DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 313 SP 009 547

AUTHOR Brosio, Richard A.
TITLE Professors, Students and Some Enduring Concerns in the West.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 26p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; Educational Philosophy; *Education Majors; *Higher Education; Professors; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; *Teachers Colleges

ABSTRACT

This paper is divided into five sections, the first of which states the author's purpose for writing the paper as being to think through the experience he had as the instructor of a pilot class within the secondary education professional sequence at the Teachers College of Ball State University. The next section is a discussion of the methodology he used in preparing the paper. Section 3 is the largest section and discusses the tasks of schools of education. There is also a discussion of the types of people who have traditionally been attracted to teaching. In this section it is asserted that schools and colleges have been sending men and women into the world who no longer understand the creative principles of western society. The theme in the fourth section is that modern education is based on a denial that it is necessary or useful for the colleges and universities to transmit the classical culture of the west from one generation to the next. This section also notes that the university experience cannot and should not be an exact mirror of life. It is stated that real scholarship always moves in a realm where choices are more numerous and the possibilities more varied than they are practical. The final section emphasizes that teacher education must not allow itself to operate outside the perennial concerns of western civilization, and that those who teach in higher education must have some convictions about what is worth learning. (RC)

Professors Students and Some Enduring Concerns in the West

Richard A. Brosio
Assistant Professor of
Secondary and Foundations
of Education

Teachers College
Ball State University

Muncie, Indiana

...the Existentialist philosopher Kierkegaard had predicted that ours would become the Age of Journalism; men would be driven toward information rather than wisdom...[1]

(I)

The purpose of this study has been to think through the experience I have had as the instructor of a modest pilot within the secondary education professional sequence here in Teachers College. I committed myself to think and write in a deliberately philosophical way. G. Max Wingo has said:

> ...the fundamental policy question of the purposes of education cannot be answered by the educational philosophers alone. They should not expect to do it alone and nobody should expect them to. However, the issue can be raised by philosophers, and should be, because it is normative, and therefore philosophical, and because nobody else in the field of education seems particularly interested in raising it...The possibility exists for philosophy of education to move out of its poverty-stricken state, to reassert the leadership it once had in the intellectual arena... It may well be that too much time already has been frittered away by philosophers talking to each other and by aimless dabbling in the schools on the part of well-meaning romantics... and reorganizers who think that anything, including human education, will yield to the mechanics of scientific management.[2]

The paper which the reader has before him (him is used throughout the work as symbolic of the species, her is implied and will not be used) is not intended as a report of what occurred during the ten weeks of the pilot class which I taught. This writer intends to communicate to the reader that he taught the course in the mood suggested by the points and concerns raised in this work.

The pilot teaching experience consisted of having the undergraduates sign on for seven hours of study with me. The seven hours consisted of four hours of a laboratory experience commonly called Participation and three hours of the undergraduate course in the social foundations. The two courses are not usually taken together during the same quarter and almost never with the same instructor.

My assumption is that undergraduates need to have long periods of time within which they attempt to master conceptual paradigms: paradigms which allow them to understand the disparate phenomena they see in the institutional school and in the society at large. The mastery of such conceptual paradigms is difficult. The difficulty may be compared to the lack of ease which many people have when trying to learn a foreign language. In order for students to learn difficult conceptual language an optimum learning situation must exist; the instructor must have a longer period of contact with students than the normal thirty class hours afforded in most quarter-organized classes.

The pilot that I am describing allowed for a better time bloc than would have been the case had the students been enrolled for just one class with me. During the first part of the quarter the students met with me for one hour daily in a classroom situation, for five days a week. There was additional opportunity for professor-student contact at the laboratory school where they participated. The frequent meetings and the longer time bloc allowed for a more favorable climate for building concepts which were based upon real school (participation) experience. Paradigms could be built - through the study of books, hand-outs, films, discussion, lecture, exams, etc. - so that the students could come to understand, to make sense of, what was, or was <u>not</u>, occurring in the participation site at the laboratory school.

The pilot was not just based upon the advantage of more student contact hours. One of the criticisms aimed at the foundations of education is that it is done in a vacuum - a vacuum detached from the "real" school. The pilot was an attempt to provide a setting, a climate, a mood[3] within which the weaving together of theory and practice could occur. For too long educational institutions have operated as though theory and practice

were two separate realms, while in fact they are inextricably one. I have written in another place that:

> An experience (as contrasted to a simple undergoing) is had when proposed actions are seen in terms of possible and anticipated consequences. A technical definition of experience, and of education, is that particular reconstruction of mere undergoing which adds to the meaning of what has occurred, and which increases one's ability to direct the course of subsequent events. When that reconstruction occurs, than an experience can be said to have been had. A composed tale of meaning replaces the simple undergoing of and being buffeted by raw occurence. Theory is the placing of what is undergone into a broader and longer course of events. In order to have an experience one must by necessity integrate theory and practice...For Dewey... the reconstruction of occurence into experience is education.[4]

(II)

Whenever one engages in systematic effort he must follow some methodology. In some fields methodology is obvious, well established, fixed and even capable of being taught to apprentices/students. It is well known that we live in an age in which what people understand science to be is considered the most powerful methodology of all. There is some lack of consensus regarding what the scientific method quintessentially is.

This writer has wrestled with the whole problem of what the methodology of philosophy of education can and should be. Integrally related to the broad question of what philosophy of education is to be methodologically, is the equally important question concerning what methodology is most appropriate to the kind of study this writer is committed to doing.

Harold Rosenberg has reviewed two books by Mary McCarthy in the New York Review of Books[5]: The Seventeenth Degree and The Masks of State: Watergate Portraits. Rosenberg defends McCarthy against a certain Mr. James Fallows. I would like to suggest that this essay is written in the

methodological spirit to which Rosenberg refers in his defense of Mary McCarthy.

Rosenberg writes that the masses of data accumulated by the news media surrounds events with a "zone of moral weightlessness." He claims that Nixon tried to defeat the impeachment inquiry through a landslide of details. The American public did not buy into Nixon's ploy: they did not suspend judgment until the final shred of evidence was in. Molotov was reputed to have said, according to Mr. Rosenberg, that, "The facts are nothing but propaganda."[6] Molotov meant that what counts is the framework within which the data is placed. Rosenberg writes:

> In the Washington Monthly...Mr. James Fallows, one of the editors, attacks McCarthy's newsgathering capacity and... her apparent lack of respect for finding out the facts... His case against McCarthy consists of citing instances in which she dared to speak while being less than fully informed.[7]

After watching the Watergate witnesses McCarthy concluded by process of elimination that Nixon himself had authorized the break-in - a conclusion which was certainly not probably true when McCarthy wrote, although it made a good deal of sense. Mr. Rosenberg tells us that Mary McCarthy's political writing belongs to the genre of people talking to one another.

> What distinguishes McCarthy's discourse is not any secret access to the truth but its analytical quality and metaphorical reference - as talk it ranks with the best we have.[8]

So often the academy is suspect by the larger public and part of the reason may well be that intellectuals, scholars and even writers simply do not master the art of good talk at the analytic and metaphoric level.

Michael Novak has written in his The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics that the real task of an intellectual is to be a conscious part of what he is attempting to describe. An intellectual is not an expert on the hard questions of self, school and society in the same way that a physicist

is an expert; but it is he who has historically led in the search for meaning in western civilization. The intellectual must know what the experiences of the individual in society are before he can begin the difficult task of helping to articulate a description of the human condition for his, and his contemporaries', time and place. Novak reminds us that the authentic intellectual does not tell people things that they must do; he does not even tell things that they do not already know. Instead, he helps a people to articulate what is already a profound but latent feeling or recognition. We are all intellectuals when we are struggling in obstinate and courageous fashion with the profound questions which bedevil our lives within the human condition.

Rosenberg recommends McCarthy's two latest books for "...the pleasure of having an usually brilliant participant in the family table talk..."[9] Perhaps our methodology is simply rigorous thinking within a philosophical framework, and the result of the methodology applied to authentic problems is "good table talk?" What McCarthy does is to unleash her highly developed literary talent upon the myth of Vietnam. This enterprise is basically the same whether it takes the form of novels, theoretical essays or reporting.

> "Men," said Aristotle, "have a sufficient natural instinct for what is true, and usually arrive at the truth." It is the function of good writing to heighten this instinct and stimulate greater reliance on it.[10]

III

One of the key problems confronting those of us who think seriously about education is the mistaken notion that the institutional school is somehow cleanly separated from the greater society and culture. The

everyday problems of education within the institutional school are almost overwhelming to those who are in charge so it is not always the case that school problems are seen and studied in historical, economic (macro), political, social and even social-class perspective. Philosophic perspective simply means in all too many instances that the person claiming it has felt better labeling what he holds as "philosophic." It is being argued here that it is the task of those of us who are serious students of the institutional school, and of education more generally conceived, to see problems in the broadest possible perspective. It is especially important for professors in schools of education to develop such a perspective when studying the special kinds of problems brought to our doorstep by the kinds of teacher candidates who come to schools of education.

It has been said earlier in this work that undergraduates need to have long periods of time at their disposal so that they could attempt to learn the new language of conceptualization and paradigm-building. This is especially true when one considers the kinds of young people who have historically been attracted to elementary and secondary education in America. John Martin Rich has written:

> The status of teachers during colonial times varied considerably from one colony to another, thereby making it difficult to form an overall appraisal... [however] It is true that teaching was often looked upon as a job to use in supplementing one's income until something better materialized...[11]

Rich tells us that a schoolmaster's salary was equivalent to such skilled workers as carpenters and bricklayers. In addition to low pay, teachers in colonial American were expected to be loyal to the civil government and religiously orthodox. Professor Rich then tells his readers:

> However, it should seem that teachers would chafe under these restrictions, it should be remembered that throughout the history of American education individuals recruited for teaching careers were those who would abide by such codes; by the same token, teaching has tended to attract the less unconventional. "Few teachers," according to Howard K. Beale in his discussion of freedom of teaching in colonial times, "had ever thought of differing from colonial views. Many regarded themselves as guardians of correct thinking." [12]

The value system of the teacher is usually more of an area of scrutiny while job hunting than is the area of academic preparation. By recruiting only those teachers whose values are generally congruent with the values of the school district there is a subtle avoidance of later difficulty. The nineteen sixties was a startling exception, but even during that anomalous decade, the brave, iconclastic, trouble-attracting teacher was a small minority. The conservative nature of the nineteen seventies along with the "teacher shortage" has allowed a closer scrutiny by those who hire. It is still true that most teachers come from families whose main source of income is from small farms, factory jobs, small business and lower echelon corporate work. The sons and daughters of these parents still view teaching as a position allowing for social mobility. It has not been out of this matrix of the social population from which the most inquisitive and iconoclastic persons have come.[13]

Teacher education has historically attracted persons from the ranks of the lower middle class and from among the families of the skilled and semi-skilled working class. Prospective teachers have not come from the families of those who have been economically, politically or socially powerful. This writer is not making a case for the inherent inferiority of young persons from such social backgrounds; but the thesis is being forwarded that college students from the kinds of origins being described have not come to college or university with a rich

background in terms of what is deemed important for the successful teaching of academic subjects. One can make an argument for the class bias of academic success indicators, but be that as it may, the teachers colleges have not historically drawn from a universe of the most academically talented. For a whole series of reasons it would be accurate to say that K-12 teachers have not been the folks who have raised the earth-shaking questions concerning the assumptions upon which our culture rests.

The hard fact is that teacher candidates continue to be the kinds of young persons who do not have many other attractive professional options. They have chosen teaching as a profession because they recognized it as the most probable avenue out of blue collar and small business jobs.

With the radical transformation of college attendance since 1945 we have seen the sons and daughters of working class parents attending colleges in an unprecedented way. The teachers colleges continued, after 1945, to attract students whose families were not economically secure and who did not in most cases have access to the high culture.[14] The schools of education continue to attract students who have a narrow vocational view of higher education. For so many of our students a degree and teaching certificate means a ticket out of the ranks of tradesman, housewife, non-union labor, hamburger franchise "assistant manager," beautician, dental assistant, scribe for a large corporation, small businessman, etc.

The central question to be asked and confronted is: how does one honor the commitment to the democratization of higher educational opportunities - how does one meet the commitment to the concept of a career open to talents - and at the same time insure that the earning of a degree in higher education means the attainment of the tools and

attitude to understand, and enjoy the fruits of the high culture in western society? Higher education and schools of education in particular must insure that the graduate has a chance of becoming a person who has the tools and proclivities to master and enjoy the intricacies of the higher culture. It is not clear to this writer at this historical time that those who earn a four year degree and/or teaching certificate are becoming anything but white collar proletarians. The fear being expressed here is that far from becoming adults who have begun the mastery of the high culture they are becoming adults with a narrow technician focus, i.e., the "nurses" of Harry Broudy's description. Professor Broudy writes that he is impelled to:

> ...blame the illusion that our classrooms are staffed by professional teachers as one of the most insidious causes of our slowness in making progress in the genuine reform of schools. It as if we wondered why medicine did not progress if medical practice were carried on exclusively by nurses, technicians, and hospital aides. Yet we have something like this on the teaching staffs of our schools, except that our teachers are nowhere so well trained in techniques as nurses are...All that saves the teacher from mechanical following of rules is the perspective provided by whatever general education he picked up during the undergraduate years.[15]

It is the contention of this work that higher education should attempt to turn a carpenter into a man and not a man into a carpenter. That is not to say that a society does not need carpenters; but the point is that the Greek concept of man means a citizen of the polis - a person who has developed his intellectual and spiritual capacities so that participation in the affairs of humankind is possible. The young person who comes to college must have a chance to become all that he or she can become. In spite of a recognition that intellectual concerns must be balanced by a healthy psyche, this writer maintains that the main business of higher education is to help develop the academic,

intellectual, cognitive facets of man. The citizen of the polis in classical Greece was a participant because he was thought to possess reason. It seems clear that mastery of the high culture of the west still means the intellectual power to understand and enjoy the quintessence of the west's cultural heritage. The college or university must not cheat the sons and daughters of workers! The parents who do the difficult jobs in this country have long dreamed that their children could go on to higher education. Most of us have believed that it was a progressive step when the doors of the colleges were opened to the children of parents who profited from the social revolution of the New Deal, but if higher education is to become debased then it would be a cruel hoax indeed. Entry into higher education must allow the sons and daughters of the working class to become persons who understand that to study Cervantes or Newton or Solzhenitsyn does not have to be immediately relevant or practical. It is another whole argument when one begins to analyze the kinds of political, economic, etc. changes which need to take place in American society which would allow us to become a democratic community where economic security would be more possible.[16] These young people must be given the chance to understand that the development of the mind, the appreciation of the great storehouse of western culture is practical in the most profound sense of the word: they must come to see, as the Greeks did, that the unexamined life is less worth living.

Robert Hutchins is not a favorite of those who have subscribed to what is commonly considered the democratization of higher education. There are profound chasms of disagreements between this writer and what he perceives Mr. Hutchins to be saying, but there is common ground as

well. It is being argued here that Mr. Hutchins understood before many of us that higher education might not be compatible with the kind of democratization which has occurred. This writer is not arguing for the kinds of standards which exclude the poor and less fortunate from universities and teachers colleges; he is saying that the university experience must be the kind of intellectual one which allows the student the chance to understand the assumptions upon which the culture is built in a way that would not be easily duplicable if he did not attend. It is a political and economic question to speak of what share of the wealth certain kinds of jobs should command. We have erroneously tied college education to the promise of more salary and Hutchins was one of the first to systematically warn us. The sons and daughters of the working class have found out that in spite of four year degrees the best positions in the economy still go to competitors whose real advantage is that they made a "wise genetic choice" in a society where birth and family context are still crucial to monetary success.

Hutchins has written:

> Turning professional schools into vocational schools degrades the universities and does not elevate the professions...My contention is that the tricks of the trade cannot be learned in a university, and that if they can be they should not be. They cannot be learned in a university because they get of of date and new tricks take their place, because the teachers get out of date and cannot keep up with current tricks, and because tricks can be learned only in the actual situation in which they can be employed.[17]

Hutchins continues: all that can be learned in a university is general principles, the fundamental propositions of any discipline.

> The trouble with the popular notion of utility is that it confuses immediate with final ends. Material prosperity and adjustment to the environment are good more or less, but they are not good in themselves and there are other goods beyond them. The intellectual virtues, however, are goods in themselves and good as means to happiness.[18]

Harry Broudy said said that relevance makes sense in higher education only if one has already gained freedom from Plato's cave and become enlightened by knowledge. For a young person to demand immediate relevance and freedom from academic rules makes sense only if he wishes to be merely trained, and if he can do what higher education demands, on his own, without subscribing to the university's version of academic discipline. The burden of proof, Broudy tells us, is on the student.

> We may...be approaching the moment of truth in higher education, when only those who can use the resources of the university...will be given access to it.[19]

Christopher Lasch and Eugene Genovese have written that the university no longer serves as an exclusive upper class institution.[20] The university's most important function today is, they inform us, that of training a vast body of intellectual workers upon whom the corporate system depends. In the last quarter century the university has become in a special sense a working class institution. The university trains technical workers in the special skills needed to run the industrial/corporate bureaucracies and to carry out the commands of the managerial elite. Higher education has become a higher level of industrial apprenticeship. Lasch and Genovese continue: instead of educating men and women of general culture, the university now trains people who administer and govern through the application of special expertise and skill to narrowly defined problems. The university is no longer a place in which philosophical questions about the very premise upon which the society is based can be raised.

There are those who profit from using the universities and the whole school system as a place in which to train intellectual workers. These intellectual workers are to find compensation for powerlesness in a culture of consumption and mindless leisure.

If the children of those who work at lower and middle level jobs are to be really educated in the university in a way that they do not become unwitting accomplices of a status quo which neither they nor their parents had a voice in establishing, then they must be made to see that they have a vital stake in the maintenance of intellectual standards. They must be given a chance to understand that a restoration of learning must occur. The arts and humanities must be rescued from their degraded, essentially ornamental, position. The ultimate goal is to humanize the conditions of industrial apprenticeship by restoring the unity of all learning within the context of an industrial democracy as Dewey envisioned.[21] Scientific and technical subjects must be taught in a way so that the student can develop an ethical perspective. The pretense of objectivity has become irresponsible because the techniques have been drawn exclusively from the hard sciences, particularly quantifiable science, while unquantifiable experience has been pejoratively relegated to the "value judgment" zone. The humanities tradition requires disciplined reflection of experience as well as the mere having of it; obviously this entails the use of a finer discriminative ability than the type afforded by common sense alone.

We must come to understand that education is accomplished when under the tutelage of the cultized mind the less cultivated one achieves new insights. That process cannot be democratic! This encounter, which must occur between professor and student in higher education,

> ...is the act of inquiry, with all the drama and uncertainty to which any real inquiry is subject. Insights as well as mistakes and false starts are unique events. The happy phrase, the clever turn of the argument, the indignations, the satisfactions - these constitute the living process of becoming educated. This is...what high school students anticipate in higher education, and they are understandably disappointed when they find that they are expected to spend ninety per cent of their time continuing the didactics of high school.[22]

General education, as opposed to training and narrow vocational education results in thinking and feeling with the resources of the learned, and hopefully, the wise. Broudy tells us that the generally educated person provides his own test of self-cultivation; the test of the process is the process itself.

IV

It has been asserted in section three of this work that schools and colleges have been sending men and women into the world who no longer understand the creative principles of western society. Our civilization cannot be effectively maintained without the revival of the central perennial culture of the western world. The institutions of the west, at their best, were formed by men who learned to regard themselves as inviolable persons because they used reason to confront the problematic. They considered reason to be that power which allowed persons to comprehend the physical and moral order of the cosmos and man's place within the cosmos. Freedom for rational man meant that within that order there existed a personal moral responsibility to perform duties and to exercise corresponding rights.

Modern education is seemingly based upon a denial that it is necessary or useful for the colleges and universities to transmit classical culture of the west from one generation to the next. Some of that denial is done in the name of John Dewey, but it is well known by those people who seriously study Dewey that his disagreement with Plato never included a denial of the great western intellectual tradition.[23] The vacuum in

higher education is filled with elective, eclectic, specialized, accidental, incidental, spontaneous, vocational substitutes. There is no common faith, no common body of principle, no common body of knowledge, no common moral or intellectual discipline.[24] The graduates and citizens have no common purpose and no common culture. There is no community of scholars - there is no community. Mr. Walter Lippmann has written:

> We have established a system of education in which we insist that while everyone must be educated, yet there is nothing in particular that an educated man must know.[25]

It has been said by some that things change so quickly that the old classical heritage is no longer relevant. Lippmann disagrees: he contends that we have abolished the old curriculum because we are afraid of it, "...afraid to face...in a modern democratic society the severe discipline and the deep, disconcerting issues of the nature of the universe, and of man's place in it and of his destiny."[26]

Lippmann's words cannot be improved upon by paraphrasing. This key idea from him gets at the very heart of the malaise in higher education that this work is developing. Walter Lippmann writes:

> For what enables men to know more than their ancestors is that they start with a knowledge of what their ancestors have already learned...It is tradition which brings them to where advanced experimentation is possible...individuals do not have the time, the opportunity, or the energy to make all the experiments to discern all the significance that has gone into the making of the whole heritage of civilization... If they exclude the tradition of the past from the curricula ...they make it necessary for each generation to repeat the errors...[27]

There is one more central point to be uncompromisingly nailed down in this fourth section - higher education is not the whole of "real" life itself. Like any construct or work of art, the university is a slice of

the whole. The university experience can never be an exact mirror of the whole of life, nor should it be. Real scholarship always moves in a realm where choices are more numerous and the possibilities more varied than they are at the level of the practical. At the level of everyday affairs the choices are narrow partly because prejudice has become set. At the level of though the choices are broad because there is no compulsion of events. Dewey called thought a dress rehearsal. In spite of the power of thought to capture, explain and direct the flow of events it is well recognized that it is hubris to the extreme to think that cognition can ever completely explain and master the brute flow of events. It is obvious then that the university experience is always somewhat removed from the arena. It is not a violation of the Deweyan spirit to say with Lippmann that the realm of the scholar is never immediate. The scholar's province, and the proper main province of the university, is in the past from which he distills understanding, and the future, for which he prepares insight. The university is in but not completely of the town. Harry Broudy has said:

> ...a high-grade education for all may not be so implausible and quixotic after all. For it is the workman, to whom his job is no more than a brute necessity, who most urgently needs the schooling that will lead to a reflective capacity to expand the narrow margins of his life.[28]

And:

> In general education, the school would induct every pupil into the vestibules of connoisseurship in all phases of human life. It would preach openly that the cultivation of one's power for living well is a duty as well as a privilege.[29]

Can the teachers colleges avoid addressing themselves to the challenge? It is the position of this work that the schools of education cannot and must not.

V

Teacher education must not allow itself to operate outside the perennial concerns of western civilization. Teachers colleges must not lose sight of the larger concerns confronting the historical culture of which they are a part. Granted, the schools of education cannot and must not become a slavish replica of the colleges of literature, science, and the arts, but it is within the liberal arts colleges where the central concerns of the west have been studied; therefore, teachers colleges will separate themselves from this mainstream at their peril. Admittedly every profession needs certain special skills in order to perform, but every profession is tempted by the use of jargon, "expertise", and in-house parochiality instead of wisdom. The teachers colleges must struggle to maintain a connection with the main concerns of western civilization. We must realize that a beginning teacher who possesses a great deal of technique but who is not grounded in the big books of the west may be as dangerous as a debater who is willing to argue any side of the issue on demand in order to win points for his debate team.

In the concluding section of this work the aim will be to sketch out a mood within which teacher education should be conducted. It should be made clear that this writer understands certain kinds of narrower professional competencies have to be dealt with in order to perpetuate a profession, but the argument being forwarded here is that the narrower professional concerns must be anchored to the larger and greater concerns and traditions of western civilization.

Systems of information, especially if they attempt to become "scientific" tend to lock themselves within their own in-house treadmill, "...and the man perpetually buzzing after information usually misses what is really happening, especially in himself...Art speaks to us from that other region..."[30] The forms of imagination that any epoch produces are perhaps the ultimate data?

The artistic tradition in the west has always attempted to set things down simply and to hold to a standard of rightness against the chaos of contingent life. Is this not at the center of what teacher competency should be? Since the time of classic Greece, man the artist, has used language and other constructs to get at, and fleetingly capture, what was considered to be essential and universal. The quest is in no way demeaned because it was finally realized that in the end life and being are mysterious - mysterious and resistant to our efforts to comprehend.

William Barrett has written that the actual life of a people occurs within the felt texture of experience, in the moods and emotions that bind and divide us within the daily round of life. "That is why art, which is so much a matter of texture and style, reaches a stratum of historical reality deeper than that of ideas."[31] Herbert Marcuse has written that whenever philosophy was not merely apologia it has confronted the given facts by what those facts exclude. Philosophy begins when the given state (all of it) is questioned. Marcuse says that the philosophic quest procedes from the finite world to the contruction of a reality which is not subject to the painful difference between potentiality and actuality. It is apparent that philosophy and art are at the center of western experience. It is also apparent that the time has come to include philosophy in our analysis of problems in education. The schools operate according to an implicit philosophy, but in most cases the philosophic premise is camouflaged. Martuse talks of a philosophic quest which is a conscious effort to knot all our knowledge and insight into a linguistic structure in which things are called by their right names.[32]

At the very heart of what is before us is the realization that man is a contingent being. Real education - as well as authentic philosophy and art - have always spoken of courage: courage as the act of life itself, the courage

to go on creating and enduring against the backdrop of possible nada. William Barrett, speaking of the English writer, E. M. Forster, has explained that he, Forster, knows that the best things in a civilization, and indeed civilization itself, are perched precariously over the abyss of nada and contingency. Around the clean well-lighted place of Ernest Hemingway's metaphor lurk the goblins. Ultimate reality may well be the surge of brute occurrence that flows over and around and through us and in which no day ever succumbs to man's attempt to control it. The realization of this human situation is education in its quintessential sense! Teaching is essentially story telling. The mature person who has wrestled with and continues to wrestle with the spectre of nada and the goblins develops conceptual, metaphoric, artistic, philosophic tools to cope with the seeming chaos. The community of scholars and teachers construct a story which enables persons and a people to deal with the most profound problems which bedevil all of us during core authentic moments of realization.

> The stories must tell of the most universal and at the same time intimate matters we all live through, but never fully comprehend...Because despite all our progress and our vaunted accumulation of knowledge, we are still children in the dark who... [construct] stories so that we will not be so alone, that tne darkness may become more familiar... and the poor shreds and patches of our life be pieced together.[33]

Those of us who teach in higher education must be less diffident than we have been during the recent past. We must have confidence that we can re-establish our bridges to the tap-roots of our culture. We must come to believe in the community of scholars. We who are professors in higher education must do more than simply start where the students are at; we must take them somewhere. In order to do that we must have some convictions about where they should go - convictions about what is worth learning. Martin Buber has written:

...at the opposite pole from compulsion there stands not freedom but communion...At the opposite pole of being compelled by destiny or nature or men there does not stand being free [of those things] but to commune and to covenant with them. To do this, it is true that one must have first become independent; but this independence is a footbridge, not a dwelling place. Communion in education...means being opened up and drawn in. Freedom in education is the possibility of communion.[34]

Epilogue

The extension of ourselves into outer space, as Kubrick shows, is only more of the same, and can hardly tell us much about our own meaning.[35]

Footnotes

1. William Barrett, Time of Need: Forms of Imagination in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), p. 208.

2. G. Max Wingo, Philosophies of Education: An Introduction (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1974), pp. 355-356.

3. Richard A. Brosio, "An Alternative Mood for Teacher Education: A Minority Report," The Teacher Educator, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Spring, 1974), 9-14.

4. Lane F. Birkel, Richard A. Brosio, and Patrick D. Daunt, "A paradigm for Teacher Education," Illinois Schools Journal, Vol. 54 (Spring-Summer, 1974) 59.

5. Harold Rosenberg, "Up Against the News," review of Mary McCarthy's, The Seventeenth Degree and The Mask of State: Watergate Portraits both published by Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich. The New York Review of Books, Vol. XXI, No. 17 (31 October, 1974), 16-18.

6. Ibid., 16.

7. Ibid., 17.

8. Ibid., 18.

9. Ibid., 18.

10. Ibid., 18.

11. John Martin Rich, Challenge and Response: Education in American Culture (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1974), p. 25.

12. Rich, Challenge and Response, 26. From Howard K. Beale, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), p. 38.

13. Rich, Challenge and Response, 31.

14. There can be no definitive statement concerning what high culture is during a time and in a society where there is no recognized group of culture arbiters. In the historical past cultural arbiters achieved such status through class leverage in a most profoundly undemocratic way. The term high culture causes discomfort among many because the unavoidable contrast is to lower culture. This writer thinks that a recognizable higher culture can be discerned and constrasted to a less high one or ones. The intention is not that an economically rich or politically powerful class come to be thought of an sysnonomous with the high culture. The dichotomy is not a class one, but one of individual taste and accomplishment. There are great ideas, books, performances, persons, architecture, paintings, music, etc. that have served as a thin red line of hope and inspiration to all who have experienced them.

Aeschylus, Marcus Aurelius, Thomas Aquinas, Newton, Verdi, Einstein - these names belong to all who have examined their lives, they are a part of the best of all of us. This writer is convinced that men of good will can come to reason together, to dialogue, and when we do, we shall always recognize the main outline of what the high culture has been and continues to be.

15. Harry S. Broudy, The Real World of the Public Schools (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972), p. 61.

16. Richard A. Brosio, The Relationship Of Dewey's Pedagogy To His Concept Of Community (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Social Foundations of Education Monograph Series, Malloy Lithoprinting, Inc., 1972), Chapter 3.

17. Robert Maynard Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 47.

18. Ibid., 62.

19. Broudy, Real World, 84.

20. Christopher Lasch and Eugene Genovese, "The Education and the University We Need Now," The New York Review of Books, Vol. XIII, No. 6 (9 October, 1969), 21-7.

21. Brosio, Dewey's Community, Chapter 3.

22. Broudy, Real World, 190.

23. John Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1920).

24. Walter Lippmann, A Preface To Morals (Boston: Beacon Press, 1929).

25. Clinton Rossiter and James Lare (editors), The Essential Lippmann (New York: Random House, 1963), p. 421.

26. Ibid., 421.

27. Ibid., 422.

28. Broudy, Real World, 211.

29. Ibid., 230.

30. Barrett, Time of Need, 5.

31. Ibid., 56.

32. Richard A. Brosio, from unpublished talk at American Educational Studies Association, Annual Convention, November 1-3, 1974, Waldorf-Astoria, New York City. The paper's title: The Educational Importance of Marcuse's Work.

33. Barrett, Time of Need, 338.

34. Martin Buber, Between Man and Man (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965), p. 91.

35. Barrett, Time of Need, 360.