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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In his lectures at Yale University in 1943, Jacques Maritain, spoke of education as an art, which deals with both the "sphere of ethics and practical wisdom." Education, he said, refers "either to any process whatsoever by means of which man is shaped and led toward fulfillment... or to the task of formation which adults intentionally undertake with regard to youth, or, in its strictest sense, to the special task of schools and universities." "If the aim of education is the helping and guiding of man toward his own human achievement, education cannot escape the problems and entanglements of philosophy, for it supposes by its very nature a philosophy of man, and from the outset it is obliged to answer the question: 'What is Man?' which the philosophical sphinx is asking."

---


2 Ibid., p. 3.

3 Ibid., p. 4.
American education has changed drastically since the 1940's, but within the last decade the change has been rapid and has taken a direction new to both educators and students. Traditionally theorists wrote about education as an art; recently theorists and those designing instructional materials discuss teaching as a learnable science. The traditional model of teacher as artist, philosopher, or intellectual guide is less visible today; some of those respected and active in the profession are thinking of teachers as facilitators and are involved in trying to develop models for the facilitator.

Television has made many varieties of information available to the entire nation; both within the classroom and outside of it television has become a standard and frequently indispensable aspect of life. The passing of information frequently is equated with education; this equation is not necessarily valid. Nevertheless, television often serves as the model upon which children base their views of the world and to which they turn for assistance in learning how to make judgements, ethical and moral judgements as well as those involved with common sense.

In the early part of this century John Dewey warned of the danger of using information, or trying to use information
in helping young people to develop the power of judgement. 4 Judgement, Dewey said then, involves the ability to select and to discriminate; the test in education is whether the student can put it to use. 5 "What we need in education is a genuine faith in the existence of moral principles which are capable of effective application," he states. 6 He asks for teachers who understand that it is urgent and necessary for morals to be translated into "the conditions and forces of our community life, and into the impulses and habits of the individual." 7

Another scholar and philosopher, Pierre Tielhard de Chardin says of education:

It is through education, by the progressive spread of common viewpoints and attitudes, that the slow convergence of minds and hearts is proceeding, without which there seems to be no outlet ahead of us for the impulse of Life. Directly charged with the task of achieving this unanimity of mankind, the educator, whether his

5 Ibid., p. 55.
6 Ibid., p. 66.
7 Ibid., p. 58.
subject be literature, history, science or philosophy, must constantly live with it and consciously strive for its realization. A passionate faith in the purpose and splendour of human aspirations must be the flame that illuminates his teaching. 

Today we must examine ourselves and the state of education to see if we are moving closer to the convergence of minds and hearts, to the ability to select and discriminate and then put moral principles into our daily lives, or if we are moving somewhere else. Our society seems to be increasingly fragmented. Hatreds are being expressed, often violently; centuries of racism and persecution, traditions of exploitation and self-interest by a white Western World seem to be reaching their grim but logical conclusion. The exploited are rebelling and from South Africa to South America, to all the cities of this nation, people are asking for what they see as just retribution for the sacrifices they have made.

In South Africa Alan Paton predicts a bloody rebellion. 

His message is that of any of the minorities in America: Revolution

---


9 Alan Paton, *Newsweek*, (August 7, 1972) p. 32. In an interview in Newsweek Paton stated, "In sober truth, black militancy is the response to white suppression. Black power is the response
must come.

In the midst of this conflict and general social turmoil, education and educators must be prepared to take stands and to help students make judgements which will not isolate them from the ethical and moral crises around them, but will help them move with integrity and practical wisdom.

This research will attempt to give a critical overview of some of the traditional approaches to teaching and to teacher education and to then apply some of the questions raised by selected educational theorists and contemporary social critics to instructional materials used in teacher education. This will be done in an attempt to see where education now stands in relation to the prevailing social system; to try to define the prevailing attitude of educators; and to describe the direction educational theory and practice seems to be taking.

After the events of the 1950's the public demanded more and more teachers because there were not enough persons to staff to white rejection, Black hatred was fed on white arrogance. Now that it has grown up, it can feed itself.... I now have another fear--which is that now that the hating has begun, it will not stop but it will spread and grow. I hope that we have not left it too late. I hope and pray there is still time to stop it."
classrooms. The public put an accompanying stipulation to that demand: teachers needed to instruct young people in the sciences. The profession reacted, and there was a shift in emphasis nationally, from liberal arts education to the education of scientists and a profound belief in the scientific method was developed and cultivated.

This researcher has made the hypothesis that something else happened concurrently with the public demand for scientists. That hypothesis is that, even before the national events of the 1950's, technological developments were subtly changing educational theorists' views; that even before public education became the object of public attack there were signs that nationally education was changing from its traditional role of intermingling information with a way to use that information to make value judgements, to the function of giving information. The complaint of many students, newly graduated from colleges of education, that they do not know "what" to teach reflects, in part, the shifting emphasis in educational theory.

John Dewey has stated that history can teach us the methods of social progress, and that it can reveal to us illustrations of what is fundamental to the forces of life. \(^{10}\)

\[^{10}\text{Ibid., p. 38.}\]
History had demonstrated that a life of moral tradition, a ceaseless search for self definition within the framework of our own traditions, can teach us respect, humility, and love for man. History has demonstrated that freedom of inquiry is basic and natural.

To equate freedom of inquiry with scientific inquiry, however, is something quite different from the heritage great teachers have given us.

A specifically scientific model for inquiry may, in fact, limit it.

As Bernard Mehl says in the introduction to *Classic Educational Ideas*,

> On this last third of the twentieth century we may be entering a stage of reduced freedom. We are being asked to release our historical rights by appeals to happiness and well-being growing out of an increasing devotion to technology. These appeals appear to state that we can divorce ourselves from history and that we can place the educative process at the disposal of the scientific determiners of behavioral and genetic health. The issue is not one of progress versus the status quo, or one of being for sickness, cruelty or crime as against eliminating the world's evils. The historical reality of today demands a recognition of the concept of limits....
To deal with limits, to apply them with humility and knowledge, to realize that limits will be opposed by the dogmatist on the one hand and the utopian on the other, is to assume a stance of courage. Such a stance cannot be taken with smugness, nor does it offer to anyone a superior moral or intellectual position. It calls for a deep sense of commitment to teaching and learning and a love of that history which is the harbinger of ambiguity necessary to the continuation of a foolish human condition which stops short of perfection.

Within this context, then, this study will attempt to demonstrate the direction education is taking today, and to speculate on the meaning of that direction. The research will be based upon historical and philosophical resources in an effort to understand the present, and in an attempt to project where the future may take us.

Historical references were selected because they seemed to represent predominate themes in the development of American educational theory and the American educational system which purportedly translated the system in actuality.

Individual theorists were selected because they represented prototypes of particular philosophical positions.

---

Instructional materials which were examined were selected because they, also, seemed to be indicative of current trends in teacher education.

It is hoped that all of these materials in combination represent guidelines by which a reasonable speculation can be made about the future.
CHAPTER II
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE SURVEY

About twenty years ago Gilbert Highet predicted that education would be at exactly the place it is today, although his prediction was not made as such but was described in his study on The Art of Teaching. Highet understood the need for understanding limits and working within them; he knew that one had to deal with the ambiguities of life in order to understand the facts of life.

Scholarship must be accurate whether it is interesting or not. Teaching must be interesting, even if it is not one hundred percent accurate.

With that quote, Highet stated the ambiguity of a classroom. A student will learn, he suggests, if the teacher can talk to the inner student, can arouse in the student the desire to assimilate and reflect on the great ideas of the centuries, if he can master the trends of social thought and use them as a framework for understanding and dealing with the world and ideas around him. Highet does not

---

2 Ibid. p. 219.
suggest that teachers eliminate the necessity for dealing with facts; he does suggest that we combine facts with their higher levels of meaning. "One cannot understand the rudiments of an important subject without knowing its higher levels—at least well enough to teach it." He suggests that a child's mind is rangeless and that teachers, by their attraction to a method, limit the range for the child rather than allow the child to discover and define his own limits.

There is nothing about this to suggest sloppy or sketchy scholarship, though some could accuse and say that Highet has failed to acknowledge the need for disciplined examination, for detailed and methodical study. To those who would criticize, he has an answer.

... teaching is an art, not a science. It seems to be very dangerous to apply the aims and methods of science to human beings as individuals, although a statistical principle can often be used to explain their behavior in large groups.... But a 'scientific' relationship between human beings is bound to be inadequate and perhaps distorted.... Teaching involves emotions and human values outside the grasp of science. You must throw your heart into it.

---

5 Ibid. pp. vii-viii.
Today such statements may sound naive, or like the ramblings and reminiscences of a latter day Mr. Chips. To Highet the throwing of one's heart into a classroom involved interpersonal relationships between students and teachers— as they sought historical frameworks for the traditions, or the material, they worked to master or to understand.

Outside the field of education there is sturdy scholarship to back up Highet's claim that the teacher must help the student understand and work within limits, that the classroom must be the forum for exploration with a view toward understanding one's relationship to an overall society rather than with a view toward mastering details. C. Wright Mills' examination of the study of social science seems to be expressing the same thing, and his view might be applied to the development of teacher education curricula as well as to the study of the social sciences.

Whether the point of interest is a great power state or a minor literary mood, a family, a prison, a creed—these are the kinds of questions the best social analysts have asked. They are the intellectual pivots of classic studies of man in society—and they are the questions inevitably raised by any mind possessing the sociological imagination. For that imagination is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another—from the political to the psychological; from the examination of a single family to comparative assessment of the national budgets of the world; from the theological school
to the military establishment; from considerations of an oil industry to studies of contemporary poetry. It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self—and to see the relations between the two. Back of its use there is always the urge to know the social and historical meaning of the individual in the society and in the period in which he has his quality and his being. 6

Mills states that when a man develops this self-consciousness, in the sense of seeing himself and the "intersection of biography and history within society" 7

...men whose mentalities have swept only a series of limited orbits often come to feel as if suddenly awakened in a house with which they had only supposed themselves to be familiar. Correctly or incorrectly, they often come to feel that they can now provide themselves with adequate summations, cohesive assessments, comprehensive orientations. Older decisions that once appeared sound now seem to them products of a mind unaccountably dense. Their capacity for astonishment is made lively again. They acquire a new way of thinking, they experience a transvaluation of values: in a word, by their reflection and by their sensibility, they realize the cultural meaning of the social sciences. 8

It seems that the awakening of the lively sense of inquiry and astonishment at the capacity for new insights is what Higet is urging that the teacher himself aspire to and try to translate to the


7 Ibid. p. 21.

8 Ibid.
student. His historical survey is full of the suggestions of this very thing. He quotes Aristotle and his decision that though Plato and Truth were both held dear, he will select Truth because it is right.  

Hight talks about the conflict in the classroom, such as conflict Aristotle must have felt in assessing knowledge and a man, as one that is inevitable and is "rooted in the very depth of the human soul." He seems to rely on the knowledge that a teacher himself must be aware of the ambiguities between knowledge and the realities of human behavior and must define his own limits to work within these ambiguities.

He does not ignore the method of teaching; but interestingly, his descriptions of teaching methods tend to be those of interpersonal relationships. There is no technology to Hight's methods, but rather a definition of some of the various ways men and students reach understanding together. He cites major influences in the historical development of Western teaching; these tend to be those of the influence of the total culture, belief in the innate goodness in man, and understanding of the difficulty externally

---

9 Hight, op. cit., p. 212.

10 Ibid. p. 208.
imposed limits.  

Throughout his discussion on the art of teaching it is clear that Highet sees it as being within the individual; the development of a teaching method is, to him, the development of the individual—the individual's growth toward a total understanding of the various components of historical and philosophical life.

One has to take note of the fact that Highet predicted what was to come in the next decade as teaching became less of an art and more of a technological activity. He warned that unless the classical, traditional model of teacher was retained in part there would be student rebellions, scathing criticism of adults, and demands which could not easily be met and which would not offer solutions but create more problems. Perhaps the reason Highet knew so clearly what would come was his obvious respect for youth. Highet speaks of and treats students with respect and understanding, two essentials in the art of teaching.

---

11 Highet worries about any type of classification of either students or teachers because of the danger of ruling out the eccentric, who may be the one person responsible for rapid and outstanding advances and achievements in any given field. His sections on the goodness in man are based on an examination of the methods of Jesuit scholars, for whom Highet shows considerable respect. One cannot help but compare the sense of teaching and teacher described and revered by Highet with that described by de Chardin.
An historical survey of education in America reveals that the ambiguity of the classroom, as perceived by Highet, reflected an ambiguity of purpose and goals by those who started our educational institutions and those charged with the responsibility of maintaining them. Our English heritage led us to believe that education really was the responsibility of home and church, but in practice we charged the state with carrying out that responsibility. We were neither totally English nor totally European in our ideas of education, but we combined elements of both with the particularly American Calvinist tradition. We were, in the beginning, educating for the salvation of the soul. While there were differences between the New England Calvinist tradition, the middle colonies' more parochial attitudes, and the southern colonies' belief that education was a commodity to be purchased by the rich for their children and dispensed as a charity to the poor, the New England colonies set the pattern which was to dominate the history of American education.

Historian William French states that "The colonial education pattern was based primarily upon two conceptions: First, that the school should be an instrument for the preservation of religious faith and denominational orthodoxy; second, that the school should properly be used to preserve the existing social and
economic stratification that had been brought over from Europe. 12

Throughout his historical survey, French alludes to the fact that this peculiar combination of religious faith and social stratification may have led our educational system in the public sector into our only socialist institution and that this, in turn, might be responsible for the attacks upon education in the late part of the 1950's. This idea will be picked up later for purposes of understanding the present day situation and where public education is now and where it is moving.

For nearly 100 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the ideas of education held by the New England colonies dominated the American educational system. The spirit of education for citizenship prevailed and never completely died out. The idea that we can change our society if we change our schools, held by many modern educators, has its roots in the tradition which began in the New England colonies.

Although the state never controlled education from the federal level, the state and local levels always were intimately tied to education and schools. And they were controlling forces in

decisions about who teachers were and how they were prepared. In the beginning teaching was mostly maintaining discipline and hearing the lesson recitation.

Butts and Cremin tell us that teachers were expected to live up to the expectations of those who controlled the schools; in New England it was the town meetings, selectmen, committees, and ministers; in the South it was the governors, local parish officials, religious agencies. But "The most common requirement of teachers were that they be religiously orthodox, loyal to the civil government and morally acceptable," 13

This loyalty to the civil government and moral acceptability gave rise to conflicting elements and reflected in another way the ambiguity this country has felt in regard to teachers and education. Teachers were expected to sign statements of loyalty to the government and this signing often muzzled them in efforts to teach political and social truths. At the same time they were expected to set the standards for morality and ethics, a morality and ethics which supposedly revered truth and learning. In yet another way the ambiguity affected teachers---while expected

to live up to and teach the prevailing morality and social standards, teachers were treated with something less than respect and honor. Teaching was not looked on as a profession until relatively recently; teaching was not honored for itself, but was seen as a stepping stone to something else. While teachers were expected to be the moral leaders, they often were adventurers or misfits who could not succeed in anything else.

Teachers included in their ranks many women who taught while they were young and before their marriages, but the idea of the teacher as a spinster who had no choice but to stay in the classroom was a myth that died very slowly.

Butts and Cremin tell us that beginning in the early 1800's the literature was filled with material concerning the qualities of the ideal teacher; at this point the teacher was a "form of an eclectic saint; the knowledge of Socrates, the patience and kindness of St. Francis, and the economic self-denial of a mendicant friar." 14

The notion of school-keeping, not teaching, prevailed until after the ideas of Horace Mann and the concepts of teacher training developed. French suggests that from about the 1830's until the

14 Ibid. p. 228.
1900's American education entered into an "Age of Reform" which took on many aspects. He lists these as:

1. To demonstrate to the people the need for universal education.
2. To improve existing schools through obtaining new buildings and equipment.
3. To extend the length of the school term.
4. To prepare better teachers.
5. To improve the curriculum.
6. To establish control and supervision.
7. To make school free and available to all children.
8. To compel attendance.
9. To extend educational opportunity beyond the rudiments of learning for an ever-increasing proportion of children and youths.

All historians seem to agree that one of the post Civil War developments in education was the idea of lessons in pedagogy; the art of teaching should be added to the curricula of those institutions preparing teachers. And, largely, those institutions were Normal Schools - schools which prepared teachers to

16 Ibid. p. 99.
present normal education in the communities. These normal schools generally were two years' in length, but it was not unusual for persons to stay only six months and then go out into the community and teach. In the late 1900's and continuing through this century, the National Education Association, beginning with its Normal School Department and others who were leaders in the field of education began to look toward professional education for teachers. The idea was to produce good teachers, not profound scholars. Here another ambiguity is reflected in the American educational system; for while the aim of pedagogy, to produce good teachers, was sound, the idea sprang up that to pursue education was not scholarly. Thus the notion that teaching was a second class profession continued while the country persisted in putting a profound belief in the idea that the schools could and should reform the country and keep, at the same time, the best of this country's moral and ethical standards.

In this century the normal schools eventually developed into teachers colleges, and since the profound changes which followed World War II into state colleges. Colleges and Universities added Education to the degree granting areas; the stature of the teacher and of teaching as a profession changed, but it changed dramatically as the social and cultural mores of the nation changed.
The major philosophical influences relating to education per se came, in the beginning, primarily from Europe. From Switzerland, the child-centered approach of Johann Pestalozzi, a learning of objects, spiced with a learning of the spirit, tempered with love and morality. From Germany, the theoretical level of education of Johann Herbart with its five steps still used by many in elementary education. (The five steps of preparation, presentation, association, generalization, and application even prevail in some college classrooms today.) And, also from Switzerland, from Friedrich Froebel, a disciple of Pestalozzi, the idea of self-activity and learning through play and the introduction of education first through the kindergarten—literally a "garden of play" before formal education begins.

French and other historians suggest that the ideas of progressive education which dominated the early part of this century began with Francis W. Parker, who used methods of induction rather than memorization and rote.¹⁷ Parker's thesis was to "center education around the child, and to correlate the subjects of the curriculum in such a way as to make them meaningful to the learner."¹⁸

---

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 137.
¹⁸ Ibid. p. 137.
In this century the ideas of John Dewey dominated until the sudden change after World War II; it was the age of progressive education, which was directed around the child's learning through active participation. Progressivism led to the idea that a teacher, inspired with zeal and enthusiasm, could make any new idea work, but an uninspired teacher could spend the same amount of time and not get any idea to work. Teaching was considered an individual art, methods could not be prescribed. Methods could be understood, but the dedicated and inspired teacher would adapt and improvise until he found means which were compatible with his own personality and the collective personality of his classroom.

The post World War II period saw massive attacks upon the public schools and upon education generally. Progressivism, previously held in high honor, went by the board under a barrage of criticism led by James B. Conant and Admiral Hyman G. Rickover.

Both men had their beginnings firmly in the military and scientific areas of American life. Burgess and Borrowman suggest that, in a paradoxical way, American public schools were relaxed and encouraged students to examine and explore their own interests and social commitments leisurely while around them the brutal economic situation of the 1930's and early 40's prevailed. Later, they say, pressure for productivity mounted, technological advances
became imperative, and scientific discoveries were absolute necessities. In this atmosphere both Conant and Rickover led a charge against education which dramatically changed the course of teaching and teacher education; a change which continues today and which will determine our future.

While the debate was about progressive schools and progressive education, in fact the theorists did not actually change the schools. There is little evidence to support the idea that much of the theory was translated into action and quite a bit of evidence to indicate that very little was. The gap between theorists and practitioners continues to be one of the big questions within the profession. More will be said about this in Chapter IV.

French suggests that the attacks of Conant and Rickover and others had less to do with their backgrounds in science than with their basic political conservatism and their ideas that American education was so basically socialistic that it would, ultimately, deliver this country into league with Soviet Russia. To both these men and other critics who joined them, and in keeping with the


20 French, op. cit., p. 137.
general public opinion of the 1950's, a liaison between Soviet Russia and the United States was the worst possible alternative for this country. The popular national sentiment was that Russia somehow loomed as a Super Power, out to destroy democracy, and even worse, democratic peoples. Brain washing and fear of a giant Soviet Big Brother were the ghosts which haunted many an American family, and this fear was reflected in all of the social and political actions of the time.

When Russia launched Sputnik I and left America temporarily behind in the space race, the controversy became centered on the schools. The idea that the schools could change society persisted, but this time there was a great difference. The fact that Russia had launched a missile into outer space before this country tried to do so meant that our schools had failed. And by this logic, the obvious conclusion was that progressive education had failed. Progressive educators were turning out lethargic children who could explore many areas but who were expert in none. Much was made about children dabbling into basket weaving and handicrafts instead of scholarly pursuits. Creative thought was disparaged and scientific inquiry was lauded. The demand was for expertise, specifically scientific expertise.
Ultimately, however, the need for scientific expertise became the need for technological know-how. What was seen as a reaction to Sputnik I probably was part of the massive technological revolution which was affecting all of this country---and indeed all of the world. In fact, this technological revolution may be the most important influence our educational system has had to face.

Technology and its impact on world culture did not suddenly appear, nor was the launching of Sputnik I any sort of turning point. It was, rather, one of a series of landmarks in the effects of man's increasingly apparent decision to honor method rather than humanistic approaches to the problems of life. Sputnik, however, did act as a catalyst for those who saw education as somehow the institution to blame when it appeared that American know-how and superiority had failed. This belief in American superiority is rooted in the Calvinist tradition of individual merit and man's ability to conquer all obstacles. It is significant that those who made the loudest outcry were men such as Conant and Rickover, whose reputations were made in the institutions of scientific and military endeavors, for this country has traditionally honored both nearly as much as it has honored education. Driven by a desire to prove that the American tradition could, indeed, raise men to glorious things, we fell into the spirit of technological advances naturally.
We also clung to a traditional idea of democracy and a fear of socialism or communism, while, as French suggested, failing to see that we indeed revered socialist institutions without seeing them as such—the prime example being our educational system. A combination of a political conservatism and a faith in technology drove such men as Conant and Rickover to launch massive attacks against schools. That they were listened to indicates the country was ready to believe such things. These men represented a type of thinking dominant in the country at the time.

In the following twenty years other changes in education and traditional humanistic approaches to teaching began to become more and more apparent. A look at men who represent aspects of these changes is necessary to determine where the contemporary educational system fits into the overall pattern.
CHAPTER III

PROTOTYPES OF CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

To understand what is happening in education in the 1970's and to make any projections about the future, it is important to examine what types of thinkers and scholars received wide public hearing in the years following the significant attacks upon the system after Russia's launching of Sputnik. No one man or educator, of course, dominated, nor did any particular school of thought. Nor does any one man represent a single point of view. Rather, in examining the major writings of the past twenty years, we find that educators' writings generally were in keeping with the prevailing trends in social and cultural forces. One writer may be seen to hold conflicting points of view, or may be seen to gradually shift emphasis, or to slide from one position to another along with sociological changes around him.

The writers to be presented for study here represent prototypes of educational criticism and inquiry indicative of the 1950's and 1960's. They each made significant contribution to the body of educational literature, but they also represent the writings
and practices of many other recognized and respected scholars. They have been selected for this study because they are prototypes and because it is believed that their writings reflect the changes from the traditional humanistic view of teaching to the ideas which have developed modern definitions of teachers and teaching.

None of the writers to be discussed should be categorized exactly because, as has been mentioned, they all represent several aspects of developing educational thought. For clarification and simplification in this study, the writers will be examined in groups which will be arbitrarily classified as Neo-Humanistic or Liberal, Conservative, Positivistic, Technological, and Existential or Neo-Romantic.

Gilbert Highet, whose work *The Art of Teaching*, has already been discussed, is a fine example of the type of inquiry classified here as Neo-Humanistic. As was described in Chapter II, Highet sees the ambiguity of the classroom, the conflict between the need for the teacher to speak to the inner student, to awaken the student's own natural curiosity and give it some direction and framework in which to proceed, and the need to master specific information which will serve as tools in different and more elaborate
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1Highet, op. cit.
inquiry. But, Highet, as do all of the Neo-Humanists to be discussed here, ultimately puts faith in the need to attract the rangeless possibilities of a student's mind, and in the belief that people by nature are basically humanitarian, and that given proper opportunity and encouragement they ultimately will seek an understanding of the various components of historical and philosophical tradition in order to give themselves a humane and moral way of life. Highet, as stated, believes in study and understanding of the world's great scholars, philosophers, and artists. He believes an individual's mind and spirit will be awakened to the possibilities within himself and he then will begin to develop those potentialities. This, he claims, is true of both student and teacher, and the pursuit of such high forms of knowledge by both consists of the art of teaching.

Highet is looking for a way for teachers to help prepare students to face the problems of life-adjustment, a phrase which was made popular by proponents of progressive education and which drew much criticism from its later opponents. But Highet is not seeking the same type of educational practices; instead he seems to be making a plea for a return to the classical European model of teacher as leader and student as disciple, and he puts his belief in the cooperative efforts of the two. His faith is that together teacher
and student will be able to discover truths about their own worlds and learn to live within them in a moral and humane way.

In the mid-forties Jacques Barzun, talking about education and the Teacher in America, began to touch upon teaching as an act of self-actualization. He noticed that everyone knows the difference between drudge and the Teacher. No one doubted, he recalled, the Teacher in Socrates, Jesus, Buddha and so forth. It was simply understood and known that these men were Teachers.

He made the implication that students also know the difference between the drudge and the Teacher, and that this is an important distinction and significant fact to keep in mind when looking at approaches to teaching. The beliefs put forth by the great Teachers of the world exist always and need to be advocated as strenuously as ever before; perhaps even more strenuously.

Barzun, another Neo-Humanist or Liberal thinker, notes that in recent years---and this was written in the 1940's---it was not that teaching was lost, but that regard for it was lost. This is a highly significant insight, because in the years since Barzun's comment, with investigative studies surrounding our schools,
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around inner city versus suburban schools, and the bombardment of books about why children can't or don't learn, regard for teaching has continued to decline.

Barzun honors tradition and the complex relationships inside a classroom and, like Hightet, comments that the teacher is always the student and the leader, too.

...... each instructor, if let alone, develops the manner suited to his talents. This implies that all "methods" in the "educator's" sense of the word are wholly beside the point. 3 

Barzun tells us that the teacher first needs to understand and accept himself before he can become the leader in the classroom. He talks about the disservice cold reason and orderly processes of the mind have done to teachers and teaching and makes the point that it is the disorderly probing and investigating done by an individual mind that brings us to insights and understandings, and helps us explore our ideas to their most distant points and grasp bits and pieces of the meaning of life.

In 1959 we find Barzun still recognizing the steady decline in respect for the profession of which he is a part. He worries that America seems to be putting itself against that which can ultimately

3 Ibid. p. 45.
He explains at length the reasons we are suspicious of the intellectual, but not of intellect itself.

Again, interpreting Barzun, one must notice that he touches upon an important insight, but does not explore it fully. For example, commenting that movements in school reform and teacher improvement have failed, he states it is because we mistrust the intellectual. He never grapples with the fact that he, too, is an intellectual and that it will not be a movement which will bring knowledge and intellectual growth to other teachers and students, but he who can do it in the classroom.

In *House of Intellect* Barzun predicted and foresaw a lot of what was to come in the decade immediately following the book's publication.

He properly assessed that portion of the public mind which does not question but assimilates all that goes on around it. He realizes that this nation will allow itself to be led, in spite of its Calvinist tradition of individual strength and perseverance, because a substantial portion of its citizens have been lulled into complacency by their very belief in the rightness of America. He understands that this paradox makes it possible for the nation to be

---

lulled into accepting mediocrity, or worse, as its best. Barzun recognizes that linguistic analysts have broken up the art of conversation, and has seen that "Americans began by loving youth, and now, out of adult self pity, they worship it."\(^5\)

(It must be noted that Barzun recognizes that America, in adapting the European child-centered approach to education, neglected a significant counterpart, that of having an entire culture support such an approach. Again, the curious ambiguity and paradox in America is adaptations of other traditions.\(^)\)

Barzun sees that in this nation the idea of helping a child has displaced the idea of teaching a child.\(^6\) In this way he rejects a part of progressive education and accepts the traditional view of teacher expressed by Highet. Barzun uses this as supportive of the why schools have failed; he indicates that teachers have made patients, research tools, sociological case studies of children and students instead of teaching them and helping them grow in intellectual pursuits and the ability to reason. His attack here is similar to the attacks of conservatives; as a Liberal, he has elements of Conservatism, also.

\(^5\)Ibid. p. 95.

\(^6\)Ibid. p. 102.
Finally Barzun predicts that in colleges and universities teachers will be doing less and less teaching, that teaching will be assigned to graduate students. He flatly deplores the fact that this nation, which makes general and liberal education an ideal, in actuality makes the ideal impossible by the way schools are run and classes are taught.

Intellect, he says, has been subdued to pedagoguery, and the nation has fallen in love with movements, such as testing services, and methodological changes. He predicts the language and ideas of new-think and IBM and warns that intellect is in serious peril if educators do not take heed and revere the workings of the mind more than the ways the mind works.

All of this becomes profoundly clear in the late 1960's when students themselves began to tear their universities apart with charges that echoed Barzun's warnings. But there is one especially significant factor: the beginning of the student protests was reflected at Columbia University, Barzun's own university, as dramatically and as shockingly as it was at any other spot in the nation. Indeed, Barzun was unable to convince his own students
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and colleagues, apparently, as he sought to convince an anonymous public for his books, that the moments of peril were in fact here.

In his study of the American University, based upon his own knowledge of Columbia and ultimately upon his examination of other large universities, Barzun sees that in order to catch up and modernize the university has entered the public marketplace, and ideas and thoughts have become a marketable commodity along with stocks and bonds, computers, and cars.

He urges that "Freedom must be salvaged out of the previous lack of system (of the university) without replacing the anarchy of laissez-faire by that of bad bureaucracy." He states and restates that the university has taken on too much; that it has offered a proliferation of courses coupled with a flight from teaching; that there are no longer models for teaching, teachers, or students, and that in competition with the public market, the university has become more like an empire than a place of learning.

Barzun's criticisms are similar to the cries of his students in the 1960's, when student revolt and violent demonstration reflected a tragic disillusionment in the education system. This
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student disillusionment will be discussed at length later, but in examining Barzun it must be mentioned that he wants life in the university not to be just another year in any non-specific place. He wants university life to have a special meaning of its own, where student and teacher together can explore and expand and grow as human beings. He wants teaching to be an art; he wants it removed from a decaying position. He deplores the cult of informality, or that of the strict methodologist; he wants the best of the lecture method retained--that part which clearly conveyed order and connection between differing parts and types of information and which should lead to increased knowledge and insight. He is against increased specialization until classrooms and subjects are but fragments of a whole. He knows that students have begun to ask themselves what a subject "does for the soul as against the professional journals." He knows there is a giant morality gap in the university; between the administration and its faculty, between the faculty and its students, and between the university and the larger community surrounding it.

Barzun says we will have to come to grips with and decide whether we want our universities to be places of learning or public

\[11\] Ibid. p. 78.
utilities, and he yearns for a time when teaching will be less cant and more actualization of persons of dignity.

Barzun applauds Columbia University for withstanding the pressures of both progressives and technocrats and trying to maintain a balance. He praises the administration of President Grayson Kirk and the changes it has made. He uses Columbia as an example of how a university can remain more like a republic and less like an empire at the very time its students occupied President Kirk's office and so completely disrupted the university that it closed. Barzun understood his students but he remained aloof. He observed and commented, but did not participate.

Jerome Bruner, a social scientist examining the role of the educator in the social sciences, seems to have understood more clearly than Barzun some of the elements lacking in our teachers and our system of education. In an essay in the Harvard Educational Review in 1961, Bruner pointed out that we must give credit to the "self-propelled thinker" in the student. He understood and
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discussed the problem of perfection of intellectual pursuits and the uniquely personal self; but he believed that each person must search out and find his own relationship with his environment and that the teacher, more than any other, can help in this search—provided he is involved in it, too.

In classifying Bruner with the Neo-Humanists, it must be carefully noted that, for the purposes of this study, a selective interpretation of his works is given. For much of Bruner's work can be classified with the technologists; Bruner is a scientist and is concerned with scientific method and how scientific inquiry should be used in the educational system and for the advancement and improvement of society. He departs from other scientists and technologists, however, in his recognition of the humanist's contributions historically, and in the amount of attention he pays to the humanistic tradition in education.

Bruner sees in the educator, as well as in the student, the need for constant examination and re-evaluation of information, morality, ethics, and the data which comes from the sciences. His major difference from many scientists is that he reveres and honors the dreamer or the philosopher.  
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scientific models, and recognizes that we have lost models for the dreamer. He says, "A child copes with problems as he masters information, but not only in behavioral ways; he needs to understand what is going on around him, the information needs to be a means for the child to understand and realize his own self, too." He warns that teachers must think of the child as someone who needs practice in inquiry, not more and more information. With increased technological methods and bits of scientific knowledge available, and invading every part of our lives, Bruner points out, teaching must convey to the child that it is not the storage of information that is important, but the retrieval of it when it can help us become more fully human beings.

This approach to teaching is reflected by Bruner even though he approaches teaching from the social scientist's and curriculum developer's position. He understands that not teaching devices but teachers are the principal agents of instruction. In his report of the Woods Hole Conference of 1959, Bruner predicts that the decade ahead would be a decade of debate over how much the teacher could contribute or how much the teacher could be

16 Bruner, op. cit., p. 29.

helped technologically to contribute to the student and his learning.

For Bruner, involved as he was in the study of the social sciences and scientific research, there was never any question but that human emotions, dreams, and pure questioning had to be preserved. He understood that we were becoming a nation in love with method; he fought to preserve the dreamer.

Even as he stressed structure, processes in education, he drew back and pointed out that there is an essential self-involving matter which is important.

Mastery of the fundamental ideas of a field involves not only the grasping of general principles, but also the development of an attitude toward learning and inquiry, toward guessing and hunches, toward the possibility of solving problems on one's own. 18

To instill such attitudes by teaching requires something more than the mere presentation of fundamental ideas. Just what it takes to bring off such teaching is something on which a great deal of research is needed, but it would seem that an important ingredient is a sense of excitement about discovery--discovery of regularities of previously unrecognized relations and similarities between ideas, with a resulting sense of self confidence in one's abilities. 19

18 Ibid., p. 20.
19 Ibid., p. 20.
These statements come from a curriculum expert who does have and has had a reverence for the ways of science, but who understands that there is something more needed, and that it falls in line with the dreamer, the philosopher, the teacher who will join the act of inquiry in a disorderly way to help in the search for self-actualization.

Bruner states that the teacher must risk presenting a shaky hypothesis to the student, otherwise why would the student risk his own shaky hypothesis. He says that "To communicate knowledge and to provide a model of competence, the teacher must be free to teach and to learn."\textsuperscript{20} He believes the teacher must be an "immediately personal symbol of the educational process, a figure with whom students can identify and compare themselves."\textsuperscript{21} If this is so, then the teacher must be constantly and endlessly engaged in the search for knowledge of self and his relationship to the environment and people around him if he is to be a model for his students.

This scientific man can also write a great tribute to the humanist in our lives. In \textit{On Knowing, Essays For The Left Hand},

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. p. 90.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid. p. 90.
Bruner\textsuperscript{22} sings a hymn of praise to the dreamer, the philosopher, the myth in life, the metaphoric understanding of creativity. He senses and he proclaims that we can do much worse in life than to try to live with its ambiguities. In addition, he suggests that we will be better off living with the ambiguities between the scientist who works with reason and the dreamer who plays with hunches and reaches for the stars, than in trying to eliminate them. In the elimination, he suggests, we may create a monster which will make life unliveable for us all. Bruner would like for us to have a new frontier, a frontier for "the full use of human beings."\textsuperscript{23} And though in the end he acknowledges his own biases as a scientist, he believes the future potential humanism is more challenging, offers more hope, and more beauty, than a future devoted only to science.

Throughout the turmoil of the 60's Bruner saw the decay and disintegration of teaching and teachers. He wrote, in 1971, of The Relevance of Education\textsuperscript{24} at a time when everyone seemed to want relevance in everything. Even then he remained constant

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22}Bruner, op. cit.
\item \textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid.} p. 165.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Jerome Bruner, The Relevance of Education (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1971.)
\end{itemize}
in his belief that it was through thought, not examination and pure research, that we could perfect ourselves and seek to right a world gone mad. He revered the range of man's intellect, its power to be challenged from within and without, and its ability to function independently of the technology imposed upon it.

Bruner states that in our technological society education will have to become a way of life because the technology will impose more and more demands upon us. He saw, as Barzun did not seem to, that we were engaged in a romance with the technological, the method; our love affairs were with machines not with people. Bruner does not give in to the technological; he urges that in teaching we "search out the deeper, underlying ideas to teach, rather than presenting the technical surface that is so likely to change." 25

For the curriculum expert, he suggests that good problems are more important than a well defined curriculum; and these good problems, he states, are the problems one has in learning how to find one's own self and relationship to a hostile and non-human world. He consistently mentions the need for teachers to

25 Ibid. p. 103.
internalize and act upon their own discovery of self in their work, and in that way show students how to internalize knowledge and use it for their own human good.

As to relevance, he states: "But I do not believe that the cure in the classroom is to be endlessly concerned with the immediacy of such issues—sacrificing social relevance to personal excitement." Relevance, he suggests, depends largely upon who you are and where you are at a given moment; he suggests that we put aside the matters of relevance and deal more fully and more completely with the basic issues of life.

"Education must no longer strike an exclusive posture of neutrality and objectivity," he writes. "Knowledge, we know now as never before, is power. That does not mean that there are no canons of truth or that the idea of proof is not a precious one. Rather, let knowledge as it appears in our schooling be put into the context of action and commitment."

Bruner is stating that the power is in ourselves, not to be part of the great public mind, of which Barzun spoke, that is lulled into apathy and assimilation and acceptance. Bruner wants
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teachers to instill in the young the belief that they have the power within themselves to change their own lives, to change them to work for human growth, human development, rather than for increased de-humanization and technological advancement.

Consistently we seem to find serious scholars and men who are dedicated to students and teaching, whose vision falls just short of the total picture of how teaching should be approached. The fault, as has been mentioned, lies not with their individual ideas, but with the fact that they have not, themselves, internalized what they have spoken.

In Sidney Hook we find another such example. Hook can be classified as a Neo-Humanist, a Liberal, but elements of his thought fall into the classification of Conservative, also, in that he is concerned with the profession's image rather than with contributions. Hook gives us more insight into who the teacher should be and how we find him, and this insight is with the humanistic thinkers and he takes a liberal position in regard to the individual teacher and his freedom to make significant personal contributions. But he is concerned about the invasion of the profession from the outside; he has the respect for teaching and teachers that Barzun warned that we, as a nation, were losing. But Hook's concern is
with those without the profession who would mold it and, ultimately
dilute and change it. He stands for the opposite of the conservative
charges of an Admiral Rickover; he is concerned about the invasion
of Rickover into the province of professional educators. But it is,
ultimately the opposite side of the same coin.

He is eloquent when he speaks of the teacher. He
knows that as all teachers reflect on their own past they see
individuals, not methods or techniques. He understands and states
that teachers in the past have done more than simply offer
instruction in a certain subject matter; they have contributed
substantially to the manner in which lives are molded; they have
served for us as moral, spiritual, and ethical models. For this
reason it is imperative that teachers know fully and instinctively
what it is they set out to do when they embark upon the profession.

As adults when we look back on our
educational past, we remember teachers, not
methods or techniques or even the special
content of their instruction. Their influence
on our lives, our ideals of conduct, standards
of judgement, secret ambitions and hopes, even
our choice of life careers is often unknown to
them. Unconsciously we learn from everyone
but we have a tendency to resist those whose
explicit business is not to teach us. Only to

28 Sidney Hook, Heresy, Yes - Conspiracy, No (New York:
The John Day Company, 1953)
the teacher do we willingly open ourselves to influence without feeling belittled or resentful or ashamed of our ignorance. In some ways the relation of teacher and student is as intimate as that of physician and patient. There is still a kernel of truth in the ancient notion that the teacher especially in his concern for wisdom, is the physician of the soul. He occupies a privileged position of trust not always reflected in the emoluments of social esteem accorded him by the community. 29

Hook wrote this in the 50's, and since that time the privileged position of trust he so clearly saw for the teacher has been violated; students do not trust their teachers in the ways Hook meant them to. (In fact, to a large extent teachers in their predeliction for improved teaching methods and extended use of teaching aids surrendered the right to be trusted by their students. The result was student rebellion.)

Hook talks about the self-actualization of the teacher.

There can be no emotional maturity, of course, without knowledge, but knowledge of the ways of things is not sufficient to achieve it. Ability to handle formulas or to predict the interacting behaviors of material substances, as many teachers know, can go hand in hand with an opacity to human relationships and the complexity of social interactions. Emotional maturity seems to depend more upon knowledge of self and others, upon proper historical

29 Ibid., p. 140-141.
perspective, an awareness of how often the best of men fall short of their own ideals. It avoids the assumption that because men are not angels, they are beasts and conversely. The emotionally mature do not lose their sense of wonder and awe at the spectacle of human existence against the infinite backdrop of the cosmos but neither are they continually being surprised by events. They do not confuse innocence with virtue or deplore human finitude as natural depravity. They are skeptical of large claims without being cynical, and their faith, even when deep, is not fanatical.

Hook tells us that the teacher must do more than get the student to think, he must get the student to think about himself in relationship to all of the major fields of human interest; he must get the student to find some meaning for himself and his own life against the perspective of all that has preceded him. Only then will he gain insight into the future.

Hook also warns that a teacher will not instill in students a worship of facts, but instead will help the student understand facts only as tools for use in opening the deeper mysteries of life. Hook wants the teacher to help the student find alternatives, to define and work within all areas of life's ambiguity, as well as within a specific field. In order to do this, Hook says, the teacher must
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himself be searching for the alternatives, defining, along with his 
students, his own place in relationship to the rest of the world, and 
must even be looking for ways he can live with the ambiguities in 
his own life.

Hook, as has been mentioned, also was concerned with 
influences outside the profession, especially in academic freedom 
for the teacher. He became more and more concerned, with the 
possible influences of communism and its dangers, or imagined 
dangers, inside the profession. Hook, a liberal insofar as his 
concern for teaching as an art and as a humanitarian influence upon 
the lives of students, a liberal in his concern for the teacher's need 
to establish and maintain an academic purity inside his own classroom, 
becomes a conservative when political matters are raised.

In the collection of essays In Defense of Academic Freedom, 32 
Hook, and the authors whose views he has assembled, places the 
blame for the extremely discomforting and often violent student 
activities of the recent past upon the students or upon administrators. 
If students and younger faculty members are, as Hook states, 33 
irrational and intolerant, are authoritarian and inflexible in their 

32 Hook, ed., In Defense of Academic Freedom (New York: 
Pegasus, 1971)

33 Ibid. p. 196.
demands, Hook must share some of the blame for failing to live up to the model of teacher he described two decades earlier and whose classroom and freedom he has defended.

One final example of a Neo-Humanist and liberal educational thought is Philip H. Phenix, who has struggled with the same problems as those mentioned by the previous writers. His book Philosophy of Education, written at the end of the 1950's, resembles much that was written at that time. He was not attacking education or the model of progressive education. Like others, and like many of the more conservative writers, he was concerned with the Christian teacher, educating for a democratic way of Life. Like Bruner he was concerned that we preserve the dreamer and the scientist. Like Hook he was insistent that we educate so that students could function as total human beings, not as frightened, confused experts in single fields. Phenix chose to call the teacher a "maker of persons." The actual wording is not significant; what is significant is that he saw, like Highet and all of the others, that the teacher needs to be that person concerned with all of life, not with

certain aspects of it, and that the concern and the search need to be continuous.

Phenix holds some of the Existentialist position toward education, also. In Realms of Meaning he states that we are educating for life; that we are educating so that a man may find freedom within himself; that we must learn to know and to be, that we must acknowledge the absurdity in our lives and exert the courage to become fully free and human in spite of that absurdity.

Phenix makes the plea that education be an education for life and that it never stop within the teacher, because as the world around him changes the teacher must understand what about himself must change and what must remain constant. Phenix tried to use this basic understanding of the teacher and the act of teaching to develop a curriculum. In other words, he tried to turn the nature of the teacher into the nature of a curriculum. In doing so he, too, engaged in one of the absurdities about which he seems to understand and write so fully. He tried to solve the ambiguities and absurdities he has urged us to accept.

Deep questioning, he tells us, is the basis of philosophic inquiry, and philosophic inquiry must be the function of education.

________________________

Education must stimulate imagination; imagination must be the basis for a general education which prepares persons to go forward in life.

The Trend to Conservatism

One of the critics of the 1950's who joined with Rickover and others in attacking the child-centered approach to education, and one who spoke out before the launching of Sputnik, is Arthur E. Bestor. Bestor is one of our best examples of a Neo-Humanist who became very conservative in regard to the classroom and approaches to teaching. He wanted the humane teacher, but he was strict—conservative—in his definitions of what the humane teacher should be doing in the classroom.

*Educational Wastelands* tells us that schools have failed students, and, worse yet, have violated the public trust and failed in the responsibility originally given them. Bestor says it is not lack of effort which made the schools fail, but lack of direction. He believes that teachers can be the models described by Highet and other Neo-Humanists, but he also believes that there must be limits placed on the teacher. He thinks the progressive era encouraged the teacher to deal with trivia and ignore content.

---
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"The issue in American education today," he wrote, "is not drawn between those who believe in scholarship but are indifferent to good teaching, and those who believe in good teaching but are indifferent to scholarship. The issue is drawn between those who believe that good teaching should be directed to sound intellectual ends, and those who are content to dethrone intellectual values and cultivate techniques of teaching for their own sake, in an intellectual and cultural vacuum." 39

Bestor believes that pedagogy itself is a science and treats it as such; he disclaims that it should deal with ultimate and philosophical questions. In this he shows his conservatism. He wants the limits for the teacher and content to be defined. In fact, he claims that progressive education is more aptly named regressive education. He wants the teacher as a model for life and morality; but he defines that morality and that way of life—and the definition is that of traditional American Christian democracy. Bestor believes that pedagogues (and he specifically means those who propose progressive education) have "completely divorced schools from the basic disciplines of science and learning." 40

39 Ibid. p. 11
40 Ibid. p. 44.
He continues:

Intellectual training, once the unquestioned focus of every educational effort has been pushed out to the periphery of the public school program. Into the vacuum have rushed the "experts" from state departments and colleges of education; the curriculum doctors, the integrators, the life-adjusters--the specialists in know-how rather than knowledge. Out of their overflowing minds they offer to furnish ready-made philosophy to guide the entire educational system. All that scientists and scholars need do is supply the little facts to fill up the blanks in the great schemata which the educationists devise. The curriculum engineers will do the rest. They will be happy to draw the really vital generalizations from the data which grubbers in laboratories and libraries so obligingly but so uninspiredly amass. They will point out to the teachers (unimaginative dullards, as they see them) the relationships that exist among the great fields of knowledge. That a discipline may have order, logic, and proportion within itself is a fact that seems to have escaped their notice. Is it any wonder that the curricula of so many American public schools today are so trivial, so unbalanced, so out of harmony with the thinking of trained scientists and scholars that they constitute a mere parody of education? 41

The lengthy quote from *Educational Wastelands* is given here because it is indicative of the type of attack Bestor made upon the child-centered approach in 1953 and is but a small sample of the more violent attacks made upon the public school system later in the same decade.

41 Ibid. p. 44.
Bestor was not someone outside of the profession attacking it, but a humanatistic person within the profession. He believed that teacher education belonged in the university setting as a vital part of a total university program; he believed strongly in the total man, in learning in the complete sense and not in specialization. But he was conservative enough to believe that child-centered had meant dabbling and trivia. That a teacher was a moral and spiritual leader he did not question. But he felt that the limits of philosophical and scientific inquiry had been described and defined and that teachers needed to stay within them and that "pedagogues" needed to stay outside of them.

It must be made clear that Bestor did not believe in specialization and expertise as the later technologists did; he was not a methodologist, but he could not and did not give unlimited freedom inside the classroom or the profession to teachers or teacher educators. He wanted a liberal curriculum for the education of teachers, based, as he said, on the principles of liberal arts and sciences, and he felt that then the American educational system could be restored to its true position and re-set upon the path it was designed to follow.

Bestor believed in education, public education for all, and in teacher-student inquiry. He simply could not allow for no limits
and ambiguities.

"The first duty of education is to make possible the survival of our country," says an archtypical example of conservatism toward the American public school system as it was expressed in the 1960's. That statement was made by Max Rafferty in the foreword to his book *Suffer, Little Children*. Rafferty, a Californian, who was in a position to implement his views as head of the state's public school system, felt that to adjust to the Twentieth Century was to come to terms with madness, and, although many Existential or Neo-Romantic thinkers might agree with him, it would be for entirely different reasons.

Rafferty shares the views of other Neo-Humanistic thinkers that education is an art, and should be geared toward the individual. He rants against utilitarianism and the pragmatists, and any school program which suggested adjustments to environment. Here his basic conservatism is totally apparent. He would adjust the environment to *us*, and "*us*", as his writings and his actual practices
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showed, is defined as middle class, white American Christian, conservative people.

Rafferty shared Bestor's concern that some of the problems surrounding education were in danger of being solved by the wrong persons, and he, also, felt that the schools had been teaching trivia. But he went much further than Bestor and stated that matters such as federal aid to education and racial integration—the great social problems of the country—were simply not in the scope of education. 45

Like many who want to defend the status quo, or the status quo for them, Rafferty said he was concerned about standards and the maintainence of educational standards and excellence. When he defined standards his position became that of an elitist. He rants about the "slobs" and "punks" who are given credence in classrooms, and states they should not be allowed into schools at all. The lower classes he states should not even come into contact with public education. These lower classes, he defines, as the "slobs and punks" who will not even conform to the standards of dress, cleanliness, morality and so forth. His arguments become circular—and worse yet, blatantly elitist and racist.


46 Ibid., pp. 80-81.
One of the most interesting of Rafferty's proposals is his plan for the education of the gifted, in which he would not only put intellectually gifted students in special classes, but also in homes which had been carefully screened for the proper intellectual and social environment and allow these students back into the community for short periods or visits with their families. 47

It is not necessary to dwell on proposals such as these. But Rafferty's thought also is prototypical of the more extreme and conservative reactions to the launching of Sputnik and all of the social, cultural, and educational upheaval which followed in this country.

Positivism in Educational Theory

Writing concurrently with some of the writers discussed and continuing into the period of the 60's are educational theorists whose works are here categorized as Positivistic. Some of these persons, as they move with social and cultural trends become similar to those who will be discussed later under the classification Technologists.

These authors, of which B. Othanel Smith is an example, understood the dilemma of the co-called pragmatist, and his brother

47 Ibid., p. 81.
in opposite, the expert. They were looking for ways to combat the
cult of the practical, the cult of the expert, and find some means
to guide teachers to a center; to help teachers, and ultimately
students, to gain perspective on the two, and to improve the quality
of education and teaching in the process. Smith and his colleagues
dealt with the need for teachers to understand value judgements and
their roles in the classroom experience; they were, in fact,
searching for ways to improve practical wisdom in relationship to
the academic wisdom a teacher acquires in his own education, and to
the larger community in which he and his student find themselves.
They put great emphasis on the fact that the role of judgement must
be considered in relation to situations which are part of a greater
pattern; Smith defines and gives examples of both. There is both
implicit and explicit faith in the interrelatedness of the single
judgement of one man and the collective judgement of his times.

In the concluding chapter of this early book by Smith, one
finds a striking comparison to the ethical and moral values of both
Maritain and deChardin.

---

To the educator in a democracy the development of such methodological, moral character in those being educated becomes the inspiration and the goal of professional effort. This goal defines for the educator the kind of persons a good educational program will develop. When he knows what the traits, qualities, and abilities of desirable democratic characters should be, he has a gold mine of suggestions for molding a program of education for them.  

Smith and colleagues clearly believe, at this point, that the character of the teacher is of utmost importance; that one must try to cultivate in the teacher an understanding of self and devotion to a set of principles, or ethical standards so that this faith in personal character can be passed on to students. The book and the program for developing such a character in the teacher clearly reflect this nation's Puritan background. The thinking is similar to the national pattern following the upheaval of the 40's and World War II; the study works toward educating for a calm and untroubled educational system with teachers and students of good solid, moral, democratic character but ignores to large extent the signs of what was to come. Smith, unlike Highe, in his studies only alludes to the real meaning of technological advances.

The study preceeded the release of Sputnik and the consequent massive technological push. However Smith, et. al. do not

49 Ibid., p. 254.
ignore the impact of the push toward technocratic man and a
technological society. They are concerned with the meaning of an
increasingly mechanized society; they recognize and speak to the
need for the teacher to somehow remain separate from the scientific,
the judgement-free, the mechanized trends around him. Yet, they
are at the same time concerned with symbolic language; they are
looking for ways to compartmentalize and analyze character traits;
yet they are beginning the steps toward methodological reverence and a
teacher who is somehow detached from his own total self, while and
when he is behaving as teacher. Nevertheless, their ultimate
conclusion, at this time, was that the country's educational system and
its individual teachers must be schooled to "further the communion
of men and to counteract the disintegration that now drives toward
mutual destruction."\textsuperscript{50}

Smith's own posture twenty years later in relationship to
this prophetic reference to the drive toward disintegration and mutual
destruction is relevant and to the point of this inquiry. It has been
observed that persons seldom are able to see themselves in relation
to their own areas of expertise and their own relationship to history

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., p. 282.
and society. Thus it is that a David Truman and a Jacques Barzun can be present at Columbia University in the years immediately preceding and during the first of the major university upheavals and not be able to do anything about what is happening or to see their own roles.

That Smith had great faith in the Christian aspects of an American democratic way of life is further exemplified in his Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. It is significant that this study toward curriculum development is heavily weighed with how one designs a Christian program leading to Christian citizenship in an American democracy, and that the curriculum is specially designed to perpetuate the values then revered and upheld in our prevailing social system. Smith, thus reflects the conservatism of Bestor and others, but he looks toward positive ways of maintaining that which

51 Truman, a political science professor turned University Provost, and one of the leading authorities on the formation and activities of pressure and special interests groups, was as much caught in and trapped by the Columbia University situation as Grayson Kirk. Some of his public statements at the time reflect that he was unable to see himself or the University he represented in perspective when he was in the center of the very types of activities which he so brilliantly described in The Governmental Process (New York: Alred A. Knopf, 1951).

is good and improving it. He is not debunking other efforts, he is simply looking for more practical ways of making the system work in the most positive way. Smith and colleagues were upholding and treasuring the value of understanding the heritage from which we all spring; they were operating on the assumption that man must be aware of his own choices in an historical and value oriented tradition; that our choices reflect philosophical backgrounds.

How different then is Smith's 1970 Study of the Logic of Teaching. The movement has been from the theory of life to the practical aspects of teaching. In other words Smith now is concerned with the mechanical ways teachers behave in classrooms; the cycle is completed. He has reflected his own involvement in twenty years of change, but more specifically in the changes of the last decade. Now he is not predicting a social disintegration, but seems, in fact, to be contributing to it. He is not looking at the teacher as a human being who is in the total human struggle, but is differentiating the teacher's separate and specific actions. Smith is talking about the variables of teaching behavior in the manner in which the political scientist talks about the variables of voting behavior without looking

---

at individual voters, or the sociologist talks about the variables of
ghetto behavior without looking at individuals who happen to live in
the center of our cities. The effort to draw together a number of
interrelated parts has exactly the opposite effect, it further fragments
an environment which has lost its models and is moving ever more
rapidly toward the total disintegration Smith saw twenty years earlier.

Smith is not a technologist in the pure sense; but he is a
positivist. He is giving positivistic models now and he is trying,
more and more, to provide methods which will lead to answers.
From a position which once emphasized the need for the teacher to
deal in human values in a total community context, Smith moved to
the positivistic position of dealing in value-free teaching behavior.
He describes the activities of a classroom in terms of episodes of
specific sets of behavioral factors. The act of teaching begins to be
fragmented into pieces of a puzzle which must fit together to describe
and define a particular logic, concerned with validating single episodes
in a classroom separated from the community in which it exists and
which it serves. Indeed the students and the teacher seem to be
separated from each other as their verbal exchanges are analyzed and
scrutinized and routinized. In the analysis of the logic of teaching,
Smith has so methodically described behavior that the eccentric -
both the eccentric teacher and the eccentric student - have been ruled
out. There will be some definition for them, but it will be in terms of deviance, which can and will be interpreted as a deviance which must be corrected, or cured, not a deviance which in its own self must be honored and preserved, which by its difference can define our own activities.

It is significant to note that in this study the student is described by his choices of categories which the teacher sets down for him, either directly or indirectly; the student is not seen as contributing his own unique presence and unique logic to the classroom situation any more than the teacher is seen as reflecting his own unique heritage and human presence to the classroom. But this is not because Smith is not genuinely concerned about the teacher. It seems to be more because he has adopted a modern positivistic approach to teaching.

It is extremely important to note that the entire view of classroom exchanges is based upon what types of information the teacher wants to emphasize; there is no examination of the types of information the student wants to bring out. In fact, where descriptions of the different episodes of teaching show that the student has, in fact, discovered and responded to a unique interpretation of literature, or mathematical principle, or historical moment, the teacher is shown to comment only that the discovery is interesting, or to ask another
question which will acknowledge that the student has come to his own flash of insight and then lead the discussion back to where the teacher wants it to go.

What is disturbing about all of this is that it presents the student and the teacher in an increasingly mechanical fashion. It is a study which has left out the belief in a Christian ethic and dignity which Smith so passionately defended earlier. The human struggle has been eliminated; the classroom struggle is only to cover certain types of material in particular time spans in the most efficient way. The question needs to be posed as to how efficient a classroom should ever be. We can have efficient IBM machines, and efficient recording and taping processes, but we have been shown that these tools of efficiency invade our very homes, rule out our privacy, reduce our struggle for meaning and knowledge of self to a pattern which can be explained away by a Health-Tex commercial for television specials.

54 In recent months Health-Tex clothing manufacturing company has sponsored a series of television specials, ranging from examination of life in other countries to reports on life in this country's cities. Commercials begin with such questions as "Mommy, where did I come from," and the answers are provided by a voice-over speaker who then tells the audience, "These are just some of the easy answers to difficult questions provided for you by Health-Tex, who cares as much for your child's ideas as for his health." Some of the difficult questions covered by the easy answers include race relations and the matter of war and peace. There is something
If Smith became more positivistic in his works of the 60's, he was not alone, nor was he a forerunner in the sense that he anticipated or started a movement. There are other examples of positivistism in the approach to teaching written at the same time. Those works are not reactions to Sputnik, but, reflected the gradual movement of Twentieth Century America toward a increasingly technological bias.

Benjamin S. Bloom, in *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, represents a part of this trend to classification, categorization, specialization. In his introduction, Bloom notes the classification is designed to help teachers realize what actually is taking place in their classrooms and to make the contact between students and teacher more efficient. Bloom describes the frequent

---


56 Ibid. pp. 6-7.

drastically wrong if mental and physical health can be equated with the type of clothing worn by a child and the idea that there is an easy answer to the primary question of history, the meaning of Life and Death. It is of the same order as Levi-Strauss providing us with a fashion which then becomes part of the uniform of the Uni-sex generation. When we have lost our identities, anything is possible. If mothers need Health-Tex Corporation to provide three-minute television commercial answers to life's great struggles, children do not need mothers and Women's Liberation is right.
"disappointing interchanges between student and teacher" and tries to "facilitate an exchange of information" between student and teacher. He deliberately tries to avoid value judgements.

The taxonomy, Bloom explains, was designed to help teachers and curriculum developers, and to define what happens in classrooms so that the entire process may facilitate communication. The words he uses show the dramatic and drastic contrast between what the Neo-Humanists and the Positivists were trying to do, and reflect a substantial shift in the national culture. There is no longer a humanistic model for the teacher, instead the model is in terms of processes. Teachers are moving toward becoming facilitators. The ideal of leadership and a mutuality of student and teacher pursuing a sense of meaning in human activities has gone. The entire notion of student-teacher communication has become formalized and absolutist.

Bloom recognizes the danger of this in his explanation of how the taxonomy was prepared and he says that "Although this was recognized as a very real danger, one solution for this problem appeared to be setting the taxonomy at a level of generality where the loss by fragmentation would not be too great."  

---

57 Ibid., p. 32.  
58 Ibid., p. 33.
This language differs only slightly from that of the laboratory technician who talks about the loss in energy level from a test substance exposed to the air for too long a time. Perhaps that is where the ultimate criticism of the taxonomy and the effort that went into producing it must lie: students, teachers, and classrooms were subjected to extraordinary scrutiny so that all actions and reactions could be classified, labeled and itemized, much as one would classify, label and itemize the actions and reactions of certain chemicals placed together in one test tube. But a classroom is not a test tube and students are not chemicals.

In the literature which preceded Bloom, the relationship between student and teacher was recognized but not formalized. Bloom made the change when he tried to classify and formalize, and ruled out spontaneity and ambiguity. The language he uses has been transferred into a symbolism that relates more closely to algebraic equations than to the symbolism of a rich and abundant tradition of literature and philosophy. Studies such as Bloom's have turned the classroom into a laboratory; the art of teaching has turned into the method of teaching and human trial and error has changed into an exercise in method.

Bloom, in looking for a Utopian classroom, echoes the scientific-Utopia of B. F. Skinner. Perhaps nothing so clearly
demonstrates positivism in teaching as *Walden Two*.  

Skinner, like writer George Orwell, predicted what the early movements of the 40's were leading to: behavioral engineering, positive reinforcement. In this current decade we are dealing with more than behavioral engineering, it is genetic engineering. Positive reinforcement is the same as Sesame Street or the practice of having children buy rewards for lessons learned.

In *Walden Two*, Skinner has an answer for all of the critics; the philosophers, theologians, social scientists, and educators. His Utopia was ordered, provides for attacks from inside and outside,

---


60 The idea of positive and/or immediate reinforcement for classroom behavior deemed excellent by the teacher is not new, and is written about regularly. The "Behavior Analysis Classroom" was again described in The New York Times on Sunday, February 25, 1973, Section E, p. 7, when Education Editor Fred M. Hechinger reviewed the reward system set up in Public School 77, New York City. The children in P, S. 77 start with the reinforcement technique, described in *Walden Two*, when they enter kindergarten. They earn tokens for achievement, thus allowing them to "buy" whatever it is they want most in the school setting, ranging from playing with the classroom pets to watching educational television. The principal of the school explained to Hechinger in an interview that the reinforcement system seemed to be upgrading academic test scores for children from poverty areas, and said that it seemed to be teaching the children that they are individuals. The concept of individuality in this article fits exactly with Skinner's individuality in *Walden Two*.
produced placid, non-aggressive persons whose ordered lives could see them through any situation—but all situations have been ordered for them in advance. Skinner has ruled out the ambiguities of life in his behavioral engineering of a society.

For this study two long quotes are relevant. Skinner saw the youth rebellion which was to come: In a conversation between Castle, who ultimately rejects Walden Two, and Burris we read:

For one thing, he said, you can be sure someone will "get" Frazier before things have gone much farther. It may be the government, it may be rival religious or economic forces, or perhaps just some envious individual inside or outside the community. But someone will get him, you may be sure of that. Joseph Smith was murdered by an angry mob, Eric Janson was shot by a jealous rival, John Humphrey Noyes fled to Canada. Look at history man!

I knew what Frazier would say to that. These early communities had almost nothing in common with Walden Two, in fact or in theory. How could one draw any inferences? Frazier had seen the danger of aggression against Walden Two, and had provided for it well enough.

The possibility of working out a satisfying life of one's own, making the least possible contact with the government, was the brightest spot in Frazier's argument. I thought of the millions of young people who were at that moment choosing places in a social and economic structure in which they had no faith. What a discrepancy between ideal
and actuality—between their good will toward men and the competitive struggle in which they must somehow find a place! Why should they not work out a world of their own? 61

Skinner knew that young people would be trying to find their own world; his own Walden Two has become an example for many of the disillusioned and disenchanted young of the 60's and 70's who are trying to find an alternative to the world they now inhabit.

Another pertinent and lengthy quotation is in order:

Castle's voice broke into my mediations. ..... behavioral engineering, he was saying. If you really had a technology which could manipulate human behavior, you could raise some puzzling questions. But isn't that wishful thinking?

The evidence, I thought, seemed clear enough. Frazier had claimed some innovations in behavioral techniques which I wanted to know more about, but I could imagine a potent technology composed of the principles already used by politicians, educators, priests, advertisers, and psychologists. The techniques of controlling human behavior were obvious enough. The trouble was, they were in the hands of the wrong people—or of feeble repairmen. Frazier had not only correctly evaluated this situation but had done something about it. I was not ready to accept his educational practices as unquestionably the best. Frazier himself still regarded them as experimental. But they were at least well along toward a crucial test, which was more than could be said for their counterparts in the world at large. Their

61 Ibid., p. 307.
potency had already been too clearly demonstrated elsewhere in their misuses. Frazier had all the technology he could possibly need.\textsuperscript{62}

Skinner, himself, recognizes the dangers in the ultimate in technology and, in the end, Castle opts for the humanistic model and returns to the school. Frazier was not able to engineer the spirit out of at least one man.

**Technologists**

With the massive push from outside of the profession to produce more and more scientists and technicians after the advent of Russia's technological success in the 1950's, the material developed by those who were here classified as Positivists was taken even further. These men shall be classified in this study as Technologists; they represent that portion of the teaching profession which believes that increased skill in method by the teacher will result in increased learning by the pupil; that teaching can be broken down into behavioral sets of acts, interactions, and responses. In essence, they represent Skinner taken to his logical extreme.

While Smith and associates studied episodic behavior in the classroom, and Skinner talked about behavioral engineering in an entire community, Ned Flanders and associates study how teachers

\textsuperscript{62}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 308.
can change their behavior. They take the behavioral aspects of Skinner's proposals and use them to analyze the classroom. The classroom becomes a stage, and the movements, dialogue and diction of the performers becomes subject to scientific scrutiny.

While the classroom may indeed be like a theater, it does not need to be examined the way a Broadway critic examines the latest opening: there are differences between legitimate theater and the classroom, and these differences need to be recognized and honored.

Flanders and the team studying interaction between teachers and students have moved beyond Bloom and his taxonomy. In addition to scientifically classifying teacher behavior and possible student response, they have set about to change it, or to show teachers how to change their behaviors. But the very fact that they have studied with an eye to change means that they really believe teachers should be changed. In the face of such a broadside from the experts many teachers did, do and will believe that if their own behavior is changed their classrooms will be changed. This is true, of course, but changed how and for what is the question, and is behavioral change really to the heart of the matter?

---

It is not necessary to harangue Flanders and his researchers, but it is necessary to examine the context in which their study was made. The nation had become more and more technologized, or fragmented. A time of peace turned out to be an uneasy one, a war of nerves between the world's most powerful nations was a regular and constant subject for political and social pundits, and it seemed that Russia would win the technology race. Classrooms were blamed for most of this, something was wrong, our children were not educated fast enough or in the right way to keep up with the technological advances. This was the area in which the attacks of Rickover and others could have greatest impact. It was also true that jobs were available for technically trained personnel.

Schools, teachers, and educational researchers do not exist outside of and away from their communities and their times—they are shaped by the very times they shape. Flanders and his research team were part of these times.

Through him it can be seen that the position of value-free analysis of teaching progressed even more; teaching behavior is subjected to the tests of science; Chi-Squire, reliability, rank ordering, discrepancy scores are the measures, not what students think and believe or what their own life-search struggles may be. Ethical positions are gone, it is behavior which matters.
Flanders wants to measure attitudes and behavior, and he sees them as measurable. It is granted that an attitude is reflected in behavior, but so are many other things, and there is more to teaching than behavior, as Flanders does grant, but not with emphasis. He wants a restricted community involvement; in other words the job of preparing teachers belongs to the experts, and the teacher-engineers. Flanders makes judgements in a supposedly value-judgement free study; those teachers who are not behaving according to the way his team of teacher experts thinks they should are classified as immature teachers. Of course the correlative to that needs to be acknowledged: those teachers who behave as Flanders et al. think they should are mature teachers. There is something else worth at least passing mention; one of the basic assumptions of the study is that teacher behavior can be examined by watching teachers as they behave in front of other teachers; his assumption needs to be questioned. The atmosphere of a classroom with actual students in it is different from a staged classroom. The variable of peer pressure upon each of the teachers in the study is implied pressure rather than overt pressure. Teachers probably do not respond as they do when confronted by their own students in their own classrooms when they role-play for observers.
From the writings of the Neo-Humanists and Conservatives we learn that there is an understanding and a relationship which develops between teachers and their students. This can be disturbed by the intrusion of one observer and or be totally absent when teachers role-play the classroom experience for each other. In an actual classroom there is a mutual trust, distrust, or mixture of the two, and a kind of knowledge of each other which is similar to that which develops in a family. This cannot be analyzed and measured, and it is a variable for which Flanders cannot account.

In Flanders' book, he uses the results of his various studies to help present and future teachers analyze their behavior so there is not so much gap between intent and actuality, however this, too, is subject to question. Goffman and others have talked about body language, or about how we say things about ourselves non-verbally. The greater question has to be: Are we so concerned with our non-verbal communication that we have not heard what we actually are saying in direct verbal language?

There is value in trying to decrease the gap between intent and actuality when teachers try to reach their students, but one has to

---
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question also whether interaction analysis is the way to do it? Any
teacher, who is really teaching, knows when the classroom period
is over whether or not he has done what he intended. He knows by
both experience and intuition, by the expressions on his students' faces; he knows from the questions he has gotten from his students, or failed to get from his students; he knows because of the mutual understanding he has developed with his students, whether or not the classroom has been a place of learning. This is not to imply that there is a kind of maudlin mutuality in friendship or affection or respect---there may in fact be no friendship, affection or respect between teacher and students, but what is there is human and mutual and is built by human beings together; an observer may catch glimpses of this and a perceptive or intuitive observer may be able to catch some of it, but one needs to question if this can be measured and subjected to the tests of science.

One of the most disturbing things about Flander's interaction analysis, and the way he explains in detail how the observer should go about the business of observing, is that there is no room for the eccentric, (as Highet predicted and was concerned about). As as been noted earlier, the trend to technology early began to rule out the eccentric. That is, the eccentric student or teacher do not fit into the categories; bits and pieces of their behavior may be classified, but
they do not fit the totality. Analysis has ruled him out of existence, and may in fact have ruled the authentic genius or the authentic saint out of the classroom. The mechanical man has invaded the classroom, or the mechanical teacher and the mechanical student; it is the forerunner of the teaching machine and lessons by television. These men resemble the students of Walden Two very closely.

The question needs to be asked, not how are our teachers teaching, but what are they teaching? It is not the difference between intent and behavior, but the difference between developing character and providing minds with ideas for later inquiry. A teacher who uses interaction analysis to improve himself is in fact a facilitator; he is helping students organize material.

Interaction analysis is just a later, more refined version of B. F. Skinner's approach. The behavioral aspects of life at Walden Two are comparable to the types of behavior adjustments and changes expected from interaction analysis. The problems of Walden Two show us that the stress on behavior reinforcement and alteration may produce mechanical people, not capable of exhibiting the extremes of human emotions and not capable of widely ranging versions of individual creativity. The same problems may result from reliance on interaction analysis to change or alter teachers.
The Neo-Humanists, Conservatives, even Positivists seemed to believe that a teacher should be one who sees the potentialities in individuals and through encouragement, provision of opportunity for learning, creation of differing learning experiences, and by example determines the environment for intellectual growth. Unless the teacher himself is living in the proper environment for intellectual growth, and this of necessity demands that he be adaptable, flexible, and not concerned with the behavior of interaction but the actual interaction—he will not be able to provide this for the student. Teaching as much as learning is an act of self-actualization. It is only as the teacher becomes more and more aware of himself and develops a consciousness about himself in his present world that he can help the student reach this type of discovery, too.

A teacher who uses interaction analysis to improve his own behavior according to a static code is in fact a facilitator; he helps students organize material according to a manner and mode which is already set down.

The technologist not only participates in the preparation of teachers and the formation of the classroom; he is concerned with analyzing it and describing it with an eye to improvement. It is important to note that improvement may or may not be the same type of classroom improvement envisioned by liberals and Neo-Humanists.
described earlier. An example of a technologist's view from without the profession is the material done by Christopher Jencks. With David Reisman, Jencks wrote *The Academic Revolution*, in an attempt to give an historical and sociological accounting of the state of the American school. 66 It is significant that the student demonstrations and resulting violence, the massive interest in the supposed student sub-culture, a national disillusionment with the school system from the elementary to the university level, had taken place when Jencks and Riesman did their study. In the era of increasing use of technology in the classroom, and in the preparation of teachers, students were marching out of classrooms demanding more voice and more chance to be heard. Jencks and Riesman applied the tools of a scientific society to the study of the academic revolution. (It is significant that a discipline previously not identified with science, namely history, is now one of the social sciences and is subject to as much technological influence as any other field.) Jencks and Riesman are aware of the failures inherent in applying a set of methodological tools to a field of human endeavor that is not methodologically oriented from its beginning. They realize all of the drawbacks in their study

and they acknowledge that much of what they have used in conclusion is based on speculation. But they state that in the area of human endeavor such as teaching, perhaps speculation is as close to hard data as they can get. They say they will "generalize and speculate on the basis of many kinds of evidence," including the impressions and observations of others.\footnote{Ibid., xii.} The great break with those previously categorized as Neo-Humanistic seems to be in the fact that Jencks really wants to have data such as statistics and other demographic information to use in describing the academic revolution. One suspects that the Neo-Humanists would not use this type of data, even if they had it, but would reply to the speculations and observations of those who had been intimately connected with the institutions they intended to examine.

Jencks and Riesman have clearly identified some of the distinguishing characteristics of the American University and the attitudes of the 60's--one of them being that education, both from the standpoint of the educator and the student, seems, in many ways now to be seen as a rite of passage into an economic market place. Students, they say, are working for certification in the form of degrees which will get them jobs.\footnote{Ibid., p. 62.} They are not, Jencks implies,
seeking education for the sake of learning. Colleges on the other hand need grades, promote the grading system, and the grades are used to help locate jobs. The same thing, Jencks says, applies to persons going into the professional schools. Students work for grades to get them into professional schools; professional schools look for grades—or results on giant, standardized tests—as indicators of whether this individual or that will succeed. Success is seen, of course, in terms of acceptability into the research or economic aspect of each profession.

Jencks and Riesman are concerned—rightly—with the relationship between social stratification in our society and higher education. They indicate that it is virtually impossible for the top student in a poverty area to enter a so-called top university and therefore his chances of making the top of the economic ladder are cut in much wider proportion than the chances of someone higher on the social stratification scale. Therefore, they conclude education does not and has not made a difference to the very persons it should be reaching. Later they state more explicitly that the calls for academic reform which would help the student from poverty or lower

\[69 \text{Ibid., p. 131.}\]
socio-economic areas enter the university have failed; for little real change has been made. They also point out that social stratification and the changing role of the university now have placed some of the former university functions onto the high school; so that Blacks, or people from other poverty bases have even less choice open to them and less chance of succeeding if they do select the university route as a way out of ghetto life.\(^7\) A fascinating correlative to this is that even bright ghetto children usually drop out of the college of university programs they are in, and even the dull children or suburban upper-middle class families go on to college and do complete their courses.\(^7\) The statement, then, can be made that the university is failing in its job if it makes no difference in the life of a student.

But is it; What type of a difference was it expected to make? Jencks and Riesman point out that initially education was to be an end in itself. But while the myth has been that, according to our Puritan heritage, we were educating for each man to be his own person, we were, of course, educating for conformity. The graduate school phenomenon, Jencks and Riesman suggest, exaggerated the situation until the conflict defined itself in terms of an educational elitism and

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 146.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 147.
what they term, know-nothings. The pressures to research mounted; the conflict arose over pure or applied research. Jencks and Riesman also suggest that graduate instruction should narrow the gap between the students' personal lives and their work.

...the critical problem of graduate instruction in the social sciences and the humanities is to narrow the gap between the individual students' personal lives and their work. The graduate school must somehow put the student in closer touch with himself, instead of making him believe that the way to get ahead is to repress himself and become a passive instrument "used" by his methods and his disciplinary colleagues. This is no mean task. The difficulty of the job is not, however, an excuse for the present situation, where the student's subjectivity is not even regarded as a problem.

Using their technological tools, Jencks and Riesman have spotted the ambiguity between what a school once was supposed to have done in this country, and what actually is happening.

Jencks and Riesman, also, point out that graduate schools have failed by not putting the graduate student "in closer touch with himself, instead of making him believe that the way to get ahead is to repress himself and become a passive instrument"'used' by his

\[72\] Ibid. p. 518.

\[73\] Ibid.
methods and his disciplinary colleagues. They are extremely critical of graduate study as it presently exists, and state that, perhaps the most valuable contribution graduate schools could make in reform is to give the graduate student experience in both theory and practice, no matter what the field of study is. This is particularly relevant for education, because many students in education, unless they are granted the special teaching assistantship, do not have experience in teaching; indeed they do not have exposure to the classroom at all. In their chapter on the art of teaching, the authors recognize that a teacher is exciting if he continues to learn and as he continues to be stimulated by his work. They suggest all manner of methods in which the relationship between the graduate student and teaching, the undergraduate student and teaching can be changed. The significance of Jencks's work for this study is that it deals with the issues which students were dealing with during the recent disruptive periods in the educational system. It is, however, vital to note that Jencks used the methods or tools of the scientist and technologist and tried to fit them into an art and come out with a method.

\[74\text{Ibid.} \text{, p. 518.}\]

\[75\text{Ibid. p. 520.}\]
Reviews of Jenck's new book, *Inequality, A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*,\(^{76}\) suggest that he and his colleagues make the statement that schools have nothing to do with the amount of social, economic, or political mobility a person in this country can have. In other words, the reviews suggest Jencks is saying that unless the foundations of this country are changed, unless the assumptions on which the country operates are changed, the country will remain the same regardless of what takes place in the schools. He is not suggesting that schools be abolished, nor is he saying that they have failed or succeeded; he simply states that there is something else at loose which will change the fabric of American existence. Experimental schools, experimental methods, the reviews state, make no more difference than the traditional schools in Jencks' mind. Once again, Jencks has used the measuring tools of the technologist and applied them to education and once again, he makes no quality judgements, he simply measures and describes what is. According to the *New York Times*\(^{77}\) review, Jencks wants a return to the idea of education and teaching in its "old" form, or of

---


\(^{77}\) Ibid., p. 45.
the type sought by the Neo-Humanists; he simply states his case for it in technological terms.

**Neo-Romantics**

He is not the only one to be asking for a return to a more traditional view of teaching. In response to the technological trend, and in response to the demonstrations of students, many writers have come forward with alternatives, or with criticisms about the advanced technology and the de-humanization of students.

As a loyal academic, I must make a further observation. Mainly to provide Ph. D.'s there is at present an overwhelming pressure to gear the better elementary schools to the graduate-universities. This is the great current reform, genre of Rickover. But what if the top of the ladder is corrupt and corrupts the lower grades? On visits to 70 colleges everywhere in the country, I have been appalled at how rarely the subjects are studied in a right academic spirit, for their truth and beauty and as part of humane international culture. The students are given, and seek, a narrow expertise, "mastery," aimed at licenses and salary. They are indoctrinated with a national thoughtlessness that is not even chauvinistic. Administrators sacrifice the community to aggrandizement and extramurally sponsored research.

This is the writing of Paul Goodman, one of the early critics who reacted to the technological-scientific response to the criticism beginning in the late 1950's. Goodman became something

of a folk hero to the youth sub-culture because he saw so clearly that they were being cheated in their education. He realized that educating for jobs, or technologically preparing persons for technological jobs was not education. He spoke out harshly against the de-humanization of the school system and of both administrators and teachers in it. The confusion which resulted in the educational system as a result of the arguments and counter-arguments springing up in the 50's was clearly understood by Goodman.

He also understood the need for leadership, and leadership in value judgements and how its lack would affect young people.

Very many students are utterly confused. Our American society is peculiarly lacking in moral justification, in its mores, its culture, its economy, or its governments. Those who, like Professor Newcomb's students at Vassar, have come to college convinced of the "social stability" are upset by the "dissensual opinions" of many of their professors. Social criticism by Mills, Whyte, Riesman or myself, are widely used as texts. But this is not part of an orderly debate, for we have little literate opposition. Authors who can write an English sentence are not inclined to defend the present stability; nor if they were so inclined would they have much to say. Besides, the young people's own Beat and Hipster writers range from the unsparingly cynical to the devastatingly apocalyptic. Nevertheless, while the system is subjected to such attack and has no moral defenders, the
students, academic teachers, and of course the administrators, offer the astonishing spectacle of behaving as part of the system without batting an eyelash. This is utterly confusing. 79

Goodman captured the imaginations of the young because he saw in the system the things they saw as harmful. He spoke out against the technological and made a plea for the humane. But he did something else; he went the next step toward honoring the native intelligence and curiosity in the young. In fact, he almost over-honored it. That is, he came close to creating a new kind of elite—the elite of the sub-culture of young who were dedicated to the Western philosophical tradition, or those who were simply job oriented in the tradition of labor. He could criticize what was wrong with our system, but he had no new alternative to offer. The lock-step system which he criticizes had, indeed, produced students who could no longer tolerate the restriction and increasing technocracy. But, could they take the amount of freedom which Goodman would have given them? The answer cannot be given now, because we have not seen it work to the extent that we can make a realistic value judgement. But what we have seen can lead us to believe that a Summerhill will become as mechanized in time as the public school

79 Ibid., pp. 286-87.
system; or that intra-community disputes will become as profound and have as devasting results on young people as the public school system.

Goodman, however, would have his teachers thoroughly schooled in the Western tradition (for Western students, it must be noted, not universally), so that they can do, as the Neo-Humanists wanted teachers to do--teach with thorough knowledge of their tradition and historical and philosophical heritage and help young people to come to some terms with and understanding of themselves in relation to the larger world around them.

If Goodman was a leader to young people, others became leaders to teachers. In the same Neo-Romantic and Existential tradition we have Nat Hentoff and John Holt.

Holt, in 1964, wrote How Children Fail which spoke of teachers and teaching and concluded that we have taught our children to become technocrats. Holt's contention was that students give back correct answers on examinations and in classroom discussions because they have understood that teachers want to hear what they think parroted back to them. He asserts that it is memorization and

---

replication which teachers want and which they expect from children. In the process, he claims, teachers have ruined the spark of life and curiosity in every child; that children are bored in school and the reason is that teachers have bored them to failure because they have not tolerated the creative learning process. He, like Goodman, makes a plea for watching the child's own mind develop and what fits in best with the child's natural development, what best fills his own curiosity and encourages further, individual inquiry.

Hentoff, however, another of the Neo-Romantic school, is concerned with the education of the poor. He speaks to the technocratic, bureaucratic, methodological school system in its relation to the children of poverty. Our Children Are Dying is a series of episodes which describe the attitude of one New York City school principal toward students, and the changes in their lives brought about by the expression of his attitude. (For clarity, it must be pointed out that these episodes are not at all like the episodes used by Smith et al. in The Logic of Teaching; rather these are brief vignettes which put, together, give the total picture of the man.)

The difference between this principal's school and others was the man.

---

It did not have to do with method, or with new techniques, or additional materials to assist in the classroom (even though the school was eventually moved to a less dilapidated building). The difference was in the human approach to the school situation and in the principal's attitude.

One common element among the Neo-Romantics is a respect for children and a respect for the child's natural curiosity; and along with that, a deep belief that given the opportunity, children will learn and will succeed. The real question comes in learning what is success.

_Death At An Early Age_ is another example of material written by a representative of this school of thought. Jonathan Kozol, as did Hentoff, gives a case study of one school. Only in this case study, Kozol was the teacher and the school was in Boston. What comes through in this community is the utterly inhumane treatment given to children; the total lack of respect in which they are held; and in the total lack of understanding of what goes on to create a classroom experience. The children were learning, but what they learned had nothing to do with what they were expected to learn and

---

that had no relevance to their daily lives. \textit{Death At An Early Age} represents the despair of one man trying to function within the system and change the system to the ways he thought he could make it more humane. These ways ultimately were unsuccessful because they drove him out of the system and left everything the way it was.

In his later book, \textit{Free Schools}, Kozol shows a different type of insight into the particular situations children of poverty must face--and he shows particular insight into the art of teaching.

The myth which is at stake in this familiar pretense is that the teacher, by concealing his own views, is able to withhold from advertising his own bias in the classroom. In fact, however, this is not the case. No teacher, no matter what he does or does not say, can ever manage not to advertise his bias to the children.\textsuperscript{83}

In \textit{Death At An Early Age} Kozol was blatantly trying to expose his bias to the children and became suspect by many. In \textit{Free Schools} he seems to be making a return to the types of things Hightet and others were saying about teaching.

What the teacher teaches is by no means alone, or even primarily in what he says. It is at least in part in what he is, in what he does, in what he seems to wish to be.\ldots{} The secret curriculum is in the teacher's own lived values.

and the convictions in the lineaments of his expression and in the biography of passion or self-exile that is written in his eyes. The young white teacher who appears to children to be vague, low-key or indirect, straight in the face of human pain, of infant death or malnutrition, may not teach children anything at all about pain, death or hunger, but he will be teaching a great deal about the capability of an acceptable and respectably situated North American adult to abdicate the consequences of his own perception and, as it were, to vacate his own soul. In denying his convictions in the course of class discussion, he does not teach nothing. He teaches something. He teaches, at the very least, a precedent for nonconviction.  

Kozol, here, seems to be saying that the positivists, the technologists, the methodologists are wrong, that moral conviction, a respect for tradition and history come through to students if teachers will allow it. To teach morality one needs to be moral. To teach students how to live life, one must, Kozol seems to be saying, live it to its fullest in the classroom—to search with the students for answers to all of the large questions, or small, teachers may have to join students as they search for meaning in a world which seems, as Rafferty said, to have gone mad.

84 Ibid., pp. 68-69.
CHAPTER IV

CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL CLIMATE

In the preceding chapter, prototypes of alternative approaches to teaching were presented. These ranged from models of Neo-Humanistic thought, looking on teaching from the Classic Western tradition, to Conservatives, Positivists, Technologists, and Neo-Romantics. While these do not represent all of the alternative approaches to teaching, they exemplify some of the major trends in this century.

None of these models was designed in a vacuum, however. Teaching has been part of the national social fabric in an intimate way since the beginning of the school system in this country. The school system not only reflects social trends, but it is part of society and perpetuates in miniature what is taking place on the total national scene.

It has been suggested in this study that part of the current approach to teaching is a reflection of this nation's reaction to the Russian launching of Sputnik in the latter part of the 1950's, but there is a second major factor which has had significant impact upon
teaching and those persons who are involved in writing about and preparing teachers to enter school systems. This is the massive technological revolution, one of the most distinguishing features of the Twentieth Century, not just in America but worldwide.

The reaction to Sputnik understandably affected the attitude of this country toward schools and expectations of the schools. Previously however, B. F. Skinner in Walden Two developed an approach to teaching vastly different from anything preceding it. Walden Two stands as a critical turning point in teaching, just as its proposals for behavior modification mark a turning point in ways of looking at man as a being to be conditioned for society.

It will be the task of this chapter to analyze the meaning of Walden Two and of the technological society in which we are now operating, using the position of French historian and philosopher Jacques Ellul as a point of reference. Within this analysis, current approaches to teaching will be examined in more detail.

The important thought in Walden Two is that human problems lend themselves to solution through engineering. Skinner

\[1\] Skinner, op. cit.
refers to behavioral engineering, or behavioral reinforcement. His people are programmed to respond in specific ways, much as computers are programmed to give appropriate responses to specific questions. Frazier, the prototype of teacher, in Skinner's view, knows what he is doing -- he is engineering people scientifically to create a modern world, free from the traditional problems of humankind, and he does it by teaching.

The traditional argument about approaches to teaching has been changed at this point; Walden Two provided the change. No longer was the debate between those of the progressive school, who believed in child-centered approaches to teaching, and those traditionalists who believed that content was the main ingredient to be considered in approaches to teaching. With Walden Two a new dimension was added; since then the issue has been how to establish the proper behavioral goals for the classroom and the proper behavior of both teacher and student.

Frazier, the behavioral architect of Walden Two, justifies the teacher's use of behavioral modification methods because, he says, they can and will be used for human improvement rather than against humanity. Frazier, believes scientific management of human behavior would offer hope and help to men; Castle argues that it
would deny freedom through control by the behavioral engineers. Frazier's counter argument is that behavioral control, scientific management of human beings, has already been used and by the morally bankrupt rather than those who believe in morality, or at least believe in a rational resolution to humanity's problems.

"It's a little late to be proving that a behavioral technology is well advanced," Frazier responds to Castle's criticisms. "How can you deny it? Many of its methods and techniques are really as old as the hills. Look at their frightful misuses in the hands of the Nazis! And what about the techniques of the psychological clinic? What about education? Or religion? Or practical politics? Or advertising and salesmanship? Bring them all together and you have a sort of rule-of-thumb technology of vast power. No, Mr. Castle, the science is there for the asking. But its techniques and methods are in the wrong hands -- they are used for personal aggrandizement in a competitive world, or, in the case of the psychologist and educator, for futilely corrective purposes. My question is, have you the courage to take up and wield the science of behavior for the good of mankind? You answer that you would dump it in the ocean!"

Frazier believes that freedom is not the issue in regard to human endeavor. When Castle attacks him on the matter of freedom, Frazier explains that control will be exercised one way or the other.

^Ibid., pp. 256-57.
"I deny that freedom exists at all," he says. "I must deny it—or my program would be absurd. You can't have a science about a subject matter which hops capriciously about. Perhaps we can never prove that man isn't free; it's an assumption. But the increasing success of a science of behavior makes it more and more plausible."

Previously we have not dealt with persons who so absolutely denied the matter of man's freedom; it was argued back and forth about how and in what way man was free, but in teaching this marks the beginning of a belief in a science and a control which changes all of the old debates, or outdates them.

Frazier and his concern about freedom have been made more explicit in Skinner's latest book, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, in which he argues that the time has come when we can no longer afford to engage in the debate about freedom; in fact the time has come when we can no longer afford the idea of freedom. Control, he states, is necessary for survival; man must be engineered, as Frazier engineered in the utopian Walden Two. Skinner argues that

---


man is controlled, already, by a thousand external influences which have come about in a random, totally unplanned way, and now run rampant. Unless they are scientifically engineered by men of good will and men who are concerned with the survival of mankind, these external influences, Skinner believes, will bring about total destruction. Therefore, the matter of freedom and individual dignity is a luxury we cannot afford. Belief in the nature of the inner man, the spiritual man, Skinner says, is a myth and opposite to what can be scientifically demonstrated by behavioral architects. Now, the time has come to do away with the myths because survival is in the balance.

It is important that Skinner believes that men can have good will, and that a feeling of good will toward mankind and nature can be engineered as well as an attitude of ill will and destruction. What has been eliminated is the spontaneous man, or the rebel, and the belief of human dignity. Skinner surrenders human dignity as he surrenders human freedom.

Skinner, of course, sensed what others have sensed, that man is a victim of his own technology and that technology must be understood in order for man to understand the twentieth century and the possibilities for his future.
In *The Technological Society*, Jacques Ellul tells us that both Marx and Engels, particularly the latter, foretold the Twentieth Century technological phenomenon which would change not only the quantity of technology and society's use of it, but the quality of technology and society as well. It is the change in quality which distinguishes the modern age and which has so dramatically changed human existence.

For Ellul, the multiplicity of techniques have changed their essential characters. He sees them in the terms of behavioral engineering, as Skinner does, and he tells us that this is much different from the techniques of the past which have been kept separate from human character. It is the merge which concerns Ellul, for he does not believe that behavioral engineering can be used for the good of mankind. Ellul states that technique, now, has taken on its own character.

Ellul also believes that freedom is not necessarily an essential part of human nature, but he also believes that technique has a character of its own. In this frame of reference it is easy to understand Skinner and Frazier. Ellul and Skinner share the belief

---

that freedom is not inherent. They part dramatically because Ellul believes that man can transcend technique and elect dignity. Skinner believes that management of technique is beyond freedom and dignity.

In my conception, freedom is not an immutable fact, graven in nature and on the heart of man. It is not inherent in man or in society, and it is meaningless to write it into law. The mathematical, physical, biological, sociological, and psychological sciences reveal nothing but necessities and determinisms on all sides. As a matter of fact, reality is itself a combination of determinisms. Freedom is completely without meaning unless it is related to necessity, unless it represents victory over necessity. To say that freedom is graven in the nature of man, is to say that man is free because he obeys nature, or, to put it another way, because he is conditioned by nature. This is nonsense. We must not think of the problem in terms of a choice between being determined and being free. We must look at it dialectically, and say that man is indeed determined, but that it is open to him to overcome necessity and that this act is freedom.  

Skinner would agree that freedom is not graven in the nature of man, but he could not agree that man should transcend necessity; Skinner's man must respond to necessity, and in doing so mold his nature.

6Ibid. p. xxxiii.
Ellul states: "In the modern world, the most dangerous form of determinism is the technological phenomenon. It is not a question of getting rid of it, but, by an act of freedom, of transcending it."

Skinner, instead of transcending, makes further use of the technological phenomenon because he sees it as a solution to the human condition and its inherent ills.

Technique, or method, unless unchecked, Ellul says, exists today; there is no counterbalance. Once there was the counterbalance of morality, public opinion, social structure and the state. But this exists no longer, because each has become submerged in the technological sweep. Ellul's statement regarding public opinion is an example:

Public opinion is all the more important in that it is a two-pronged element. In the first place, there is modern man's collective worship of the power of fact, which is displayed in every technique and which is manifested in his total devotion to its overwhelming progress. This adoration is not passive but truly mystical. Men sacrifice themselves to it and lose themselves in the search for it. In this sense Mussolini was right in speaking of men realizing themselves in and through the state, the collective instrument of power. The martyrs of science or of the air force or of the atomic pile give us the most

---

profound sense of this worship when we see the
deference the crowd pays them. "I have faith in
 technique," declared Henry Wallace, the former
Secretary of Commerce of the United States. His
faith indeed dwells in men's hearts. Man is
scandalized when he is told that technique causes
evil; the scourges engendered by one technique will
be made good by still other techniques. This is
society's normal attitude.  

For the purposes of this study, this quotation seems
especially relevant. For the failures of one technique of teaching
are thought, by the profession, to be removed or replaced by the
development of other techniques. The loss of demands for teaching
to be primarily directed toward producing moral and spiritual
leaders did not come simply when there seemed to be an urgency to
produce scientific leaders. It really happened much earlier when
the profession and its individual members lost sight of the historical
perspective of the technological revolution. Today we are much like
the world of Walden Two. Triple M produces overhead projection
systems which, it advertises, are designed to "inspire classroom
discussion." Universities purchase such devices to make their
atmosphere more human and to better fulfill student needs.  

8 Ibid., p. 303.

9 An advertisement for these systems says that good
teachers "love" the projection system; the implication, believed by
many, is that if you do not love the system you are not a good teacher.
These good teachers are alleged to love the machine "because it
Another extensive look at Ellul is in order as examination is made of the profession's transference, acknowledged by Maritain, from art to tools. Ellul deplores the trend toward progressive education which ostensibly has the happiness of the child as its goal. He deplores progressive education because it has formulas, methods, and techniques to produce happiness. Happiness, Ellul says, is not and should not be man's goal; there is something higher. Further, progressive education, as he sees it, programs happiness and well being and produces persons programmed to live in a programmed, technological society. He quotes Maria Montessori when she says "Education must become a truly humane

gives them a chance to be creative. By learning a few simple techniques a teacher can develop or adapt his or her own course materials." As part of the background for this study, the researcher contacted Triple M in Columbus and was told that The Ohio State University is purchasing more and more of the teaching machine materials. The Triple M representative then explained the machine was good not only for normal students, but also for the handicapped. Using as his example a blind student, he explained the machine could give the student voice and feel at the same time and "we have eliminated the need for another person to help the student. With the machine he can do it alone," the representative said. This conversation is reported here because it so perfectly demonstrates the public mind and feeling. Why indeed should a blind student need another person near him? Unless, of course, his very soul has need of some human contact. With the increasing acceptance of mechanical aids to teaching, there is the possibility that we will produce a generation of "Joeys", described by Bettelheim. We will all "know", sooner or later, that we cannot face life alone, but will need an aid, a pill, a tool, or a technique, such as an encounter group, to help us "live."
science to guide all men to judge the present situation correctly."

Then he expands upon that quote:

This statement seems to be truly remarkable in that it designates candidly the end of psychopedagogic technique in the best possible circumstances, within a liberal and democratic conception of man, state, and society. (Mme. Montessori is a liberal and speaks for liberal countries.) I have taken Mme. Montessori's statement by way of example; but one could examine the purpose of this technique in numerous other pedagogical studies published in the past few years.

We note first of all that this technique must be implemented by the state, which alone has the means and breadth to carry it through. But the rigorous application of the psychopedagogic technique means the end of private instruction—and therefore of a traditional freedom.

Second, this technique is "pantocrator." It must be exercised over all men. If one man is left who is not trained according to its methods, there is the danger of his becoming a new Hitler. The technique cannot be effected unless all children are obliged to participate and all parents to co-operate. There can be no exceptions. If only a minority are educated to comply, this technique can resolve none of the problems it is intended to meet. Mme. Montessori's statement is therefore neither a metaphor nor an exaggeration; all human beings, without exception, must be reached. We note again the aggressive character of technique. Mme Montessori emphasizes the fact that "it is necessary to free the child from the slavery of school and

---

\[\text{Ibid., p. 346.}\]
family" for him to enter the cycle of freedom proper to this technique. However, this freedom consists in a profound and detailed surveillance of the child's activities, a complete shaping of his spiritual life, and a precise regulation of his time with a stop watch; in short, in habituating him to a joyful serfdom. The most important aspect of this technique is the forced orientation toward it. It is a social force directed toward a social end. 11

Ellul, as he defines a technological society, also has defined the new debate in education. As was previously mentioned, the debate is not between proponents of child-centered or content-centered education. The debate is about the extent to which a technological world can or should be involved in educating persons with a social conscience.

Ellul says:

The education of the child, however, is not directed toward some merely abstract social end. Concretely, the child must develop a social conscience, understand that the meaning of life is the good of humanity, and grasp the need for an entente among all nations. These ideas are much less vague than one might think. The good of humanity, for example, is not the obscure notion that the philosophers pretend it to be. At most, it varies somewhat with the political regime; and even this variability is becoming less and less pronounced. Compare Life magazine with the Soviet News and you will see that the "good of humanity" is conceived in almost identical terms

11 Ibid., p. 346-47.
of the United States and in the Soviet Union; the difference lies mainly in the persons charged with securing it. In both cases, the social good can be reduced to a few concrete and precise factors. The corresponding educational technique, as a consequence, takes a completely determinate direction. Social conformism must be impressed upon the child: he must be adapted to his society; he must not impair its development. His integration into the body social must be assured with the least possible friction. 12

There is very little difference between Skinner and what Ellul describes here. The difference between the past and Twentieth Century education is that educators are looking for ways to fit the person into the social fabric with the least possible friction. The matter of education has gradually and subtly changed as the rest of life has changed in an increasingly technologized society. There is, indeed, little difference between the good life in Russia and America --- while America feared Russian technological takeover, Russia feared the same thing. And both countries had technological capacities for total world destruction. The space race was a false issue: the issue had been correctly identified by Skinner in the forties. Was God, as we had previously known him, dead and could he be replaced by Frazier, the man of science? Or had Frazier already taken over the management of the world?

12 Ibid., p. 347.
Skinner and Ellul are not the only social critics warning of loss of human freedom in the face of advancing technology and acceptance of the inevitable life changes which accompany it. Marcuse, for one, speaks to the same issues in One Dimensional Man. He, too, tells us that the historical framework we now are in is technological and that it is not the intelligencia, not the professional, who can remove us from the trap but the common man -- the man who struggles daily with his own problems of existence and need and finds the answers within his limits and as he works within them. Marcuse warns that even the examples of the humanity in us are fed into the machine of technique, just as any idea and any human endeavor, no matter how private, personal or vividly illustrative of the essential goodness of man can be fed into the machine of television and, consequently reduced to meaninglessness; or placed in exact relationship to everything else in life, with the effect of rendering everything meaningless. Marcuse's one dimensional man is perhaps no better personified than by teachers in classrooms of elementary, secondary schools, colleges or universities. Teaching has become value-free and non-judgemental.

Teachers do not take risks of shaky hypotheses, as Hight said, because they cannot afford to, or because technique has changed the nature of the classrooms and teaching.

Two educators at Teachers College, Columbia University have demonstrated the change from the risk of shaky hypotheses to method in their recent book *Models of Teaching*. This book surveys approaches to teaching currently in popular use, based on the best of past and current philosophic thought. Their purpose is to "help a teacher build up his capacity to reach more children and create a richer, more diverse universe for them." The emphasis is on quantity of people to be reached not the quality of contact.

The authors explain the book also is to help curriculum makers enrich learning centers, to make materials more interesting, to create educational opportunities, which will eventually replace schools. In short, they tell us, the book is to help create a "cafeteria of alternatives" for a "rejuvenation of our troubled society."

It is not productive to discuss the merits of creating models, for there is no dispute about whether we all need models or a model

---


from which we can shape ourselves, and a teacher needs an example from which to create his ideas and around which he can mold his classroom. It is relevant to examine the models presented by Joyce and West, because they vividly demonstrate the current educational trends. It is relevant to examine how Joyce and West recommend the models to be used and for what purpose. These models can serve, as the authors tell us, to create a "cafeteria of alternatives" and, presumably, serve as many persons as a cafeteria serves hungry patrons. The language selected by the authors indicates the change of outlook in serious academic inquiry.

It is extremely significant that the philosophers upon which the models have been designed are as widely divergent as Plato and Carl Rogers. It is significant that the authors are able to put them all on an equal plane and discuss the merits and drawbacks of each model dispassionately and with no value judgements being made. In fact, it is possible for the authors to, in a particular sense, equate Rogers and Skinner because they are seen from the same value-free standpoint, and the ends of their inquiry and philosophy are made to agree: both are to be used as selections in a cafeteria of teaching models.
Joyce and West group their models into four categories: those oriented toward social relations and man's relationship to his culture; those which draw upon information processing systems and the human capacity for processing information; those which draw upon personality development and the processes of personal construction of reality, and the capacity for men to function as integrated personalities; and those developed from the ways human behavior is shaped and reinforced.  

Joyce and West say a model and the supports it needs show the instructional -- or direct - effects, and the nurturant -- or indirect -- effects. All of the models designed from the authors' summaries of separate philosophies show these instructional and latent or nurturant effects, although each model is different. The supports to which Joyce and West refer are anything, or anyone, used in putting the model into practice. These supports can be audiovisual aids, practices such as gameing or role playing, or teachers and students. Student and teacher have been put on the same value plane as the outside techniques. The model is the method.

The authors demonstrate with each model how it may be adapted for classroom use and give detailed examples and annotated

---

17 Ibid., p. 8.
instructions for teachers or teams of teachers using any or all of the models. Throughout their discussions, however, the authors keep everything value free; they mention that the teacher may become anything he wants to be. Teaching, for them, is simply role playing (indeed role playing is one of the methods suggested from one model) and the teacher may be anyone or anything he chooses to be for a particular lesson. T-group therapy is as acceptable as a teaching model as is Aristotelian inquiry. The danger here is that the student then has no model, and is taught, indirectly, that there is merit in everything. There is no suggestion by the authors that a teacher should or could take a particular ethical or moral position and apply it.

Joyce and West state that these models can be used as strategies; teaching has become a strategy for a wide variety of purposes, according to the authors. A teacher, they state, may wish to "use Skinnerian techniques for teaching of skills, and Rogerian methods to help open his students to a sense of their own potentialities and a willingness to capitalize on them."\(^{18}\) The fact that there is no merging of Carl Rogers and B. F. Skinner philosophically, does not seem to bother the authors. Teaching is

\(^{18}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 21.\)
eclecticism, but there is no limit to the teacher's borrowing power.

The authors' own definition of teaching is significant in relation to the definitions of teaching historically:

Teaching should be conceived as the creation of an environment composed of interdependent parts. Content, skills, instructional roles, social relationships, types of activities, physical facilities, and their use all add up to an environment system whose parts interact with each other to constrain the behavior of all participants, teachers as well as students. Different combinations of those elements create different environments eliciting different educational outcomes. ¹⁹

Teaching has changed from its historical development; it now is creation of an environment and this view owes more to Skinner than to anyone else. Teaching is behavior modification, not character development or sheer intellectual inquiry.

The position of the National Education Association at present seems to support the ideas presented here by Joyce and West. While previously the NEA was concerned with the teacher and the profession in terms which were more in line with the human or humane views described in Chapter III, now the NEA supports the idea of basing approaches to teaching on the business-industry

¹⁹Ibid., p. 25.
oriented methods of systems analysis and product-oriented models.  
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In fact, since 1969, and after involvement by the government which set restrictions with the awarding of grants, business-industry models for production-management-product are, in large degree, the model for approaches to secondary education.

Joyce and West demonstrate this, especially in their use of a Conceptual Systems Theory model, developed upon the writings of David Hunt. 21 This model states that human development must be seen in terms of increasingly complex levels of behavior and seeks to build a conceptual level which will produce optimal training environments. The language is as removed from traditional educational language as the model is from models historically used in teaching and in teacher education.

Using Skinner and Ellul as frames of reference, it is clear that Joyce and West have decided to build upon Skinner rather than upon Ellul—the decision really is beyond freedom and dignity; it is to manage. The teacher is a participant on an equal level with the students. He must always be on an equal level with students in terms of human dignity and in the sense that, as humans, they learn


21 Joyce, op. cit., p. 298.
together. But when the teacher is a facilitator, or one who helps
to engineer the processing of information, the entire orientation
has changed. Since there is no longer the question of human
dignity, it is not important just what position the teacher occupies
in the classroom. In fact, the teacher may easily be replaced by
a programmed method of teaching, or by a teaching aid such as
simulation, television, or a game.

The 1973 catalog of aids available in the teaching of
social studies gives a picture of what is being recommended to
teachers, and it shows what models teachers are being asked to
use, and the extent to which technology has replaced books and
human interaction in the classroom. Among the listed teacher
resource materials are books recommending how teaching can be
a subversive activity; one recommending 101 ways to bring
subversive activities to children, books on value games, and
lecture notes. Filmstrips, simulations, other games, multi-media
shows, or multi-media kits, records, how-to-make kits and
demonstrations—the list of technological aids is 154 pages, and this
is for social studies education alone. The point is that technique
and method in the purely technological sense increasingly is becoming
the rule in the classroom. The traditional teacher-student

---

22 Social Studies School Service 1973 Catalog, 10,000
Culver Blvd., Culver City, Calif.
participation examples have been replaced. As Ellul has stated, technology has taken on its own character and the method of the classroom has become more important than the content and character of the classroom and the people in it.

One of the peculiarities which follows from the current orientation is the definition of value. Using again the literature for social studies education we find *Values and Youth*, edited by Robert Barr, which attempts to help the social studies teacher deal with young people who are trying to find a sense of meaning in a society in which they feel increasingly alienated and fragmented. 23 Barr, in his introduction, states that he is concerned that he finds teachers still turning to the past for examples, although he believes that value questions are important for young people.

We continue to focus social education on the past, while the most serious concerns of youth are in the present; we continue to try to teach information, while students labor under difficult value dilemmas to which the information rarely relates. Social studies are suffering from a credibility gap between what students learn about society in school and what they learn about society outside school. To continue such a practice is educational suicide. 24

---


24 Ibid., p. 7.
Barr has collected essays, or portions of other books to give a variety of examples of the ways teachers may handle value issues; in fact, it is indicative of current educational practice that many, if not most, text books are collections or parts of other books, essays, short statements gathered under one cover, rather than the thoughtful reflections of one person. Along with this collection of essays, Barr presents practical information for teachers, and this is a series of topics teachers may present to make their classrooms more pertinent, or to have them deal with the same issues their students are, and suggestions of music teachers may bring to the classroom. The rationale for music in a social studies classroom is that it deals with values---and with the students' value search. Listed among "All-Time Greats" are: Bob Dylan, The Beatles, Simon and Garfunkel and Jefferson Airplane. 25

It is not the purpose of this study to take issue with Barr or to single him out from among the many persons who are engaged in a similar search for how to bring more meaning into social studies education. However it is significant that social studies educators should advocate not looking at the past in order to understand the present.

John Dewey suggested in the beginning of the Twentieth Century that children learn moral principles passively and from

25 Ibid., p. 100.
watching and seeing what the teacher holds in esteem. In the hands of any teacher, what might seem to the teacher to be a matter of course can become to the student a matter of utmost importance. What is used in the method of the classroom can be and is used by the student as he molds his own character. Examination of the present, using the current books engaged in that examination, turns out to be discussions of methods and techniques. The relationship to Skinner is clear; students are being conditioned, their leisure is selected for them by their teachers. They are being conditioned and the books which teach inquiry are, in fact, limiting inquiry and creating a different type of character from that of the classic Puritan model previously honored in the public school tradition.

The Newman-Oliver chapter in the Barr book is another example of the relationship to Skinner in teacher education. They describe the three choices they believe a teacher has in handling issues and values: to assume a neutral position, that of Devil's Advocate, or that of the committed. Then they give a formula for the rational operations of the social studies teacher dealing with issues and values. Like Skinner, they believe that values can be put into the pattern of rational operations, and they have a formula
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26 Ibid., p. 55, Fred Newman and Donald Oliver, "The Teacher's Role in Value Issues."
for this: issue stating; summary-inventory-agenda; clarification; elaboration; relevance; referring to qualified general ethical and learning principles; consistency; conditional reasoning; weighing opposing and alternative positions; defining terms; comparison and distinction; evidence and examples; using source and authority; establishing the need for information.
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The difficulty with this type of assistance to the teacher is that it limits rather than frees; the formula has the effect of constricting rather than opening. To cover all alternatives is to take the model of Frazier and cover all of the options man has when he is conditioned to a rational existence.

One of the complaints of Barzun and Brunner was that we have lost models for the teacher. Brunner, particularly, lamented that we have lost the model of the dreamer. With the strategies outlined by Newman-Oliver it is clear that we do have a model, but it is not the model of the dreamer. The model is quite like Skinner's Frazier.

Beyer, also writing in the area of social studies education, goes even further in offering strategies for the social studies teacher.

27 Ibid., pp. 64-66.

Again, the reference point is strategy, not content. Beyer gives a series of possible topics for social studies units, analyzes how the teacher may handle them with the emphasis upon strategy. The strategy is technological. In his unit on the teaching of the Housa West African tribe, Beyer suggests that the teacher turn to the linguist and to other various resources outside of the social studies which may be available. Included in these resources is the "human resource" and the example given is to use a returned Peace Corps volunteer as a "human resource."29 The Peace Corps returnee is assigned the same significance as linguistic studies, anthropological sources, or the photographic displays which are suggested. Throughout the lesson example, the teacher is urged to deal with such references as the Housa "may be", "perhaps" he is, he "may also be": the teacher is directed not to take a position, the matter of value and judgement is simply not referred to. Instead, the information is described in terms of input and output. The model is technological. It is a process which is described. Teachers are urged to "let the lesson go where the kids want it to go"30, but they also are urged not

29 Ibid., pp. 80-100.

to allow the lesson to be "sidetracked." Clearly there is a confusion here for both teachers and students.

The strategy becomes limiting and directive; there is no sense of the human relationship and no identification of the Housa as a group of men who may share a sameness with the students in spite of differences. In fact, there is no suggestion that the teacher help the students come to a decision about the Housa, or to make a value judgement on the basis of what they have learned. The emphasis is upon inquiry.

Norman Sanders has done the same thing and his book directly calls upon Bloom's Taxonomy as its basis. Sanders uses Bloom's Taxonomy and breakdown for questions designed for memory, translation, interpretation, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, and then presents a series of actual questions to demonstrate the use of each category. The emphasis is upon the process of questioning, and not the content.

Process is a part of teaching, about that there is no dispute. But the point is that now the process is totally technological: in the
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31 Ibid., p. 108.

example of Ellul, the method has taken on its own character and the human element is gone. The process is that which is geared to efficiency; it is not the process which the artist, the poet, or the dreamer uses--one which is open ended and does not have a direct kinship with the machine. The manner in which the artist confronts problems is described by David F. Kellum in The Social Studies, Myths and Realities, a text for teachers which draws more from the Neo-Humanists for its model than from the technologists. Kellum says the artist, and the teacher as artist, confronts two problems, synthesis and communication. Kellum is against his process-oriented colleagues who, he believes, are taking over the field of teacher education in social studies.

Kellum is selected for inclusion in this study because he does represent the minority viewpoint. The point is not that no one uses the Neo-Humanistic model, but that very few use it today. Kellum is against efficiency and methodology as primary in teacher education. "We teach students that effective teaching is basically a science," he writes, but he believes that teaching is not learnable, not a science, but an art. Therefore the teacher must use the artist as his model.

34 Ibid., p. 18.
35 Ibid., p. 17.
but, Kellum states, "most teachers are themselves artless persons."\textsuperscript{36}

Rather, he infers, most of those who teach now are more related to the Skinnerian model than those of Barzun, Brunner, Hight. He is concerned that mastery of method is predominant, not mastery of content.

Kellum uses as one of his examples the teacher in social studies education and the minority group. He says that public schools have tried to reconcile Black and white differences, without the teacher having to establish his own position. Kellum states that the teacher must first find his own position in regard to minorities, and that the position must start from self-respect.\textsuperscript{37} Implicit in his argument is that the position of self-respect begins with basic faith in man's good nature. He does not claim answers because answers would bring one to the too rational approach dominant in recent years, he says, pointing out that many rational, well-educated men are bigots. His plea is for some irrationality and some consideration of ambiguities. To add Black studies to a curriculum, he says, is not enough. The teacher must face the question of the nature of man.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 19.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p. 62.
Finally, Kellum attacks the experts who look for ways to motivate students. He says we cannot create the will to learn, we cannot motivate, but we need to grasp that man has an essential "disposition to learn."\(^{38}\) The failure of the experts and a faith in expertise, he says, is the failure of the educational system and it is grounded in the fact that curricula are forced on people. The will, he says, is overtaxed not the brain. The only ideal motivation, he states, is an appreciation of learning as an end in itself, and not a method.\(^{39}\)

While there is always a gap between the theorists and the practitioners, the latter do rely on the former either directly or indirectly for their philosophical position. The position of the Neo-Humanist or the Neo-Romantic can be found today, but it is the position of the Technologist which is seen most often. The belief in expertise has superseded the belief in discovery of the basic nature of man.

One of the theorists who has made an effort to bridge the gap between the philosophy of education and the practice of education is B. Othanel Smith. (Kellum's book and Smith's show remarkably

\(^{38}\)Ibid., p. 73.

\(^{39}\)Ibid., p. 83.
similar positions, especially in regard to the teacher in reverence
for content. ) In Teachers for the Real World, Smith tries to show
how his theories may make a difference in education by making a
difference in the teacher. 40 This study, which was developed by the
Task Force of the NDEA, National Institute for Advanced Study in
Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, attacks the problem of teachers
dealing with minority people and the effects of racism on both
teachers and students. Smith believes that education must be
revitalized, and that one of the ways of doing it is to make or keep
the teacher human. Smith does not talk about the methodology of
teaching; he deals with the teacher. This is especially important in
view of his use of methodology in The Logic of Teaching. 41

Smith seems to belong in the framework set by Ellul; that
man must fight increasing attempts at depersonalization by understand-
ing who he is, what his heritage is, and how he can elect to make
humane decisions, not technological contributions. In describing
teachers, Smith states that teachers must be well versed in content,
they must understand what they are teaching more than how they teach.
He insists that teachers must become familiar with the students'
world, and in the case of minority students this means that the teacher must rise above the American heritage of racism and understand how cruelly society has treated minority groups.

"Only when the school reaches out to the lonely, when it respects the right of individuals to be different, and facilitates the socialization of the antisocial will it be doing a good job. And that can happen only when teachers are trained to deal with such problems," he writes.  

Training teachers to reach out to the lonely is, for Smith, giving teachers thorough familiarity with subject matter, with the broad historical and philosophical interpretations of social traditions and an ability to relate these traditions to the student's world. His position is totally in opposition to that taken by Barr; he believes we must learn from the past and look to the past to understand our present and predict our future.

For Smith we stress too much teaching the how of the classroom. He believes that instructional difficulties are more likely to be resolved by the teacher who has a solid understanding of his subject matter than by the teacher who has a background in instructional methods and only surface knowledge of his subject. The teacher, he

\[42\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 7.\]
states, must have the ability to relate his subject to the rest of the world. Smith believes that teachers must confront their own prejudices and specifically their own racial prejudices before they have anything to offer students, either those economically advantaged or those economically disadvantaged. (Again the similarity of position with Kellum is clear.) If teachers have not faced their own prejudices and do not have a clear understanding of their own heritage, Smith says, they will perpetuate a view of man which is at best abysmally narrow and at worst deliberately distorted, in order to maintain a white middle class superiority.

This is not to say that Smith ignores the methodology of the classroom. He does not. But his view of the importance of method is tempered by his faith in the traditions of a liberal arts education. He quotes Barzun and reflects Barzun's belief that the liberal arts tradition may be dead or dying. Like Barzun, Smith believes that this is tragic and is an indication that contemporary society may be surrendering itself to the technocrats and experts who modify behavior but have little understanding of man's essential nature or his potential. He is concerned that our increasing interest in the how of the classroom

\[43\text{Ibid.}, p. 117.\]
will lead us to ignore the question of why and what we are teaching.

Self-understanding and self knowledge, Smith believes, are basic to any teacher and this, he says, will come with a return to the liberal arts tradition rather than a view of instructional technology and expertise. This is an important point because Smith as a theorist is trying to bridge an important gap and, although he understands the literature of the technocrat and has, in fact contributed to it, his contribution to the practical aspect of teacher education relies more heavily on the Neo-Humanist tradition. He basically wants teachers to be value oriented and to teach from humane and liberal traditions. His belief in human dignity and self-knowledge through knowledge of traditional historical and philosophical explorations is akin to Hight's belief that the attempts to understand man through scientific inquiry will lead to an inadequate or distorted human relationship. While Skinner proposes classroom methodology as a solution to the human condition, Smith fears surrender of the spontaneous man and proposes that the classroom be used to discover the human condition.

In direct contrast to this position is that set forth by Alice Rivlin whose book Systematic Thinking for Social Action is used in classrooms in secondary school instructional methods courses.  

Mrs. Rivlin is an economist whose analysis of social institutions has been used heavily by government agencies which contribute to social legislation. Her discussion of education reveals that she believes that schools can be analyzed in the same manner in which one looks at other institutions. The delivery of education, she describes, is analogous to the delivery of health care. 45 She looks at measurable outcomes of education, measurable reading skills, mathematical abilities, and subject knowledge which can be tested; she also examines educational inputs, such as curricula, different types of teachers, facilities, equipment and teaching methods. And this is examined by economists and other analysts for ways of getting a more efficient education. 46 Because projects funded by government agencies are the ones Mrs. Rivlin can measure, and because before these projects were funded they were subject to budget-cost analysis, systems analysis, and were examined with a view to efficiency, it is not surprising that her conclusions and her recommendations could be the same as those given to any business or industry seeking to determine its own efficiency and its costs. Mrs. Rivlin is making studies, furthermore, to determine the cost of efficient education

46 Ibid., p. 70.
to the poor or the disadvantaged (and she claims that it is a myth that most of the disadvantaged are Black, that more are white\textsuperscript{47} and she finds that she cannot come up with a clear relationship to school inputs and outputs. Therefore, she suggests, such further investigations as longitudinal data systems for keeping track of individual children, better feedback about whether these children need consistent remedial programs, and information about each child's own characteristics and family background. Once a data bank system is established for schools, she thinks, it might be more efficient to assess how education can change the social make-up of this country and what types of educational methodologies can produce more efficient results and, therefore, deserve more government support.

She deals with the matter of accountability and discovers, not surprisingly, that there is difficulty in coming up with a description of to whom the education system must be more accountable. But she uses various models and suggestions, including the voucher idea which would entitle parents to "buy" an education for their children at whatever school they deemed best.\textsuperscript{48} The merits of particular proposals such as the voucher idea are not the subject

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 12.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 135.
of this paper. What is, is the extent to which approaches to education have reflected a change in the character of the entire social climate.

In an technological and systems oriented society, it is appropriate for persons to be examining school systems with such technological tools. However, this does mean that we have entered a new time in history and the type of teacher who will fit into a system designed from such a model will be radically different from the type of teacher who fits into schools which clearly reflect the basic Puritanical models originally used in this country. It is to be assumed that there will be the usual gap between what is proposed and what actually takes place in public school classrooms; but the gap is narrowing as such books as Rivlin's are being used in teacher education programs.

Some educators believe that by describing life inside the classroom we will learn about teaching. They, too, have departed from the traditional debate over content and pedagogy and now describe the classroom much as one describes anything using scientific data. The classroom thus becomes a source of data which can be used for nearly any purpose; the purpose in these cases, ostensibly, is to help teachers become more relevant to the needs of their students.
Philip W. Jackson's *Life in Classrooms* is typical of this type of book, as is *Teachers Talk* by Estelle Fuchs. Jackson and Fuchs are close to the Neo-Romantics in that they try to see the classroom from the student's point of view in order to tell teachers what it is they do. They differ markedly, however, in that they use scientific tools, they analyze data and try to make the classroom more humane on the basis of the observed data.

Jackson's book is oriented more toward methodology and behavioral analysis than Fuchs', although both draw heavily on a Skinnerian model; they want behavior examined and then modified. Jackson reports many studies done inside elementary classrooms; rarely does he use his own study. His book then is a compilation of the behavioral studies of others, and from these collected observations, he hopes, prospective teachers will learn how to teach.

Fuchs, on the other hand, is an anthropologist, using the anthropologist's tools and applying them to the classroom. She has a control group of teachers beginning their careers in inner city schools; the hypothesis is that the teachers and their students differ

---


so drastically that certain things must be called into action before they can really relate and learning can take place. From her group, she collects information about life in inner city schools by having teachers keep notebooks about daily happenings. These notebooks and teachers' own solutions of what they see as major or minor incidents are later analyzed with an eye toward change.

Jackson has human behavior charted and analyzed in the same manner one would analyze the behavior of any group of animals; it is only in the end of his book that attitudes or human values are discussed. And then he is forced to say that the so-called best teachers are motivated more by instinct than by any set of learning principles. Fuchs has human behavior studied by relating a series of incidents; and in the end she must admit that much of what she has learned has to do with things more outside than inside the classroom. She has in fact described teacher relations with supervisors, principles, other teachers, secretaries, parents, and community groups. From both books very little about learning, or teaching is actually demonstrated. Instead what is given is types of behavior and suggestions for changing that behavior to get something more efficient and more productive. In both books, mention is made of industrial research and business systems analyses as helpful in studying teacher-student relationships and how they may be improved,
or made more efficient. The relationship to Skinner is clear. For Fuchs, the relationship to Flanders and interaction analysis is clear; both are method oriented and both believe that by altering behavior, classrooms will be improved. Content is not their concern. This fact, however, differentiates them from the traditional studies of classrooms. Content is seemingly not a concern; and yet it must be of concern to the new teachers to whom these books are directed. But in a nation of experts, it is in keeping with the technological trend that the how of the classroom be the subject of study rather than the philosophical or historical why of the classroom.

Two other books which are task, or competency, oriented are Developing Teacher Competencies, and The Instructor and His Job. 51, 52 The latter book is designed, say the publishers, "to give practical and substantial assistance to instructors, supervisors, and others who are preparing to teach" 53 but it is geared, specifically, to those who would be teaching industrial arts subjects. The model is that used by the military; the author was an instructor in various

51 James E. Weigand, Editor, Developing Teacher Competencies (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1971.)


53 Ibid., Publishers' Foreward.
branches of the military or other Federal agencies. Consequently, the techniques discussed are techniques which are designed to have people behave in predictable ways, both teachers and students. The examples given are strictly militaristic and the book is illustrated with cartoon examples clearly designed to appeal to servicemen. The book is mentioned here only to show the vast difference in approaches to teaching and teacher expectations when what is recommended for teaching skills to men in the military services is also recommended for industrial arts teachers in public schools. Behavior modification is clearly the model; the emphasis is on technique, which has become an end in itself.

Weigand's book, on the other hand, is not militaristic, but is technological in orientation. Teacher competencies are presented in task-skill oriented ways; they are presented to correspond with student task-skill-age groupings. Teacher competencies are described and defined totally behavioristically and examples are provided. The text is set up in work book style, so that teachers may practice their skills to themselves before they use them in the classroom. Training is given in such areas as empathy, respect, internal and external personal make-up and similar areas. The authors deliberately set out to define teaching as a science and they, indeed, are able to do so. They deliberately state that there is no
art to teaching, but it is a science which needs to be learned methodologically.

These books, and others like them, are designed to bring discipline to education through method. It is interesting to note what another theorist, Arthur Bestor, stated about such methodology in 1953, before the debate had been so drastically changed. In a pamphlet published by the Foundation for Economic Education, Bestor stated "The disciplined mind is what education at every level should strive to produce." 54

... The seed must be planted at the beginning and cultivated continuously if the crop is to be ready when it is required. And these intellectual abilities are required, not merely as a prerequisite for advanced study, but also and especially for intelligent participation in the private and public affairs of a world where decisions must be made on the basis of informed and accurate thinking about science, about economics, about history and politics.

The real evidence for the value of liberal education lies where educational testers and questionnaire-makers refuse to seek it, in history and in the biographies of men who have met the valid criteria of greatness. These support overwhelmingly the claim of liberal education that it can equip a man with fundamental
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powers of decision and action, applicable not only to boy-girl relationships, to tinkering hobbies, or to choosing the family dentist, but also to all the great and varied concerns of human life— not least, those which are unforeseen.  

In the survey made of instructional materials available and being used in teacher education program, only the arts—music and art education seemed to have escaped the methodological approach. Perhaps it is because the two are still considered to be creative and immune to technological influences. But in discussion with those in these fields it becomes apparent that the trend is toward technical and behavioral approaches. There are attempts being made now to eliminate the teacher in art education; Indiana University is experimenting with computerized approaches to art education and programmed learning. In music the trend, so far, is to remain to the concepts of learning advanced by Bruner and to use these only as a framework for allowing children to find their own freedom and expression in sound and in accompanying motion. It is likely, however, that music education, also, will be approached in a similarly behavioristic way when one listens and knows of computerized symphonies now being played for audiences nationally.

In this chapter two views of technology have been used as the framework for examining instructional materials for teachers in

55Ibid. pp. 18-19.
dealing with all age groups; Jacques Ellul's analysis of a
technological world, in which the technology takes on its own
class, and B. F. Skinner's analysis which states that technology
must be used to mold human character. Ellul elects to believe in
human dignity beyond technology; Skinner elects to believe that
world crises demand that we seek something beyond human dignity -
technological control by behavioral engineering.

Their difference has shown itself in the increasingly
efficiency and expertise directed approaches to education. These
are beyond all of the traditional approaches presented earlier; even
those of the more contemporary Neo-Romantics who try to use some
technology but, nevertheless, stay within the classic concepts of
liberal arts education through basic understanding of history and
philosophy. The newer instructional materials show that the debate
in education has changed dramatically, and that in fact, the debate
may be over. We may be producing schools of experts. In the
following chapter some of the implications of this trend will be
discussed with recommendations for teacher education curricula.
CHAPTER V
A NEW TEACHER FOR A NEW TIME?
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this study several themes have emerged. The most significant is that the traditional debate among educational theorists has changed. The issues are not about the types of content and elements necessary in a balanced curriculum. The current debate is about behavioral goals. The classical notion that men should look to history and philosophical traditions for their teaching models has passed. Now the assumption is that teaching is learnable as a science, and that mastery of skills and tools is the important aspect of teaching. The debate becomes a questioning of which skills and tools produce the best experts. This change became partially evident in the late 1950's in the attacks of such men as Conant and Rickover who blamed schools and education for the supposed failure which permitted Russia to move ahead in a space race. Actually the change began earlier and runs much deeper than even those critics of the schools imagined at the time.
Another theme or trend which has become apparent is the increasingly changed attitude toward classroom content. The how children learn and what they are learning as an inseparable combination has been replaced by a search for how children learn and the method by which they should be taught. Again, establishment of behavioral goals has replaced pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. The problem is a very different one and it owes its beginning to man's gradual surrender of bits of himself to the mastery of technique as he inevitably became part of what has been described as a technological revolution. Rather than a revolution of technology, it seems to be a gradual technological take-over and men, unknowingly and in a mistaken view of progress are giving away their inner selves and adopting an artificial and scientific way of life. The problem in education, which showed itself before the space race controversy of the '50's, is best expressed with B. F. Skinner's Walden Two, whose teacher model is Frazier, the ultimate behavioral engineer. The educational utopia then changed from one of men in pursuit of knowledge without the restrictions of encroaching worldly influences to the utopia of the scientific laboratory. The philosopher was replaced by the behavioral engineer.

Even before Skinner's novel, educational theorists were beginning to see and to predict what was to happen. Robert Maynard Hutchins in the 1930's described the dilemma in The Higher Learning
While speaking specifically of higher education, Hutchins' thesis applies to current elementary and secondary school thought. Hutchins complains about the dilemmas of whether institutions are preparing students for life or for vocations, whether schools are involved in research or the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, whether our notion of progress is that things must get better and better from age to age—rather than that man must become wiser, whether the state of the nation depends upon education, or whether the state of education depends upon the state of the nation.

Hutchins' observations apply directly to the subject of this paper. His fear, expressed by the Liberals, Neo-Humanists, Conservatives, Neo-Romantics discussed earlier, is that education will become preparation for vocations and that learning will fall by the board. While others may have referred to the dreamer as the model, Hutchins referred to the conflict between the pursuit of truth and the preparation of young people for careers. He felt that the decision to do the latter would be the downfall of universities and ultimately of education as it previously had been known. He felt that when universities began to enter the public market place, pursuit

---


2 Ibid.
of knowledge was dead or dying. This fear, as has been demonstrated, was reflected by many who followed Hutchins, and it seems to have been a realistic fear because now the emphasis is upon vocational training and career development and schools are in the public market place.

Education has entered the market place as Hutchins feared and, as Ellul believes, it is a technological market place. The concern is bigger and better products. Teachers are being considered as marketable products, and they are marketed in much the same manner as commercially prepared products are marketed. In fact, it would not be stretching the analogy too far to state that teachers are being commercially prepared by the methodologists who are concerned about the process of the classroom rather than the content of the classroom.

Gilbert Highet expressed the fear that this would happen. He claimed that man cannot be related to science, that any such relationship is bound to be inadequate and distorted. Men who try to relate themselves to science, he believed, would end up in despair. Barzun deplores the fact that education is entering the public market place and he worries about student despair and disillusionment. But he also asked for adaptations of traditions, which is close to asking for methodology. Barzun wants life in the university to have a
special meaning, where students and teachers can grow together as full human beings. He wants the art of teaching to be honored and is against fragmentation and specialization, as Hutchins was against the trend toward research and data collection. Barzun, like Sidney Hook, looks for education to be food for the soul, with the teacher a type of physician of the soul. All of these men deplore the giant morality gap in universities, between administrations and faculties, between faculties and students, and between schools and the larger communities surrounding them.

This morality gap is national, however, and reflects the dilemma Hutchins described; schools and nation are moving circuitously; the health of one is inextricably tied to the health of the other.

Barzun, on the other hand, has not fully understood the difference between his version of the effects of cold reason and orderly scientific inquiry. He has not the grasp of technology Ellul has. Barzun still has respect for method as such and begins to show leanings toward some of the inroads technology is making into schools. He talks about supports to the classroom and the teacher, and they are such supports as types of buildings, ways to eliminate outside noises from the classroom, daily scheduling and such. In this way Barzun was the theorist from which men such as Beyer and
Jackson extrapolated their ideas of supportive things in classrooms.

Barzun assesses the American character and understands that it has allowed itself to accept the bland, the untroubled and the smooth; that it will accept mediocrity. Linguists, he says, have broken up the art of conversation and Americans, out of adult self-pity, now worship youth—and leave the young, as a result, without models.

None of these things has happened overnight and it must be noted that there is the usual gap between what theorists state, what those in charge of instructional materials extrapolate from the theorists, and what actually takes place in classrooms. Significant in this decade, however, is the increasing sameness of thought—and it is a technological sameness. The classrooms are becoming more process oriented than content oriented. As Beyer and Jackson extrapolated from Barzun, so others have reflected the predictions of Hutchins. Data banks of information about students and teachers and voucher systems for buying education, as advocated by Rivlin, demonstrate the reality of Hutchins' concern about scientific research inside the university.

Barzun's concern for the disillusionment and despair of youth became reality. When we began to help children instead of teach them, we made them patients, or research subjects. And they
did rebel. As Barzun predicted, when the total regard and esteem of a profession was placed in jeopardy, individual teachers found it difficult to flourish without the societal support they needed. Students suffered. American worship of youth incorrectly interpreted students' attempts at rebellion. Their spontaneous outbursts became the proper subjects for study by the experts, adults who believed that youth had answers to the problems of a lethargic nation which accepted bland mediocrity as its best, but which seemed to be tormented by internal and external conflicts which the experts could not solve. The dilemma is clear: students were crying in despair and were crying for help. They did not want to be turned into experts and technocrats. As John Holt as stated, our children do not want to be technocrats, but we are forcing them to be. Students in rebellion were trying to find themselves through re-discovery of a heritage lost to them.

Sidney Hook, Philip Phenix, B. O. Smith, all noted that the loss of heritage would profoundly disturb education and, consequently, the young. They foresaw and spoke against education becoming obsessed with platitudes and answers and increasingly dedicated to tolerance rather than opportunity to live within the ambiguities of life.
The loss of heritage reflects itself in current schools and instructional materials. Our Puritanical foundations would have us discover self and our relation to both a higher being and a sense of ultimate wisdom. But our schools and todays experts would have us discover how to function efficiently. The myth of the melting pot in this country has now come true. We never were a melting pot as long as Italians fought Irish, and Irish fought Poles, and Poles fought Jews for control of individual neighborhoods. Then we preserved heritage, and children and teachers had to deal with differences inside classrooms. Their search had to be the search for a wisdom of humanity which made survival possible.

When we became obsessed with tolerance and began to offer the bland, we began to dwell on our similarities rather than honoring our differences, and we truly became a melting pot nation. Our classrooms sought to instill in the young the belief that everything was alright; the "I'm OK, You're OK" syndrome of present day pop culture became the by-word. It was then that youth rebelled, they sought a heritage, but they became the subjects of expert analysis and they created their own heritages, based on religions, meditations, artificial stimuli foreign not only to this country but to human life as western man has known it. The drug culture or the sex culture both are expressions of a desire to find a sense of human
heritage. Both cultures, however, destroy both the heritage and humanity.

Experts who are studying the young and looking to them for answers are like Barr who says we must not look to the past but to the present. They do not see that the educational suicide is not in looking to the past, but in examining only the present. As Ellul criticized the Montessori method, we can afford to criticize the love of method. The teaching of behavior, or setting behavior modification as the goal of the classroom fails individuals, it limits the very freedom it purports to honor. Teaching behavior, as Skinner and Ellul state, acknowledges that freedom is not graven in the heart of man. But teaching behavior rules out freedom, and ultimately rules out human dignity. The abnormal, the deviant, the eccentric, spontaneous man is eliminated. When a child is freed from family and school, he is freed from mankind.

These methods, ruling out difference and non-conformity, perpetuate our tradition of racism and the persecution of the poor. The Puritan ethic and Calvinist belief that man can make it on his own becomes impossible when a great middle class accepts mediocrity. Nationally we now are product oriented, and in this orientation the state of the nation and the state of education are one. We are a nation of consumers and viewers: and with each consumption
we must develop another process of packaging. We now are a nation of observers not of thinkers. Consequently we can observe our cities being destroyed, our young trying to rebel, and then we study them dispassionately. In the process, all of our programs designed to help Blacks, Indians, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, or any oppressed or minority group, in fact keep them where they are, low in national esteem, at the bottom of any economic scale, least ranking in depth and range of privilege. Our schools which once were our only socialist institutions are no longer such: they are laboratories for scientific examination.

While Jackson cites studies which state that, in the end, the so called-best teachers do their jobs by intuition, Flanders and his associates try to measure intuition and in so doing rule it out. Jencks' observation that education has become a rite of passage into the market place for the privileged middle class is right; but Jencks measures that with technological tools and tries to create a technology for saving ambiguity. This is not possible; the technological tool rules out the ambiguity. Rafferty's claim that we are living in a century of madness is right, but he is right for the wrong reasons. He would have us create an elite which would further oppress and by this oppression rule out the human condition, as Skinner would, by seeing it as a problem subject to a methodological solution.
Rafferty would create an elite in one way and Paul Goodman, a man as different from Rafferty as it is possible to be in his worship of youth, would have us create an elite in another way. Both elitisms would extinguish the humanity they purport to revere. Both men, however, see themselves as rebels and radicals, but they in fact simply offer the alternate sides of a single coin.

They are not truly rebels. The true rebel is one who dedicates himself to life and its continual re-birth and re-definition. Our teachers must become rebels in the Existential sense described by Camus if we are to offer alternatives to technological advances. Camus understands that the rebel is not a person who opposes certain administrative or authoritarian directives, but a person who dedicates himself to understanding the dignity and durability of mankind. Camus understands the ambiguities and the dichotomies of life and tells us that the struggle is to know ourselves at any given moment against the background of those dichotomies and ambiguities. His colleagues, Sartre, and de Beauvoir, also tell us of these ambiguities and dichotomies, and show us that it is the particular decision at one

---


special moment to honor man's dignity and potential which gives meaning to our lives. (It must be noted, however, that these scholars are not immune to the technological or methodological world around them, and their dialogues often broke down into debates about which particular decision was best.)

Perhaps theirs is a peculiarly European or French outlook, but one doubts that when presented with the works of Henry Miller or Norman Mailer, who also show us where we are going, even as do Hutchins, Barzun, who cannot be classified as Existentialist as Miller and Mailer, Sartre and Camus can be. Miller and Mailer relentlessly pursue the overall questions of the meaning of life in relationship to our tradition and our history.

Miller, just as James Baldwin after him, predicted the racial struggles and crises which now confront us. Norman Mailer has seen that our struggle was how to define ourselves as men and women---as a man and a woman---and not the struggles of countless and isolated political, social, or scientific battles. Their insights, however, like those of the educational theorists described, have been

---

lost in contemporary instructional materials.

These men are artists who have contributed their insights into the best of man's potential, and it is significant that their insights seemingly have not been incorporated into contemporary educational thought, just as music and art as subjects have, to date, remained somewhat immune to the technological and methodological advance in instructional materials. Perhaps this is because music and art are now, and for some time have been, considered to be peripheral subjects; in the gradually encroaching technology, music and art have been considered to be outside of the concern of those who would technologize education. As long as there are bulletin boards in classrooms there will not be a rash of text books about how to bring art to the curriculum or instructional materials in the how of art. The products and the raw materials are the instructional materials now, and that is how it should be. As long as there are school bands (which may not actually perform music, but which give the illusion of doing so) and school ensembles, orchestras and choirs in "leisure time" classes, there will not be a rash of text books for music methodology, or a rush of musical experimenters who work with the sounds of the computer. But eventually there will be no bulletin boards and no school bands or orchestras if current trends continue.
None of this has been deliberate, or rapid. The blame does not fall on science as a subject, nor can it fall on individual people. As has been shown, Jerome Bruner is a scientist who honored philosophy and the dreamer. Abraham Maslow, psychologist, has taught us that there can be a belief in the ultimate goodness and dignity of man above and beyond devotion to method or technique. We cannot say that man simply decided to put his faith in tools, because from the beginning man has experimented with tools and has looked to technology and methodological progress. It is the extent to which we look to technology and the degree to which we now honor it which makes this decade different. The difference is between having faith in the goodness and dignity of man along with the recognition of method, and having faith in method without consideration of the goodness and dignity of man. There is not a crisis in our classrooms, as some would have us believe, but a crisis within our nation which reflects itself in our classrooms. Education and the state of the nation now are one and the same; the social ills which beset us as a nation beset our schools; poverty, the ignorance of racism, a bankruptcy of spirit and morality exist in both.

---

In his study *Secular City*, Harvey Cox shows us that increased urbanization, which also is increased technology and progress, has not wished to destroy tradition; it has simply bypassed it. It is this bypassing of tradition which has changed the educational picture and may produce a new teacher in a new time.

For educators and for those responsible for teacher education curricula this has extreme significance. It means that curricula must provide for a choice—one between expertise and pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. If good teachers are born, they must also be encouraged because the potential for good teaching must lie within us all. What appears to be happening is that the potential is being eliminated by devotion to method. Instead of relegating historical and philosophical inquiry to that peripheral realm occupied by music and art in elementary and secondary schools, it must be given an integral place in any curriculum; the philosopher must be given a place beside the expert. Curriculum developers who relied on the nature of knowledge, the nature of the individual, the nature of society were not wrong; an understanding of the nature of things is at the heart of any curriculum. What distorts is the nature of the method which follows, and the place process and design now occupies in curriculum design.

---

Inquiry for its own sake must be recognized and not extinguished if we are to create teachers and not bigger and better products. Those who wish to teach expertise will succeed and will create more experts and eventually the gap between theory and instructional materials, between instructional materials and practice will diminish and become non-existent, and that is what makes this particular time in education new. As methodologists provide more and more answers, spontaneous man will be eliminated. Unless the model of dreamer, historian, philosopher, and artist is constantly kept alive, each of these will disappear from our midst. Theorists who make grave predictions will find that they are right unless one voice remains which refuses to go along with expertise, one voice seeking its own manner, time and place for expression. Once the rejection of expertise is made, the system of experts breaks down. If spontaneous man is permitted to survive, if some can live with the ambiguities of life, if the eccentric is allowed to remain, the predictions will not be realized, and there will remain the possibility of men making a choice for dignity and freedom. The new teacher in a new time will be developed if we allow expertise to eliminate the choice.
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