact, education is an expression of social leisure and more or less explicitly Americans hold to this attribute. And if the children and students are not so knowledgeable as, for example, Europeans are, they are full of energy and more socially mature.

"As to the difference between French and American students," Andre Maurois says, "I should sum up by saying that French students are
generally one or two years ahead of American students in general culture, but the American students seem more unspoiled, keep a fresher mind, and know better how to get along with people. Like the whole culture, education in the United States is more organic than formal. And in a country two hundred years old, it is bound to be. The past sediments are still too thin, and therefore the stream of the present and the future more alive.
FOOTNOTES

CONCLUSION


APPENDIX

DATA ABOUT AMERICAN POLITICAL AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM
Figure 1 Our System of Checks and Balances

Figure 2 The Structure of Education in the United States

### Table 1

Percent of the population 5 to 34 years old enrolled in school, by age:
United States, October 1947 to October 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total, 5—34 years</th>
<th>5 years*</th>
<th>6 years*</th>
<th>7—9 years</th>
<th>10—13 years</th>
<th>14—15 years</th>
<th>16—17 years</th>
<th>18—19 years</th>
<th>20—24 years</th>
<th>25—29 years</th>
<th>30—34 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes children enrolled in kindergarten, but excludes those enrolled in nursery schools.

NOTE—Data are based upon sample surveys of the civilian noninstitutional population.


Table 2

- Estimated enrollment in educational institutions, by level of instruction and by type of control: United States, fall 1973 and fall 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of instruction and type of control</th>
<th>Fall 1973</th>
<th>Fall 1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total elementary, secondary, and higher education</td>
<td>59,039</td>
<td>58,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>52,038</td>
<td>51,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>6,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-grade 12 (regular and other schools)</td>
<td>50,519</td>
<td>50,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular public schools</td>
<td>45,409</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular nonpublic schools</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public schools</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonpublic schools</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-grade 8 (regular and other schools)</td>
<td>35,133</td>
<td>34,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular public schools</td>
<td>31,333</td>
<td>30,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular nonpublic schools</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public schools</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonpublic schools</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12 (regular and other schools)</td>
<td>15,386</td>
<td>15,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular public schools</td>
<td>14,076</td>
<td>14,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular nonpublic schools</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public schools</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonpublic schools</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education (total degree-credit enrollment in universities, colleges, professional schools, teachers colleges, and junior colleges)</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6,389</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>7,397</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The 1973 figures for regular nonpublic and other elementary and secondary schools, and all 1974 figures, are estimates. Surveys of nonpublic elementary and secondary schools have been conducted at less frequent intervals than those of public schools and of institutions of higher education. Consequently, the estimates for nonpublic schools are less reliable than those for other types of institutions. The estimates for 1974 are derived from the increases expected from population changes combined with the long-range trend in school enrollment rates of the population.

2 "Regular" schools include schools which are a part of State and local school systems and also most nonprofit-making nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, both church-affiliated and nonsectarian. "Other" schools include subcollegiate departments of institutions of higher education, residential schools for exceptional children, Federal schools for Indians, and Federal schools on military posts and other Federal installations.

3 Excludes undergraduate students in occupational programs which are not ordinarily creditable toward a bachelor's degree. There were approximately 1,632,000 of these nondegree-credit students in fall 1973.

4 Includes students working toward first-professional degrees, such as M.D., D.D.S., LL.B., and B.D.

NOTE—Fall enrollment is usually smaller than school-year enrollment, since the latter is a cumulative figure which includes students who enroll at any time during the year.


Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated retention rates, fifth grade through college graduation: United States 1965 to 1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR EVERY 10 PUPILS IN THE 5th GRADE IN FALL 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8 ENTERED THE 9th GRADE IN FALL 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 ENTERED THE 11th GRADE IN FALL 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL IN 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 ENTERED COLLEGE IN FALL 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 ARE LIKELY TO EARN BACHELOR'S DEGREES IN 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 - Earned degrees conferred by institutions of higher education, by field of study and by level: United States, 1971-72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of study</th>
<th>Bachelor's degrees (requiring 4 or 5 years)</th>
<th>First professional degrees (requiring at least 6 years)</th>
<th>Second level (master's) degrees</th>
<th>Doctor's degrees (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All fields</td>
<td>883,460</td>
<td>43,410</td>
<td>250,080</td>
<td>33,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and natural resources</td>
<td>13,640</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and environmental design</td>
<td>6,440</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area studies</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>37,230</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and management</td>
<td>121,830</td>
<td>29,960</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>12,340</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and information sciences</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>190,850</td>
<td>97,730</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>50,310</td>
<td>16,650</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and applied arts</td>
<td>33,810</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>18,00</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professions</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home economics</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters¹</td>
<td>73,200</td>
<td>12,710</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>23,630</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sciences</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>20,390</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>43,080</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public affairs and services</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>157,640</td>
<td>17,420</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and other fields</td>
<td>15,320</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Includes general English; English literature; Comparative literature; Classics; Linguistics; Speech, debate, and forensic science; Creative writing; Teaching of English as a foreign language; Philosophy; and Religious studies.

Table 5—Gross national product related to total expenditures\(^1\) for education:
United States, 1929-30 to 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar year</th>
<th>Gross national product (in millions)</th>
<th>School year</th>
<th>Total (in thousands)</th>
<th>As a percent of gross national product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>$103,095</td>
<td></td>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>$3,233,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>75,820</td>
<td></td>
<td>1931-32</td>
<td>2,566,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>55,601</td>
<td></td>
<td>1933-34</td>
<td>2,294,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>72,247</td>
<td></td>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>2,649,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>90,446</td>
<td></td>
<td>1937-38</td>
<td>3,014,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,494</td>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>3,199,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,540</td>
<td>1941-42</td>
<td>3,203,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td></td>
<td>191,592</td>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>3,522,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td>212,010</td>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>4,167,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
<td>231,323</td>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>6,574,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td>256,484</td>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>8,795,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
<td>328,414</td>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>11,312,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td>364,593</td>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>13,949,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td>397,960</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>16,811,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>441,134</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>21,119,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>483,650</td>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>24,722,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>520,109</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>29,366,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>590,503</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>36,010,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>684,834</td>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>45,397,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>793,927</td>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>57,213,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>930,284</td>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>70,077,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,054,915</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>84,748,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,294,919</td>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Includes expenditures of public and nonpublic schools at all levels of education (elementary, secondary, and higher education).

\(^\ast\) Estimated.

NOTE.—Beginning with 1959-60 school year, includes Alaska and Hawaii.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>Total expenditures for public schools (in thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Current expenditures for day schools</th>
<th>Current expenditures for other programs</th>
<th>Capital Outlay</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total *</th>
<th>Current *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>$1,036,151</td>
<td>$361,120</td>
<td>$3,277</td>
<td>$153,543</td>
<td>$18,212</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>2,316,790</td>
<td>1,843,552</td>
<td>9,825</td>
<td>370,878</td>
<td>92,536</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>2,344,049</td>
<td>1,941,799</td>
<td>13,357</td>
<td>257,974</td>
<td>130,909</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>5,637,643</td>
<td>4,687,274</td>
<td>35,614</td>
<td>1,014,176</td>
<td>100,578</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>15,613,255</td>
<td>12,329,389</td>
<td>132,566</td>
<td>2,661,786</td>
<td>489,514</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>16,373,339</td>
<td>14,720,270</td>
<td>194,093</td>
<td>2,862,153</td>
<td>587,823</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>21,324,993</td>
<td>17,218,446</td>
<td>427,528</td>
<td>2,977,976</td>
<td>701,044</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>26,249,026</td>
<td>21,053,280</td>
<td>640,304</td>
<td>3,754,862</td>
<td>791,350</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>32,977,182</td>
<td>26,877,162</td>
<td>866,419</td>
<td>4,255,791</td>
<td>977,810</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>40,683,428</td>
<td>34,217,773</td>
<td>635,803</td>
<td>4,659,072</td>
<td>1,170,782</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>48,050,283</td>
<td>41,817,782</td>
<td>395,319</td>
<td>4,458,949</td>
<td>1,378,236</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>56,031,041</td>
<td>46,956,775</td>
<td>2,127,958</td>
<td>5,259,330</td>
<td>1,686,938</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes expenditures for adult education, summer schools, community colleges, and community services (when separately reported).

†Includes current expenditures for day schools, and other programs, capital outlay and interest on school debt.

‡Includes day school expenditures only; excludes current expenditures for other programs.

§Estimated.

NOTE.—Beginning in 1959-60, includes Alaska and Hawaii. Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.


### Table 7
Enrollment in federally aided vocational classes, by type of program:
United States and outlying areas, 1920 to 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Distributive occupations</th>
<th>Home economics</th>
<th>Trades and industry</th>
<th>Health occupations</th>
<th>Technical education</th>
<th>Office occupations</th>
<th>Other programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>265,058</td>
<td>31,301</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,938</td>
<td></td>
<td>184,819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>981,882</td>
<td>188,311</td>
<td></td>
<td>174,957</td>
<td></td>
<td>618,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2,290,741</td>
<td>584,133</td>
<td>129,433</td>
<td>818,765</td>
<td>758,409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2,624,786</td>
<td>605,099</td>
<td>215,049</td>
<td>954,041</td>
<td>850,597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2,001,153</td>
<td>469,959</td>
<td>181,509</td>
<td>806,605</td>
<td>543,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2,227,663</td>
<td>510,331</td>
<td>174,672</td>
<td>911,816</td>
<td>630,844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2,836,121</td>
<td>640,791</td>
<td>292,936</td>
<td>1,139,766</td>
<td>762,628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3,364,613</td>
<td>764,975</td>
<td>354,670</td>
<td>1,430,366</td>
<td>804,602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>3,165,988</td>
<td>746,402</td>
<td>234,934</td>
<td>1,391,389</td>
<td>793,213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,164,851</td>
<td>737,502</td>
<td>220,619</td>
<td>1,380,147</td>
<td>826,583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3,413,159</td>
<td>785,599</td>
<td>257,025</td>
<td>1,486,816</td>
<td>883,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3,629,339</td>
<td>775,892</td>
<td>282,558</td>
<td>1,559,622</td>
<td>983,644</td>
<td>27,423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,768,149</td>
<td>796,237</td>
<td>303,764</td>
<td>1,588,105</td>
<td>938,450</td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>101,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4,072,677</td>
<td>822,664</td>
<td>321,665</td>
<td>1,723,660</td>
<td>1,005,383</td>
<td>48,935</td>
<td>148,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>4,565,390</td>
<td>860,605</td>
<td>334,126</td>
<td>2,022,138</td>
<td>1,060,274</td>
<td>59,006</td>
<td>221,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6,070,059</td>
<td>907,354</td>
<td>420,426</td>
<td>1,897,670</td>
<td>1,269,051</td>
<td>83,677</td>
<td>253,838</td>
<td>1,238,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7,533,936</td>
<td>891,158</td>
<td>574,785</td>
<td>2,261,338</td>
<td>1,628,542</td>
<td>140,987</td>
<td>258,832</td>
<td>1,733,997</td>
<td>49,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,793,960</td>
<td>852,983</td>
<td>529,365</td>
<td>2,570,410</td>
<td>1,906,133</td>
<td>198,044</td>
<td>271,730</td>
<td>2,111,150</td>
<td>354,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>11,710,767</td>
<td>895,450</td>
<td>640,423</td>
<td>3,425,698</td>
<td>2,397,968</td>
<td>336,552</td>
<td>337,069</td>
<td>2,351,878</td>
<td>1,304,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>12,268,538</td>
<td>927,591</td>
<td>738,547</td>
<td>3,516,883</td>
<td>2,702,238</td>
<td>421,075</td>
<td>364,044</td>
<td>2,499,095</td>
<td>1,114,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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