DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 263 95 SO 010 709

TITLE Education and Citizenship: A Conference Report.
INSTITUTION Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 93p.; Report of the National Conference on Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good (Kansas City, Missouri, September 20-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship; Civic Belief; *Civics; Conference Reports; Cultural Pluralism; Democratic Values; Educational History; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Educational Practice; *Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethical Instruction; Ethical Values; Futures (of Society); Global Approach; Knowledge Level; Moral Values; *Political Attitudes; Political Socialization; Social Studies; *Values

ABSTRACT

The document presents a report of a national conference on education and citizenship which focused upon how to help students become responsible and effective citizens of a more responsive society. The document is presented in five chapters. Chapter I presents a historical review of civic education from colonial days to the present. Chapter II identifies factors hindering reform of civic education in public schools, including alienation, lack of interest and discipline, negative effects of television viewing, and deficiencies in civic education programs. Chapter III examines the values base of citizenship education and suggests that educators devise programs which stress moral education without identifying with a specific religious doctrine. Chapter IV describes K-12 and community programs which stress one aspect of citizenship education. Examples include programs in economic, legal, political, multiethnic, and family relations areas. The final chapter explores future directions of citizenship education and offers suggestions for improvement. Suggestions include tailoring citizenship education programs to contemporary and local interests, raising the visibility of citizenship education, and encouraging formation of national citizens' groups to promote citizenship education. A directory of conference speakers is included. (Author/DB)

Education and Citizenship

A Conference Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Denver, Colorado

Foreword

Neglected since Sputnik but of increasing concern since Watergate, citizenship education may be due for a renaissance.

That possibility emerged in the wake of a national conference on education and citizenship that is described in this summary report. The conference was one of a series of Bicentennial conferences on education sponsored or cosponsored by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) under the leadership of Dr. Leon P. Minear, regional commissioner of education in Denver, Colo.

The citizenship conference was held in Kansas City, Mo., Sept. 20-23, 1976. It was cosponsored by USOE and the Council of Chief State School Officers. More than 400 people participated, representing six segments of American society: home, church, school, business, labor, and government.

The "new social studies" of the 1960's tended to "downgrade explicit citizenship education as a proper goal of the school curriculum," said education historian R. Freeman Butts, professor emeritus at Teachers College, Columbia University, in a general session address.

According to B. Frank Brown, director of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education, as schools made room for a "phantasmagoria of new activity"—courses on sex education, drug abuse, and career education — "important traditions such as citizenship education have been deemphasized or dropped from the accountable part of the total curriculum."

An insight into the magnitude of the problem was provided conference participants through preliminary findings of a post-Watergate survey of citizenship knowledge that was conducted by the federally funded National Assessment of Educational Progress:

- Nearly 40 percent of the 13- and 17-year-olds surveyed believe the President can appoint members of Congress.
- Twenty-five percent of 13-year-olds and 20 percent of 17-year-olds are not familiar with the basic functions of U.S. courts.
- Forty-three percent of the 13-year-olds and 31 percent

of 17-year-olds indicated no interest in learning more about U. S. government.

• More than 10 percent of both age groups believe the President and army generals don't have to obey U.S. laws.

While school-based citizenship education obviously requires reform and renewal, children learn some very important "unvarnished truths" about politics and economics through their out-of-school experiences, said Harvard University research psychiatrist Robert Coles. He condemned present classroom instruction in civics-related courses as unrealistic, lacking in historical perspective, and never touching upon controversial issues that shape today's society. It is outside the classroom, Coles said, that children learn about America's class system, the struggles of contemporary champions of unpopular causes, and the nation's inequitable economic structure.

Michael Scriven, of the University of California, Berkeley, noted that the raising of social consciousness about the condition of minority groups, women, and the environment came not from the schools but from education by the news media. But messages for raising consciousness can be much simpler than those required to provide solutions, he said.

Both Scriven and former U.S. Commissioner of Education Terrel H. Bell agreed that the foundation of effective citizenship education must be ethics and moral values.

"Citizenship without ethics is a shabby shell," said Scriven.

"Education for citizenship begins with moral and ethical values," said Bell.

Such citizenship education is a major responsibility, although not the exclusive responsibility, of the Nation's schools and colleges, Bell said. "We are not giving it enough attention and enough priority . . . it requires a deeper concern and a more urgent, front burner activism than has been the case in the past few years."

A grassroots strategy to redesign citizenship education was urged by Howard Mehlinger, director of the Social Studies Development Center at the University of Indiana. He called for the formation of a national alliance of individuals and groups to promote citizenship education as a continuous social need instead of a problem to be solved tomorrow and forgotten the next day.

The national group, he said, could monitor legislation, publish material, promote national programs to enhance

local efforts, stimulate research and development, and establish a national commission on citizenship education.

The conference was part of an intensive citizenship education effort conducted by USOE since December 1975. A citizenship education unit is preparing a study of the status of civics and citizenship education. This study is scheduled to be published in the spring of 1978. It will delineate the dimensions of "citizenship education" within formal schooling, the family, community organizations, religious groups, and the education activities of government, labor, business, and industry. It will include recommendations for developing a more responsible and effective citizenry, and for creating a more responsive society. The study will incorporate many of the concepts explored at the Kansas City conference.

This summary report consists of edited versions of some general session addresses plus brief reviews of all other sessions as reported by a group of summary writers.

The conference was coordinated by W. Phillip Hefley, USOE regional commissioner in Kansas City. This report was edited by Jan Klinger Hamilton, director of communications for the National Association of College Admissions Counselors.

– John Chaffee Jr.
Editorial Coordinator

The National Conference on Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good was held Sept. 20-23, 1976, in Kansas City, Mo.. It was cosponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers. However, the opinions expressed in this summary report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of either the Office of Education or the Council of Chief State School Officers, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Summary Writers

This national conference report was edited by Jan Klinger Hamilton, director of communications for the National Association of College Admissions Counselors. Summary writers during the conference were: Polly Carithers, director of public information, Oakland Schools, Pontiac, Mich.; James P. Clark, headmaster, St. Thomas Academy, St. Paul, Minn.: Nan Patton, director of communication services, Wyoming State Department of Education; Chris Pipho, associate director, Research and Information Department, Education Commission of the States, Denver; Doris Ross, research associate, Research and Information Department, Education Commission of the States; and Kathleen Woodman, director of school-community relations, Elgin, Ill., public schools. Editorial coordinator was John Chaffee Jr., public information officer, Office of the Commissioner, U.S. Office of Education.

Contents

Part One

Historical Perspective

By R. Freeman Butts

The founders of the Republic viewed their revolution primarily in political terms rather than in economic or social terms. Therefore, they viewed the kind of education needed for the new Republic largely in political terms rather than as a means to academic excellence or individual self-fulfillment. They talked about education as a bulwark for liberty, equality, popular consent, and devotion to the public good; goals which took precedence over the uses of knowledge for self-improvement or occupational preparation. Over and over again, the Revolutionary generation, both liberal and conservative in outlook, asserted its faith that the welfare of the Republic rested upon an educated citizenry and that republican schools, especially free, common, public schools, would be the best means of educating the citizenry in the civic values, knowledge, and obligations required of everyone in a democratic Republican society.

All agreed that the principal ingredients of a civic education were literacy and inculcation of patriotic and moral virtues; some others added the study of history and the study of principles of republican government itself. The founders, as was the case of almost all their successors, were long on exhortation and rhetoric regarding the value of civic education, but they left it to the textbook writers to distill the essence of those values for school children. Texts in American history and government appeared as early as the 1790's. The textbook writers turned out to be very largely of conservative persuasion, more likely Federalist in outlook than Jeffersonian, almost universally agreed that political virtue must rest upon moral and religious precepts. Since most textbook writers were New Englanders, this meant that the texts were infused with Protestant, and above all,

Puritan outlooks.

A less flamboyant but real faith in the study of history as a preparation for citizenship was expressed by Thomas Jefferson.

In the first half of the Republic, civic education in the schools put preeminent stress upon the inculcation of civic values, relatively less upon political knowledge as such, and no discernible attempt to develop participatory political skills. Learning to participate was left to the incipient political parties, the town meetings, the churches, the coffee houses, and the ale houses where men gathered for talk and conviviality. The press probably did more to disseminate realistic as well as partisan knowledge of government then did the schools, as the Federalist papers demonstrated. The goal was predominantly to achieve a higher form of *unum* for the new Republic.

Post-revolutionary reality

In the middle half of the 19th century, the political values inculcated by the civic education program of the schools, did not change substantially from those celebrated in the Republic's first 50 years. In the textbooks of the day, their rosy hues if anything became even more golden. To the resplendent values of liberty, equality, patriotism, and a benevolent Christian morality were now added the middle class virtues (especially of New England) of hard work, honesty and integrity, the rewards of individual effort, and obedience to parents and legitimate authority.

Of all the political values that the textbooks extolled, *liberty was preeminent*. Whenever they attempted to explain why children should love their country above all else, the idea of liberty took first place. Now this was undoubtedly of prime importance in promoting unity in an increasingly diverse and pluralistic society. Yet the loyalty to liberty was more in affective terms of feeling than in analytical terms of knowledge.

As the Civil War approached, the textbooks began to speak of the dangers of disunion, and, being Northern in origin, began to become more outspoken about the evils of slavery. The predominant tone of the school textbooks of the 19th century was Federalist and conservative, according to Ruth Miller Elson:

"The nineteenth century child was taught to

worship past achievements of America and to believe in the inevitable spread of the American system throughout the world. . . . While Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy agitated the adult world, the child was taught the necessity of class distinctions. Nor are Jefferson and Jackson ever ranked as heroes. . . in the schools Hamilton and Daniel Webster governed the minds of the children."

None was more eloquent than Horace Mann himself on what he candidly called "political education." Mann began with the assumptions of the founders that citizens of a republic must "understand something of the true nature of the government under which they live." He spelled out the civic program in terms which will sound familiar to all teachers of civics since that time:

> *. . . the constitution of the United States should be made a study in our Public Schools. . . and should be taught to all the children until they are fully understood.*

Caught in the swirl of contesting forces in Massachusetts occasioned by the immigration of Irish and Germans of Roman Catholic faith, by the changes in urban life attendant upon the industrial factory system, Mann knew all too well that "if the tempest of political strife were to be let loose upon our Common Schools, they would be overwhelmed with sudden ruin." He recognized that many would object to *any* study of political matters in the schools because the Constitution is subject to different readings. He saw the dangers of political partisanship in the appointment of teachers on the basis of their political fitness in the eyes of the school committee.

Mann could not admit that the public schools should avoid political education altogether, nor could he risk the destruction of the public schools by urging them to become "theatres for party politics." His solution was similar to that which he proposed for religious controversies; the schools should teach the common elements that all agreed to, but skip over the controversial.

Knowledge should concentrate upon the formal structure of the governmental institutions and the skills of participation should be delegated, along with the controversial, to the non-school agencies of party, press, and caucus of adults. Thus it came about that the emerging public schools were

largely content with a civics program that initiated the poor, the foreigner, and the working class children into the political community by literacy in English, didactic moral injunctions, patriotic readers and histories, and lessons that stressed recitation of the structural forms of the constitutional order.

Progressive modernization

In the 50 years straddling the turn of the 20th century, the character of civic education programs began to undergo much more searching examination then they had for the first 100 years of the Republic. While the picture of basic values constituting the political community did not change radically, there were three significant alterations in emphasis of the schools in response to the rapid social transformations of a half-century of modernization.

First, the earlier stress on love of a grand, free country became a more shrill and passionate devotion to a *great and powerful Nation*. The doctrines of manifest destiny, winning of the West, building an empire overseas, and making the world safe for democracy led to exaltation of the United States as the superior Nation of the world imbued with the mission to lead all the rest, and thus deserving a loyalty to "my country, right or wrong."

Second, lurking fear of the alien and foreign influences was exaggerated by the millions upon millions of immigrants who poured in from Southern and Eastern Europe and Asia. While civic textbooks attributed this influx to the search for liberty and equality, the civic education programs of settlement houses, patriotic organizations, nativist associations and industries began to turn more and more to Americanization programs that stressed not only didactic praise of the historic American political values but also demanded outward signs of loyalty from the new citizens as well as the old. Stress upon the public Pledge of Allegiance, salutes to the flag, loyalty oaths, patriotic songs, compulsory instruction in English, and attacks upon foreign language teaching in the schools were now added to the more traditional and conservative instruction of the textbooks.

A third shift in emphasis in the political value commitments was a more prominent rôle given to the image of the self-made man, the self-reliant individual who had shifted from pioneering in the West to pioneering in the develop-

ment of the industrial, urban, business system that was modernizing America so rapidly and thrusting her producing and consuming capacity ahead of all the other nations of the world in such a short time. The political side of this image was, of course, that it had all happened under auspices of a free enterprise system apart from government controls.

Another liberal reaction

But another liberal reaction to the social and political results of an aggressive industrial, capitalistic order led to the progressive movements dedicated to popular political reforms in the electoral systems and civil service, social reforms in the cities, the prisions, the sweat shops, child labor, women's rights, temperance; and the rest. Underlying the progressive reforms was a belief in the collective efforts of government to control rampant business enterprise, protect the rights of the people, and bring about good government through an honest and efficient civil service, professional bureaucracies, and regulatory agencies.

These conflicting political values began to reveal themselves in different approaches to civic education in the schools as educators responded in different ways to the ebullient modernization of America's polity and economy.

One response of academically-minded educators in the 1880's and 1890's was to stiffen up the study of history (and thus reduce the emphasis upon civil government) by introducing more rigorous scholarly knowledge into the history texts and the courses.

The main assumption of the Committee of Ten headed by President Eliot of Harvard, was that all courses in high school should provide the same strong mental discipline for the non-college-bound majority as for the college-bound minority. The teaching of history was thus not primarily to develop good citizenship and love of country, but to teach high school students to think like historians.

Meanwhile, the study of civil government had an upsurge in the early 1900's as new ideas about civic education began to appear among proponents in political science, economics, and sociology. In 1916, a committee of the American Political Science Association, reflecting the progressive reform movements, argued that the standard courses in civil government should be shaken up. Instead of starting with the study of the U.S. Constitution and a description of the for-

mal and structural organization of government and then proceeding to a similar study of State constitutions and governments, the procedure should be reversed. The committee endorsed the study of "community civics" assuming that political affairs nearest to home are the most important and should be considered first. The progressively inspired Municipal League promoted this idea.

Incorporated into "social studies"

In the long run, however, *the rising movement to make citizenship education the special province of the "social studies," was probably more influential for it came to pervade the elementary as well as the secondary school.* This movement took place under the auspices of the NEA's Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education whose final report, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education,* was published in 1918.

The new mood was revealed by the chairman of the Social Studies Committee in 1913 who stated that:

> *Old civics, almost exclusively a study of government machinery, must give way to the new civics, a study of all manner of social efforts to improve mankind.*

History still held a major place in the course proposals for grades 7-12, but a problems approach was to infuse the whole program. Civics was proposed for the junior high school years as well as a new course in "problems of democracy" for the 12th grade.

While the general impact of the final, over-all commission report in the *Cardinal Principles* of 1918 was great indeed in making citizenship one of the cardinal goals, especially of the social studies, it tended to reduce emphasis upon abstract academic material in favor of live problems. It also tended to reduce the *political* concerns of civic education in favor of social and economic and practical personal problems. Note the withdrawal from "constitutional questions" in the pursuit of good citizenship:

> *Civics should concern itself less with constitutional questions and remote governmental functions but should direct attention to social agencies close at hand and to the informal activities of daily life that regard and seek the common good.*

While this approval of the study of problems and

"socialized recitation" in classrooms may seem to be a modest proposal to modern teachers, it by no means swept the profession off its feet. Teaching by the book, lecturing, note-taking, question-and-answer, recitation, memorizing, essay-writing, and examination-passing continued to be the prime methods of history and civics classrooms. And venturing out into the community was still more radical, especially if a zealous civics teacher actually ran up against the local politicians.

Reform of civic education

The outpouring of proposals and projects to create more effective civic education programs during the past half century would take volumes to relate. The variations of details run to infinitude, yet there is a repetiveness and sameness to the lists of goals and objectives set forth by one commission after another. All that can be done here is to suggest the range of political outlooks that seemed to motivate some of the major approaches to civic education.

In the wake of World War I, citizenship education programs in the schools, the textbooks, and the teachers themselves were subjected to almost constant campaigns at the hands of conservative civic and patriotic organizations whose views today seem particularly narrow-minded and defensively patriotic in their anti-foreign, anti-pacifist, anti-immigration, anti-radical outlooks. In the 1920's, the American Legion led the campaigns to get Congress and the State legislatures to require civic instruction, flag salutes, military training, and loyalty oaths in the schools.

In contrast, the 1930's witnessed a social reformist outlook sparked by the economic depression, the New Deal, and the onset of totalitarianism in the world. One of the most impressive liberal examples of educational response was the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, funded by the Carnegie Foundation from January 1929 to December 1933. The dominant tone of the most widely read volumes was set by the *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission (1934)*. The age of individualism and laissez-faire in economics and government was closing, and a new collectivism requiring social planning and governmental regulation was emerging. The clear implication was that youth should be inculcated with the values of economic collectivity and interdependence in

place of economic individualism, while promoting personal, and cultural individualism and freedom.

Naturally, the social frontiersmen set the profession on its ears and elicited vigorous and shrill counterattacks, especially from the major patriotic organizations, but the major professional organizations responded, on the whole, positively as far as giving renewed attention to civic education was concerned. The National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators jointly sponsored in 1935 the Educational Policies Commission, whose pronouncements softened the social reconstructionist economic views. They did, however, emphasize over and over again, the need for education for democracy.

More realistic effort

The consensual effort thus to make civic education more realistic while at the same time not to embrace the extremes of radical-sounding reconstructionism or reactionary radical-baiting, led civic educators to the agreed-upon ideals of democracy, as Horace Mann had proposed, and to community activities that would involve students in participation but not controversy. World War II which broke into this movement with its emphasis upon mobilizing the schools for the war effort served to reassert the values of patriotism as the basis for unity.

Following World War II, the idea of special projects in civic education began to catch on as a means of mobilizing school systems of cities or States to give special attention to citizenship education.

In the 1950's, education for good citizenship became a rage in school systems all over the country both in the effort to infuse the social studies with the idea and to highlight the fact that the schools were *not* radical and *not* subversive, but were supporting the basic principles of *political* democracy and the basic economic values of the free enterprise system. This was a response to the Cold War crusade against communism in the world and a kind of defense against the onslaughts of McCarthyism at home. Reflecting the spirit of accommodation and good will epitomized by the Eisenhower years in the presidency, civic education programs reflected twin drives — a fierce opposition to communism in the world, and the hope that good will, cooperative actions, and positive democratic attitudes would

strengthen democracy at home.

In the 1960's, a coincidence of forces saw a general relaxing of explicit calls for more and better civic education. The "new social studies movement" and the rise of student unrest and activism undercut patriotism as an argument for civic education. Responding to the successes of the new math and the new science stimulated by Sputnik and funded so generously by NDEA, the National Science Foundation, and the private foundations, the "new social studies" took on the patterns of the social science disciplines: cognitive analysis, systematic acquisition of sequential and organized knowledge, conceptual analysis, "inquiry learning," "discovery method," and in general, a stress upon thinking like a social scientist, reminiscent of the primary sources movement in history teaching of the 1880's to 1900.

It was clear that the revived disciplinary approach to knowledge tended not only to belittle "soft," diffuse and superficial programs of social studies in the schools, but to downgrade explicit citizenship education as a proper goal of the school curriculum.

Other side of the 1960's.

A hard-headed, political scientist might well argue that citizens are made by the total process of political socialization outside the schools. Democracy, like all big governments, must rest upon the expert knowledge of specialists which cannot be encompassed by the average citizen. Political science is a very complicated intellectual discipline about political behavior, not a set of maxims about good citizenship. Caught in the middle by such disciplinary views from one extreme and by the raucous nonnegotiable demands for "relevance now" from militant student activists at the other extreme, the traditional programs of civic education seemed pale, irresolute, and outmoded.

In contrast, much of the work of the new curriculum-development projects of the 1960's was more realistic, more sophisticated, more analytical and skeptical, and more attuned to the claims for equality of the unincorporated minorities and their struggles for civil rights than was the civic education of the 1950's, but it still remains to be seen whether they will emphasize sufficiently political values, political knowledge, and political behavior.

Revived in the 1970's

Now in the 1970's, we come again to a revival of interest in civic education. It does seem apparent that the explicitly political ingredients are being stressed in many of the latest civic education approaches.

My own view is that an efficacious civic education in the schools will include not only attention to the curriculum and classroom teaching and learning, but will also embrace the whole educational system and not only social studies teachers: the way school is organized, administered and governed; its activities and cultural climate; and its relationships with the community and other agencies concerned with civic education. The school as a whole institution will deliberately adhere to and exemplify democratic political values as well as impart valid and realistic knowledge, and teach the skills of participation required for making deliberate choices among real alternatives.

The political goal of civic education in America is to deal with all citizens in such a way as to motivate them and enable them to play their parts as informed, responsible and effective members of the democratic political system.

In the best of times this is no easy task. It is doubly difficult — and important — at the present time when so many citizens have lost confidence in the integrity, authority, and efficacy of public persons and governmental institutions, and when so many youths believe that our institutions do not practice what we preach or what our schools teach.

To overcome lack of candor, or myopic partisanship of left or right — and excessive superficiality, a viable civic education should not only regenerate a commitment to the fundamental values and processes of the American political community but should do so in the light of rigorous, critical, and analytical studies. These studies would embrace the full spectrum from left to right, attempting to winnow the most reliable scholarship available and would arrive at what my late colleague, Lyman Bryson, called "significant truth rather than plausible or beguiling half-truth."

We well know that didactic moral instruction and outward expressions of patriotism through pledges of allegiance, loyalty oaths, or flag salutes have lost their savor among academics. We well know, too, the danger of attempts to use the schools for self-serving patriotism, manipulative propaganda or partisan politicization. Somehow, the schools

must promote a strengthened sense of the importance of civic morality and political integrity — a revitalized civism devoted to the political virtues of constitutional self-government that have sustained us at our best, that we have ignored or desecrated at our worst.

To build social cohesion

In renewing a sense of political community, embodied above all in the Bill of Rights, civic education should help to build social cohesion without resorting to coercion, without succumbing to witch hunts against the deviant, without silencing the unorthodox, and without dwelling upon an ethnocentric preoccupation with American society to the neglect of the interdependence of the peoples of the world.

In a desirable plurastic society, civic education must honor cultural *pluribus*, but also strengthen political *unum*. Somehow civic education must promote and protect the right of all persons to hold a diversity of beliefs. In the recent past, American educators have dealt with political education very generally or very gingerly. Civic education must also develop a commitment to *actions* that uphold the common bonds of a free government as the surest guarantee of the very holding of a pluralism of beliefs. We must try to design a civic education that will, in Jefferson's words, "render the people, safe as they are, the ultimate guardians of their own liberty."

It may be that some future historian will look back on our efforts and applaud them.

Part Two

Problems and Deficiencies

By B. Frank Brown

Society now expects the elementary schools to teach courses on careers, drugs, venereal disease, and sex education. In assuming responsibility for this phantasmagoria of new activity, the important tradition of citizenship education has been dropped from the accountable part of the curriculum.

The control of civic education must be wrested from the social studies departments, and civic education programs percolated throughout every course taught in school.

The alienation of people

At the head of a long list of problems in civic education is the disenchantment of people with their institutions. Evidence of this disaffection is seen in public opinion polls that reflect a growing lack of confidence in both institutions and Government. Documentation of the estrangement is found in sinking voter registration and decreasing participation in civic affairs.

The causes of disillusionment are varied and complicated, extending across the entire range of political and social life. A breakdown of the causes of the alienation include:

(1) the relentless growth of Government over the past decade and the corresponding decline in the quality of Government;

(2) fears that economic activity is polluting the environment and diminishing the quality of life;

(3) the lack of convincing approaches to the problems of inflation and energy;

(4) the disaffection of young people with the rigidities of tradition;

(5) the inability of the country to deal with the galloping increase in crime;
(6) the enduring public reaction against the more outrageous aspects of student unrest in the 1960's;
(7) a persisting guilt over the decade of mistakes and failures in Vietnam;
(8) growing evidence that the Watergate episode was not an isolated incident but an expression of widespread immorality at the highest level of government;
(9) the revelation of violations of individuals' rights and privacy by the CIA and FBI;
(10) arbitrary powers exercised by bureaucrats over the private sector;
(11) illegal business trasactions by multinational corporations;
(12) an impression that bureaucrats and elected representatives do not comprehend the changing values and aspirations that have overtaken the country; and
(13) a feeling that people are unable to influence the things that are happening to them.

This litany of causes of disaffection is epitomized in a statement made recently by Harvard sociologist David Reisman for *The New York Times*. According to Reisman:

> *". . .there is a feeling that the country isn't worth much. It is racist, sexist, imperialist. It reflects a despair. . .there is no search for a usable past."*

The extent of alienation as measured by recent polls is now at a whopping 61 percent of the population.

This brings me to the point that the most current and pressing problem in citizenship education is the issue of *how civic education should take place in a society where people are at variance with their institutions*. Until we come to terms with the basic limits of government and institutions, it will be difficult to reconcile people's broken expectations and overcome the present cynicism of young people toward education for participation in civic affairs.

The dissonance in society signifies that the introduction of a new course or modest alteration in the citizenship curriculum will not materially affect student learning in civic education. What is indicated is a major reconstruction of the civic education curriculum. This must begin with a new definition, clearly setting forth what being a citizen means in the latter part of the 20th century. Not until the respon-

sibilities of citizenship are determined can new programs on how to educate for citizenship be developed.

Problems in the schools

Another problem of great magnitude is the apparent ineffectiveness of the schools in preparing today's children and youth for the public tasks of a democratic society. This ineffectiveness is clearly visible in (1) the low quality of conventional civic education programs, (2) the willingness and eagerness of young people to accept distorted and sensational messages from the media, (3) the accelerating increase in juvenile crime and violence, and (4) the increasing disrespect felt and expressed by young people for the most important institutions of their society.

An informed disrespect would be embarrassing, but encouraging; unfortunately, every examination of young people's knowledge and opinions reveals that both the critical and the supportive attitudes of the young float atop an abyss of ignorance. *The 1973 citizenship test by the National Assessment of Educational Progress demonstrated that 17-year-olds and young adults know frighteningly little about the personalities or policies of governmental leaders, and have not even begun to understand the workings of the American political process.*

Other studies document a startling shift in the values of young Americans. Comparing the replies to his questionnaire gathered in 1967 and in 1973, Daniel Yankelovich concluded that this 6-year period marked the end of one era of values and the beginning of another. The most dramatic change Yankelovich noted was a turning away from the concept of patriotism. In 1969, 35 percent of the young people in Yankelovich's sample considered patriotism an important value; by 1973, only 19 percent considered it significant.

Some of the blame for this deterioration in both understanding and attitude must be accepted by the schools. Citizenship education — which the founding fathers considered crucial to public education — has been allowed to disappear behind the facade of more fashionable concerns. *Meeting the noisiest demands of the community one at a time rather than attempting the hard work of building a coherent curriculum, the designers of elementary programs have pushed aside civic education in favor of other social problems.*

Citizenship — a neglected area

Citizenship education in the schools, which has long been a neglected area, is now in a serious state of intellectual disrepair. In the elementary schools, it is an interdisciplinary subject which is frequently lost in the shuffle as society fosters more of its problems on the schools. The elementary schools are now expected to intervene in the national trend toward a new immorality by teaching courses on drugs, venereal disease, and sex education.

Out of a societal concern for jobs and the economy, career education has recently been pushed on the schools. This complex subject—requiring detailed and sequential study—has been developed in units which ludicrously reach all the way down into kindergarten. *As the schools made room for this phantasmagoria of new activity, important traditions such as citizenship education have been deemphasized or dropped from the accountable part of the total curriculum.*

At the secondary level, the major burden for teaching about citizenship is borne by the narrow, lifeless civics courses which are usually taught in grades 8 or 9. This weakness is compounded by the fact that too often this course is taught by the school's weakest teacher, or an athletic coach, who needs a light teaching schedule because of after-school coaching activities. This is a further indication that we, as educators, have not considered citizenship an important subject.

Another problem of considerable proportions is the question of how to wrest control of civic education from the social studies departments to which it has been delegated. The rubric of civic education should be percolated throughout every course taught in school. Certainly, the morals found in good literature are equally as appropriate to learning about citizenship as are the precepts of social studies.

The collapse of discipline

A serious obstacle to effective civic education programs is the collapse of discipline in the schools. George Gallup, who annually polls the public on their attitudes toward the schools, reported recently that lack of discipline has been named as the number one problem of the schools in 7 of the last 8 years. In my reference to discipline I am not talking about a rigid authoritarian atmosphere with absolute com-

pliance. But we must have enough order in our schools, and sufficient regard for the purpose of education, to allow students and teachers to go about the business of teaching and learning without interference and disruption.

Underlying the breakdown of discipline is the growing rate of crime in schools. Crimes in school — many of them unreported — have multiplied in the last 10 years. This is an area where the larger society must help. The school is defenseless against a criminal justice system that simply books the juvenile offender, notes his crime in its record books, and then returns him to school to do it again. The first definition of a good citizen is that he does not commit crimes. Without a societal commitment to the seemingly obvious truth that crime in school is utterly intolerable, programs of vivic education are likely to breed cynicism rather than respect.

The element of misbehavior in schools is not sufficiently stressed. There can be no effective programs of citizenship training in schools where the washrooms are dangerous, the halls are dirty, and students behave discourteously to their teachers or to each other. A part of this problem, and a factor which creates skepticism in youth, lies in what is called the "hidden curriculum". The "hidden curriculum" can be defined as the way the school actually operates in contrast to what it says it does. It is the students' perception of an adult-directed system which says one thing and does another.

Hidden curriculum

A fundamental part of the hidden curriculum issue is the operation of the schools themselves—which fail to practice good citizenship by not instilling in the student bodies a respect for cleanliness and decency in the halls and in the rest rooms. Some schools make an effort to do this, but most of this energy is directed through the student council, which has failed miserably as an institution representing students' interests. The schools should dispense with the presently organized student council, which is sponsored by the national principals association, and institute new and improved forms of governance in which students are profoundly involved in making decisions affecting the daily life of the school.

As Alan Westin, the noted civil libertarian, put it so well:

"Our schools are now educating millions of

students who are not forming an allegiance to the democratic political system simply because they do not experience such a democratic system in their daily lives in school."

G.K. Chesterton once observed that Christianity had not been tried and found wanting; it had been found difficult, and not tried — and so it is with civic education. Meaningful and effective programs in citizenship education cannot be bought from the shelf, and no small part of our present malaise expresses the failure of past attempts to accomplish the political acculturation of the rising generation in a school context.

Properly understood, civic education is not just a matter of knowledge and understanding, or of attitude; it is a matter of behavior. Attitudes and understanding grow out of behavior just as behavior flows from attitudes and understanding. A good citizen at school is more likely to be a good citizen as an adult.

Educating for responsibility

Another significant problem confronting the reform of civic education is the serious imbalance which now exists between students' rights and responsibilities. The situation is this: the schools have been agitated for the past 10 years over the question of student rights, but there has been no corresponding hue and cry over the equally important matter of student obligations. The result is that a critical imbalance now exists between students' rights and their responsibilities.

The major problem in American education is the unresolved question: What obligations do students have to school and society in return for their entitlement to 12 years of education at public expense? Put succinctly, this is a question to which no one has proposed an answer. Research is nil and the literature is extremely thin. The consequence is that schools have not delineated student responsibilities in such a way that the student knows precisely what they are, nor are they woven into the curriculum in any decipherable way.

When the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education made its study in 1973, it analyzed hundreds of handbooks published by schools and State departments of education under the title, "Student Rights and Respon-

sibilities. It found that 99 percent of the content of these documents dealt with student rights and that roughly one percent of their content dealt with responsibilities.

Within the last several years, student rights all the way up to due process have been guaranteed by the Supreme Court in the cases of *Tinker v. Des Moines, Goss v. López, and Wood v. Strickland.* Surely the time has come for educators to stress the acquisition of responsibilities — without which rights quickly become meaningless.

Shrinking schools

Looming as a quantum problem in the reform of civic education is the end of the boom in education. In the 1950's and the 1960's the schools were in a period of great expansion. The explosive growth of that period permitted a constant influx of younger people to flood the staffs of schools. But the boom is now over. Instead of growing, schools are shrinking, with the rate of population growth in the United States currently below replacement level. This means that the schools no longer have the opportunity to bring in large numbers of younger staff members, and the ones that are there are growing older.

So, when you think about the reform of civic education, you have to think about what you can accomplish at a time when the schools are getting smaller; fewer kids are going through them; and the teachers are growing older. And that is very different from the normal, expansive way the American people like to think about things.

The problem of television

Not the least of the problems confronting the reform of civic education is the television media. The noted international psychologist Kenneth Keniston contends that "television has become a flickering blue parent — occupying more of the waking hours of children that any other single influence, including both parents and schools."

In countries saturated by television, it is well established that children spend more than 4,000 hours watching television before they enter the first grade; and between kindergarten and graduation from high school, they have spent 12,000 hours in school and 15,000 hours viewing television.

In spite of this enormous exposure and influence, the media has taken no responsibility for helping to develop

civic competencies. It is certainly within the grasp of television to give deeper information as well as encourage discussion but, strangely enough, it has remained aloof to this potential.

In view of the enormous amount of viewing done by children, much of their attitudes, values, and behavior are unquestionably influenced by the media. But the evidence strongly indicates that the kind of political information which comes from television lacks coherence and consistency, and can be best be described as fragmented. Some theorists have gone so far as to advance the thesis that "There is a deliberate policy on the part of the mass media to promote 'disassociated impacting' of information." Their analysis is based upon programming policies which emphasize the sensational or the conflict of the moment rather than the long-range issues. Certainly, the more inhuman and bizarre the event, the more attention it receives on television.

Agent of conformity

The towering impact of television as a mass agent of conformity is epitomized by Oscar Krantz, who referred to it as "the massiest media in the history of mass media." Perhaps Frank Lloyd Wright described television more colorfully than anyone else when he referred to it as "the chewing gum of the eyes."

While the evidence is not yet in as to the effect of television on morality, extensive research in the last few years by Keniston, Kohlberg, and others, has concluded that while we now have the most literate society in history, it is in a state of unbelievable moral underdevelopment. Data indicate a failure almost everywhere to generate moral development and a consciousness for civic responsibility.

The question arises: Just what impact has television had on citizenship? While there is insufficient research on this topic, there is ample evidence of a decline in the quality of citizenship over the period of television's greatest growth. For example, the percentage of the population which voted during the past four presidential elections has gone down steadily and significantly. Between 1960 and 1972, when 30 million citizens became of voting age, the voter ranks grew by less than nine million people. This dropoff was primarily among the younger voters. While a direct relationship be-

tween the rise of television and the decline of voting cannot be proved, it is abundantly clear that television has not aroused fresh enthusiasm for participating in the democratic process.

What is disquieting is the mounting evidence that television has had a negative effect on citizenship. Mervin D. Field, a California analyst, reports research findings which indicate that television viewers often experience an uncomfortable feeling of being left out. Dr. Michael Robinson, in a study for the Aspen Institute, determined that the growth of television has contributed to a noticeable decline in citizens' beliefs in their institutions. Dr. Robinson concluded, ". . .the greater the dependency upon television, the greater the personal confusion and estrangement from government."

The media — and especially television — must be faulted for failing utterly and completely to accept any accountability for the development of responsible citizens.

Deficiencies in civic education programs.

Up to now, I have been discussing problems and deficiencies which hinder the reform of civic education.

First, I fault the credentialing practices of the various State departments of education. Nowhere do I find that, as part of their preparation, teachers of civic education are required to do an internship in government, municipal affairs, the criminal justice system, or some other related area. Most State departments simply require that prospective teachers select from a smorgasbord of courses in history, anthropology, and sociology.

In order to accomplish the goal of reforming civic education, high school curricula must be broadened to include a community internship in civic education as a requirement for graduation. It is ludicrous to have teachers who have not interned themselves setting up and organizing internship programs.

Secondly, I fault the colleges of education. For years, the teacher training institutions which train teachers in the social studies have been kind of "fitting teachers for an unfitted fitness." First, they have failed to select and train the high quality of teachers needed in this area. A review of course offerings by colleges of education reflect a complete lack of imagination and often an absence of fundamental training for

teachers of civic education. Under the leadership of colleges of education, civic education has simply lost its way.

Recently the dean of a college of education wrote me that the problems of civic education in the teacher training institutions were serious, but not hopeless. To which I replied, "They are hopeless, but not serious."

Another glaring deficiency is the skittishness which public school teachers feel toward moral education. They approach the topic with trepidation — or not at all. This is contrary to public opinion. In his annual poll on education, George Gallup reported in 1975 that 84 percent of the public school parents favored instruction in moral education in the schools. This data was confirmed in the 1976 poll by only a slightly lower percentage.

A National Assessment

What do American students know about their government and what are their attitudes toward one another?

Results of a Bicentennial survey of 13- and 17-year-old students by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) disclosed that:

- Even in light of recent political history, 14 percent of the 17-year-olds and 12 percent of the 13-year-olds think the President of the United States does not always have to obey the laws of the land. In fact, the students place Army generals and the President on about the same level: 12 percent of the 17-year-olds and 13 percent of the 13-year-olds think that Army generals don't have to always obey the law.
- When asked whether Congress or the President has the right to stop radio, television or newspapers from criticizing government operations, over 80 percent of the 17-year-olds and over 70 percent of the 13-year-olds recognize that such an act is against the rights of a free press.
- Thirty-two percent of the 17-year-old students do not think it is important to vote in all elections nor is it necessary to vote if it appears that the candidate of their choice isn't going to win.
- An overwhelming number — over 95 percent — of the 17-year-olds think a person should be able to vote whether rich, poor, male or female; 6 percent agree with the state-

ment, "some people should not be allowed to vote because they are not smart enough."

"Most of the results show that American youths, at least on paper, are concerned for the well-being and dignity of others and recognize that discrimination is wrong," said Roy H. Forbes, director of National Assessment. Eighty-five percent of the 17-year-olds do not think the color of a person's skin is a basis for choosing a friend, and 9 out of 10 support equal-housing opportunities," Forbes continued.

"When asked whether getting a job should depend on one's sex, race, political opinion, religion or abilities and skills, nearly all students agree that the determining factor should be one's abilities and skills. However, when asked: 'If you saw several students fighting in the hallway, what would you *do?*' only 37 percent of the 17-year-olds say they would either look for someone in authority or try to stop the fight themselves. It is interesting to note how different groups answer that question," Forbes said. "Contrary to most NAEP results, males score 20 percentage points below females on this question; students from the urban fringe are 4 percentage points below the national level, while those from economically disadvantaged urban areas are 7 percentage points above the national level."

The National Assessment findings are from a select portion of a major assessment in citizenship and social studies to be released in 1977. The Bicentennial survey was given to 5,000 students during the 1976 spring school semester.

The lowest scores for each age group are in response to the question: "Suppose the President sends troops to another country to fight. What action can the Congress take to stop U.S. participation in the fighting?" Congress can exercise its power of the purse by refusing to provide money for further military action, but this fact is known by only 16 percent of the 13-year-olds and 22 percent of the 17-year-olds. The most common response is that Congress can declare the President's action unconstitutional.

Asked whether Congress has the right to pass a law establishing a national church, 82 percent of the 17-year-olds and 69 percent of the 13-year-olds say no. Thirteen-year-old students from the Southeast score unusually high on this question, 6 percentage points above the Nation.

This NAEP survey also found that just over half of the nation's 17-year-old students know that each State has two

U.S. senators and that the number of U.S. representatives from each State is determined by the State's population. Thirty-five percent of the students think the President can appoint people to Congress.

"These figures are disconcerting when one realizes that, within a year, these students will be of voting age and the life-blood of our democracy is dependent upon an informed citizenry," said Marie D. Eldridge, administrator of the National Center for Education Statistics, under whose auspices NAEP operates.

Resolving Crucial Problems

Abigal Van Buren, more affectionately known as "Dear Abby," listed what she considered to be the Nation's most crucial problems, not necessarily in order of their importance: poverty, crime, violence, unemployment, inflation, racial inequality, mental illness, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, venereal disease, equal rights for women, the cost of welfare, concern for our elderly, the crumbling family syndrome, and the decline of standards in our education.

To put it in more contemporary language according to Abby, "turning on, tuning in, freaking out and shacking up."

Abby's special concerns begin with one of the problems seriously affecting young people throughout our Nation — drug abuse. . . an estimated 80 percent have tried pot by the time they are seniors in high school. According to Abby, the media has done an excellent job of educating the public to the dangers of drug abuse.

"It's to the credit of our young people that rehab centers and halfway houses are staffed almost entirely by students who themselves were once hooked on drugs, but with treatment and determination, were able to re-enter society as respectable, law-abiding citizens."

Crucial problem

Another crucial problem, cited Abby, is the inferior quality of our education.

"Being the recipient of approximately 10,000 letters a week, of which more than a third come from the 30-year-old or under age group, I can attest to the fact that those who

were educated in the 1950's and 1960's did not receive *anywhere near* the quality of education as those of us who were educated in the 1930's and the 1940's."

Abby alluded to "poor handwriting, atrocious spelling, and pathetic grammar" with little ability to express themselves clearly or even adequately in their letters.

The results of a 4-month in-depth survey by the *Los Angeles Times* showed a decline in standards of schools and colleges causing educators across the Nation to agree, "You just can't expect as much from students today as we did, say, 15 years ago."

Abby theorized that the permissive atmosphere is currently responsible for children reared at home today to resist discipline and lose respect for authorities at school. Then too, teachers claim pressures for lowering traditional standards of academic quality, consequently dispersing A's and B's for work that formerly merited C's and D's.

Abby decried high rates of absenteeism in classrooms, low attendance in college classroom with high enrollments and the rise in teacher's salaries — all contributing to why "Johnny can't read."

Back to the basics

There is a solution, however! *"Go Back to the teaching of basics: reading, writing, and math."* While parents and authorities are quick to lay the blame on television, William Schramm, Director of the University of Hawaii's East-West Center, and national authority on communications and learning, said he found no hard evidence regarding the effects of television on academic achievement. He further stated that television may be partially responsible for the rise in verbal abilities of primary grade children as reflected in standardized achievement test scores. Abby feels that television, with parental guidance, can be an effective tool for teaching children.

Citizen education can resolve two high-priority problems: teenage pregnancy and venereal disease. The sexual revolution today shows that one million teenagers become pregnant every year. In 1974, nearly 608,000 teenagers gave birth and an estimated 300,000 teenagers had abortions. Today, teenagers account for one third of all abortions in the United States.

Abby praised the efforts of Planned Parenthood for pro-

viding information, contraceptive care, and related health services on the basis of need and not on the basis of the ability to pay.

"Obviously, not all of our Nation's crucial problems can be solved by educating the public, but the solutions to the problems of drug abuse, the rise of venereal disease and the problem of unwanted children can be solved in no other way."

Examining Relationships

"The principal problem to which all sectors of American society ought to address themselves," said William F. Buckley, Jr., "is the problem of the evanescing affection felt by the public for human freedom.

"It was at Gettysburg that Abraham Lincoln, addressing a crowd of people who had been dazed by the length of the preceding speech, uttered what he thought were simply a few words of purely ritual importance which, however, continued to resonate throughout the 19th century and the current century. He ended that talk by asking a question which was widely understood as being rhetorical. The question was: Could a government by the people, of the people, and for the people endure?"

It was subsequently revealed by Lincoln's biographer John Hay, that Lincoln attached considerable importance to that question. As Lincoln explained to Hay, "My parents experienced revolution, and I, as a second generation American, feel that revolutionary impulse. I understand what it was that the United States fought to achieve in declaring its independence, because that experience is related to me, and I feel it almost as though I had experienced it myself. But what about our children and our grandchildren's children? For them the American Revolution will be merely an abstraction, and an abstraction which it will be difficult for them to recall with any vividness."

"It seems plain," Buckley said, "if we survey the ease and the relaxation with which the United States seems to be surrendering its appreciation of freedom and its constituent parts, that Abraham Lincoln's question is not one that we can answer with the kind of historical conviction that he

hoped might be aroused by his declamations at Gettysburg."

Buckley noted that freedom has a certain utilitarian base that seems to be widely accepted, "if only pragmatically." As an example he cited the fact that five percent of the population in the U.S. is engaged in producing food sufficient to feed 30 percent of the world.

"We also have a dim apprehension of the nature of spiritual freedom. We know what the motions are, we know what the rituals are, we know what we are required to say about freedom, but in point of fact we find that our convictions about it, when tested, tend to be rather superficial."

Discovery of Mao's China

Buckley then discussed the "discovery" of Mao's China by American journalists and intellectuals about 5 years ago, and the numerous books and articles written about it subsequently. He cited Harvard University Professor Ross Terrell, who said it was difficult to answer the question "Is China free?" because freedom is always defined under the limitations of the relevant entity. "For the United States, it happens to be the individual," Terrell wrote, "for China it's the whole state."

This, Buckley said, gives us an insight into the nature of the problem. "We experience that ideological egalitarianism that follows in the wake of international diplomacy in an age in which one is afraid to affirm one's values.

"Our experience with China is a key to understanding the extent to which we have psychologically prepared ourselves to subordinate freedom, which once was primary in our considerations. We did learn as a result of an unhappy generation toying with a Wilsonian foreign policy that it isn't our responsibility — it isn't, indeed, possible for the United States — to impose freedom on other people. John Adams knew that a hundred years before Woodrow Wilson experienced his vision. John Adams said in his inaugural address, 'The American people are friends of liberty everywhere, but custodians only of our own.'

"So we have retreated from an explicit form of Wilsonianism, but we did not retreat from the standards by which we measured life in other parts of the world. We did not find ourselves saying we are indifferent to the question of whether human freedom is tolerated in this state or in that state. We did say we are not prepared to send the Marines to

enforce freedom because of the limitations of our own military might — our own resources — but we never found ourselves saying it doesn't really matter whether a society is free.

"And yet that is exactly what some of the most important men and women in the United States have been saying explicitly and implicitly about life in China today. This is a reflection of a deep lack of conviction in the United States about the continued relevance of human freedom, and I judge that to be *the* crucial problem of the century — the great question of whether 5, 10, 15, 20 years from now, we will be insisting on the kind of freedom that has distinguished this society and that served as the inspiration for Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg."

Role of government

What is the role of Government? Largely passive, according to Buckley. He quoted Dr. Johnson, "The end of political liberty is personal liberty," and stated his own belief that there is no reason for political liberty except in order to effect personal liberty.

What is the role of education? "The role of education is, among other things, to affirm the whole notion of intellectual progress. Under academic freedom as commonly understood, it is impossible to make any affirmation whatsoever, because all ideas are supposed to start equal in the race. But it is impossible, without expressing a profound epistemological pessimism, to assume that nothing gets discovered in the course of education. And if certain things do get discovered, such as that freedom is an achievement towards which we all ought constantly to struggle, then its opposite, slavery, is always to be despised and fought against."

What is the role of religion? "Religion, surely, is there primarily to remind us of the preeminence of the individual conscience." Buckley quoted Whitaker Chambers who said that human freedom is a political reading of the Bible, with its stress on the individual and the incompatibility of slavery and with the whole notion of the uniqueness of man.

Role of labor

What is the role of labor? "Labor ought, above all things, not to identify itself as simply one more lobby for the sake of attempting to wrest one more advantage for this union or that

union. Labor ought to be in the forefront of the principal demand of human freedom, which is the right of the laborer to maintain for himself, to the extent that it is possible while still living in a common society, the fruit of his labor.

"This," Buckley said, "is how the various sectors in American society impinge on the question of human freedom.

"Albert Jay Nock, the essayist, wrote this haunting line in his journals a generation ago: 'Someday I think I will dedicate myself to trying to write an essay on how does one observe that one is slipping into a Dark Age.' He meant that if you knew it was a Dark Age, you would resist your movements toward it. It is that which you don't know that you tend to do without knowing the consequences of your inattention.

"It was Alfred North Whitehead who said that a society reveals most about itself in what it does not say, because what it does not say is that which it takes for granted. What we are not saying with any conviction at the moment is that we continue to believe that the primary secular value is human freedom."

A Student's Perspective

By Frederick D. McClure

What is the shape of our Nation's future? And furthermore, what are our responsibilities in shaping this future? A number of experts predict that by the year 2000, America's population will be over 300 million, with more than three-fourths concentrated in sprawling supercities.

We can look back and trace rather easily the trends and influences which have brought us to our present point. And we can look ahead and see that unless some of these trends are checked or rechanneled; we could indeed, by the year 2000, arrive where we might wish to turn back the clock — but cannot.

The divorce and juvenile crime statistics continue to rise. We are alarmed, so we ask ourselves the question: What is the reason for the upward-spiraling number of broken homes and delinquent acts? Many newspaper and magazine articles

are diagnosing the problem as one which has its beginning in the American home.

The family used to be a closely-knit group and the home was self-contained. It was shelter; it was security; it was a kind of school where life's basic lessons were taught; it was a kind of church where God was honored. It was a factory where the basic necessities of life were made.

Then came the 20th century — great industrial centers were built; child psychology was developed, materialism increased, new communication and entertainment mediums appeared on the scene — and our home life, as a result, experienced shock and change.

Lately our institutions have been under attack — the Supreme Court, the FBI, the military, the Congress, the Presidency, the flag, the church, the educational system, and even the home. However, in spite of these faults and failures, I still believe in these American institutions, and our goal should be to cleanse and protect them as they protected us throughout the years.

Preserve home life

What is happening to America, then? Where is our sense of moral values? No wonder the American home and other institutions are seemingly crumbling. No wonder a concerned J. Edgar Hoover once said, "The home is the citadel of American life. If the home is lost, all is lost." Thoughtful spokesmen the world over agree that if society's health in the world is to be maintained, the homes and our institutions must be preserved.

Probably the most serious and important problem involves population growth by the year 2024, it is expected that there will be more than seven billion people on our planet. Also affecting the future will be the depletion of our natural resources such as petroleum, the natural fertility of the soil, clean water, and so on; and serious disruption of the ecological balance and man's environment.

Also threatening our society and mankind are the ever apparent decline of personal and governmental morality. Even now this appears in the disintegration of basic ideals of law and justice. The crime growth and consumer egotism also figure into this destruction of mankind. The spread of alcoholism and drug addiction add even more fuel to the fire.

Another pressing problem today is protein starvation, af-

fecting hundreds of millions of people. The problem of feeding this starving world boils down to the case of the "haves" versus the "have nots"; a case of the developed countries versus those that are just now developing. The criteria that determines whether or not a country is developed boils down to the availability of feed and its production, the amount of income, and the population.

During the next 50 years alone, the importance of energy created from huge power plants with pollution controls will become even greater. At the same time, there will probably be increased exploration of atomic energy sources.

Don't return to the past

With these factors in mind, it seems that it is absolutely impossible for mankind to return to the so-called healthy life of the past, which was, in reality, very difficult and often cruel and joyless. This is probably the case even if man could make this change under the conditions that currently or may exist through competition and economic and political circles.

I accept the fact that we live in a world, even though its population is constantly and steadily increasing, that actually is growing smaller and smaller every day, because of the changes and advances in technology, spurred by research and development. I also recognize that the United States may seemingly have a moral and humanitarian obligation to help others, so I am not suggesting a policy of isolationism as we attempt to solve the problems that we face. Yet, I am suggesting a policy along with other nations that is in keeping with good sound economics. Show me a businessman or nation that cannot adjust to changing times, and I will show you an individual or nation headed for bankruptcy.

Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced. Then we can truly live up to the challenge of former President Harry S. Truman and accept the premise that progress occurs when courageous and skillful leaders seize the opportunity and face the challenge of changing things for the better. For yes, the only thing constant in America today is change, and our future lies not in the vastness of our machines but in the smallness of our spirits.

Archibald MacLeish said, "America was promises. And its promises have always motivated us — self-fulfillment,

freedom and independence, a decent living. The promise of pleasure, of a life beyond mere drudgery, of being new/young, in the forefronts of an adventure, on top of things. The 'unalienable rights' of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The Hidden Curriculum

Children sense the "unvarnished truth" about politics and economics through their life experiences and impressions gained outside the classroom, claimed Robert Coles in his speech presented in General Session I. He condemned present classroom instruction in civics-related courses as unrealistic, lacking in historical perspective, and never touching upon current controversial issues that shape today's society. *It is outside the classroom, Coles said, that children learn about America's class system, the struggles of contemporary American heroes for unpopular causes, and inequitable economic structures.*

Coles based his claim on extensive and indepth interviews with children over a long period of time—an approach to data-gathering on children's citizenship attitudes that has not been used in prior research. His findings, said Cole, provoke questions like: (1) How do teachers impart political socialization (citizenship education)? (2) What do university level political scientists teach about?

Children's perceptions of American politics in no way, apparently, resemble the idealized and traditional subject matter most often used as a basis for education for citizenship. Children whom Coles has interviewed "will tell you about Richard Nixon and will tell you even more abstractly about the nature of political office before Watergate . . . Where did they get the strong, discerning knowledge? Were they taught in school? Where have many Appalachian children learned about the coal companies? That has to do, with the class system in America, one of the great unmentionables in American education.

. . . "Somehow our children figure this out. I suspect that many of you know they are not taught these kinds of things in school. . . They pick up a word here, a word there . . . sometimes in an aside, an uncle, a relative, a minister,

maybe the family doctor."

Coles used the education system in South Africa to add emphasis to his claim that children are not realistically educated for citizenship in the classroom. While visiting South Africa two years ago, Coles "tried to tell people about American children in various parts of the country: black or white, rich or poor, rural, suburban, northern, southern, eastern, and western." He was told, he said, by a collection of black school teachers that, "not in a hundred years, would the school children of South Africa even dream of taking a stand against their government." But, he continued, "in complacent, strong, monolithic South Africa. . .those children have taken to the streets. . .against mighty arms and they have been shot down and they still march in the streets . . . A government that has had absolute control over the educational system of millions of people has, with tremendous, relentless enthusiasm and conviction, indoctrinated these children only find them marching in the streets."

These developments in South Africa, said Coles, are analogous to the American scene in the 1960s, when "some well-indoctrinated young people" — some even from the schools in the rural south in the 1950s — took issue with what they had learned — took issue even with what they had learned in college."

Coles asserted that Freud was right in many ways when he gave children credit for enormous ingenuity by virtue of a certain type of child-like guile. Children often learn about political realities in spite of and not because of what they are taught in school. "In our schools, as we are taught about Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln he asked, where is the effort to attach this history to the living, breathing realities around us? How does the history of these heroes relate to the Washington gangs and the political lobbies of the 1970s?" Referring to the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Coles queried, "What do we call those who stand up and make their assertion? How are they referred to in our schools?"

It is vitally important, Coles stated, that a balanced political perspective be worked into every curriculum in the country, and that we eliminate the teaching of negative reactions to "current events not clarified by historical perspective." The reality gap in this country, he observed, exists at even the highest levels.

Part Three

Values and Morality

By T. H. Bell

Citizenship education cannot and should not be divorced from moral education. The two are intimately related, and moral education may well be the single most important component of the more general concept of citizenship education. I think that the willingness of conference participants to posit ethical or moral rights and wrongs, do's and don'ts, is a testament to where we are — and perhaps a reflection of where we have been. The time is long past when we can muddle our way through an area as vital as moral and citizenship education. Indirection, vagueness, or ostrich-like neglect avail us nothing.

Examples could be drawn from any period in history attesting to the need of human societies for some recognized system of morality or code of ethical conduct. It simply is not possible for men and women to live in groups without practicing adherence to some form of moral behavior. Moral education does not have to have a basis in organized religion. If spiritual values can be shown to have naturalistic meaning, as I believe they can, then there is no need to attempt to validate them by reference to supernatural forces or reference to specific religious doctrines. If morality occupies a natural and necessary position in the affairs of civilized humankind, and is not the exclusive province of organized religion, then it is the common responsibility of all men and women to accept the teaching of moral values in a system of public education. The psychologist Abraham Maslow put it in even stronger terms:

A place in education

"The teaching of spiritual values, of ethical and moral values," wrote Maslow, "definitely does have a place in

education, perhaps ultimately a very basic and essential place, and this in no way needs to controvert the American separation between church and state for the very simple reason that spiritual, ethical, and moral values need have nothing to do with any church. Or perhaps better said, they are the common core of all churches, all religions, including the non-theistic ones. As a matter of fact, it is possible that precisely these ultimate values are and should be the far goals of all education, as they are and should be also the far goals of psychotherapy, of child care, of marriage, the family, of work, and perhaps of all other social institutions."

First, let me sketch the present climate as I see it. For it seems to me the signs and harbingers are everywhere. That there is stong and increasingly vocal public advocacy for moral education can hardly be disputed. (I am deliberately avoiding the stronger term "mandate," although it may be more accurate.)

Take, for example, the messages coming at us from all sides from two interacting fields — politics and the media. Anyone who followed the national conventions this summer, anyone who has listened to the statements of both presidential candidates — I promise you this is a bipartisan speech! — anyone who has read or viewed media commentary on the contemporary scene must be aware of the call for a reaffirmation of our historic values. The need to state and teach our values is so widely voiced that we may lose sight of its importance. Fortunately, like all truisms, it remains true.

Items for consideration

Some other signs and portents. Item: The 1975 Seventh Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education included a series of questions devoted to education in morals and moral behavior. Seventy-nine percent of those interviewed supported the instruction of moral behavior. Of parents with children in public schools, 84 percent were in favor of moral education. Of parents with children in parochial schools, 85 percent were in favor. The *Phi Delta Kappan*, in its December 1975 issue, commented as follows on this survey: "Presumably, the home and the church are the proper places to give children instruction in morals and moral behavior. But in the absence of such instruction in many homes, the responsibility shifts . . . to the schools. At least to meet the present need, an overwhelming majority of all groups in the population would like to see such instruction

provided by the schools. And, significantly, one of the groups most in favor is that composed of parents of children now attending public schools."

Item: The citizenship objectives of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1974-75, lists seven major goals. Four of them are directly related to moral education: Show concern for the well-being and dignity of others; support just law and the rights of all individuals; approach decisions rationally; and help and respect [one's] own families. In several ways, the report emphasizes that students must formulate their own beliefs while understanding and respecting the viewpoints of others.

Item: In a recent survey of State departments of education, an overwhelming majority cite moral education as a major goal. Most of them are engaged in, or planning to be engaged in, carrying it out. The Michigan Department of Education, in a task force report, stated: "To show young people the value of moral inquiry [is] most distinctly [the purview of public education], since in a democratic society, one of the purposes of the public school — if not the purpose — is to educate for the betterment of the whole."

The Hawaii Department of Education, in a 1973 document, stated: "Values education is a process of discovering and developing values. Its aim is to encourage teachers and students to raise questions about what constitutes the good: the good life, the good man. It seeks through analysis and survey to discover what people individually and in groups believe to be good."

Standards of quality

The State of Virginia's Standards of Quality for Public Schools states two specific goals of public education: participate in a free society; and develop ethical standards of behavior and a realistic self-image.

The introduction to the *Guide for Teaching Ethical and Moral Values in Alabama Schools* states:

"Whereas, there has been widespread confusion and misunderstanding of the imperishable truths, time-tested doctrines, and democratic ideals upon which our state and nation were founded; and . . .

"Whereas, there has in recent years also been a clearly evident decline in the spirit of patriotism and disregard for religious, moral and ethical values on the part of young people and adults as well; and . . .

"Whereas many students in Alabama's public schools, colleges, and other institutions of learning, and teachers themselves are sometimes disturbed and uncertain about what positions they should take as to basic truths, standards of morality and ethical behavior; and . . .

"Whereas, Alabama has never formulated a statewide program for teaching morals and religion in public schools . . .

"Now, therefore, be it resolved that the State Board of Education hereby authorizes the preparation of a general handbook and related curriculum materials to be used in such instruction . . ."

Despite this cacaphony of diverse voices urging moral education, there seems to be a curious misapprehension among some that moral education is "new" or "innovative" or "gimmicky." Of course, nothing could be farther from the truth. What we are talking about is as old as this country — and older. For moral education has always been with us. God willing, it always will be with us. The enduring social and personal values on which it is based are grounded in the American heritage.

Whose values?

When we consider these basic cultural values, it is important to recognize that the question of *whose* values is not really relevant. They are all of ours, the values — or ideals — of the many, many elements of our pluralistic society. There might be room to differ on the source of values — for instance, revealed truth, rationality, or intuition, or a combination of these — but it is not the source that concerns us. The social-political agreement of our body politic, on which this country rests, resides in a set of values which transcends their source and ethnic or radical diversity.

Would anyone here dispute the fundamental value of respect for self? respect for others? equality? liberty? R. S. Peters, the noted British philosopher — cites, among others, as values basic to democratic societies: liberty, rationality, and freedom, including the freedom for self-development and autonomy. Moral educators, values educators, religious, and special interest groups — you name it — come together on exactly this point. These *are* our fundamental values. These have always been our fundamental values.

Even a cursory reading of America's basic documents reveals how deeply these values are embedded in our his-

tory. The signers of the *Mayflower Compact* in 1620 stated: "[we do] solemnly and mutually in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine *ourselves together into a civil Body Politick,* for our better Ordering and Preservation,... And by Virtue hereof do enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, and Offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient *for the general Good of the Colony;* unto which we promise all due Submission and Obedience."

From this beginning have flowed our most cherished historic documents: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. All of these reaffirm, as this conference is now reaffirming, the values which have shaped this country's destiny.

The documents contain the words, phrases, and concepts which illuminate the principles that have guided us for 200 years. They clearly reflect both our Judaic-Christian tradition and our Western intellectual tradition. These are the very principles and values which sustained us in our earliest days. They are the principles which have continued to sustain us through wars, adversities, and national upheavals.

"Moral" vs. "education"

Up to now I have been talking about what the word "moral" means in moral education. Let me now approach it from the point of view of the second word: "education." Again, our past illuminates the present. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 states, in Article 3: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This country's schools were grounded on a concern for transferring our basic values to our children, in short, educating them in these values. In earlier and simpler times, this was accomplished through a loose, informal, but intimate confederation of home, church, and school. Each, in its own way, was a purveyor of moral education. Each reinforced the other two. Thus there was a three-way interaction, with teachers, parents, and religious leaders sharing functions, roles, and yes, even places of residence. Moral education thus became an implicit responsibility of the child's most immediate environmental influences.

Things are not that simple today. The mixed blessings of

the industrial revolution, urbanization, technological advances — and all their accompaniments — have led to the highly complex and fragmented social structure we now live in. Unlike earlier times, today's children may rarely be in contact with a religious leader or organization, may (and this is well documented) require of their home only a bed and a TV set — *but* they *do* go to school — at least, most of them. The downward spiral of alienation and dropouts exists, to be sure, but school is perhaps the sole common denominator of children past infancy.

Schools assume responsibility

Today, then, it becomes even more imperative than ever for the school system to assume the responsibility for moral education. It stands alone in having both the opportunity and the right to do so — a claim which can be made for no other social institution. And, schools *do* "teach" moral education every school day of the year, whether they know it or not, whether deliberate or not. Teacher attitudes, disciplinary codes, and the so-called hidden curriculum all operate to implicitly convey a values/moral set. There are no "values-free" schools. Our task here, then, is to consider ways of deliberately, systematically, and effectively carrying out moral education in the schools — and to do this in a way that violates none of the ethnic, racial, or religious differences that characterize our country's children. Education for citizenship begins with moral and ethical values.

You will note that I used the words "effectively" and "systematically" in speaking of teaching moral education. I use them purposely. We are learning all the time in this field. Our new knowledge and research provide a rich source of valid information about what techniques, approaches, curriculums, do and don't work. The issue is really not whether moral education should be embedded throughout a curriculum or taught directly in a separate course — or both. The point is that schools now have access to a knowledge base which can guide effective moral-education programs. The evidence is in, and we must use it.

Reference to crucial aspects

Some very important strands of this knowledge base refer to crucial aspects of moral education. For instance, the developmentalists (Kohlberg and many others) have arrived at significant findings regarding children's developmental

growth in moral judgment. The prosocial theorists (Staub, Bandura, and many others) have identified, tested, and validated techniques which are effective in teaching children to behave in a helpful, altruistic, caring manner. A triangulation of effort from many approaches has helped us to analyze and identify what constitutes moral/ethical action. These are only a few quickly mentioned aspects of the new knowledge and research which, together, enable us to mount effective educational programs.

When we consider the proliferation of such knowledge, it becomes a certainty, not a speculation, that we now know enough to go about this complex business of moral education. Finally — and I hope I hardly need say this — we can go about it in a way that is fair, noncoercive, and nonoppressive. In short, we can go about moral education morally.

Earlier I referred to both historic and contemporary documents and statements highlighting our enduring commitment to moral education and the values on which it is based. There is one effort under way at this time which is related to this conference and which, I believe, deserves special mention. Under the auspices of the National Institute of Education, a national program was launched earlier this year to plan an agenda for research and development in moral/citizenship education. I congratulate Bud Hodgkinson on that program — as I congratulate the architects of this present conference.

Call for reaffirmation

Let me again sound the call for a reaffirmation of and rededication to our national values. They lie at the very heart of moral education. And moral education, in turn, lies at the very heart of citizenship education. If our society is to survive as we know it and want it, educators have a responsibility and an opportunity of awesome proportions.

This conference marks a crucial step in assuming that responsibility and seizing that opportunity. From here we can *move*, move to help schools carry out the powerful moral-education programs to which we are all — from our different backgrounds and disciplines — committed.

It seems to me that the most important outcome from this national conference might well be a resolve to get our major institutions to assume more responsibility for citizenship responsibility. Of all the institutions that serve the public, certainly our educational institutions ought to be foremost in

concern and commitment to both the preservation and improvement of our American system of government. This ought to be a universal commitment that transcends almost all others in priority and in importance. Those of us who accept the proposition that this can best be done through education ought to be turning our thoughts and resources in this direction. Perhaps this ought to be foremost in the institutional goals on every campus and in every school system.

Whose responsibility is it?

As we address ourselves to the question: "Whose responsibility is it?" — we should be responding that the responsibility heavily rests with education and with our educational establishment nationwide, kindergarten through graduate school, public and private. But we should not by any means assume that it is exclusively the responsibility of education, for we all know better. The point I want to make in addressing myself to this question is that I think that it is a major responsibility but not an exclusive responsibility of education. We are not giving it enough attention and enough priority. To be sure, we teach many subjects that address themselves to these basic issues and responsibilities. But in these times it requires a deeper concern and a more urgent, front burner activism that has been the case in the past few years.

Recent events and the emergence of recent problems that are deeply rooted in our social structure remind us that American education must assume more leadership by devoting more of its resources to the improvement of governmental responsiveness and the quality of life and living through that improvement by means of bringing enlightened citizen commitment to government and to its responsiveness and overall effectiveness. Through teaching, research, and service emanating from our educational institutions, we should take on the enormous challenge to attain great strides upward in this necessary, active concern that becomes a new moral imperative for all of the American people.

Are We the People?

Badi Foster, Harvard University professor, began his presentation by questioning the composition of participants in

the national conference.

"Who has been invited to this conference, who is absent, who has been excluded? What are the criteria by which we were selected? Are the old connections sufficient to bring together those who have become disconnected, or who perhaps never have been connected to their government? . . . Who then, do we represent? Whose interests have we aggregated, whose vital concerns have we blurred for the sake of consensus, whose interests have we excluded?"

Foster continued to query the "whys and wherefores" and hidden agendas of conference participants. He stated, "For the past 20 years, those who have been creating models of political socialization, commonly called civics, government, or courses in citizenship, have not viewed themselves as part of the problem. In their books, their speeches, their public pronouncements, we find a simple message 'If only you would participate as I do, If you would vote, participate in the party of your choice, lobby with your representatives, join your favorite interest group, you too would feel the satisfaction of being a citizen,' In essence, if you do what I think is appropriate as a political participant, you will feel good about being an American."

Citizen apathy and mistrust

Foster went on to articulate on the responsibilities of citizen education in relation to citizen apathy, alienation and mistrust. He alluded to an analysis of superficiality caused by definitions imposed by upper middle class academicians, pollsters, and government officials.

"When was the last time you read a textbook, or heard of a policy for improving citizen education which was defined by a member of 'grassroots, the rank-and-file or the silent majority,' about whom we are apparently concerned in their alienation, mistrust, and sense of distance from *their* government." Foster discussed the dangers of exaggerating concepts and "falsely endowing it with mysterious and overpowering powers of its own.

"We must face the fact that we are about the business of setting policy for others. The definitions of problems and solutions we arrive at here, incorporating our values, assumptions and beliefs, will become the guidelines for National, State, and local policy. We need to ask, what are the qualifications that give us the right to such influence?

Foster stated that it might be too difficult to question the

above questions because of arrival at new questions "which are messy, awkward, embarrassing, and downright difficult to measure.

"The way we get together precludes questioning the questions. We shudder at the presentation of critiques informed by ideologies and analyses at odds with our own. We consistently respond to problems with conferences, committees, and consultants."

Badi Foster continued to question the list of participants at the conference asking "do we want to treat the symptoms of alienation, mistrust, and sense of distance, or do we want to examine the causes of those symptoms to the most fundamental economic, political, and social relationships in our society? If people are suffering from polluted water, do we only set up clinics to ease the pain, or do we clean up the water?"

Who am I?

Foster stated his reasons for sharing a sense of "who I am" and some of his experiences that helped to shape his sense of alternatives for citizenship education.

"I must now turn to the basic task and ask, in creating alternatives, what do we need to do better?"

According to Foster, citizenship education is too narrow, too binding a conception as it is currently defined.

"We must begin to see citizenship as the capacity to link with others in solving a broad range of specific problems that are common among people regardless of city, State, and National boundaries. We must ask more and more people, what does it mean to be a citizen? We must ask whether the education we offer to increase participation encourages creativity, increased awareness, compassion, new kinds of connections among people, new notions of the means available for solving the concrete problems of daily living.

We need to create models of participation at this conference, added Foster, "that people can take home to their clubs, kaffee klatches, churches, their one-to-one discussions with friends and antagonists." Foster added that presently we only have a model which academics, government bureaucrats and the "local chamber of commerce" have the power to implement.

The "old boy" network

"How many others can hire consultants, know how to

organize activities for a cast of hundreds, go from conference to conference relishing in the, 'old boy' network?"

Foster concluded by emphasizing the need to ask questions *about* conference participants before seeking solutions to the topic at hand.

"Before we can create alternatives for citizen education, we need to ask ourselves these questions: Who has been invited to this conference, who is absent, who has been excluded?

"About whom do we speak?

"For whom do we speak?

"Whom do we represent?

"Are we the people?"

Discipline: The Key to Excellence

Moral authority and its importance to education was the theme of the speech given by the Rev. Jesse Jackson to educators, labor leaders, parents, businessmen, and others at the citizenship conference.

"Schools have to assume responsibility for the morals depicted wrongly in our society," Jackson said.

Jackson also stated in his opening remarks that "we are in a civilization crisis — climbing from the valley of limited opportunity to the top of the mountain of opportunity with more mountains to climb."

The current atmosphere in schools, according to Jackson, is at a level of crisis. He stressed the importance of a "will to learn and the urge to excel" while warning conference participants that these current crises will lead to a breakdown in leadership.

"The principal has to have the moral authority of the parents and the 'guts' to teach discipline. There are specific laws that must be taught to all children by adults." Just what are these laws?

Four laws for survival

First of all, children have to learn the law of sacrifice, according to Jackson. "They must learn that the laws of

convenience lead to collapse and that the laws of sacrifice lead to excellence."

The law of discipline was cited as the second law. "If a child graduates from school and has not been taught discipline, he has missed one of the laws of survival." The third law, or the law of duty, belongs to those that dutifully will rise to the top while those who are merely beautiful will be expendable. The last law, perseverance, emphasized the will to win. According to Jackson, "If you can see it and believe it, you can achieve it."

Most principals do not believe that their children are going to excel, said Jackson. They feel that they are there merely to keep order and they don't even do a good job of that. He further stated that teachers do not believe those students can excel and they don't believe that those students will ever be their neighbor.

When asked what is a course for excellence, Jackson replied that it is an attempt to rule out mediocrity, but also to do more than that. It is an attempt to stop finger-pointing and name-calling and engage ourselves in the total involvement concept.

"If students don't come to school with a will to learn and the urge to excel, all the teachers and equipment in the world will not make the difference," added Jackson.

Politician on top of list

Jackson cited eight levels of involvement in the education system beginning with the politician at the top of the list and working on down, in successive order, through the board of education, superintendent, staff, principal, teachers, students, and finally parents.

"The problem is that the parents are on the bottom of the list," said Jackson. Parents have dropped out and have been pushed out of the bottom of the educational system. Teachers cannot teach enmasse without the massive involvement of the parents, he stated, and added that the hostility between teachers and parents must stop. "The school system cannot survive with that parent at the bottom."

The death of ethics, according to Jackson, is a sabotage of excellence. "A society that does not have ethical standards cannot survive. We are in a civilization crisis, a blaze of mediocrity settled upon our heads and it is hard for us to

breathe. We must develop, down in our guts, the fact that self-determination is our goal; self-reliance is our lifestyle and we must say to ourselves over and over again that nobody will save us, from us, for us, but us."

Jackson concluded that our forces must be pulled together, given new assignments, given new reality and pushed for excellence.

"There is no outside force of people more adult than we are, more responsible than we are, nor more educated than we are. We are they."

Influences on Citizenship

Michael Scriven began his remarks by talking about the main trends which are now developing and which he feels are extremely likely to affect our attitudes toward the content and methods of citizenship education — the crucial factors to which citizenship education must respond by preparing our citizens to cope sensibly with new threats and choices.

He cited the following key trends: the withering away of the family, the multiplication of the media, the collapse of conservative crime control, the deterioration of the educational system (failure in basic skills, intolerance of diversity, union control of curriculum content, professorial control of education), the waning of national autonomy, the reduction of oppression (for blacks and women), the emancipation of ethics from tradition, and the increasing incompetence of government.

Scriven said he believes this country is already sliding into a decline and fall phase, and not necessarily related to the economic situation, the infant mortality rate, rising murder and rape statistics, or Watergate. "What worries me most is simply that most citizens have not caught up with this reality, are still too insecure to accept criticism of their country, their union, their racial heritage, their gender, and their religious groups. They are still hopelessly ignorant of the system of values of which they are a part."

Lip service to freedom

Scriven reiterated other comments heard throughout the conference to the effect that too many citizens give lip ser-

vice to freedom, but are not prepared to support it in specific instances. He noted that a large majority of the people do not believe that someone who thinks the system of government in Russia is better than the one here, should be allowed to speak on a public broadcasting network. Nor would they allow someone who believes there is no God to do so, or someone who wishes to criticize a governor or other elected official. "In other words, they believe strongly in freedom of speech except in an individual case."

Power of the news media

Scriven talked at length about the power of the news media, commenting that the raising of social consciousness as to the condition of minority groups, women, and the environment does not come from the schools but are major examples of media education. He noted that creating awareness is much simpler than providing solutions, and that the messages for raising consciousness are also simpler than for providing solutions.

"The core of the purpose of education is, I believe, ethics. Citizenship without ethics is a shabby shell. The two must be combined, but there must be a revolution in what we're currently teaching," Scriven said, and added that community support is essential to success in that area. In his opinion, local control of schools is the most severe handicap to effective citizenship education that we face today. Local boards give in to local pressure, he said, so that it is impossible for educators to realistically portray crime and discuss radically different lifestyles and political systems.

Building results into programs

Scriven listed the following "results" that he believes should be incorporated into programs in citizenship education:

- An understanding of the limits or at least the costs of growth (part of environmental education, economics);
- An understanding of the mutual dependence of nations (global perspectives);
- Understanding what little we know about the causes of crime and failures of crime-fighting (criminology);
- Understanding the demographics and dynamics of the family model and alternatives to it (sociology);
- Understanding the power and limitations of the media;

- Understanding the nature of and the relationships between law and ethics and religion and ethics;
- Understanding the alternatives to, as well as the basic principles of, our form of government (political philosophy).

"I don't believe it's the task of civic education to make us all activists," Scriven said. "Our task is to teach understanding — action must be left to the individual." Traditional models in education are almost certain to fail, he warned, "but there are signs that we can still provide citizens with a deeper understanding of the rights of others, and often this will lead to action on their part. All that education can legitimately do is to provide that understanding, and I hope we will be able to do that better than we have."

ECONOMIC EDUCATION

"Unless you get it in the schools, you don't get it."

That was the candid assessment of M. L. Frankel, president and director of the Joint Council on Economic Education, at the opening session of the Special Activity Group on Economic Education.

Frankel said seven States have mandated a total kindergarten through grade 12 economic education program and similar legislation is pending in three other States.

He cited two major reasons why economic education is an integral part of citizenship education and should be taught in the Nation's schools:

- Government affairs are increasingly economic in substance or effect. The relationship of government and economics is reciprocal.
- To become effective citizens, students need to know the economics of consumerism and career choice. "The heart of effective consumerism or career choice is economics," Frankel said.

Teachers, he said, are usually untrained in economics. Preservice teacher training in economics education should become a priority, he added. "Improvement in the schools will come only if those who teach have themselves been taught."

An effective economics education program, according to Frankel, is integrated into the total curriculum. It is not a special course labeled "Economics 101." The objective should be to develop an analytic base for understanding economic issues. And to be effective, the approach should be objective, nonpolitical, and nonpartisan, Frankel said.

North Carolina model

North Carolina's approach to a comprehensive K-12 economics education program was outlined by A. Craig

Phillips, State superintendent of public instruction, at the second session of the Special Activity Group.

North Carolina's plan, he said, brings together the public sector, through the State Department of Public Instruction, and the private sector, through the North Carolina Council for Economic Education.

The joint venture will implement over the next several years a comprehensive Developmental Economic Education Program (DEEP) model that includes:

- A proven outline for curriculum change and evaluation that is flexible enough to accommodate the needs of the individual school system;
- A structure which promotes community interest and coordinates community input;
- A philosophy which emphasizes blending economics into the curriculum to enhance present courses rather than replacing existing, worthwhile courses with economics;
- Periodic evaluation of the program and the services of consultants;
- A library of economic education materials and access to a wealth of materials developed by other school systems and organizations;
- Assistance in various activities of the program, including financing, from the North Carolina Council on Economic Education, which acts as a liaison between the school systems and the many other groups interested in promoting economic education.

"The most attractive element of the DEEP model is that the local school system can structure the type of ecnomics program that fits its needs," Phillips said.

Other models

The remainder of the second and all of the third and fourth sessions of the Special Activity Group were devoted to presentations of other model economic education programs. Highlights of these presentations included:

School-based models — Dr. Marilyn Kourilsky of the Graduate School of Education at UCLA described four economic education programs for kindergarten through twelfth grade students. . . . Gwen El Sawi discussed citizenship programs sponsored by the National 4-H Foundation . . . . Sandra Kuntz informed participants about the International Paper Company Foundation's 14-year-old Public

Seminars and University-based models — Robert V. Guelich described Montgomery Ward's consumer economics forums of inservice teacher training. . . . William Walstad of the University of Minnesota discussed community college courses. . . . Stephen Buckles of the University of Missouri provided an overview of the transformation of 4-year college courses in economics to the case study method focusing on the economics students will need after college.

Adult Education and Voluntary Organizations — Dell Wells described the Economic Education Roundation for Clergy. . . . Harrison Johnson discussed TRW's employee education program . . . William O'Neill of the Aetna Life and Casualty Company showed segments of the National Economy Quiz that was prepared for national television.

Politics and Citizenship

Civic education is "everything that is good — everything that helps to make people generally better human beings — that helps to make people more cooperative, more friendly, honest, fair, decent, and so on." So said Robert Horwitz of the Department of Political Science, Kenyon College, in his address to the special activity group on education and politics. One of the most important components of civic education — the political — is not easily found in books and other curriculum materials, and tends to be ignored, or at best, superficially treated, Horwitz said.

To understand political systems, said Horwitz, we need to use the word *regime,* to understand its meaning, and to be aware of those factors that contribute to a change in regimes. What kind of regime do we have here in the United States? Horwitz claimed that a careful review of the Declaration of Independence, which lays down the fundamental principals of the American regime, along with an examination of the writings of John Locke, a British philosopher who lived in the 17th century, reveals that "All of us here today are to a great extent, the very creation of John Locke. . . We live in a portion of the world that was created by John Locke and his friends — a certain school of political philosophers." Through his writings, Locke exerted considerable influence

on seven areas essential to the maintenance of a regime: (1) religion, (2) family/home, (3) property/acquisition, (4) justice (5) rights/duties, (6) philosophy, and (7) government.

Locke's civil society

Locke examined the creation of a civic society from the viewpoint of Hobbes, who stated that early man lived in a "state of nature — a hostile, brutish, antisocial, and necessarily short-lived being." This early man, said Locke, was "free and equal" to do as he pleased, with no understood limits on acquisition of property and rights. Locke's civil society is based on an understanding of man's "state of nature" and the development of an encompassing structure that would provide for the "preservation of property, which includes one's live, one's liberty, and all the material goods that make life more certain, more endurable, and more pleasant." Horwitz pointed out that this view is a highly individualistic understanding of man that denies our clasic understanding that men are social beings, and that denies the Biblical understanding of man as well.

To illustrate differences in regimes, Horwitz used seven areas to draw a parallel between Mao's Chinese communist regime and the present American regime. Mao's regime, he said, was based on the writings of Karl Marx, and put into place by radically changing the Chinese peoples' concepts of religion, involving a conversion to atheism; by replacing the bourgeois family and home with communes; by teaching the people not to want property in the same way as their predecessors; by establishing a new understanding of their relationship to the state, from dialectic materialism to economic determinism; by providing the people with new understandings of philosophy, reality and thought, and by changing the actual relationship of people to their government. "Thirty-forty-fifty years from now," said Horwitz, "there will be no Chinese left who remember pre-Mao China. . . the Mao regime will be fully established as a normal and entirely natural system."

The developers of the American regime — Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, etc. — were all influenced greatly by Locke's writings. Horwitz noted that Locke's early anonymous writings on tolerance helped bring religous intolerance to an end. Locke's extension of Hobbes state-of-nature man is reflected in the U.S. Constitution, which

gives citizens equal rights to protect their lives and property. In Locke's view, Horwitz added, "The state of nature is a simply miserable state, one within which human beings are going to live in penury, in desperate poverty, with existence sparse and uncertain, and all of this because there is no way to protect and increase property."

Locke's view of *justice*, a pivotal concern for any regime, is that it is hinged on "comfortable, commodius self-preservation;" this is in contrast to the views of Aristotle and Plato, to whom justice was the "fullest possible development of human virtue for its own sake" and the Christian view of justice as the creation of order on Earth in preparation for the life beyond.

"Political education," said Horwitz in a closing statement, must encompass "an understanding of the nature of political alternatives. Each of us must understand the major alternative regime possibilities that exist in a contemporary world. I think that the United States rests largely on the Lockean principle. The Soviet Union, Communist China, and other communist countries rest on Marxian principles. The Lockean principles, I think, are sounder. They make for better civilization and a higher political order, yet they may have their limitations. We must transmit our understanding of regimes, and of Lockean principles, to our students."

What have we omitted?

The lost notion of partisanship should be introduced into civic education today, said William Schneider, professor of government at Harvard University. In contemporary politics, substantive consensus (agreement on issues) is often confused with procedural consensus (agreement on procedures), he explained. "We know that democracy requires procedural consensus. So long as everybody accepts the procedures, we are going to tolerate a great many differences. Substantive consensus is a fiction — a fiction in American History and a fiction in contemporary life. Present day civic education programs deny the reality of political conflict between parties, and attempt to argue for some sort of substantive consensus."

Schneider said that he would try to restore the dignity of partisanship in a democracy because political parties and their differences (conflicts) are essential to the functioning of democracy. Thomas Jefferson once said, "If I could not get

into heaven unless with a political party, I would not choose to go there," and thus set the stage for the rejection to strong partisanship and conflict that has dominated American life for the last 200 years. Although political parties are found in all democracies in the world, and therefore must have some essential function, they are virtually ignored in civic curriculums, claimed Schneider. In American politics today, differences between political parties are obscured through coalition approaches to substantive consensus.

Communist education systems provide a much stronger basis for citizenship than democratic systems, Schneider said, because citizenship in a communist country is viewed as inseparable from the notion of partisanship — "to be a good citizen is to be a good communist, and since the communist party dominates society, to be a good citizen is to be a good partisan. In the United States, the two-party system involves (1) differing or alternative views on what is good for the public, and (2) competition for public support in which a *particular* view of what is good for the public is expounded in a manner in which the *entire* system is represented.

The building of a party majority in American politics, then, rests on a delicate balance, in which the party platform must reflect the concerns of party members, but must be broad enough to garner the support of the general public. Attempts to achieve this balance have led to the erosion of the acceptability of "taking sides" — a critical component of democratic theory. Coalition-building, stated Schneider, which "involves only noncontroversial, nondivisive issues that will appeal to the broadest range of voters without necessarily driving away any supporters" has been a dominant mode of party competition in this country, at least during this century. The end result of this is voter apathy, the feeling that the voter has no viable choice between parties, candidates, or views.

Usable alternatives

Schneider remarked that today people are voting for or against the performance of a current regime because they have not been presented with "usable alternatives" by the opposition. "Today," he said, "the men who are being elected in our system are the consensual politicians." The current political system rewards coalition strategies, but fails to recognize that opposite, alternate, *usable* choices are

necessary to the operation of a democracy.

Voters faced with the frustration of "no choice" react in several ways. In the 1960's, the reaction took the form of *protest* to "the failure of the parties. . to take sides." *Alienation,* which is occurring in the 1970's, is a belief that both party alternatives are inadequate, and that neither expresses the view of the electorate, and that neither party can provide effective government. "Protesters know what they want," Schneider explained, "and alienated voters know what they don't want." A third reaction to no-choice politics that has not occurred in the United States is *extremism,* and is best illustrated by the rise of the Hitler regime in Germany. At first, Hitler was regarded as a crank, but got some initial support because of his anti-Semitism. But when Germany's political system came to the point where citizens viewed it as no longer effective, these frustrated citizens opted for Hitler's extreme alternatives.

Schneider concluded that, in order to avoid extremist reactions to the American political system, the U.S. Government must produce more substantive results, and the two-party system must provide usable alternatives, based on the reality of conflict, in order to give voters clear and reasonable choices.

Law and Civic Education

Few areas of our daily lives are untouched by law. How can we do a better job not only in helping young people understand legal concepts and procedures, but encouraging them to be active participants in the system? This was the major focus of the discussions in the sessions on law-related education.

Role of law

Joel Henning, director of the Division of Professional Education of the American Bar Association, set the theme for the sessions by saying that law-related education should be rational, sceptical, and aggressive. While civic education in the past has to a large extent been similar to doxology, he said, it should be a matter of intellectual inquiry, and he perceives law-related civic education as being primarily

process-oriented.

Charles Quigley, executive director of the California project, "Law in a Free Society," involved the participants in a role-playing activity that he uses in the schools to teach an understanding of judicial processes and also to improve students' participatory skills.

The setting was a Senate hearing on an environmental issue in a Western State. After Quigley presented the facts about the issue and the participants decided what groups would have special interests in the matter, each table was assigned the task of representing a particular interest group, i.e., power company, local developers, Navaho Indians, Hopi Indians, environmentalists, consumers, and deciding what arguments they would present. Afterwards, a mock hearing was held, with representatives from each interest group making their presentations and answering questions from the hearing body.

During the discussion that followed, Quigley explained that a Senate hearing was chosen deliberately instead of a court trial. Not only does it expand the concept of law-related education, since many people, adults and youth alike, limit their thinking about the law to courtrooms, it also shows students that they can express their views and participate in government easily by personally testifying in city, county, or State committee hearings without the necessity of hiring counsel to represent them.

A hearing like this also emphasizes the various roles people play in society, Quigley added, roles that depend primarily upon interests and choices, not necessarily right versus wrong.

Emphasize participation

Prof. Alan Westin from Columbia University noted that legal questions also involve moral and ethical questions. He said one of the problems in curriculum development has been a failure to choose proper subjects that are relevant to students. "We must seek more active modes of education. Find places where you emphasize the history of participation," he said. "Most American history is about groups struggling to get into the participatory process. This should be a central theme — the study of groups struggling to get in, why, and why they were resisted." He also stressed the importance of letting students participate in their schools,

"not just in choosing the colors for the school dance, but in decisions that really matter.

"Participation," Westin said, "is the heart of the American political system, and the unifying thread. We need to find a single vision, instead of having it fragmented through other areas — geography, history, social studies, etc."

Constitutional Rights Foundation

Todd Clark discussed the Constitutional Rights Foundation, an organization established in Los Angeles nearly 14 years ago by a group of people who were concerned about the way the Bill of Rights was being taught in the schools. Financed largely by members of the community, it receives about $170,000 a year from direct contributions.

"Programs like this," Clark said, "indicate the kind of commitment you get from people who have a stake and know they have a stake in citizenship education."

The Foundation's programs operate on the basic philosophical premise that it is extremely important, if young people are going to understand how their communities work and how values can be applied to community life, that they have an opportunity to go out into the community beyond the classroom and get involved. The Foundation works with community people to give "reality testing" to students, and some 600 attorneys from the Young Lawyers' Association are available to the students either in the classroom or on a "hot line" basis.

The Foundation also makes various materials available to teachers, including a quarterly newsletter formerly entitled *Bill of Rights* and now called *Bill of Rights in Action*. Among the best-known of their role-playing simulations are "Police Patrol" and "Jury Game."

"Teachers love mock trials," Clark said, "but the jury selection process has not been covered well in the past. Usually a teacher preparing for a mock trial says 'You be the judge, you be the prosecutor, you be the plaintiff, you be the defendant — and everybody else is the jury.'"

Not only do high school students participate in the project both inside and outside the classroom, they also teach other students, in junior high schools that participate in the program.

Another major activity of the Constitutional Rights Foundation is a semester-long program about law which culmi-

nates in the spring with Law Day, a full day of activities that include panels, simulations and an opportunity for students to talk informally with professionals in the legal system. Last year the participants in the Robert Kennedy assassination re-investigation made presentations on Law Day.

"Teachers must have access to a great deal of information," Mary Conway Kohler said, "and if they don't have it, they must know where to find it."

Kohler is Director of the National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc.

"We had breaks when we were young that these kids aren't getting — they're isolated," she said. Recognizing this, the National Commission on Resources for Youth decided to establish models — "or find them behind the closed doors of teachers" — where kids could participate in the community, where they could receive credit and where they could have "quality" participation. "The work must be responsible and challenging, it must affect others, and it must meet a genuine need — too many jobs in volunteer groups are 'made' work."

Youth Tutoring Youth is one of the Commission's most successful programs; Kohler said she lost count when it became operative in 500 cities. Other projects revolve around community service, social action projects and internships for students.

Kohler said the biggest barriers to projects of this nature are principals and teachers. "Principals are afraid to rock the boat, the teachers are tired and overworked. As a group, they're scared."

Kohler voiced a conviction that was emphasized throughout the sessions: students must have a role in the decision-making process; and, she added, they must have time for critical reflection, to relate what they have experienced with what they are studying.

ACLU and citizenship education

Aryeh Neier discussed various projects of the American Civil Liberties Union as they pertain to citizenship education. "We think of ourselves as an organization that acts on public problems. Our role is not so much to educate as it is to advance certain points of view, to advance individual rights." But, he said, since the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision, the role of the ACLU has changed. Fewer

people fear the law now, and more perceive it as a way to redress wrongs.

"With the revolution in perception of the law, people have begun to use it, and to learn more about it in order to use it." As a result, the ACLU is trying to distribute information to as many people as possible about what rights are specifically available to them in areas that concern them. Specific interest groups include students, mental patients, prison inmates, armed forces personnel, and women. The ACLU has published a series of 12 "rights" books, and 18 more are in the planning stages.

Global Perspectives Education

"Global participation is a fact; increasing interdependence of peoples is real," said the national conference speakers in a variety of ways. Their task in this special activity section was to indicate ways to increase the awareness of young people and their elders of their roles in global affairs and to help them behave in ways that will be conducive to the welfare, not merely of their own country, but of their common species.

An exercise in "personal archeology" convinced the participants that a high degree of international cooperation was evident in their clothes, their personal effects, and in the food they had consumed in the past 24 hours. The Swiss watch, the keys to a Toyota, the diamond in an engagement ring, the shirt from Hong Kong, and the half-cup of coffee getting cold on the conference table were clues to their nonconscious participation in foreign economies and relationship to the people whose work make up those economies.

John Richardson, Jr., Assistant U.S. Secretary of State and head of the Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs in the State Department, warned that citizenship education could not be confined to learning about and participating in our own national institutions.

"We hang together"

"Franklin's statement on signing the Declaration of Independence, 'We shall all hang together, or we shall surely hang separately,' is as apt to world society today," Richardson said, "as it was to the American colonies in 1776.

"What is called for in today's world is less obvious than in Franklin's. There is no enemy army to defeat. Destruction may come from war between other countries, from famine, from a disregard of the environment. The enemies of our time are barriers of the human mind and spirit to bargaining and negotiation, and failures of perspective, rationality and conviction.

"Our experience has been domestic and isolated. Our relatively parochial history and disproportionate power has made it hard for us to relate to others. We are frequently unable to appreciate the most cherished commitments of other people; and we cannot appreciate freedom if we do not understand it in the context of other countries."

A need to negotiate

Richardson termed as new in the perspective of world politics the need to develop a capacity to negotiate, bargain and persuade, to avoid having to dictate that which is no longer feasible. The leaders of this country and its citizens must learn to stop, listen, and heed in order to achieve our own purposes. We must quit thinking of those outside Western Europe as objects to be manipulated.

The "pictures in people's heads", he said, impinge on diplomatic relationships with other countries. Correcting these pictures can create a more favorable climate in which the diplomats of this country and others can work.

He referred to the recent Law of the Seas Conference, noting that the necessary degree of compromise has not yet been acquired. In this area, institutional arrangement is absolutely required if we, as human beings, are to survive.

Richardson cautioned educators on overemphasizing pride in Nation: "No amount of national pride will assure our ability to create world peace or to compete in the world political process."

He was encouraged by what he termed a relatively new transnational concensus:

- Governments ought to promote the general welfare.
- Starvation is unacceptable.

- Torture is unacceptable.
- Nuclear and biological weapons are unacceptable.
- Diversity within limits ought to be tolerated.
- There are economic trade-offs in development.
- There are limits to growth.
- Certain principles of behavior are acceptable.
- A variety of technologies are workable anywhere.
- Space trips have inspired a new planetary consciousness, introduced new modes of communication so that much more can be shared, and awakened interests that transcend national preoccupations.

A global dimension in the elementary and secondary curriculum is fundamental to the State Department's ability to perform constructively, Richardson declared. A transnational, international perspective must reflect reality and avoid the hypernationalism that impairs our strength to deal constructively with other nations.

"There is a need for content," he concluded, "with philosophical dimension that encourages sensitive and empathetic response to human difference."

Defining foreign policy

Lively disagreement broke out during the second meeting of the global perspective task force on the definition of foreign policy. Foreign policy formation, said one participant, is a function of the officials of the United States Government. Foreign involvement and foreign relations are the province of citizens within the framework of foreign policy.

Richardson entered the discussion to point out that the State Department tries to perceive and encourage international involvement that will enhance its policies.

Further argument over semantics was resolved with the agreement that the average citizen abroad for business or pleasure does not *represent*, but *is a representative of* his country.

Several members of the group declared that they had their own foreign policies about which they did not consult the State Department. "I lower my thermostat to reduce the need to import oil." "I will not spend my few American dollars traveling in a country that jails newspaper editors and reporters." "I don't use aerosol cans."

Multiethnic Education

In opening remarks to the audience attending the session on multiethnic education, Dr. Francis X. Femminella, associate professor of sociology and education with the Department of Education Policies, Programs, and Institutions in Albany, N.Y., distinguished between an immigrant group and an immigrant community, and an ethnic group and ethnic community.

He said that essentially an ethnic group is people who have the same ethnicity which he explained as a sense of personal identity that includes shared psychological, social, and cultural qualities giving us a sense of peoplehood which also includes the ideology of a "common ancestry."

He added that there is a historical notion involved in defining immigrant community: As people immigrate to America they move together and establish institutions for themselves that provide for their needs and particular desires, such as worship, foods, and help in breaching language barriers.

In other words, he said, they decide to become an immigrant community that is very visible and defined.

As members of the immigrant community move away from the identified community, Dr. Femminella explained, they retain visibility in many cases and at that point they become a member of an ethnic group. "They are the progeny of an immigrant group community that has dissipated.

"There are those among the ethnic group who make a conscious attempt at uniting with other members of their ethnic group for the purpose of having full participation in United States society and that is what I am referring to as an ethnic community," he stated.

"Salad bowl" theory

The traditional theory of the "melting pot" has been gradually changed to that of a "salad bowl," said Dr. John Tsu, director of the Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., in remarks to participants in the citizenship session dealing with multiethnic education.

The civil rights movement of the 1960's, the American black's growing identity with the culture of Africa, and the

movement of Spanish-speaking American's fight for teaching and learning of Chicano, Cuban, and Puerto Rican cultures — in addition to the American Bicentennial celebration, have led to the "sudden emergence of the concept of ethnicity and a consequent rising expectation of all ethnic groups," Dr. Tsu stated.

He related historically that 10 years ago, "children of most of the ethnic groups were good citizens without creating school or community problems." This was due to a number of factors:

First is the strong family relations of ethnic Americans; secondly is the ethnic pride an individual identifies with his or her ethnic group; and thirdly, is the "concept of shame" that a child inherited from his or her ethnic group, Dr. Tsu explained.

According to Dr. Tsu, the 1970 census reports there are 60 million Americans who identify strongly with their ethnic origins.

Leading these groups with 22 million members are the American blacks, followed by nine million Spanish-speaking Americans, six million Jewish Americans, four million Italians, and followed by those of German, Polish, Asian, and Irish heritage.

Ethnic Heritage Studies Act

As a result of the emergence of ethnicity and the conceptual change in American society, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act was passed by Congress and signed into law in 1971 providing for the development of curriculum materials, dissemination of curriculum materials, institution of teacher training programs, and the promotion of cultural activities of ethnic groups.

Dr. Tsu believes that the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act "is a landmark in American history and a new chapter in American education. Now, we must take this opportunity to teach our children about ethnic pride and about the culture and heritage of each group and it should be an essential part of a new citizenship education."

Dr. Tsu noted that civic education can learn from the growth of the nation's bilingual programs and their emphasis on multiethnic education. He said that bilingual education has been able to keep children in school and avoid dropouts and social problems related to that.

He said that bilingual education is more than language, it is culture and self-identity and he predicted that by 1990, the Spanish-American will be the largest identified ethnic group in the United States.

Dr. Tsu said that the world is getting smaller and society is changing and as an "enlightened citizen we need to know other languages" and other cultures.

Italo-American study project

Dr. Donald H. Bragaw, chief of the Bureau of Social Studies Education with the New York State Department of Education in Albany, described an Italo-American project which is tied into the New York State curriculum.

This project resulted from the Italo-American community "response" that their ethnic group had been eliminated from curricular studies. An in-depth study resulted in an in-depth heritage K-12 program that takes students through a sequence of studies, from the Italian immigrant to the impact of his heritage on America.

Beginning in the lower grades with studies comparing an American city with a counterpart city in Italy, the student is taken through steps eventually leading in the upper grades to identification of leadership qualities in Italo-American models.

Josie White Eagle, project director of the Indian Education Office for the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, North Dakota State Department of Education in Pierre, described a Title IX grant the State received under the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act that is beginning to increase awareness and understanding of the Indian people.

Ms. White Eagle said that the Indian population of North Dakota is 42,000 or seven per cent of the total State population. She said that 15,000 Indian students are enrolled in both public and nonpublic schools and that one out of every nine students is Indian.

"We feel there is a need for good creditable materials in our schools for better acceptance and awareness of the distinct cultural background of our Indian students," Ms. White Eagle said.

The project developed not only curricular materials but also saw the development and implementation of statewide teacher training programs in the use of the materials.

Cleveland heritage studies

Karl Bonutti, associate professor of economics at Cleveland State University, described the Cleveland Heritage Studies Program which helps children learn more about themselves and their neighbors and promotes empathy towards others. The educational materials developed for the elementary, junior and senior high levels use both the cognitive and the inquiry methods.

He added that since there are 60 identified ethnic groups in Greater Cleveland, it is important for school children to know the "reality of Cleveland" and to eliminate misconceptions of the cultural heritage of each.

Other phases of the program have seen the institution of Saturday language classes for students desiring to learn another languaee. Currently there are 42 classes being held with 4,000 students attending.

In the discussion that followed it was the consensus that Americans have to increase their awareness and understanding of the heritage of other American peoples and their problems in order to solve the problems of the country.

Participants felt that Americans should take pride in their multiethnicity.

Michigan ethnic heritage center

Dr. Otto Feinstein, chairman of the Michigan Ethnic Heritage Studies Center in Detroit said that the "test of this country's citizenship is that the people can remain different, but yet can fulfill their need and provide together as one country." He added, "Ethnic studies, in my opinion, is the only approach to social sciences which has the central focus, people."

In the portion of the program which followed, Dr. Feinstein discussed communication for ethnic continuities and differences.

There are two options in citizenship education: (1) Should the Government function to the will of the people; or (2) Should citizens be trained to function to the will of the State.

He said "The first problem in citizenship education is to educate those of us who work in institutions for the people and have to be responsive to them, in content and not in form."

In his comments, Dr. Feinstein said, ". . .we are in a period of major cultural change. The reason there is a lot of

confusion and absention isn't. . . because of a very different view of what reality is and there isn't a consensus not on what goals ought to be, but on what is really happening.

"I think the basic problem in this country, at this point, is that people should know what the country is: who its people are for starters, what are the problems of the people, not what are the problems within the institutions and that what are the options people have for dealing with the problems they have," Dr. Feinstein stated.

Influence of mass media

He added that the most massive educational influence is the media. "The media is one of the crucial elements in getting a momentum going in all the institutions we have."

He said, "Once you get that feeling that there is shared reality in the country, then the institutions will start to address themselves to it, because there are, after all, still human beings functioning in all of the institutions."

Dr. Feinstein demonstrated one form of this medium by a presentation of a 40-minute demonstration video tape developed by his group which shows the new pluralism in America.

He said that use of such media can readily demonstrate the "growing sense of identity among ethnic groups that are now acting comfortably and demanding services that demand respect."

Following the tape, participants discussed how individuals and institutions can systematically encourage National and local television companies to include more multiethnic programming during prime-time viewing.

Referring to the fact that a change in broadcast policy will not happen automatically, Dr. Feinstein said, "and again, that's a key problem of citizenship education. You sell the American system as taking care of all the problems of the people democratically, then you don't clue them in that it takes a lot of work to push that machine."

Desegregation and bilingualism

Dr. Irving M. Levine, director of the Institution on Pluralism and Group Identity of the American Jewish Committee based in New York City, noted, "We face a very interesting prospect in the future that really comes to us through the struggle around desegregation and bilingualism,

two extremely difficult problems for the society to resolve.

"If you take the dimensions of the problems then you realize they are the tips of the iceberg on the question of American diversity and perhaps one of the reasons we have a historical situation," he said, "where one group at a time seems to break out of what we call the uniformity state." He said as one group emerges, another "fades."

He told the audience that there is an opportunity today to move towards "pluralistic education."

"Structurally, we might be better in this country if we began to see integration as a qualitative function of what happens in the classroom, what happens in the educational experience, rather than in merely quantitative terms."

Dr. Levine feels "we're not going to make it if we only see it in quantitative terms on a desegregation basis."

He noted there are many opportunities and many dangers in pluralistic education. "Can we make all these allowances for all these groups in American life?" Levine asked.

"The time has probably come where more and more groups are going to say, and correctly to educators, there is a piece of our value system that we want protected, a piece of our history we want noted, there is a sensitivity to who we are that we want to service, we think that's a service of education."

Ethnic succession

He said that "generationally" what is taking place in the urban centers is "ethnic succession" where the sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters of recent immigrants are the educators and run the content of urban education.

Being a son or daughter of recent immigrants does not automatically mean those people are particularly sensitive to their ethnic group, Dr. Levine stated.

He said we have still not looked closely at the identity, identification patterns of teachers and administrators.

"We do not know how to connect yet with the realities of home life style, street life style, and ethnic life style. We do not know how to do it yet. And, we don't even know how to do it yet with representatives of the very ethnic groups that are having the greatest problems. This is a long term educational problem," Dr. Levine stated.

Dr. Levine also talked about non-formal networks.

He said, "One other very big problem in American education. . . as well as in social work and sociology . . .is a capacity to identify the non-formal networks that take place in every community."

"We are not aware of an immense amount of activity that is going on, on the non-formal level in all communities relating to families, neighbors, and ethnicity," he said, "and, it is through some of these non-formal and informal networks that some of the answers to our educational problems lie."

Ethics Education

A definition of terms was one of the first tasks presented to the group on ethics education. Russell Hill felt that ethics education encompassed many different slogans, such as, values education, moral development, moral citizenship education, pro-social education, responsibility education, and character education. To give participants a better understanding of the approach being taken, Hill gave the following definition: "Ethics education instructs students in knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable them to realize ethical principles generally accepted in American society which are derived from our social, religious, and democratic tradition. These ethical principles include: Valuing self, caring for others, truth, rationality, justice, equality, and liberty."

Hill went on to justify the need for ethics education by saying that 16 percent of all goal statements from State departments of education, are directed towards ethics. A specific example shown to the group was taken from the National Assessment of Educational Progress Citizenship Assessment of 1974-75. One of these objectives reads as follows:

Show Concern for the Well Being and Dignity of Others

A. Treat others with respect.
B. Consider the consequences for others of their actions.
C. Guard safety and health of others.
D. Offer to help to others in need.
E. Support equal opportunity in education, housing, employment and recreation.
F. Are loyal to country, to friends and to other groups whose values they share.

G. Ethical and dependable in work, school and social situations.

Statements of principles related to ethics education and moral education are in our laws, in our goal statements, and in the language used in assessment circles, according to Hill, who then asked, "what should we do about it?" He felt that schools have generally withdrawn from the active teaching of ethics in at least any formal or specific manner while, on the other hand, the public has indicated through opinion polls and other sources that they have a new interest in the teaching of ethics education. While these two forces are at work, there is new theory and research leading to the development of new programs that need to be reconsidered. Exposure for these new ideas and programs were one of the reasons why the ethics education special interest session was placed on the agenda for this national conference.

Hill went on to point out that there were seven schools of ethical education. He felt that many of the following viewpoints have much to offer and could be profitably synthesized:

(A) Value education — finding values central to personal behavior;

(B) Developmental education — hypothesizing stages of development through which the individual must grow;

(C) Decision theory — emphasizing rules of decision for the application of moral principles;

(D) Religious education — calling for the acceptance of revealed truths;

(E) Prosocial research — identifying specific behaviors as socially positive or negative;

(F) Psychoanalytic thought — emphasizing the unconscious acquisition of standard perceptions in early life.

Rounding out this suggested construct for ethical education, Hill suggested six modes of teaching ethic education to be considered by participants as they listened to the programs to be presented. These techniques include: (1) direct teaching of content, rules and values; (2) modeling and inducing behavior through personal interaction; (3) developing a social climate which models and enforces desirable values and behaviors; (4) socialization through participants in a positive role — perhaps using helping behavior; (5) confronting the individual in group situations that require ethical judgments; (6) utilizing media to deliver ethical messages through modeling and role taking.

Summary of the sessions

Russell Hill felt that the descriptions of the programs given in the four sessions displayed a great richness of theory and that real research is possible in the area of ethics education. He felt that continued agreement or a public policy statement is needed so that the schools can continue to select and choose programs which will lead to real ethics education offerings for students. He also felt that more money is needed to make sure that the best programs are developed. He felt that money cannot be offered on a short-term basis but that a long-range continuing effort is needed. His final point was that time was the most important element. Too many people are looking for quick solutions and are willing to implement poorly developed programs. He felt that there are interesting programs on the horizon, that possibilities exist but that the programs are for the most part not ready and that additional money, time and research are needed to create the kinds of ethics education programs that the schools will find the most beneficial.

Family-Related Education

Effective citizenship education depends on the success of the efforts of one generation to socialize another. Historically, this process has been vested in the family. At the national citizenship conference it was both implied and stated that the ability of the family to perform this important role was ebbing.

Even before 25 participants in a special activity group began discussing "Family Related Education," they had already heard Michael Scriven describe what he termed the "withering away of the family:"

- Possibly more than 50 percent of contemporary marriages will end in divorce.
- Possibly twice as many adults will remain unmarried in the year 2000 as now.
- Possibly 10 times as many homosexuals will be married in the year 2000 as now.
- Possibly twice as many illegitimate children will be born in the year 2000 as now.

The implication for citizenship education, according to Scriven, is that "the family cannot possibly do it; even

though [it is] competent, it is not always present."

Partnership between families

James Gabarino, of Boys Town in Omaha, Neb., the first speaker in the special activities group, called for a partnership between families and schools in achieving the goals of socialization.

"When things are tough for families, they are tough for school and community," he said.

Gabarino suggested that the goals of socialization include training to become competent in and committed to the roles of citizen, worker, and procreator. The evidence, he said, suggests that there is cause for concern in all three facets of adulthood — in all three roles.

Family, school, and community function together in the socialization process. Citing the interpendence of schools and families, Gabarino stated, "they sink or swim together."

All issues of social policy affecting children, therefore, Gabarino said, should be addressed jointly to schools and families. Each must assume active responsibility and advocacy for the other in the formal and informal institutional life of the community.

Gabarino proposed that the authority for socialization — and citizenship education — be lodged in "human development boards" which would be responsible for directing the policies and practices of schools to ensure that they support and augment families.

Schools would be called upon to restrict activities like relying on costly learning centers while at the same time expanding others such as emphasizing self-esteem and character learning.

Human development boards

Gabarino placed schools under the direction of "human development boards," to consolidate human services and replace other specialized groups such as boards of education. The human development board would then direct "social intervention in the life of families" with schools as the primary and immediate contact with families.

Human development boards would help to recognize and articulate the mission of schools and families and then direct the goal of schools into alternative policies and structures. A more general and uniform accomplishment of the goals of

socialization would ensue.

The practical consequences of this partnership, stated Gabarino, becomes evident. Community-wide expectations and demands, coupled with adequate social and economic support for families should be linked with a complimentary set of expectations for schools. Human development boards would then be the vehicle for the process.

Gabarino took his proposal a step further: schools can become "family development centers." In this role schools would restructure their programs to promote enduring teacher-family contacts. He added, "A new role for the 'teacher' would emerge — monitor and facilitator of general growth and development rather than cognitive specialist."

This proposal would require that a primary goal of schools would aim at controlling peer groups. "Families cannot do this alone — it requires institutional action and schools are the appropriate institutions," concluded Gabarino.

Encourage family support

The Rev. Jesse Jackson, speaking later in a general session, reiterated this theme as he repeated his message pushing for excellence in education. The role of the family is very clear, according to Jackson, in that family support for schools must be encouraged.

Gabarino replied that there is a tremendous need to allow families to operate. "The difficulty," he said, "is the absence of critical members of the family and families living on a marginal income.

"We must restore a long-term enduring interest in the welfare of the family — to establish the proper relationship before the problem arises.

"For example, employers could help with work schedules so that the number of 'latch-key children' — those who come home where no one is responsible for them — would be reduced. This, however, requires a community-wide consensus and is an example of the need to join functions."

Dr. Dorothy Rich, president of the Home and School Institute, Trinity College, Washington, D.C., focused her remarks on "Home: The Learning Place."

"Not even the best school can or should be expected to do the job alone," Rich said. "We want to tap the educational goldmine outside the school walls and build a home-school-community partnership," thus sharing educational responsibility.

Training parents

Rich described some of the Institute's programs. The Institute trains parents to become active participants in student learning and trains teachers to work with parents and community. Programs include "success for children" courses and publications for parents, as well as inservice, college courses and workshops for educators.

Lab sessions would bring all groups together in actual working situations where the emphasis for parents in home teaching focuses on thinking, reading, writing, math, and science. These meetings have produced suggestions for the following home-learning activities:

- Give your child his own calendar to be filled in with birthdates, reminders, messages.
- Select a simple recipe (for canned soup, Jello, pudding), and supervise the following of step-by-step directions.
- Conduct simple science exp: watching ice melt, water boil, and the bathroom steam up.
- Cut out and rearrange cartoon strips to teach writing.
- Post a world map next to the TV set for easy reference.
- Use the bathroom scales to weigh various objects.
- Make an educational adventure out of a trip to the grocery store by letting the child pick out items on the grocery list.

The inspiration for these activities, said Rich, is "pure common sense." The parent gains knowledge about and builds confidence in his child — and thus draws satisfaction. The child learns both self-confidence and practical ability — qualities that society values. And the teacher enters into a partnership with the parent, thus sharing accountability.

Part Five

Future Directions

By Logan H. Sallada

Historically, the American socialization process has resulted from the interaction of clearly structured, well organized groups that shared a sense of mission about the future of the Nation. They also shared codes of behavior with roots in common principles expounded in the founding of the new Nation. America's strength was in its diversity. Communities were bound by religious beliefs, ethnic backgrounds, and strong family relationships.

All of these forces, singly and in myriad combinations, had a pervasive and profound influence on the education of young citizens to handle the responsibilities of tomorrow. Pride of heritage, a vision of progress, and strong moral convictions provided a framework within which individuals could shape their own destinies in a context of social justice and the common good.

With the breakdown of the old configuration of socializing institutions comes the need for a reconceptualization of the whole socialization process. The family, the church, the neighborhood school, and local civic and community organizations have ceased to impact on the civic education of today's citizen in ways that inspire confident action. We have lost many of the old cues to predictable social behavior without replacing them with viable mechanisms for reaction to the new environment. America is in a period of transition and readjustment.

A great lady and orator, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, eloquently articulated the dilemma of our transitional times in a recent speech when she said, "We are a people in a quandry about the present. We are a people in search of our future. We are a people in search of a national community. We are a people trying not only to solve the problems of the

present: Unemployment, inflation . . . but we are attempting on a larger scale to fulfill the promise of America. We are attempting to fulfill our national purpose: To create and sustain a society in which all of us are equal."

Deterring factors

Consider some of the factors that impede the socialization of responsible citizenry and the fulfillment of our national purpose:

Mobility is one factor in the changing picture of socializing influences. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that as many as one-fifth of all Americans change their residence every year. This is both a high proportion and a high rate of mobility, and it argues for something to replace the sense of community that gave immediate and identifiable purpose to the idea of civic responsibility in the past. Twentieth century Americans do not pack up their culture and relocate en masse. They simply move, singly or in small family units. The old community ties are broken. There is no migration: Just movement, motion without melody.

A second factor in the changing socialization scene is the influence of the omnipresent television set, the modern American's personal sensory deprivation kit. The trouble with the medium is that it is an incomplete educator. There can be no personal involvement in the message it conveys. It deprives the viewer of the stereoscopic sights, fully dimensional sounds, and the taste, smell, and feel of the action.

A third element in the new picture is the process of depersonalization that occurs to all of us when institutions no longer serve but feed upon men and women. Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote that "an institution is the lengthened shadow of one man." Today's institution, whether economic, governmental, educational, or social, is more likely to be a lengthened shadow of itself which consumes human beings for its own growth.

A great deal of activity is now taking place in the formerly sacrosanct field of research on the human brain. We are beginning to understand how very little we really know about the way man learns. The evidence to date suggests that human beings are very much a product of their surroundings. Deprived of the ordinary sensory cues, the individual reacts strangely: He or she is, literally, disoriented.

A concern of educators must be with the new political environment of today's American in the context of the entire

framework of huge, impersonal institutions of all kinds.

A fourth factor in the changing socialization process is the tendency of Americans in recent decades to rely heavily on mechanical solutions to all problems, from urban planning to agricultural harvesting, medical treatment, and collegiate dating. Computers are marvelous technical inventions which have eased uncounted burdens of work and pain for man. However, in the flush of our excitement over the speed with which these machines perform so many of our tasks for us, we have tended to assume that computers are capable of reaching decisions and be a science. But politics is still largely an art. We need to take a fresh look at the balance of the arts and humanities in our curriculums, particularly in those fields of philosophy and ethics that previously formed an indispensable part of the instruction of the citizen in the art and science of selfrule.

A national policy

What is our national public policy, or do we have many State and local policies in the field of civic or citizenship education? If we have a multiplicity of policies, are they complementary? What are the historical threads of national purpose evident in citizenship education?

What is the appropriate role for the Federal Government in the field of citizenship education today? Should education for civic responsibility be primarily the concern of the formal school establishment? If so, who is to determine what constitutes citizenship education and in what format it shall be taught? Where is the dividing line between citizenship education and political indoctrination?

The U.S. Office of Education's citizen education effort will attempt to construct a road map of citizen education activity, illustrating both the major highways of thought and some of the important side roads. The Federal Government will not dictate American educational policy for civic or citizen education. Our role is one of leadership, to serve as a catalytic agent for improving the state of the art. It is school administrators, parents, teachers, and community members who must work in cooperative, innovative ways to train each new generation to carry on the traditions and business of selfrule.

To date, the most difficult question we have come up against is the definition of citizenship education. Although the entire morning of a recent conference to discuss the state

of the art of civic education was devoted to a discussion of this term, and although much subsequent correspondence has continued the debate, there remains a lively diversity of views on just what the term signifies. If citizenship education can mean so many things to so many people, is there a common framework of ideals and principles within which to fashion an educational program that is equally acceptable and productive of good results in all parts of the country?

Citizenship is both a general idea and a specific reality. We are each participants in a cause larger than any one of us, and yet the kind and quality of each individual's participation is unique. What we seek in the attempt to define citizenship education is that body of knowledge which constitutes the common denominator of conscious participation.

Many individuals, groups, and organizations have long been at work to improve the educational content and pedagogy of civic instruction, and although each may work from a different perspective, it would be wrong to exclude any of them. Similarly, it is not expected that any new definition of citizen education will include every person's idea of what the term does or should mean.

In considering the parameters of citizen education, I am reminded of a passage from a book I read recently on the thing in space we are calling the "black hole," a phenomenon formed by the collapse of a heavy star to such a condensed state that nothing, not even light, can escape from its surface. The author, a professor of mathematics in Great Britain, writes: "As understanding of the world increases, ignorance also expands, for there are fresh problems which are exposed to view by the new advances. It is as if our known world lies on the surface of a balloon, with the unknown just on the outside of it. As the balloon expands, so the known world increases, but so does the area outside it with which it comes into contract; our ignorance is simultaneously expanded."

The reason why a neat circle cannot be drawn around the concept of citizen education is the same as in the illustration of the balloon — as the knowledge bases of citizen education expand, as on the surface of the balloon, so does the space surrounding the balloon, representing how much is still unknown. Personally, I find that a very exciting state of affairs. Life is changing, and education might be defined as the process which enables man constantly to adapt himself to an ever-expanding horizon. Life then is growth.

In fashioning national policy directions for new initiatives in citizen education, it is important to understand that the *apparent* vacuum in the current social studies and civics programs is linked to the educational dilemma we are now facing with respect to lower performance in the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. Part of the dilemma has to do with grade inflation, part has to do with inadequate measurement techniques, and part may well have to do with fractured publicity on this complex subject. However, in the minds of most of us, I think there is little question that there has been an overall decline in performance in those areas that traditionally have been considered basic goals of education.

A part of the citizen education package, therefore, must be concerned with a new focus on these basic skills, for without them, additional components of an expanded concept of civics cannot be made workable. As Margaret Mead says, "It is not only that too many Marys and Johnnys can't write — they cannot read with comprehension, add or subtract or divide with accuracy. And obviously this affects their ability to absorb information in any field they choose for study." Dr. Mead offers by way of explanation the opinion that "teachers and pupils and parents have become dropouts from the learning situation."

The degree of emphasis placed upon the three R's cannot be quibbled about. We may argue about methodology, but in terms of content, we must all recognize that without a firm foundation in the basic learning skills — the ability to read with comprehension, write in a clear and simple manner, and compute accurately — the other branches of learning are suspended in thin air. Reading, writing, and arithmetic constitute the trunk of the learning tree. As former Commissioner Terrel H. Bell recently suggested, we must now look upon citizenship education as the fourth "R" of the basic learning skills of reading, writing, arithmetic, and responsibility, for if responsibility cannot be learned, then the cause of democracy is lost.

Since citizenship education is inextricably entwined with the socialization of American society, it is important that individual citizens from all sectors of American life, from business, industry, labor, home, community organizations, education and religion, government, and the media, etc., all participate in the determination of what should constitute a new civics. Obviously, there are more than just six sectors.

that have to be considered. As I mentioned previously, the only appropriate role for the Federal Government is one of leadership to serve as a catalytic agent or as a convenor to help bring representatives from the various sectors together. So as not to be confused with the discipline of civics education, the citizen education task force uses the term "citizen education" for its policy development activities. There will be no new Federal categorical program called citizen education. We also use the term citizen education to describe the process of involving citizens from the various sectors to meet in national, regional, State, and local conferences to participate in the debate over a public policy for civic citizenship education.

One of our prime tasks is to help create a new interrelationship between the people and their government — an interrelation that is believable to every citizen. This should be one of the key missions of a new civic education. This new dynamic relationship can only begin to be recaptured by the conscious creation of an informed, dedicated, and committed citizenry. Such a citizenry cannot exist through emotional commitment alone, nor in ritual appeals to flag and country. Such a new commitment calls for a new compact or civic covenant between the individuals and their government. This civic covenant will draw its strength from an educated public that understands the cardinal relationship between rights and responsibilities within the context of a democratic-republican form of government.

In considering the development of a new policy, we must not only think of American education at primary, secondary, and college levels, but also what should constitute a new civics education for the whole population. That is why sectors such as labor, business, and the media will be important in the development of a new civics education for the adult population. The mission of the Citizen Education Task Force is to provide leadership that will encourage citizen participation in the improvement of civic education at all levels of education through the cooperation of the educational community with representatives from the major sectors of American society.

Our strategy for fostering a new policy for citizenship education, is to sponsor national conferences as well as work shops on particular aspects of citizen education. As we continue to conduct the policy study we will be attempting to involve the widest possible participation of citizens through

small work groups which are representative of various sectors.

Measuring citizenship

One important ingredient in determining the policy will be indentifying indices that can be used for quantitatively and qualitatively measuring responsible citizenship.

We are currently developing a series of indices which include those citizenship education goals adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Once these indices are developed in a matrix, we plan to have them widely reviewed and considered in regional and State meetings and workshops, as well as distributed to academicians and key representatives of the other sectors for consideration.

We have learned in our meetings during recent months that the process and content implications of a new civic education include determining what knowledge bases, experiences, and skills are necessary for responsible citizenship now and through the end of the century. It appears at this point that what we are talking about is developing a civic education based on the repackaging of existing knowledge bases. One model for a new civics might be based on a core curriculum.

Knowledge that is central to such a new synergistic core curriculum might include the three disciplines and four concentrations that were presented in the special activities sessions of this conference, i.e., social sciences, economics, ethical education, global perspective education, and multicultural education.

There are no "quick fixes," grand solutions, formulas, or proposed laws for avoiding the complexities that must be considered in developing a new civics. The report of this conference will be very useful, but it will not be a panacea for a new citizenship education for the schools of America, or for civic education outside of the formal school setting. We are all citizens of this great Nation, but in no way do those of us here represent the broad diversity of views and ideas that must be carefully and patiently considered in the development of a new civics program.

Many problems will be involved in developing and implementing a new civic or citizenship education core curriculum. The difficulties commonly attendant upon any kind of educational change and advance, plus some special tech-

nical problems, will be encountered in developing a new civics program for the school. Curriculums and syllabuses must be opened to accommodate new subject matter or to repackage existing knowledge bases in a new way and suitable teaching materials must be produced. Teachers must be prepared for new tasks, and in this field in particular, such preparation will necessitate not only mastering new bodies of information, synthesized in a new format, but also adapting teaching methods to new purposes. Any new approaches to civic education must be personally meaningful to students. Programs must be designed to teach competencies related to enduring tasks of political life.

Education aimed at developing an attachment to civic principles, to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and the relevant attitudes and behavioral traits cannot be achieved simply by transmitting information or holding national, State, and local conferences. The traditional range of teaching methods may consequently need to be broadened to include new ways of working and ever-new teacher — pupil, parent, and community relationships once we determine what are the necessary knowledge bases, experiences, and skills for responsible citizenry. In this matter, methods and approaches, the general atmosphere of the school, the personality of the teachers, the respective roles played by teachers and pupils and similar factors are of paramount importance. The school, in other words, should be a place where the rights of all are seen to be respected and where each has the opportunity for direct experience in exercising rights and carrying out responsibilities.

If we hope to teach civic literacy then we must establish the conditions which provide the climate in which civic responsibility can be learned — at home, the school, the work place, and in the community.

As a first step, we must restore our belief in ourselves. We are a generous people so why can't we be generous and understanding with each other? We need to take to heart and to practice the words spoken by Thomas Jefferson:

> *"Let us restore as social intercourse that harmony and that affection among our citizens without which liberty and even life are but dreary things."*

A nation is formed and sustained by the willingness of each of us to share in the responsibility for upholding the common good.

A society is invigorated when each of us is willing to

participate in shaping the future of this Nation.

In this Bicentennial Year we must begin to define the common good and begin again to shape a common future. Let each person do his or her part. If one citizen is unwilling to participate, all of us are going to suffer. For the American idea, though it is shared by all of us, is realized in each of us.

Defining Citizenship Education

"We are moving towards a new notion of what constitutes an educational agency," David Mathews, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, asserted, terming the conference an example of the dynamic and creative role the Office of Education can play.

In this instance, he said, the Office of Education is not a funder, nor an enforcer, but a catalyst, bringing the schools into partnership with their proper allies in the family, in the community and in the business and political worlds.

Three definitions of citizenship

According to Mathews, there are at least three definitions of citizenship education useful for consideration.

"First is the knowledge necessary to be a citizen and the understanding of circumstances necessary to deal with modern events. Second is the belief in, rather than knowledge about, citizenship." He added that this was not necessarily the relationship of citizen to Government but of citizen to citizen, which is grounded in the value system that sustains us. The third definition, according to Mathews, is the individual's relationship to Government.

Mathews said he thinks of education as related to a whole host of agencies in society and that there are signs of change in the level of expectations and the way we view things.

"The country is in a mood to move back to the basics in education — to the three R's and beyond that such as discipline in the classroom." Mathews concluded that we are no longer comfortable to let others do for us what we can do for ourselves, "We are becoming again what we once were: free and unterrified citizens of this country."

Improving Citizenship Education

Good intentions and well-designed programs may not be enough to produce the effects that society expects citizen education to achieve. Many groups contribute to the citizen education process, sometimes pursuing conflicting goals and canceling each other's efforts. The American population is diverse and accepts different conceptions of what it means to be a good citizen.

The point is, according to Howard Mehlinger, director of the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University, that the lack of knowledge may not be the main factor impeding the performance of good citizen behavior. Mehlinger suggested that personality, one's status in the community, and a variety of situation factors may be more potent influences than citizen education.

Mehlinger identified these factors as the need to link in-school with out-of-school learning, the need for new conceptualizations for citizen education, the need to balance local and cosmopolitan values and perspectives, and the need to cope with the effects of television on citizen behavior.

Need to link in-school and out-of-school learning. Schools make important contributions to citizen education, but they have no monopoly on it. Citizen education consists of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are acquired in-school and out-of-school during the entire period that a child is growing up.

The process of growing up in the United States involves the gradual acceptance of increasing rights and responsibilities. Responsibility is often linked to rights; rights and responsibilities are the hallmarks of citizenship. Schools can encourage or discourage this process by the ways in which they treat students.

It is useful to think of citizen education as a type of continuing education that occurs formally and informally throughout life. The more that schools can link up with and build upon the informal instruction children receive in citizen education, the more successful they will become.

Need for new conceptualizations for citizen education. There has been little incentive American reformers to wrestle with broad conceptualizations for citizen education. For

the past decade and a half, projects and project mentality have been dominant. On the assumption that citizen education will be improved by increasing the range of tested alternatives available to schools, project directors have sought to isolate discrete instructional problems and to devise tested solutions to these problems. The project directors accepted no responsibility for how their work fit with others under development. Deciding how to integrate the various programs was left to school officials.

Consequently, there is a compelling need to devise comprehensive citizen education programs that are grounded in philosophical views about human nature, that will satisfy local community concerns, and that will draw as much as possible upon available instructional materials. Higher priority should be given to helping schools make better use of available products.

Need to balance local and cosmopolitan values and perspectives. A tension exists between local and cosmopolitan values and perspectives. Each community wants a citizen education program that conforms to its own expectations. At the same time, the educational program is expected to prepare youngsters to live comfortably in a time of rapid social change. Citizen education programs must find the means to preserve traditional ways and at the same time to prepare people for a larger society.

Need to cope with the effects of television on citizen education. Television may be the second most powerful socializing agent in American society after the family. It is surely more powerful than schools. When a family is weak or fractured, television may have the greatest impact on young children's attitudes and beliefs. A large question still unanswered is whether perspectives and values can be sold by the "visitor in the home."

In an attempt to be interesting, television news stories tend to be thematic and interpretive — usually with a negative flavor. Our young soon learn that bad news is thought to be more interesting than good news. In addition, our television news programs are concerned with "what is wrong with . . ?" This anti-institutional bias conveys one essential message: "none of our national policies work, none of our institutions respond, and none of our political organizations succeed."

The point is that television is powerful and may have pernicious effects. Those who are concerned about the need

to improve citizen education cannot ignore its influence.

Suggestions for improvement

Mehlinger made four suggestions that may contribute to the effort to improve citizen education for American youth.

1. Avoid language that treats citizen education as if it were a problem to be solved once and for all. Citizen education is a persistent, on-going social need in a democratic society such as ours. Each new generation requires citizen education. The precise characteristics of that education is likely to vary over time as conditions change.

2. Raise the visibility for citizen education in the United States. We have forgotten that a main purpose of schooling is to prepare new generations of youth who are committed to and capable of carrying forward our 200-year-old experiment in self-rule. We need to encourage States to make citizen education a major priority; to encourage professional associations to include citizen education themes in their programs; to encourage the publication of articles written in the popular style and published in everyday journals; to encourage television stations to run public service ads.

3. Foster a "grass roots" strategy for the reform of citizen education. The citizen education reform cannot be left to Washington; the job must be done in thousands of communities and neighborhoods all across the nation. The strategy could entail the formation of citizen advisory committees to meet with teachers and school officials to appraise the effectiveness of existing school practices. It could lead to the creation of self-help centers in communities for young and old. It could lead to the creation of clinics or courses for young parents who want to establish appropriate citizen attitudes when raising their children.

4. Encourage the formation of one or more national groups to promote citizen education. Presently, there is no national group charged with the responsibility to promote and cultivate citizen education in the United States. What appears to be needed is an alliance or a consortium of individuals, agencies, and groups who could join together explicitly for the purpose of promoting citizen education. Such an alliance would bring together business, labor, government, education and other professions, churches, media, and voluntary and charitable organizations — all sharing a common desire to promote improvements in citizen education.

Mehlinger concluded by stating that he has implied that the process of citizen education is occurring now and does not have to be established.

"Our founding fathers created our system of self-government. It is up to each generation to recommit themselves to its goals or it will perish. Defending democracy means supporting its principles and accepting the responsibilities of citizenship.

"There is no greater purpose in education than the cultivation of good citizenship. There is no greater heritage to leave to young people than the capacity to rule themselves in enlightened self interest."

General Session Speakers

Following, in alphabetical order, are general session speakers during the national conference on citizenship education:

TERREL H. BELL — Commissioner of Higher Education and Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents in Utah. Former U.S. Commissioner of Education — 1974-1976.

B. FRANK BROWN — Director, Information and Services Program, Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., an affiliate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. Author of numerous books and magazine articles.

WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR. — Magazine editor, author and syndicated columnist and television host for "Firing Line;" currently Editor-in-Chief of the "National Review." Recipient of many awards including the Television Emmy for outstanding program achievement.

R. FREEMAN BUTTS — William F. Russell Professor Emeritus in the Foundations of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. His most recent book is *American Public Education: From Revolution to Reform, 1776-1976.*

ROBERT COLES — A research psychiatrist for Harvard University. He is a contributing editor to "The New Republic," "Aperature" and "The American Poetry Review." His series of books *"Children of Crisis"* has won a variety of awards including the Pulitzer Prize.

BADI FOSTER — Professor at the University of Massachusetts-Boston and Harvard University. Recipient of many academic honors including a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship.

JESSE JACKSON — Clergyman and civic leader. Rev. Jackson is an ordained Baptist minister and is the founder of "Operation Breadbasket." He is the founder and Executive Director of "People United to Save Humanity" (PUSH).

DAVID MATHEWS — Former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. President of the University of Albama.

FRED McCLURE — Former President of the student body at Texas A&M. Former White House Intern. He has held national and state offices in the Future Farmers of America. He is a recipient of the National Young American and Golden Eagle Award presented by the Boy Scouts of America and the American Academy of Achievement.

HOWARD MEHLINGER — Director of the Social Studies Development Center at the University of Indiana. He is a member of several boards including the Advisory Commission to the American Bar Association, Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.

LOGAN H. SALLADA — Policy Advisor to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. He represents the U.S. Office of Education on various citizen education task forces.

MICHAEL SCRIVEN — Educator and philosopher. He is the author of *Applied Logic: An Introduction to Scientific Reasoning.* He serves on many advisory boards. Recipient of numerous grants and scholarships. His many books and articles include titles dealing with ethics, values, morals, rights and freedom.

ABIGAIL VAN BUREN — Columnist, lecturer, writer. Currently her syndicated column "Dear Abby," appears in newspapers in eight countries. Her estimated readership is approximately 55 million daily. In addition, Abigail Van Buren has her own radio show.