DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 772 SO 011 939

AUTHOR	Bender, Mary, Ed.
TITLE	Keynote Addresses from the Horace Mann Lecture Series and the Paul Masoner International Lecture Series 1972-1978.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. School of Education.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	90p. Best copy available
AVAILABLE FROM	School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Civil Liberties; Comparative Education; Cultural Background; Economic Development; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Problems; Educational Research; Educational Responsibility; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Higher Education; Humanism; *International Education; Language; Political Influences; Values
IDENTIFIERS	USSR

ABSTRACT

The document contains eight lectures addressing a variety of educational trends, issues, and concerns. The objective is to heighten the awareness of educational challenges that must be met and to promote continued professional renewal activities. Lecture I discusses fundamental problems concerning world education, concentrating on hunger and illiteracy and their relationship to the goals of education. Lecture II emphasizes the importance of education to the protection of civil, political, and social rights, focussing on the Washington, D.C. school system. Lecture III appraises education and development, using a political and economic approach. Lecture IV discusses language in education, recommending research into the various language situations of the United States, in order that educators might develop the full potential of each child. Lecture V explores the development of Soviet society from historical, philosophical, and social perspectives. Lecture VI postulates various objectives and guidelines to be considered in relevant education. Lecture VII discusses historical changes since Horace Mann's time which have changed the role of American education. Lecture VIII examines expectations of higher education, international education in a changing world, and international cooperation in higher education. (CK)

Keynote Addresses from the HORACE MANN LECTURE SERIES and the PAUL MASONER INTERNATIONAL LECTURE SERIES 1972-1978

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

Two major lectures are presented annually by the University of Pittsburgh's School of Education - the *Horace Mann Lecture Series* and the *Paul Masoner International Education Lecture Series.*

This publication includes eight talks from the submitted manuscripts that were presented at these lectures from 1972 to 1978.

Talks that were presented at the Horace Mann Lecture Series include: *Education for Liberation* by Barbara Sizemore, Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D.C.; *Language in Education: Forward to Fundamentals* by Dell Hathaway Hymes, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania; *Education in the Humane Community* by Keith Goldhammer, Dean, College of Education, Michigan State University, and *Educational Research and School Practice: An Historical Perspective* by Patricia A. Graham, Director, National Institute of Education.

Lectures that were presented at the Paul Masoner International Education Series include: *International Aspects of Education* by the Right Honorable Thomas Frederick Peart, M.P., United Kingdom; *Education and Development: A Reappraisal* by Martin Conroy, Stanford University; and *International Education: Problems and Prospects* by Shou-Sheng Hsueh, Director of International Asian Studies Programme, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

The talk by William H.E. Johnson, Professor of Education, and faculty member of the School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, on *The Development of Soviet Society: Perspectives from Educational Experience* was presented at the Education Day Program which preceded Dr. Conroy's talk at the Paul Masoner International Lecture.

No manuscript was available for the talk by Philip H. Coombs, Vice Chairman and Director of Strategy Studies, International Council for Education Development, on *What Lies Ahead for Education in Developing Countries.*

Many of the talks that were given at the Horace Mann Lecture Series prior to 1972 were published by the University of Pittsburgh Press.

FOREWORD

The School of Education, in cooperation with the School of Education Alumni, is pleased to present this collection of lectures that address a variety of educational trends, issues, and concerns. As the reader will note, each year an attempt is made to highlight lecturers, who address topics of interest to the broad educational community, including the University and the public and private school audience. This collection of lectures results from the School's desire to capture, through the printed word, presentations by these outstanding educators. We hope the readers will be able to incorporate these printed lectures into their ongoing educational endeavors, including classes, seminars, research efforts, or committees. We trust that our readers will appreciate revisiting these lectures through this publication.

Wilma B. Smith
School of Education
1979

HORACE MANN LECTURE SERIES

The Horace Mann Lecture Series is presented each year by the School of Education in recognition of Mann's matchless service to the American public school system and to heighten the awareness of today's educational community to the continuous challenges that must be met. Inaugurated in 1953, the lecture series aims to promote the continued professional renewal activities of the School's faculty, students, and alumni.

The magnitude of Horace Mann's (1796-1859) services to education must be reemphasized and kept alive so that this generation can better understand the purpose and function of a free public school system in American democracy and a reaffirmation of faith in free schools. His boundless energy, coupled with a brilliant and penetrating mind, focused the attention of the citizens of his era on the need for the improvement and support of public schools. He, more than any other, can truly be called "Father of the American Public School System."

> If ever there was a cause, if ever there can be a cause, worthy to be upheld by all of toil or sacrifice that the human hand or heart can endure, it is the cause of Education. It has intrinsic and indestructible merits. It holds the welfare of mankind in its embrace, as the protecting arms of a mother holds her infant to her bosom. -Horace Mann

By reemphasizing and keeping alive the ideas of Horace Mann which he adequately stated and portrayed to the American public school system, we are given the opportunity to pause and reflect on the present and future challenges and mandates for which we are held accountable.

Noted educators are invited to speak on present-day educational activities and outcomes. Individuals who attend these lectures have the opportunity to incorporate the ideas and challenges into the ongoing planning processes and activities within the School and the larger educational arena.

PAUL MASONER INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION LECTURE SERIES

A series of lectures emphasizing the international aspects of education was initiated by the School of Education in 1972 to honor Paul H. Masoner for his 18 years of service as Dean of the School of Education, and for his outstanding contributions in international education. Distinguished scholars and leaders from the international community are invited each year to present their views on the significance of international issues with reference to higher education.

Since his retirement as Dean, Dr. Masoner expanded his role in international study programs by continuing to serve the University of Pittsburgh as Director of the University Center for International Studies' Office of Special Programs, and as a faculty member of the Program in Higher Education. Included in his many international education endeavors has been research and study in the field of nonformal education for rural development in South America. He has visited schools, universities, and education ministries in more than fifty countries.

Dr. Masoner held various positions as teacher, counselor, and administrator in the Pennsylvania and the Ohio Public Schools before accepting a position at the University of Pittsburgh in 1945. He was appointed Dean of the School of Education in 1955.

He has been a member of local, national, and international educational and professional organizations. Dr. Masoner has held office and has been otherwise honored by many of these organizations. In 1977, he was made Honorary Fellow of the College of Preceptors in England. His most recent professional honors were his election to the presidency of the International Council of Education for Teaching, and his appointment as consultant to the U.S. Agency for International Development on education program development in Korea.

The Honorary Degree awarded to Dr. Masoner at Hanyang University (Seoul, Korea) in February 1978, sums up his untiring efforts on behalf of students and faculty throughout the world. The diploma from Hanyang University states:

> In recognition of his lifelong devotion and dedication to the development of education in the world, and particularly his outstanding contributions in promoting the educational and cultural exchange between the Republic of Korea and the U.S. of America.

Dr. Masoner received his B.A. and M.A. from Ohio State University, and his Ph.D. from the University of Pittsburgh.

Through the annual Paul Masoner International Education lectures, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends of the School of Education have the opportunity to become involved in projects to foster better world relations and education.

SPEAKERS

The Right Honorable *Thomas Frederick Peart* has been a member of Parliament in the United Kingdom since 1945. During his tenure of almost 30 years in the House of Commons he has served as a leading spokesman in behalf of education. A strong supporter of Anglo-American cooperation, he has visited the United States on government and semi-official business. Mr. Peart's services to the United Kingdom included Leader of the House of Commons; Lord President of the Council; representative at the Council of Europe; Opposition Spokesman on Education, Science and Agriculture; Privy Councilor; and Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food.

Mr. Peart received his Bachelor of Science and Post-graduate Diploma in Education from the University of Durham where he held the position of President of the Durham University Union Society.

Barbara A. Sizemore, Superintendent of Public Schools, District of Columbia, at the time of her presentation in 1975, presently holds an appointment as Associate Professor, Department of Black Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

Her professional activities included positions as public school teacher; instructor, Northeastern Illinois State College; Director, Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project; Coordinator for Proposal Development, Chicago Public Schools; and Associate Secretary, American Association of School Administrators. She has served as educational consultant to numerous projects, offices, and programs.

Ms. Sizemore has authored chapters in edited books and contributed numerous articles in educational periodicals. She received her B.A. and M.A. degrees from Northwestern University, and is presently a candidate for the Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago in the field of educational administration with special interests in sociology and urban affairs. She holds Honorary Doctorate degrees from Delaware State College; Central State University, Xenia, Ohio; and Baltimore College of the Bible.

Martin Conroy, Associate professor of education and economics at Stanford University, is an associate of the Center for Economic Studies in Palo Alto. He is chairman of the International Development Education Program, and Director of the Latin American Fellowship Program, School of Education at Stanford. Before

coming to Stanford, Dr. Carnoy was a research associate at the Brookings Institution, where he wrote extensively on Latin American trade and economic integration.

Dr. Carnoy authored numerous articles and books on economic development and on the role of education in the development process, including *Industrialization in a Latin American Common Market*, *Schooling in a Corporate Society*, *Education as cultural Imperialism*, and *The Limits of Educational Reform*. He completed a monograph on economic change and educational reform in Cuba.

Dr. Carnoy received his B.S. in electrical engineering from the California Institute of Technology, and the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Chicago in economics.

Dell Hathaway Hymes, Dean, School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, is a distinguished scholar in linguistics, anthropology, folklore, and education. His scholarly concerns for the understanding of human language and speech activity in social and cultural context have had significant impact both in linguistic theory and educational practice. Early studies of the language of Oregon's Chinook Indians led into a professional career which demonstrated the integration of linguistic theory and academic applications of that theory to practical social programs. Attempts to practice linguistic research in classrooms not only served to redirect teachers' understandings of students' language learning activities, but contributed to his own reconceptualization of language and linguistic theory.

William H.E. Johnson, Professor Emeritus of Education, University of Pittsburgh (1956-1976), has been a visiting lecturer at a number of American and European universities, and presented talks at professional meetings throughout the world. He has visited the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, frequently acting as academic leader for study tours sponsored by the National Education Association, the Comparative and International Education Society, and the University of Pittsburgh. His study of the influence of the Soviet Union on education in the other socialist countries was sponsored and published by the U.S. Office of Education.

During World War II, Dr. Johnson served as Chief of the Russian Political Department in U.S. Military Intelligence, and was involved in the shipment of Lend-lease supplies to the Soviet Union. He served as national president of the History of Education Society, and chairman of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on International Education. Dr. Johnson received his A.B. and M.A. from the University of North Carolina, and his Ph.D. from Columbia University.

Keith Goldhammer, Dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University since 1972, received his Ph.D. from the University of Oregon in the fields of Educational Administration and Sociology of Education. Dr. Goldhammer's research includes extensive local and national study for the improvement of educational administration.

Patricia Albjerg Graham was appointed Director of the National Institute of Education in 1977 by President Carter. She is on leave from her position as professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Positions held by Dr. Graham include lecturer at the Indiana University School of Education, visiting professor at Northern Michigan University, and professor of history and education at Teachers College of Columbia University. She has served as Dean of the Radcliffe Institute and Vice-president of Radcliffe College. As Director of Barnard College's Education Program, Dr. Graham worked closely with

teachers and administrators in Manhattan and the Bronx in assisting beginning teachers in their schools. In 1972-73 she was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship.

Dr. Graham has authored numerous books and articles on a wide range of topics on the history and current practices of education. She received her Ph.D. from Columbia University and her B.S. and M.S. degrees from Purdue University.

Shou-Sheng Hsueh, Director of International Asian Studies Programme at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, also holds the positions of Chair Professor of Government and Public Administration, Head of United College, and Director of Public Affairs Research Centre.

Dr. Hsueh has served in research and lecturing capacities with the government of the United Kingdom, University of Hong Kong, and with the Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration. He held visiting scholar roles at Oxford and the State University of the Phillippines, and served as Vice-Chancellor of Nanyang University in Singapore for three years.

Dr. Hsueh authored numerous articles and books on political science, public administration, social and economic development, technology transfer strategies, and university administration, which have been published in Korea, United States, Iran, France, Vietnam, Switzerland, India, Thialand, and Belgium. He has participated in over 51 international academic conferences and activities. In 1975, Dr. Hsueh was appointed United Nations Consultant at the Asian Centre for Development Administration, and served as member of the Administrative Board of Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning.

Dr. Hsueh received the B.A. degree from Yenching University in Peking, and the Lic. es Science Politique and Doc. es Science Politique from the University of Geneva.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At its inception in 1953, the Horace Mann Lecture series was sponsored by the School of Education in cooperation with the Tri-State Area School Study Council, XI Chapter of the PHI DELTA KAPPA, DELTA Chapter of PI LAMBDA THETA, Doctoral Association, and THETA Chapter of DELTA KAPPA GAMMA.

Beginning 1975, the sponsorship of the Horace Mann Lecture series and the Paul Masoner International Education Lecture series was assumed by the School of Education through the Division of Educational Development and Service. Members from the Educational Alumni Association, the Council of Graduate Students in Education, the Association of Undergraduates in Education, the Faculty Council, and the DELTA Chapter of PI LAMBDA THETA served on the *Planning Committees* of these lectures.

The *Planning Committees* assisted in getting speakers, preparing brochures, making arrangements, and helping to make these lectures "special events." Headed by Dr. Wilma B. Smith, Chairperson, Division of Educational Development and Service, the following persons served on these committees:

1975
Morris Cogan
Ryland Crary
Robert Dilts
Rutherford Lockette
Donna McCall
Don Muchalko
Bruce Noble
Anna Obong
Madeline Pascasio
Theodore Polk
Judith Scott
Ron White
Jean Winsand

1976
Anna Blevins
Dona Dalton
Richard DeRemer
Robert Dilts
Vicky Dudley
Eleanor Fetherston
Ogle Duff
Rutherford Lockette
June Mullins
Don Mushalko
Joseph Newman
Madeline Pascasio
Theodore Polk
John Singelton
Jean Winsand

1977	*1978*
Anna Blevins	Margaret Anderson
Cellestine Cheeks	Mary Bender
C. Diane Colbert	C. Diane Colbert
Ogle Duff	Robert Dilts
Eleanor Fetherston	Eleanor Fetherston
Rutherford Lockette	Theodore Polk
Don Mushalko	Patrick Malley
Thomas Panigall	Marion Tishuk
Madeline Pascasio	
Theodore Polk	
John Singelton	
Jean Winsand	

Mary Bender, Special Projects Assistant to the Division of Educational Development and Service, prepared and wrote this booklet, and edited the collection of lectures.

FREDERICK PEART
Member of Parlaiment, United Kingdom

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

OCTOBER 11, 1972

Introduction

This evening I am addressing a distinguished audience, sophisticated in the arts of education, in a famous University and in a great City and State. Should I talk to you about problems which so often catch the Press and Television headlines? For example: Student Unrest, Violence on the Campus, the Drug Scene, the Permissive Society, Pornography, Women's Lib, the Effects of Urbanization, and Alienation, just to name a few. These are serious problems, each in turn deserving close analysis, scrutiny and debate. But are they not in some way the manifestation of the neurosis of the more affluent societies? That is why I prefer to address myself to some of the more fundamental problems concerning world education. Have we failed to harness the idealism, the promise, and the aspirations born out of the aftermath of war? Do those two great concepts of freedom and democracy mean anything to a new generation that did not experience the holocaust of 1939-1945? Does the Jefferson concept of the role of education in an evolving democracy still hold? Have we really escaped from our violent past? It is not easy to give complete answers to the questions I have posed. Perhaps we make too much of the crisis of 1939-1945; perhaps we should regard it as an ugly interlude best forgotten. This would be too easy! Even now as I look at the world scene I believe that our society has still not recovered from the traumatic shocks of that war period, on the other hand we must not underestimate or devalue the feeling of hope and idealism that gripped and inspired the peoples of the world when peace came. Neither should we underestimate the great potential of science and technology which if used for peaceful purposes could dramatically change the political and social scene. For out of the horror of Hiroshima emerged the harnessing of nuclear fission and subsequently all the possibilities of nuclear fusion; out of modern artillery-rocket guns and guided missiles came the reality of space ships, exploring new worlds as man quests for new adventures. A new post war period followed revealing new political attitudes, new political alignments and new power groupings. Who would have thought that the Russian peoples would suddenly reject stalinism, or that an American President would discuss with Mao Tse-tung in Peking, or that Britain once the leader of a great Empire would seek its future in the economic autarky of the European Economic Community. Who would have thought that after 1945 nations and peoples would still resort to violence and war as in the

Middle East, Korea, Vietnam, Congo, Nigeria, India and Pakistan. Again the outburst of violence and hate which sickens me as I watch the tragedy of Northern Ireland; the sadness of the Munich Olympics; and the tragedy of Uganda where racism raises its ugly head to mar the African political scene.

You may well ask what has all this to do with Education? My straight answer —Everything! Education has to operate against the background of historical events. It can help to shape those events but it also is conditioned by them. Unfortunately too often its problems are measured in a purely narrow nationalists context. I am not suggesting that when I advocate a broader approach to Education that we should ignore the policies and practices of our national groupings: country, state, town, or village. Moreover, there are major educational problems within each and every educational system, for example: priority of resources for each sector, reform of Secondary Education, the relationship between private and public education, the place of the deprived and disabled child, and the reform of the curricula. Many of these problems are common to all countries. Here and there are differences in emphasis and approach which inevitably arise for historical reasons affecting the rate and progress of educational development.

This evening I must look at the world scene. The first great event in the post war period which has had a profound effect on world educational development was the birth and creation of the United Nations Organizations. The United Nations has its critics. There are cynics who think of it in terms of the old League of Nations, and rejoice in its inability on occasions to curb aggression between member states. They argue, "Man will never change. War will be with us always. Then why waste resources!" It is a viewpoint that I reject. Whatever its faults and limitations, the very existence of the United Nations Organization is a positive force for peace and better international relations and understanding. It continually beckons Governments and peoples to use reason and argument instead of force and aggression. It is a world forum for sensible debate and discussion. Its very existence is fundamental to a positive development of international law and order.

If one carefully examines and scrutinizes the work of the United Nations Organization one cannot but fail to appreciate and admire the role of the Specialized Agencies and particularly those concerned with Education. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization is the most important. Rene Maheu, the distinguished Director-General of UNESCO, in a preface to a booklet "Partners for Peace," published by the United Nations in 1970, states the aims and purposes of UNESCO.

> For so far as UNESCO —and indeed under the terms of its Constitution —education, science, culture, and information are not ends in themselves, but the means or methods of waging an intellectual and moral campaign in the interests of peace and international understanding.
>
> True peace, however, can exist among States only if it is based on respect for justice in relation to the individuals of whom nations are composed. UNESCO has never ceased to strive for the effective recognition of every individual's right, regardless of race, sex, language, or religion, to learn, to acquire information, to enter into the heritage of values bequeathed to us by past generations and to share in the progress of knowledge."

Rene Maheu's eloquent words reinforce the preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO which states:

> Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed
>
> Ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause throughout the history of mankind of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war.

This is what education is all about.

I wish to pay tribute to the work of UNESCO and all those distinguished international civil servants, from the Director-General down to the humble clerk and typist who make up its Secretariat, and also those who do field work in so many countries throughout the world. UNESCO's work is fundamental to that of United Nations. As Torres Bodet, a former Director-General declared when addressing an educational conference in Beirut and speaking on the need to stimulate education in human rights, that UNESCO was the world's "ever wakeful conscience" and the United Nations as the "body politic of a new world." His description still holds true today. This former Foreign Minister of Mexico and also Minister of Education had an important influence on the work of UNESCO. Undoubtedly his Mexican Ministerial experience stood him in good stead and enabled him to reconcile the interests of the less developed countries with varying degrees of economic development. He was able to define UNESCO's task in the field of fundamental education and also to recognize that UNESCO's work should be associated with the development of agricultural production and improved health conditions through the work of other international agencies, Food and Agriculture Organizations and the World Health Organization.

Ever since I have had the honour to be invited to deliver this address I have literally poured over thousands of words concerning the work of UNESCO and other related international bodies. It is only natural that my approach is that of a politician long concerned with Educational and Agricultural matters. The more I look at the International scene the more I am convinced that we should concentrate our efforts conquering two great evils which frustrate and hinder the development of education and world peace. These two great evils are still Illiteracy and Hunger.

Let us take illiteracy first. In the United Nations 1970 Report on the World Situation we had the stark statement:

> According to a recent UNESCO estimate, there are 783 million adults in the world today who are totally illiterate—an increase of 48 million since 1960. Unless special measures are taken, it is further estimated that this number will increase to more than 800 million in 1980.
>
> However, the illiteracy rate has fallen from 39.3 per cent in 1960 to 34.2 per cent in 1970 and is expected to fall to about 29 per cent in 1980. The increase in the absolute number of adult illiterates is mainly due to the enormous population explosion in the period—1,870 million adults in 1960 and 2,287 million adults in 1970. The main regions where illiteracy is prevalent are all the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where school enrollment is lowest and drop-out rates of boys and girls from regular school highest. Usually those who are most affected by illiteracy are women. Forty per cent of the world's women are completely illiterate as contrasted with 28 per cent of the men. Rural areas form the largest reservoir of illiteracy.

What an immense problem! It is a problem that remains acute because of the terrific population increase. In order to combat illiteracy the introduction of uni-

versal primary education would be a major step forward. Many countries have introduced mass illiteracy campaigns, but according to UNESCO experience, even these brave efforts have not produced satisfactory results. Nevertheless, such campaigns must be persevered. However, I strongly believe that we will not conquer illiteracy simply by pumping direct aid into backward countries. There must be wider economic and social planning involving industrialization and agricultural production and development. This poses another problem. In order to industrialize there must be available qualified and specialized manpower at all levels, but here we face a dilemma. From where does the trained personnel come? Specialists of the required kind are in short supply, and their period of training is a long one. In the least developed parts of tne world where agriculture needs to be expanded and modernized the problem is even more acute. The development of agriculture can only be achieved by the provision of appropriate vocational training and raising the basic levels of knowledge. Thus if we are to stimulate both industry and agriculture in the underdeveloped parts of the world, we need to invest more in education. Investment in education is sound business, but it must be linked to a development plan. Inevitably in that plan the key to its success will be the role of the individual teacher. The teacher may be helped with new sophisticated teaching methods and the use of the modern media of mass communication, television and sound radio; but in the end, it is the quality of the teacher's personality, character and leadership that counts. It is for this reason that teacher supply and the ratio of teachers to pupils are decisive. If we examine past statistics on teacher supply we find that in 1967-68 it was estimated that for 480 million students in primary, secondary and higher education, there were nearly 18 million teachers. Since 1960-61 the world average annual growth in teaching staff has been estimated at 3.5 per cent at the primary level, 6.6 per cent at the secondary level, and 8.1 per cent at the higher level. However the ratio of teachers to pupils has actually decreased since 1960-61, when it was estimated to be 1:30 and in 1967-68 it was 1:31. This means that the total enrollment of pupils has increased faster than the number of teachers. There is no doubt that education development has and is being frustrated by the world population explosion. This explosion pressed hard on the developing and backward countries, and acts as a brake on the raising standards of living so urgently needed.

I dislike using too many figures and statistics, but the 1970 United Nations Report on the World Situation presented some interesting information. The Report gave projections of the world population and the proportion of those living in the more developed and less developed regions of the world.

TABLE 1

Projection of World Population 1965-1985
(Millions)

Year	World	More Developed Regions	Less Developed Regions
1965	3,289	1,037	2,252
1970	3,632	1,090	2,542
1975	4,022	1,147	2,875
1980	4,457	1,210	3,247
1985	4,934	1,275	3,659

1970 Report on the World Social Situation (United Nations)
Chapter VIII World Population Situation Page 145

> The annual average rate of increase in the more developed regions would be 1.0-1.1 per cent. In the less developed regions it would be 2.4-2.5 per cent. The world's combined population, therefore, would be increasing annually by 2.0-2.1 per cent throughout this period.

Within these global totals there will be considerable regional differences. The Report further states:

> Whereas these projections remain debatable in numerous respects, it is significant that they suggest a higher rate of world population growth during the 1970's than has prevailed in any preceding period, followed by gradual slow-downs thereafter. Thus the Second United Nations Development Decade, from 1970 to 1980, may witness the fastest, growth of human members in all the history of mankind.

I have not the time to discuss or analyze these figures and projections; neither would it be right for me to suggest the ways and means to prevent a population explosion. Such a subject would make for fascinating debate and argument, and no doubt from the audience would emerge a modern Malthus ready to do battle. The simple fact we have to face is that every year many more children are born into the world, and they will have to be educated. Moreover millions of these children will be denied the right to educational opportunity. This represents one of the greatest challenges of our time. We are all involved. This is not a matter solely for the United Nations, UNESCO, and individual Governments, it concerns us all.

I now turn to the second evil—Hunger. Hunger is much harder to define than illiteracy. The child or adult who can neither read or write can be easily identified. But with Hunger it is different, it can reveal itself in many ways. Josue De Castro in his classic of the Fifties, "Geography of Hunger" writes:

> Hunger is an extremely variable phenomenon. It can exist as acute starvation, turning its victims into veritable living skeletons, or it can work insidiously to produce subtle chronic deficiencies almost without outward sign. Between these extremes it can attack mankind in many strange and spectacular disguises. There is a whole gamut of the degree of hunger, and its various effects on mankind make up an intricate and complicated history.

This evil does concern education; the stark fact is that one cannot effectively and properly teach starving hungry children. We who live in the more affluent parts of the world should not be too smug about this, for in the Twenties and Thirties many of the richer countries of the world tolerated within their own national boundaries a situation which led to children being deprived of essential food stuffs for normal healthy growth. It was then called Malnutrition—a euphemistic term for starvation. Even today in the industrial countries of Western Europe, including my own country, one can see the legacy it has left in the physiques of older men and women. In the post war period much of this problem was tackled by wise social and economic planning. I also do not underestimate the generous aid the American Government and peoples gave to those parts of the world which were ravaged by war. The new Europe owes much to the Marshall Plan. But even today despite considerable progress, for many children of the world, starvation and deprivation dominate their lives. It is in this atmosphere that sound educational advance is frustrated. It is to the credit of the United Nations and the Specialized agencies, especially the Food and Agriculture Organization, that this problem is being tackled. However, there is still the widening gap of food consumption between the more

developed and less developed regions of the world, and the existence of near famine conditions over parts of Africa and Asia.

Only recently in September of this year (1972), the Food and Agriculture Organization produced an interim report on the present world situation. It stated that last year, 1971, the worlds underdeveloped nations were only able to increase their agricultural output by 2 per cent. This would not enable them to feed adequately more than two thirds to three quarters of their respective people. The Food and Agriculture Organization also estimated that up to 500 million people are suffering from malnutrition and as long as 15 years ago. As low agriculture production increases in the underdeveloped countries many of the developed countries have produced surpluses. In the United States and Canada, agricultural production increased by 8 per cent. It could well be argued that the richer nations have become richer and the poor nations poorer.

The Food and Agriculture Organization believes that countries themselves should be encouraged to provide adequate food supplies for their rapidly growing populations. Thus Agricultural Development has become Priority #1, and to achieve the necessary progress arising out of such a plan, Education must also have a similar priority. Educational and Agricultural Development are Inextricably connected. The close and symbiotic relationship between Education and Agriculture can be further related to the important work of the World Food Program. Ever since its conception in 1963, the World Program over the years has channeled resources into education. These resources have covered many projects for the improvement of primary, secondary, technical and teacher training. This year's report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization in 1971, stated that the total cost of World Food Program assisted projects coming within the field of UNESCO's competence will amount to about 226,300,000 U.S. dollars for 1971-72. Approximately the same as for the year 1969-70.

In the recent period of March and April 1972, seven projects for economic and social development in six countries have been approved; for example, Brazil is to have help for a school feeding project. The Brazilian Government is increasing its investment in education; and as part of the effort to attract more children to school, is providing school meals to about 11 million children throughout the country. Another example is Costa Rica. This country is to receive a grant of 66,000 dollars worth of World Food Program Food to help expand the national institute for vocational training, which provides three year technical training courses over a wide field of activities. World Food Program is to supply food to the institute's canteen so enabling students to have an adequate diet. It is estimated that over a five year period approximately 700 students a year will benefit.

I defend the giving of the aid I have just described. However, I stress that the most effective aid is that which is part of a comprehensive plan for a particular region. Again in such a plan the development of Agricultural Education and Science must have a high priority. It is interesting to note that UNESCO has only just completed its first study on the historical process of development in agricultural education as a factor in socio-economic development in selected Asian countries. I understand a similar study is being made in selected African countries. Moreover, there is now an active FAO/UNESCO/ILO Joint Advisory Committee on Agricultural Education, Science and Training, which actively seeks to plan and coordinate the activities of the three agencies in the interests of Agricultural Education.

I wish to quote a UNESCO document "Agriculture and General Education," 1971:

> Economists and government planners alike have come to realize that no truly balanced national development is possible if the rural sector of the

> economy remains backward. Yet, as developing nations and international organizations pursue plans for rural transformation and progress, the role of education remains one of the most delicate, challenging and important factors in the total pattern.

These words emphasize the importance of Education in Rural Development, whether in the more developed regions or less developed regions.

In the United States there is now a growing awareness of the importance of Rural Development work and the consequential need to improve educational standards, especially higher agricultural education. Educational facilities and opportunities in Rural Areas should compare favorably with those offered in Urban and Industrial areas. This may sound obvious, but too often has Rural Development and Rural Education been neglected. It is pleasing to note that distinguished academicians like Professor Gale Johnson, Professor of Economics at the University of Chicago have been doing considerable work and research on this subject. Again only recently in Chicago, May 9, 1972, Mr. Don Paarlberg, Director of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, speaking at a conference on Rural Development elaborated on this theme of Rural Development and pointed out that the United States Rural Development scheme supported by various government departments had over a period of 15 years grown from small beginnings to a total of about 20 million dollars. On September 1, 1972, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Earl Butz presented the Department of Agriculture's Third Annual Report on Information and Technical Assistance to Congress. The report makes fascinating reading for it concerns the United States Rural Development Campaign and the work of numerous rural development committees throughout the country. I am glad to say that Pennsylvania is frequently mentioned in the report. It is refreshing to discover that the United States is devoting more resources to revitalizing rural America.

I am always tempted to follow some agricultural theme; but I must desist, except to say briefly, increased World food production, the free flow of agricultural products, with the lessening of trade and specific tarrif barriers would offer more hope and prosperity to the poorer countries of the world thus enabling them to build up their economies which is so essential if they are to defeat the evils of illiteracy and the scourge of hunger and poverty. This battle must be won, for if we lose we must recognize there can be no peace out of hunger and poverty.

But overall there is the overriding factor what is it all about, what do we mean by education. What are its aims and purposes. I will attempt to give a short answer. The fundamental aim of education should be to develop to the full the creative abilities of every child. It is for this reason that the teacher-child or pupil relationship is of paramount importance. We can have fine new schools, spacious classrooms, sophisticated laboratories, gymnasia and playing fields, but all would be of no avail unless you have good teachers. Furthermore the late Professor Alford North Whitehead who was a distinguished mathematician and philosopher wrote in his book, THE AIMS OF EDUCATION the following, "Moral education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness." This is why education should encourage the search for excellence. But let this quality of excellence be linked with the search for truth through the development of a healthy skepticism. It is as well to remember that the school is a microcosm of the society outside. It is for this reason that we as democrats should be concerned with furthering the spirit of tolerance and freedom along with international understanding. Education in the best sense can only flourish in a democratic society. This was expressed eloquently by Dean

Paul Masoner in his Horace Mann Lecture in 1963. When he said, "A commitment to the democratic ethic, with its concern for the dignity of man, for a free society, and for universal public education, is an important component of the competence we seek." In the final analysis democracy is only as good as its educational system—which should be based on freedom and equality. As a politician I am a democrat. I believe in the right to disagree, the right to say no, the right to challenge all systems and beliefs which frustrate the dignity of man. If we have vision and purpose, we can create the revolution of rising human expectations in this century.

BARBARA A. SIZEMORE
University of Pittsburgh

EDUCATION FOR LIBERATION

APRIL 24, 1975

It is with great pleasure that I join the long line of distinguished lecturers who have contributed to the Horace Mann Lectures of the School of Education of the University of Pittsburgh. Additionally, it is gratifying to be back with my friends, personal and professional, who have given me assistance and encouragement during my tenure as Superintendent of the D.C. Public Schools: Dean Kelly, Dr. Obong, Dr. Smith, Dr. Wynn and many others. Moreover, I believe that this is an extremely significant time for us to be so engaged since the public's confidence in public education is waning and their attention is diverted.

In consideration of this gravity, I have chosen the topic "Education for Liberation," to emphasize the importance of education to the protection of the great civil, political and social rights which we cherish and to remind us that the price of freedom is, indeed, eternal vigilance. This protection and vigilance depends on the creation and maintenance of an educated and well-informed citizenry and polity.

Liberation is the act of freeing and of releasing from bondage or prison. It is also the state or condition of being free. Being free of course is relative to the freedom of others. David Hawkins explains that for us in his seminal work, "Human Nature and the Scope of Education."[1] He says that there are three postulates of human nature: "men are equal, men are free and men are rational." He characterizes these propositions as "the backbone of modern political theory" and sets forth the major consequences of this tradition:

> Without equality among men there is no profound problem of politics; the obviously superior would rule. Without freedom there is no deep problem of how the rulers can rule; they will rule by force or by psychological manipulation. Without rationality there is no alternative to force or manipulation, no meaningful debate over ends, no problem of consent or consensus.[2]

Hawkins questions whether or not one can define the central problems of education theory and research without consideration of these observations.

Certainly, Black Americans have been searching for a solution to the problems of equality, equity, and equal access, all commonly subsumed under the struggle for justice undergirding the Civil Rights Movement. Because men are often "profoundly unequal, unfree and irrational" the above postulates have been classified as moral rather than descriptive. . . "a hoped-for view of a case. . ."[3] This hoped-for-

view propels us to the consideration of the principles of justice. Rawls defines justice in two principles:

> First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others. Secondly: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and attached to positions and offices open to all. There are, of course, two ambiguous phrases in the second principle, namely, "Everyone's advantage" and "Open to all."
>
> The second principle applies to the distribution of income and wealth and to the design of organizations that make use of differences in authority and chains of command. While the distribution of wealth need not be equal, it must be to everyone's advantage, and at the same time, positions of authority and offices of command must be accessible to all. One applies the second principle by holding the positions open, and subject to this constraint, arranges social and economic inequalities so that everyone benefits.[4]

The focus of the Civil Rights Movement has moved to the second principle during the 1970's. During the 1950's the emphasis was on civil rights; during the 1960's there was a shift to political rights. In the 1970's action moved toward social rights. . .the right to employment, good health care and quality education. So freedom, the concept central to liberation is dependent on equality and rationality, and equality is established through justice.

Such an argument clarifies the existence of the Court in educational decision-making today. Because educators have defaulted in their responsibility to institutionalize equity, equality and equal access, the people have clamored for justice in the courts. The courts have responded and ordered a more equitable distribution of students along racial lines. This one variable, race, however, does not include all of the various characteristics and traits which human beings possess. Consequently, our task today as it has always been, is to consider this universal educational problem: human difference and variability.

Horace Mann brought the aged-graded structure to us from Germany. When he went there, he was impressed with the way education was organized and perceived these systems as superior. He did not understand that the Prussians were more homogeneous in terms of race, culture, language, religion and so forth than the United States' population. Downs reports the following:

> An important element in the superiority of Prussian schools, in Mann's estimation, was the proper classification of students. 'In all places where the numbers are sufficiently large to allow it' he states, 'the children are divided according to ages and attainments; and a single teacher has the charge only of a single class, or of as small a number of classes as is practicable. In ranking the educational systems of Europe, Mann placed Prussia first, followed by Saxony, the Western and Southwestern States of Germany, Holland and Scotland, Ireland, France, Belgium and England.'[5]

Although Mann was an advocate for universal education and humane pedagogy, the public schools of the United States patterned their educational organizations after the age-graded norm-referenced Prussian design.

As long as the children were culturally compatible, citizen satisfaction dominated the educational scene and few changes in the curriculum were demanded. But as the Black American and Spanish-speaking population increased, a real difference projected its effects into the accepted routines of school programming. Nowhere is this more obvious than in Washington, D.C.

Decentralizing for Change

Washington, D.C., the nation's capital, is 71 percent Black. The public school enrollment is 96 percent Black and 60 percent poor. This accepted given makes the integration controversy moot since the desegregation of the District would require busing across state boundaries. However, the school board and the superintendent are confronted with the very real issue of human variation and difference. How do you educate children who vary from the accepted norms? How do you govern a school system of this sort? Additionally, how do you organize the teaching-learning environment so that new strategies appropriate to human difference can be implemented?

In August, 1973 the D.C. School Board began its search for a new superintendent intending to bring about some revolutionary changes in public education. These eleven members wanted a decentralized school system to bring about: (1) more effective management of the delivery of educational services; (2) a broadened involvement of citizens, parents and students in a democratic governance structure; (3) improved career development and special education education programs; (4) the elevation of achievement; (5) the elimination of discipline problems; (6) the enhancement of the image of the D.C. Public Schools; (7) the implementation of in-service programs for developing teachers and administrators skills and changing their attitudes; (8) increased accountability; (9) a more equitable distribution of system resources among schools; (10) improved morale; and (11) increased student attendance.

As a result of that process, I was selected Superintendent of the D.C. Public Schools To comply with rules of the Board of Education, on March 9, 1974 I submitted to the D.C. Board of Education the *Superintendent's 120 Day Report*.[6] This report included my plans for meeting the goals and objectives of the D.C. Board of Education. The D.C. Board accepted and approved the *120 Day Report* on May 31, 1974 and the school system was decentralized in the first of the planned four stages on July 1, 1974.

The D.C. Public School System had been thinking through the feasibility of decentralization for some time. It had further made some decisions resulting in partial autonomy for some school units. We saw the decentralization of the system as the completion of these several starts by the School Board. We wanted decentralization to revitalize the educational system through the creation of smaller, more manageable units. The existing system had grown dysfunctional in the face of the growth of the public schools. In addition, we felt that many of the functions currently being performed centrally, both in educational and management services, could more logically be placed in regions closer to the clients. We felt that such placement would result in faster responses to problems, more efficient preventive actions and on-the-scene assistance to local school staffs. Our principal aim, however, was meaningful participation by the total community in goal setting, planning and evaluation.

Decentralization was to accomplish: (1) restructuring the school system so that schools became more responsive to the needs and the characteristics of each student in the teaching-learning situation; (2) facilitating a more effective and efficiently operated school system by the establishment of smaller and more manageable administrative units for those who were charged with the responsibility of administering and for those who were recipients of the schools' services; and (3) establishing effective channels of communication and better working relationships among several groups responsible for cooperative arrangements to accomplish the objectives of the educational community: Parents (P), Administrators (A), Community Representatives and Citizens (C), Teachers (T), and Students (S) or PACTS.

PACTS was a process to implement a mutuality of effort among these groups in order to set priorities and standards for the educational agenda in each public school. The PACTS process involved the sharing of administrative prerequisites; namely, planning and goal setting. It was designed to: (1)build a better, stronger and ongoing relationship between schools and the communities they serve by encouraging wide-range discussion of educational priorities as reflected in the local school operation; (2) form a mechanism through which parents, school administrators, community residents, teachers and students could play a more decisive role in the educational process of the D.C. Public Schools, and (3) develop a mechanism providing a systematic flow of information to and from parents and the community about the nature, goals, programs, budget and organizational life-style of schools.

The Administrative Team Idea

The decentralization of the entire public school system will occur in three phases: (1) physical decentralization; (2) administrative decentralization and (3) political decentralization. We are now in Phase 2. The entire process is overseen by The Administrative Team consisting of the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, Associate and Assistant Superintendents, Regional Superintendents and the Executive Assistants to the Superintendent. This is an attempt to use the theoretical constructs of Dr. Richard Wynn here at the University of Pittsburgh to flatten the hierarchical structure so that decision-making becomes the responsibility of those executing its directives.

Administratively, the school system is a hierarchical structure with goals, directives, and information flowing from the D.C. Board of Education through the Superintendent to middle-management employees and finally down to the classroom teacher. This type of structure limits the range of thinking that goes into decision-making, by separating higher echelon officials from other system people, and by minimizing the number of people who can be held accountable. Simply speaking, the Board of Education determines a policy and gives direction to the Superintendent who issues an administrative regulation which is given to the middle-managers who issue it to the principals who tell the teachers. Parents are then notified through communications sent home by the students if they don't lose them on the way. Often, by this time the directives are distorted or misinterpreted. Wynn suggests several principles which are imperative to assure the success of the administrative team including faith in the democratic process, trust in people, commitment to an open climate, adequate and competent administrative staff, congruency of authority, responsibility and accountability domains, refinement of group process skills, acceptance of the contagion of group enterprise and commitment. [7]

The Administrative Team of the D.C. Public Schools meets every Monday to review the accomplishments of the preceding week and to evaluate the progress toward the achievement of that week's goals, to set the new goals and to discuss any and all problems in the system. In this way the best thinking available in the system is solicited and used; and the number of alternatives which become available for the resolution of problems and the generation of new ideas is increased. Any kind of education for liberation requires a way to unearth these options for innovation and change.

Katz and Kahn describe organizations as having three significant structural properties: system openness and differentiation from their environments, elaboration of structure and separation of the organization into potentially conflicting segments because of the hierarchical differences in power and reward, and variation in

functional requirements of organization substructures.[8] They say also that organizations differ with respect to the permeability of their boundaries. Some organizations are characterized by sharply defined, rigid boundaries. Entrance into such systems and exit from them are not the decisions of the individuals who seek admission or who seek release. The U.S. Army, prisons, and schools are such organizations; thus, they are not as subject to continuing influence from the external environment as are others and are rigid.

According to Katz and Kahn, rigid organizations are more likely to develop highly differentiated internal structures which maintain their character and resist outside forces. Often this power in these organizations is vested in the top echelon and we have an oligarchical rather than a democratic system.[9] People within any system make contributions of varying effort and value, however, and are likely to be rewarded differentially. In order, therefore, to talk about education for liberation we not only must deal with the structure of education as we know it, but with institutions impacting on that structure as well.

The Politics of School Systems

The home, government, churches, public welfare agencies, and civic organizations affect the policy-making in public schools. School board members are public officials who respond to the politics of the community in rather expected and usual ways. Elected by a constituency or appointed by an official so elected, these people must be responsive and are accountable. Politics, according to Banfield and Wilson, is the management of conflict among warring groups over scarce resources. It also concerns the acquisition and discharge of power.[10] School board members are faced with the difficult problems of resource acquisition at a time when public confidence in the ability of public schools to perform is rather low. As a consequence of this dilemma, many times their decisions are due to political expediency rather than educational necessity. This presents a severe problem to the superintendent. A fear of electoral disapproval may frighten a board into giving away the system to the union forcing the superintendent into the untenable position of getting the control back.

The problem of school board-superintendent relations has become more and more important as the tenure of superintendents has become so unstable. This instability has caused some of us to ask the question, "Is a school board necessary?" The line between policy and administration is not as clear as protectors of the status quo would make nor is the demarcation between the two as easy a matter to define as advocates for change would state. School boards are charged with making policy and in some cases the statutes say they control the public schools. School boards have the power to levy taxes in some districts and to make the budget for the schools, but these are usually subject to the approval or support of the mayor or the city council. Moreover the levying of taxes needs the vote of the polity. School board members must first get the power to levy such taxes and then win public support. In the case of the D.C. School Board, it had neither the power to levy taxes nor to approve its own budget.

The odds against an educational decision are great. Therefore, many board members are content with a policy of accommodation. Accommodation is the functional adjustment of the individual to his or her social environment through the modification of his or her habits. It is a conforming act. Such behavior complies with the status quo while liberation is a releasing, a freeing act of change.

Interestingly, often the superintendent is the educational leader of the community and as the leading expert is expected to bring about the changes in the educational system which will effect the policy of the school board. In doing this,

many times, the interests of groups come into conflict not only in civic matters but in educational matters as well. Issues rise out of more lasting divisions of society that Banfield and Wilson call cleavages. Conflicts run from issue to issue dividing the community. Politics arise out of these conflicts and consist of activities by which the conflict is carried on.[11] Banfield and Wilson further say that cleavages give rise to conflicts and nourish them, and the forces tending toward consensus plus the laws, institutions, habits and traditions regulate conflict. Since the *superintendent*, as the chief executive of the school board, must manage the conflict in accordance with board policy which includes agreements, and contracts, made with various unions and groups when conflicts occur, the superintendent is often in the middle. What course of action does he she then follow? Can the superintendent be an advocate for change in such circumstances even if that change is desirable and a sound educational decision? The answers to these questions often involve a decision around keeping the job or promoting a principle.

Human Variation

My central point is that the politics of education often obstructs sound educational decision-making; especially plans to promote programs compatible with what we know about human variation and difference. The economic and social structure of our society as we know it will not exist in 2000. The workers of that era are now in elementary school. We ignore this fact, however, by teaching children as though they were the same as the children were in 1857. Moreover, we do not acknowledge that no two human beings are alike. . .not even identical twins.

We still group children according to ages and grades. We do not expect our infants to walk and talk at the same age nor do we expect our own children to be toilet trained at the same age. We expect two-year-old children to vary in size, height, and weight as well as ability. Yet, when they come to school, we discard this awareness and expect them all to learn the same things at the same time with the same materials and the same pedagogy. To expect all children aged six, in Grade One, to learn to read is as unsuitable as to expect every male child ten years old to be four feet eleven and to weigh eighty pounds.

Curriculum Change

In the D.C. Public Schools we are trying to conceive of curriculum as meaning everything that happens in the educational institution: content (what is taught), methodology (how it is taught), and administration (how we manage and direct all services to achieve the former). In this sense the changes we are recommending are comprehensive and somewhat radical. These changes are in grouping patterns, funding priorities, organizational structure, facilities planning, special education, skill mastery and learning, discipline content arrangements, career development, and multilingual, multicultural materials. We call our curriculum the multimodal, multilingual, multicultural model, or the Four M's.

Humans learn through four symbol systems: words, images, notes and numbers. We believe that all children should be taught to master these symbols. One principal reason is the pervasive influence of television in our everyday life. Our children must learn to interpret and understand these messages. Television uses all four symbol systems to communicate. Additionally, the computer is an everyday phenomenon in the lives of our children. They must learn the meaning of the constructs these machines employ. Learning facts is no longer adequate for them. Living in the 21st century will be more demanding.

Bruner posits that the principal emphasis in education should be placed upon

skills—skills in handling, in seeing and imaging, and in symbolic operations, particularly, as these relate to the technologies that have made them so powerful in their human expression. What we teach then should involve the mastery of skills that in turn lead to the mastery of still more powerful skills and the establishment of self-regard sequences. A corollary is that there is an appropriate version of a skill or knowledge which may be imparted at whatever age one wishes to begin teaching it.[12]

Once a person has mastered words, images, notes and numbers it is possible for him or her to learn almost anything else. Certainly it becomes possible to develop a metalanguage or group of metaskills. Mathematics is surely the most general metalanguage we have developed. Its understanding is more than appropriate for workers in the 21st century and a must for anyone educating for liberation.

A cursory examination of the literature reveals a double meaning for education. One view concerns the development of special and general abilities of the mind for thinking, problem finding and solving and enlightenment through the acquisition of knowledge and information. The second refers to the socialization of the individual for the culture or mode of thought and feeling of the society, including training which is the practical application of education usually under the supervision of someone capable in an art, trade or profession. Education should provide both the means for transforming and for maintaining the social reality. Too much of our work deals with socialization, the inculcation of the young into the established social arrangements. If these are unjust, unfair and inhumane, so be it.[13]

For Black Americans, of course, socialization has not been acceptable as the sole course of educational regulation. We have struggled for enlightenment, for options, for new ideas that will transform the world. The effects of racism and injustice have provided arguments against the maintenance of the status quo and have projected Black American activity toward change. Consequently, enlightenment becomes the highest priority in a school system predominantly Black. The following changes in curriculum can be anticipated:

- A reorganization of the hierarchical skills necessary for learning language, mathematics, music and art.
- A rearrangement of the sequence of language and mathematics so that the structure of the disciplines becomes relevant to the isolated skills learned previously and so that phases can be taught when the student is ready rather than when the system is ready.
- The development of multilingual and multicultural content for teaching language, literature, journalism, speech, drama, music, art, history, geography, social science and science.
- The synthesis of special education services with the needs of students rather than the needs of the system, i.e. tutoring for students having difficulty in geometry.
- The utilization of multiage, multilevel, and multimodal groupings for instruction, varying the teacher-pupil ratio to accommodate instructional rather than institutional goals.
- The improvement of counseling and guidance services so that students are involved in problem-solving situations which result in positive solutions to students needs, problems and/or grievances.
- The synthesis of career development services with the disciplines necessary for their utilization, i.e. physics and auto mechanics.

- The integration of career development services with student needs, i.e. workstudy or work service opportunities for future lawyers.[14]

Small changes in curriculur content will not suffice to produce an education for liberation. Extensive and comprehensive change is necessary. Accordingly, teaching machines, performance contracting, vouchers and educational parks become but part of the solution. A comprehensive approach addressing the overall educational structure must occur.

Whether or not we will be able to accomplish this task in the District of Columbia remains to be seen. The obstacles are many, not the least of which is the fact that the District is a colony were government is not derived from the consent of the governed. Under Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, the District of Columbia is governed by the U.S. Congress. Citizens are not represented even though they are taxed. On January 1, 1975 Congress granted citizens a modified home rule. Under this law the citizens of the District elect their own mayor, city council, and city council chairman, but Congress retains the authority over the budgetary process, the criminal justice system and the right to veto any legislation within 30 days of passage by the City Council. The District's non-voting delegate has no vote in the House of Representatives. There is no delegate in the Senate. The District is governed by four Congressional committees, two in the Senate and two in the House. These committees carefully monitor city life and policy. The citizens of the District of Columbia would certainly appreciate your lobbying your Senators and Representatives to vote for a bill giving freedom to the citizens of the District. Next year will be the year of the Bicentennial. If you are looking for a way to celebrate the 200th Birthday of the U.S.A., take the District.

Because the citizens have no control over the budget allocation, planning for the future is severely constrained. Of course, this is a real problem everywhere. No one can effect change without support. The political contingencies are myriad. But planning for change can only exist when there is a blueprint of a social order in someone's mind. Education for liberation demands that the following be fulfilled:

- Full and free communication, regardless of rank and power.
- A reliance on consensus, rather than on the more customary forms of coercion or compromise to manage conflict.
- The idea that influence is based on technical competence and knowledge rather than on the vagaries of personal whims or prerogatives of power.
- An atmosphere that permits and even encourages emotional expression as well as task oriented facts.
- A basically human bias, one which accepts the inevitability of conflict between the organization and the individual but which is willing to cope with and mediate this conflict on rational grounds.[15]

The idea of equality is central to education for liberation. The environment of any educational system must observe the three postulates with which we began this lecture: men are equal, men are free, and men are rational. The scope of education then must provide a setting which will be compatible with these observations. If such an environment can be established, men and women can bargain for their interests in a rational way according to rules protected by the constitution and our political ideology which guarantees that all men are created equal with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

NOTES

1. Hawkins, David. "Human Nature and the Scope of Education" in Lawrence G. Thomas and Herman G. Richey (eds), *Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research*, 71st yearbook of the National Society for the Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972 pp. 287-326.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 288.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 288-289.
4. Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971. pp. 60-61.
5. Downs, Robert B. *Horace Mann*. N.Y.: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974, pp. 91-92 and p. 96.
6. Sizemore, Barbara A. *The Superintendent's 120 Day Report*. Washington D.C.: D.C. Public Schools, March 9, 1974
7. Wynn, Richard. *Theory and Practice of the Administrative Team*. Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1973, pp. 38-43.
8. Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn. *Social Psychology of Organizations* N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1966. pp. 122-125.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
10. Banfield, Edward B. and James Q. Wilson. *City Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963, pp. 33-46.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Bruner, Jerome S. *Toward a Theory of Instruction* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966. pp. 33-36.
13. Sizemore, Barbara A. "Education for Liberation," *School Review*, Vol. 81, No. 3 May, 1973. pp. 391-392.
14. Sizemore, *120 Day Report*, pp. 47-48.
15. Bennis, Warren. *Changing Organizations* N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

MARTIN CARNOY
Stanford University and the Center for Economic Studies

EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT: A REAPPRAISAL

JUNE 2, 1976

Introduction

By 1985, the majority of the world's children will have had some formal schooling. We can view this fact with pride, believing that such education is a step forward for human development, or we can view it with misgivings, fearful that much of the schooling experience is no more than a further incarceration of the human will and spirit. Our judgment should emerge from an analysis of the economic and social system which this formalized teaching-learning process is being used to maintain and to promote; I submit that only in a very limited sense can schooling be judged in terms of itself. Rather, schooling should be analyzed as an institution serving a particular society with well-defined ends and means to those ends. The human being is formed in the *total* society, and schooling contributes to that formation in terms consistent with the society's economic, social, and political structure. In order to analyze the role of schooling in human development, therefore, we must understand the nature of economic, social, and political structure and to evaluate how schooling meets the needs of that structure. And if we discuss alternative forms of education, we must deal with the kind of society to be served by these alternatives.

The decade of the nineteen-sixties was known in international circles as the decade of development. It was also a decade of unprecedented educational expansion, expansion which was to have contributed to economic growth and the alleviation—if not elimination—of poverty in low-income countries. Yet, after the decade of development was over, few, if any of the goals set out in 1960 had been met. In this current decade, already more than half-over, international educators face a whole new set of problems: unemployed educated labor, with high expectations but often finding few professional jobs awaiting them; and despite more education in the labor force and increased average levels of schooling in the population, increased overall unemployment and increased inequality of income distribution.

These certainly were not the problems that educators and planners thought they would face when they made their projections 15 years ago. Has education failed? Has development planning failed? Many who analyze the situation in low income countries blame poor economic growth performance, educated unemployment, and the increasing inequality of income distribution precisely on the inefficiency and rigidity of institutions like the educational system. Are they right to do so?

In this essay, I argue that formal education can contribute to development, but, if it does not, it is largely because the society and economy are geared up to produce increases in output in ways which are accompanied by unemployment, inequality, and the perpetuation of inequality. These are not "inefficiencies" in the economic and social system, I argue, nor is the "inefficient" formal educational system which contributes to that kind of development pattern in producing "excess" educated labor for it and helping to preserve the social class system. Rather, one group's "inefficiencies" are another's "efficiencies." I contend that in a socio-economic system dominated by a class structure (or tribal structure turning into a class structure), the dominant class will organize the economic system and the educational system to produce in a way to benefit primarily the dominant group. It is the conflict between these classes which determines the overall course of development and the organization of education rather than the goals of planners and educators. In my view, then, the "development decade" ideology mistakenly had us believing that we could overcome this class conflict with technocratic ideals and a technocratic concept of development. In the seventies, we have to begin facing the reality of social systems and what that reality means for education's potential contribution to human betterment. I contend that this implies assessing education's possibilities first as a political force for change, for it is profound structural change which is necessary before broad-based development can take place in most low-income societies.

What is the Development Problem?

If we define the development problem only in terms of increasing overall economic output, we can reduce the issue to two variables: The amount of savings/investment which can be generated from different sources and the output-capital ratio (productivity of capital). Of course, the development problem is much more complex. Not only are we concerned with how much the society produces, but what it produces, how it produces, who gets to produce the output, and who gets to consume the output. We are concerned with human rights and physical and mental health. Thus, it is important to analyze the development much more broadly than the limited view provided by increases in material product.

Most low income countries (LIC's) of the world produce goods with a capitalist organization of production; a major thrust of our thesis is that while it is possible to increase material output rapidly under capitalism, much of the development problem defined in broader terms rises from the way capitalism produces this increased output. The characteristics of capitalist development in low income countries vary in detail from country to country, but we can generalize several main features which help us understand the roots of the problem:

1. Capitalist development is based on the private ownership of property, including the means of production, and the right of the individual to the protection of that property against infringement by other individuals. In theory, anybody in the capitalist economy can own capital and use it for production; but in practice, the distribution of capital for production is highly concentrated. A relatively small number of individuals in a capitalist economy make decisions about what kinds of things should be produced and how they should be produced. Furthermore, since owners of capital are primarily interested in maximization of returns to that capital, they are likely to use all means at their disposal, including; if possible, the State apparatus, to both increase returns to

their capital and to insure that they maintain control over the means of production.

2. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that technology developed by capitalists is oriented to lowering labor costs, both through controlling worker organizations and through eliminating as much as possible of the skilled worker component of any production process (Braverman, 1974). In the low income countries technology used in the production of manufactured goods is usually imported from abroad, thus reproducing the conditions of production in the high income countries. The usual argument by economists has been that this misallocates resources, since importing technology from high income countries results in a production process based on the relative wage rates of labor in those countries rather than the lower wages prevalent in the LIC's. However, if we consider that this technology was developed in the high income countries primarily to solve labor problems in production which had little to do with overall wage levels, and that the labor problem in low income countries for manufacturing industries is very similar to that of high income countries—the elimination of the skilled work component and the control of management over labor—the importation of technology from abroad by the domestic bourgeoisie does not result in the misallocation of resources in terms of its class interests, since this imported technology has been proven effective in achieving those two main goals. In any case, the importation of technology does duplicate the production process of the high income countries in the "modern" sector and only gradually penetrates agricultural and marginal production.

3. Work is therefore organized in low income capitalist countries as an extension of high income countries' capitalist institutions, including all the elements of the division of labor in those high income countries, plus management decisions which are made in foreign corporations to maximize the overall welfare of the foreign corporation, not necessarily the welfare of the branch in the low income country. These management decisions of foreign corporations include the possibility of lowering the growth rate of the low income country branch (Chase-Dunn, 1974), the extraction of valuable resources at lower prices to use in the high income country, the retention of control over major marketing and financial decisions, etc. (Barnet and Muller, 1975). Although the multinational corporations are an important facet of understanding production and distribution in low income countries, it is also important to understand that the organization of work in many other economic institutions is also an extension of high income country needs. For example, the primary export sector involves a significant fraction of LIC agricultural labor in the production of goods for consumption in the already industrialized countries. The wages of labor in the primary export sector and the organization of work for producing these goods is heavily influenced by prices in the international economy and the types of primary goods which are demanded in the industrialized countries.[1]

4. The apparent dichotomy in the technology and division of labor between the "traditional" sector and the "modern" sector can be understood by analyzing the role that each sector plays in the development process of low income capitalist countries. Where it exists, the dynamic modern sector reflects a priority emphasis by the capitalist State on the production of goods for consumption abroad and by high income

groups and dynamic industries (capital goods) at home above the human needs of the mass of people in the country itself. In other words, the dynamic sectors in low income capitalist countries are the export and capital goods sectors, and it is to these sectors that the modernizing capitalist State diverts surplus, that financial institutions cater, and that the State supports with various indirect subsidies. On the other hand, the "traditional" sector produces "wage goods"—goods which are consumed by domestic wage earners. These include lower quality textiles, cheap household goods, and much of the stable foods consumed in rural and urban areas.

We further observe that the modern sector is characterized by monopoly production—a few large firms producing a high percentage of output and employing a high percentage of labor in the industrial sector—while the traditional sector is characterized by highly competitive conditions—many small firms competing in the market for their goods. Thus, one set of capitalists—both foreign and domestic—in the low income countries is rapidly expanding production of goods produced under monopoly capitalist conditions in domestic markets while perhaps competing for export markets abroad in more competitive conditions. Another set of "stagnating capitalists" (not including subsistence farmers who cater to their own needs) cater solely to the needs of consumers in the low income country itself and operate in that market under competitive conditions.

Both sectors, however, while differing in type of capitalist organization in production (monopoly corporate versus competitive)[2], produce goods to maximize profits, and distribute goods to those who can pay the highest prices, not those who need the goods. Furthermore, in eg sector, goods are produced in a way which maximizes profits: if this means holding wages down, so be it; if this means increasing unemployment, so be it; if this means increasing control over the work process by the capitalists/managers, so be it; if this means impairing the health and safety of the workers, so be it.

5. In practice, this results in a duality in the producing sectors, with higher wages, "modern" technology, and a complex division of labor in that part of the manufacturing sector which produces higher income goods and goods necessary for consumption abroad, durable capital goods for manufacturing, and high income country type services, and lower wages and a less extensive division of labor in the traditional sector. Since the modern sector is using production methods imported directly from the high income countries and it is attempting to maximize profits, it does not have as its primary goal the absorption of labor from the subsistence agricultural and traditional urban sectors of production. At the same time, the "modern" sector depends for its continued growth on investment funds and surplus produced by the traditional sectors, including export agriculture. So, on the one hand, the modern sector drains economic surplus from the traditional sector, creating difficulties for labor to gain a living in that sector while at the same time continuously introducing technology and management practices which reduce the amount of labor necessary for increments of physical capital. This puts pressure on labor to leave the traditional sector, which it does in large numbers, but creates conditions in the modern sector which insure that this labor will not be absorbed.

As a result, we observe in the low income, industrializing capitalist countries the universal phenomenon of increasing unemployment and the growth of large urban "marginal" populations engaged in hustling meager incomes in "traditional" urban industries or in services at the fringe of the modern manufacturing and service sector. We also observe increasing inequality of income distribution as the low income capitalist countries industrialize. A large part of this increasing inequality of income distribution, of course, is due to the increased unemployment and the widening differences between wages in the modern sector and wages in the traditional sector, particularly because of the creation of a managerial, paramanagerial, and professional class of people who are involved in controlling production, distribution, and labor problems in the large corporations in the "modern" sector and in the State bureaucracy largely at the service of that sector.

6. There is no doubt that it is possible to increase gross national product (GNP) per capita at a rapid rate with this kind of development. However, it should also be clear that the participation of the population in this increase of GNP is limited to a small minority who happen to get into that economic sector which is doing the growing and willing to pay high wages to people to play a controlling function over its workers and to those who get into the State bureaucracy and are said to aid and abet the dynamic sectors. There is already much evidence (Barkin, 1971; Langoni, 1973; Adelman and Taft, 1973) that shows the increasing inequality of income in the low income economies as they industrialize and "modernize." There is also evidence (summarized in Blaug, 1973 and Carnoy, 1976) that unemployment is increasing during this growth process. Thus, while admitting that capitalist development produces a larger pie, we must recognize that a great majority of people in the low income capitalist countries have not participated in the growth process and will not participate for many, many years to come, if at all. Indeed, as we have argued, if the modern sector depends for its investment funds on the economic surplus generated by the traditional sector as well as foreign investment there is no reason to expect this development process will be able to solve the income distribution and employment problems it generates.

Education for Development

We have gone into this rather long description of the characteristics of low income economies' capitalist development because it is essential to understand that development in order to comprehend the nature of educational systems and educational change in those countries. What kind of educational system would we expect the State to provide in this kind of "development" situation? Would we expect all individuals to receive education which helps them participate in the economic growth process and in decision-making for production? Or would we expect that children would be educated by the institution of formal schooling to fit into capitalist labor needs, which include some highly paid workers as well as large numbers of unemployed, and to believe in an ideology which justifies the inequity

of the capitalist system of production? How would the educational system distribute education in a society where the fruits of production and access to jobs is inequitably distributed?

To answer these questions, we must first clarify that the spread of Western schooling to the Third World was carried out in the context of imperialism and colonialism (and the spread of mercantilism and capitalism) and it cannot in its present form and purpose be separated from that context. Thus, although schooling which originated in the metropole promoted change from one hierarchy to another —from the traditional hierarchy of the colonized culture to some form of the hierarchy of European mercantilism or capitalism—this change was carefully defined. The structure of schools, since it came from the metropole, was based in large part on the needs of metropole investors, traders, and culture. Western schools were used to develop indigenous elites which served as intermediaries between metropole merchants and plantation labor; they were used to incorporate indigenous peoples into the production of goods necessary for metropole markets; they were used to help change social structures to fit in with European concepts of work and interpersonal relationships.

The purpose of Western schooling, then, as it was instituted around the world, was to make people useful in the new hierarchy, not to help to develop societal relationships which carried them beyond that social structure to others. So schooling in low income countries does not help people reach stages beyond this capitalist/foreign or other class controlled hierarchy, and tries to fit people to the needs of that hierarchy whether it benefits them or not. We define this as the colonizing aspect of schooling. Transformation from tradition to capitalist hierarchies occurs, at least in certain sectors, but the tools of change are not taught in the schools. Schooling is a colonial institution that attempts to make children fit certain molds, to shape them to perform predetermined roles and tasks based on their social class. Neither children nor adults are brought to understand their relationship to institutions and how they can change those institutions to suit their needs. The introduction of school itself constitutes a type of change, but once that introduction is carried out, people are brought to a certain level of social consciousness and no further.

The State in the low income capitlist economy is crucial to our understanding of the role of the schools in the "development" process. The State acts to "guide" development along a certain path, in these low income economies, it serves as an intermediary between foreign investors, foreign governments, the domestic bourgeoisie, the landed aristocracy, and peripheral classes in the low income society. The State therefore presents an ideology of development through the school system and other institutions which reflects the dominance of certain groups in society who manage to control the State apparatus over certain periods of time. Most low income Third World governments who support the type of capitalist development described above push an ideology which is conditioned not only by the needs of the local bourgeoisie and traditional oligarchic elements in their society, but also one which satisfies the ideological needs of foreign investors and foreign governments who exert a strong influence in that particular society. Thus, if the domestic bourgeoisies and perhaps the domestic government bureaucracy are dependent for their continued economic success on industrial country aid and foreign investment, they are likely to condition their own needs to the needs of those foreign powers. The school system reflects this conditioned approach to development, not only is preparing children to fit into various pieces of a class-based hierarchy which has been structured to produce goods under this conditioned development process, but in attempting to nurture in children cultural forms which are also conditioned by the

intermediary role of the State. For example, the use of French or English in many African and Asian countries as the dominant language fits this cultural mode. As Frantz Fanon and Albert Memmi have described in detail (Fanon, 1968; Memmi, 1965), teaching in a foreign language alters children's personality—it creates a split identification in children which causes them difficulty in identifying with either the culture to which they belong or the culture to which they aspire. On the one hand they consider the traditional culture as inferior, and on the other they cannot be full members of the foreign culture which is presented to them as desirable and superior. Thus, the State creates conditions through the schools for personal development which both alienates and makes difficult the attainment of human needs within the society based on its own resources and capacity.

The State's provision of formal schooling is therefore organized in large part or entirely to supply the needs of the group (or groups) which dominate the State apparatus. In the case of low income capitalist countries where a domestic "modern" bourgeoisie controls State power, we observe that State is used as a support mechanism for the labor needs and ideological position of that bourgeoisie in its interpretation of the optimum way to development. As we have discussed, that position is essentially to bring their domestic economy into the "modern" world through importing technology, fostering the production of goods for consumption by foreigners and a small group of people in their own country, and rationalizing other domestic institutions, including the State bureaucracy and the schools, to fit in with the modern production sectors.

We have argued that this modernization process produces a duality even in the industrial sector. The labor needs are very different for the modern industrializing sector and for the traditional sector of the economy, probably not so much because of the different kinds of technology used in the two sectors, but because of the hierarchies developed in the modern versus the traditional production unit (Stone, 1974). Further, the traditional sectors are being drained of surplus in order to finance the growth of the modern sector, which makes the value of additional schooling in the traditional sector much less valuable than in that high growth part of the economy.

It is not unusual, under these conditions, that rural schooling has low priority for the urban capitalists and technocrat/managers who dominate low income industrializing, "modernizing" economies. Yet, the same capitalists and managers are concerned about producing a large reserve army of skilled and semi-skilled workers in urban areas who put downward pressure on skilled workers' wages, making industrial expansion and capital accumulation (profits) more rapid. They may also be concerned with socializing children from marginal populations to accept the fate in store for them at the bottom of the urban class structure. The modernizing State may therefore expand mass urban primary and even secondary schooling both to produce a large reserve of schooled labor and to help legitimize the inequalities in the development process (Carnoy, 1974).

We observe, then, that educational systems in low income industrializing capitalist countries are characterized by an enormous disparity between rural and urban educational systems, even at the primary level. Rural schools are ill equipped; in many places several grades are taught in one-room schools, and usually due to insufficiency of classrooms, lack of motivation, rural students complete a maximum of a few years of school. Furthermore, the curriculum for rural schools is an urban curriculum, developed in urban areas and even in the capitals of foreign, already industrialized countries. In urban areas, the quality and quantity of public schooling varies greatly between the different social classes in urban areas. In many "modernizing" countries, a significant fraction of the secondary schooling available

is private, producing effective "screening" mechanisms to exclude children from poorer families from the free university education provided by the State. Those children from working class families who reach secondary school are usually channeled into vocational training rather than the academic preparation necessary to quality for university education. Finally, when the university level expands in response to corporate and State bureaucratic needs, there are large salary differentials between those occupations followed by children of lower income families who attend university, and those occupations such as medicine and engineering which require full-time study (making it difficult to work while attending university) and are taken primarily by youths from higher income families.

The entire school system, therefore, is highly class stratified, with the majority of the State's resources for education going to support those kinds of education which prepare children to work in the "modern" sector and for the managerial and technical levels of training required by that sector. On the other hand, those children who are not likely to be working in that sector receive a very small share of the State's resources for education. In addition, the curriculum at different levels of schooling is designed to prepare people for the modern sector. If children do not get jobs in that sector, the schooling they have taken does not prepare them for the tasks they will perform in the traditional agricultural or marginal urban sectors of economic activity. Yet, schooling does play an important function in socializing these children to believe that their failure is not the failure of the system, but their own failure is not succeeding in school and thus not being able to get the kinds of jobs which are highly rewarded. This is the principal "legitimizing" function of public schooling. Nevertheless, even as the school system expands rapidly and the average level of schooling increases, the number of jobs available in the modern sector does not expand as rapidly and so we find that succeeding in school still does not buy jobs for the mass of people in that sector. Even while they have more schooling, they are still not prepared to carry out more effectively the tasks required in the traditional sector.

Thus, in a "development" situation such as we find in the industrializing capitalist countries, individuals do not receive the education which helps them participate in economic growth and the political process. This is not an accident, nor a result of "inefficiencies" in the school system. Rather, the school system was designed historically to function in a way which left the mass of people unable to maximize their human potential because the economy was and is organized to maximize that potential for a few rather than the many. The schools go even further: they attempt to convince children and their families that the low level of capacity at which most children find themselves after going to school is the maximum potential which they can reach. Thus, not only does the school system fail to help individuals maximize their participation, but in this kind of development it is necessary to convince those who are operating below their potential participation that they are in the best possible position consistent with ability, and that the system has actually helped them reach this "best" position.

Given this analysis of the development problem and the educational system, why should we believe that educational policy in a low income capitalist country will be used to equalize income distribution when wage and income policies (including inflation) serve to extract surplus from workers and peasants and transfer at least part of that surplus to the top 20 percent of income earners in the country? Wouldn't it be more likely that educational policy would either be consistent with a general policy of increasing inequality, or would have little effect on earnings distribution in the face of changes in distribution wrought by direct incomes policies? And why should we expect educational policy to contribute to decreased

educated unemployment when it is in the interest of entrepreneurs and managers to have a surplus of educated labor in order to push down the real wages of skilled workers and even (eventually) technicians and professionals (as in the United States)?

And within education, why should we expect that teachers would want or even be able to impart a whole range of knowledge to their lower class pupils, when the system of education does not expect those pupils to attend school longer than a certain grade, or *to be able* to learn beyond the most rudimentary cognitive skills? How are teachers viewed in such a system? As providing intellectual inspiration, or as controlling children's behavior and preparing them for a particular set of roles in the labor force and social structure?

Undoubtedly, this sounds very pessimistic. But it is meant to present the problem realistically, so that we can deal with it realistically. As I view the problem, to equalize incomes, decrease poverty, reduce unemployment, and in general, to make the economy develop in a way which includes the mass of the population of low income countries in the gains from development, requires political organization and action by the mass of people itself. Altruism is not the driving force of capitalism, and we are deluding ourselves if we are counting on the good will of capitalists and managers either in the low income countries and the industrialized countries to carry out these reforms. Political pressure will, ultimately, convince such elites that they must act to reform (or repress), and more enlightened portions of that class will move toward greater equality under such pressure, but usually in ways that leave the system of production intact. Thus, I contend, development is not a technical problem but a political issue.

As far as education is concerned, it is unlikely that great social change will emanate from the educational system. The formal (and in most cases, the informal) educational system is too closely tied to the economic and social structure. Nevertheless, education can be used to produce change—including equalizing skills, making skills more appropriate to the production of goods needed by the mass of the population rather than a limited few, socializing people to be more cooperative and socially conscious, etc.—when the State is already committed to an equalization and full employment policy and is willing to make the changes necessary in the economic and social structure to achieve that change (Carnoy, 1975). Yet, even when the State is not completely committed to those kinds of policies, educational expansion in a capitalist economy may create contradictions in the production process and may interfere with the smooth working of the elite's vision of the way the economy and society should function. Since that vision depends, to a large extent, on the socialization of youth to accept the inequality of the system, and, on the assumption that schools play an important role in the socialization process (particularly in low income countries where the authority structure of the school is the sole connection of the poor with the opportunity to emerge from poverty), contradictions emerging from schooling may have important consequences for the production and political process.

Contradictions in the Educational Process

Although the dominant domestic bourgeoisie in the low income countries attempts to use the educational system to reproduce this class's control over the means of production and the surplus, and although it is generally successful in convincing people to accept this inequitable system of "development," it can also fail to convince children and their families that the reality described in the schools is indeed the reality they face. Formal schooling in a State controlled system can

create aspirations which are not met leaving people to question the economic system; formal schooling can teach skills such as reading which may give students access to literature which is not in the curriculum; and the schools can introduce students to adults—their teachers—who may be against the established system, and may introduce them to students whose families have taught them things different from the things being taught in school. Thus, just as the factory helped capitalists increase control over workers in the work process, it also brought workers together in the same place in close proximity and created the conditions for working class organizing. The schools also attempt to subordinate peoples' values and behavior to a particular development process—in the case of capitalist development, an inequitable one in which a few people will participate fully, and the vast majority may attend the school but will not participate in the growth of the national product. At the same time, however, the schools bring children together in school, introduce them to each other as people, their ideas, and occasionally give them a teacher/manager who is not completely convinced that he or she should present to his or her pupils a reality which does and will not exist for them.

Furthermore, the use of schooling as a selector for different strata in the capitalist work structure creates a demand for ever more schooling among young people, which eventually produces a labor force which has more schooling than necessary to carry out production tasks. Since capitalists and managers are constantly pushing for more schooling in order to increase the degree of socialization and the cognitive knowledge of their work forces, the State feels compelled to increase the amount of schooling available for the general population. However, this ever-increasing average level for schooling tends to create frustration in the labor force once it reaches the job market and finds that increased schooling has prepared it for jobs which their fathers may have done a generation ago with much less training. Only a small percentage of graduates are able to find work which makes the additional schooling seem worthwhile.

As Gintis has point out (Gintis, 1975): on the one hand, the school system becomes essential to producing socialized and cognitively prepared labor for the production of goods, so if it does not function properly, it may create problems for the system; on the other hand, while the school system actively tries to socialize and prepare this labor efficiently, the bringing together of large numbers of young people in the schools and the possibility of teachers sympathetic to the young may create the conditions under which students will act to disrupt the schools or use them as a place to organize in order to create a politically sensitized output of the schools which is not useful for the capitalist production process. As we have added, the schools may create aspirations which cannot be met by the economic system. In this case, one of the most important products of the school, a labor force which accepts its position in the system is equitable and just, fails to materialize from the schools; to the contrary, under these conditions, the output of the schools may be frustrated and alienated labor force which again creates increasing problems for capitalist production.

It is difficult to say to what degree these contradictions develop in the schools, but we do know that in both low and high income countries, the school has become a significant element in supplying socialized labor for capitalist production and for the reproduction of the capitalist system. This makes it an essential institution for the continued development of capitalism, and in a sense, it is an integral part of the capitalist production process. At the same time, there is evidence that bringing together masses of young people in the schools can create unintended values among the young which makes them less useful in the capitalist production hierarchy (for a proposed response to this problem, see Coleman, *et al.*, 1973; for a response to Coleman, see Behn, *et al.*, 1974).

Conclusions

Our analysis argues that education is a product of its environment, particularly, in low income capitalist societies, the economic environment developed by industrial country capitalists and managers working together with local commercial and industrial bourgeoisies. The problems we observe—income inequality, unemployment, abject poverty—are in large part the product of capitalist development itself. Output and education often expand rapidly in capitalist development and contradictions occur in the development process. It is these contradictions which may lead to political action which in turn may lead to a different kind of development and an educational system which helps everyone to participate fully in the development process. We have argued that it is only through political action and, often, severe political conflict, that the problems we observe in the Third World will be solved (if they can be solved at all). We have also argued that education and the economy are not inert: changes in the economy create new demands on the educational system, and these, in turn may create contradictions in production which may lead to change in the production system. Change in the production system would lead, in turn to change in the educational system, etc.

If we view education and development in this way—a political economic way—we will not create, as reformers, false hopes either for ourselves or for the mass of Third World peoples trying to survive in this decade. We cannot *give* them development and education: ultimately, they will have to *take* it for themselves.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelman, Irma, and Cyntia Taft Morris. *Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973).

Barkin, D. "Education: Una barrera al desarrollo?" *Revista de Centro de Estudios Educativos* (Mexico), 1971.

Burnet, R. and Muller, R. *Global Research* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1975).

Behn, W., M. Carnoy, M. Carter, J. Crain, and H. Levin. "School is Bad, but Work is Worse," *School Review*, November, 1974.

Blaug, M. *Education and Employment* (Geneva: International Labor Organizations, 1973).

Braverman, H. *Labor and Monopoly Capitalism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973).

Carnoy, M. *Education as Cultural Imperialism* (New York: David McKay, 1974).

Carnoy, M. "Can Educational Policy Change Income Distribution in Latin America?" ILO World Employment Program, Geneva, 1975.

Carnoy, M. *Education and Employment* (Paris: IIEP, forthcoming, 1976).

Chase-Dunn, C. "International Dependence in the World-System," (Unpublished Ph D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1975).

Coleman, J., et al. *Youth: The Transition to Adulthood* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fanon, F. *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1968).

Genovese, E. *The Political Economy of Slavery* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1965).

Gintis, H. "The New Working Class and Revolutionary Youth," in M. Carnoy (ed.) *Schooling in a Corporate Society* (New York: David McKay, second edition, 1975).

Gordon, D., M. Reich, and R. Edwards. "A Theory of Labor Market Segmentation," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 63, May, 1973.

Langoni, C. "Distribucao de renda e desenvolvimento economico do Brasil," *Estudos Economicos*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (October, 1972).

Marglin, S. "What Do Bosses Do?" *The Review of Radical Political Economics*, Vol. II, No. 2 (Summer, 1974), pp. 60-127.

Memmi, A. *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963).

Stone, K. "The Origins of Job Structures in the Steel Industry," *Review of Radical Political Economics*, Vol. II, No. 2 (Summer, 1974).

NOTES

1 Slavery was probably not a capitalist mode of production, but was intimately associated with the needs of capitalist production in Europe and the United States –therefore, it has been argued that slavery was an extension of capitalist production to the particular conditions of plantation agriculture (Genovese, 1965).

2 Without going into detail on these differences, we can mention that monopoly corporations face much more stable markets than competitive firms, and therefore may attempt to stabilize their labor force and their markets through a host of control mechanisms and management hierarchy which competitive firms cannot afford (Gordon, Reich, and Edwards, 1973).

DELL HYMES
University of Pennsylvania

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: FORWARD TO FUNDAMENTALS

JUNE 12, 1978

Introduction

I have been asked to speak about imperatives for change—change in university settings such as this, and change in schooling generally. This I am glad to do. I believe profoundly in the need for change in the way we understand language, and in what we do with language in schools. I agreed to become Dean of the School of Education because of that belief. But let me pause. Some of you must suspect that you are about to hear another lecture from a self-appointed bearer of light to the benighted. Not so. Part of what we need to know in order to change is not now known to anyone; teachers are closer to part of it than most linguists. No one who gives priority in the study of language to the needs of education could consider present linguistics a region of the already saved, toward which educators must look for missionaries and redemption. I have argued against the mainstream in linguistics for years, precisely because it has been inadequate to study of the role of language in human life. It has made assumptions, adopted methods, accepted priorities that prevent the contribution to education that serious study of language should make.

There are serious scholarly reasons for critique of the mainstream in linguistics, reasons that draw on traditions of thought with roots in the anthropology of Sapir, the sociology of Marx, the linguistics and poetics of Jakobson, the literary criticism and rhetoric of Burke.[1] There are scientific problems internal to linguistics that cannot be solved without change in the foundations from which they are approached. But there are civic reasons for critique as well. One by one some of us find it intolerable to continue a linguistics defined in a way that divorces it from the needs of the society which supports us. The number of students of language sharing this outlook grows. The time is ripe for a relation between the study of language and the study of education that is one of partnership, not preaching.

Please do not misunderstand. To criticize linguistics is not to absolve education. The ability of schools to deal with the linguistic situation in the United States is severely limited. One often says, start where the child is, develop the child's full potential. To do that, linguistically, one must have knowledge of the ways of speaking of the community of which the child is part. Very little knowledge of this sort is available. Each of us has some insight into these things—some command of the ways of speaking; but each of us is a poor judge as well. Just because language is basic to so many other things, so presupposed, much of our speaking is out of

awareness; we may be ignorant of much of it, or even in good faith confidently misreport it. Things we are sure we never say may turn up on someone's tape; matters of more or less may be assimilated to a sense of all-or-nothing. Our impressions of the speech of others may be remarkably accurate for placing them, without our being aware that our own speech may contain some of the same features. Recently a linguist and anthropologist in Montreal recorded the speech of two friends, a man and a woman, each speaking sometimes in formal situations, sometimes in informal situations in which the colloquial French known as Joual was appropriate. She played samples to a distinguished Montreal audience. The audience heard four people, not two. It could not be convinced that there were only two, so strong were its preconceptions as to the categorical difference.

If we are to know objectively what speaking is like, there must be ethnographies of speaking, open to discovery of facts that are inconvenient for one's grammar, pedagogy, or social assumptions. Educators and linguists alike have been remiss in not thinking of such knowledge as needed. Where linguists have pursued intuitions and universal models that ignore the realities of speech communities and language use, many educators have pursued notions of language and correctness that have had the same effect. Why want to know more about something one already knew was not really 'language'? that one knew was 'wrong'?

All this leads me to believe that there are three primary imperatives for change.

First, to *see* the need for knowledge of the language situations of our country.

Second, to *support* training and research to obtain such knowledge.

Third, to *change* the relations between linguistics and education.

Let me elaborate on this last imperative for a moment. A new relation between linguistics and education may be basic to all the rest. The essential point is that the nature of the change that is needed is not one-sided or one way. Linguistics and educators should work together and change together. Only thus can research on language be relevant to the situations faced by schools.

I shall return to the relation between linguistics and education. Now let me try to give substance to the need for knowledge.

Wanting to Know

Certain goals on which we would probably agree should govern imperatives for change. The treatment of language in schools should help, not harm. It should help children, and through them their families and communities, to maintain and foster self-respect. It should be consonant with respect for diversity of background and aspirations. It should contribute to equality rather than inequality.

It is probably hard to keep from nodding to words like these. Such words are familiar and accepted. Yet we face assumptions and ignorance about language and contradict and work against such goals.

Consider a school in a community. What would you want to know, were you responsible for the linguistic aspect of the schooling there? There are many who would not think that there was much that they needed to know, even how to use the language of the children. Recently I was asked to a meeting at the Philadelphia School Board to help resist pressure to remove the requirement that a teacher in a TESOL class know the language of the children being taught English, that is, be able to communicate with them. Most teachers at the school in Madras, Oregon to which children from Warm Springs Indian Reservation go, do not think they need to know anything about the Indian languages in the homes from which the children

come, or the etiquette of speaking there. By and large, indeed, knowing languages and knowing about language is little valued in our country, if it involves acceptance of diversity. You and I may have no difficulty in understanding standard West Indian English, may even admire it—I think it myself the most lovely English I have heard. But the daughter of a family from Jamaica was just admitted to a state-affiliated university in Philadelphia on the condition that she take a course in English for foreign students. Have you not often heard a proper middle-class white say in exasperation to a cab-driver or voice on the phone, "Oh, I can't understand you", although the black or Spanish accent was entirely intelligible? Identification of the difference having closed the listener's ear?

When educated, concerned people want to know about language, what is it they are likely to want to know? A graduate student at my university reports that when she spoke recently to the group that supports her studies, their serious, well intentioned questions made assumptions about languages and their relations to human groups that a linguistics student could not even have imagined entertaining. Recently I was asked by a cultured voice on the phone to help with a program being planned for the Canadian Broadcasting System, to view French in Montreal in the light of similar situations in the United States and the Caribbean. I began helpfully naming friends who know about such things, when it came out that the premise of the program was that the French-speaking lower classes of Montreal could not think right because they could not speak right. (You can imagine the haste and confusion with which I withdrew the names and tried to dissociate myself from the whole thing).

These are merely recent instances that have impinged upon me in the course of a month or two. It is almost too painful to be a student of language attentive to such things—examples accumulate so readily of prejudice, discrimination, ignorance bound up with language. It makes one wonder if discrimination connected with language is not so pervasive as to be almost impervious to change, so deeply rooted as to almost preclude support for the asking of questions that might lead to change. To be sure, some may be sure that children would be fine if left alone, and be glad to learn what is wrong with schools. Others may be sure that schools are doing what is right, and be glad to learn what is wrong with children and the homes from which they come. It is hard to find people who sense a need to understand objectively the school child's communicative world, a world seriated into a multiplicity of contexts of situation and ways of speaking suitable to each, a world of a plurality of norms for selecting and grouping together features of a verbal style, of a plurality of situation-sensitive ways of interacting and interpreting meaning in terms of styles, such that a type of situation such as classroom interaction with a teacher or formal test-making has meaning in terms of its relation to the rest. Such that each involves a spoken or written genre that has a place in a series of such, a possibility of performance dependent on particular rules for commitment to performance. So that to understand the part of a verbal repertoire that appears in educational settings, one needs to be able to compare choices of communicative device and meaning, displays of communicative and cognitive ability, across a range of settings. So that to understand the part of a child's (or teacher's) ways of speaking one sees in school, one needs to understand the whole. One needs to do or to draw on linguistic ethnography.[3]

As you know, there is little done and little on which to draw. What I have sketched in general terms is what one might reasonably ask about if concerned with the role of language in schooling in another culture or country; expecting things to be strange, one wants to know. In a sense, we need to be able to stand back from our own situations so as to see them as strange and as needing to be known.

Black Americans, Native Americans, Spanish-Speaking Americans

I should not suggest that nothing at all is known or being done. Certainly there has been a good deal of attention in recent years to patterns of speech associated with some of the major groups that make up this diverse country. Yet the research is scattered and spotty with regard to both geography and class. The case of 'Black English' is instructive. In the 1960's the ways of speaking of Black Americans attracted attention. The research has been important in demonstrating the systematic, rule-governed nature of the vernacular spoken by many Blacks, as aginst notions of it as an incoherent corruption. Notions of Black children practically without language were shown to be functions of intimidating formal situations in schools, to be situational, not general. Some of this work helped as well to highlight the respects in which distinctive features of the vernacular point to the wider spectrum of Caribbean Creoles and their West African elements. Awareness grew of the place of the vernacular in peer group interaciton against the background of Caribbean and African traditions of spoken artistry. Still, research focused mostly on the variety of speech most strikingly different from the public standard, the vernacular of adolescent urban males. Much less analytic attention was given to the speech of Black women, of preachers and ministers, of established upper-class families, or to the Caribbean and African background of elaborated 'talking sweet' and public oratory. And some explanations of what became known were so partial as to be false. Some linguists wished to treat the vernacular as only superficially different and formally derivative from standard English, for reasons having to do in part with convenient simplicity of a grammatical model. Others wished to treat the vernacular as so distinct that it might require its own textbooks. There are indeed places where people want their variety maintained independently in print from a closely related one (in Czechoslovakia Slovaks feel this way about the relation of their variety to Czech). In the United States such a conception fails to take into account the actual attitudes of many Black people who want the variety of English in the classroom, especially the written variety, to be the common standard. Still others drew from this isolated fact the inference that Blacks depreciated the vernacular, even speaking of 'self-hatred'. In point of fact, there is widespread acceptance of the vernacular variety at home and in informal situations generally;[4] it retains a special place even among Black students at a university such as Princeton. Yet sympathetic interpretations of Black speech can be inadequate too. Many come to know Black terms for uses of language, such as 'shucking' and 'jiving', and regard them entirely as an Afro-American ethnic heritage. Yet analogous genres of language use can be found among lower class white youths; and such ways of coping verbally may have their origin in subordinate social status as well as in ethnic tradition.

The relation between varieties and uses of English, on the one hand, and being Black, on the other, is complex and only beginning to be adequately known. The situation is little better with regard to other major groups. We think of Native Americans in terms of the many languages lost, and of efforts to maintain or revive those that remain. The relation of schools to these efforts is of the greatest importance. My own anger and passion about the treatment of language in schools comes largely from experience of local schools and educational research institutions that affect Indian people at Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon. But these situations must not be oversimplified. Indian Americans themselves may differ in their views as to what is best in terms of language. And aspects of language that are crucial to the success of Indian children may not involve the traditional Indian language at all. Where the Indian children are, linguistically, may not be an Indian language, but an

Indian variety of English. There are probably several dozen such Indian varieties of English in the United States. They play a significant social role. Someone who has been away, and who returns to a local community, must take up the local variety of English or be judged snobbish. Features of children's speech that seem individual errors may in fact reflect a community norm. They may reflect a carryover into English of patterns from an Indian language. In the English of Indians at Isleta pueblo, south of Albuquerque, New Mexico, a double negative contrasts with a single negative as a carryover of a contrast between two types of negation in the Isleta language. There are doubtless other such examples, but the fact is that Isleta English is the only form of Indian English carefully studied and reported on in print, and that only in the last few years.[5]

The language situation of an Indian community will be still more complex, in having standard as well as local vernacular English present, and a vernacular, even reduced, variety of an Indian language as well as or even instead of its 'classic' form. In the Southwest Spanish may be a factor as well. Yet we have hardly more than a few sketches of such cases. With Indians as with Blacks; research has not attempted to provide systematic knowledge of the language situation of the communities experienced by children. Research has focused not on social reality, but on the exotic. To say this is not to condemn study of traditional Indian languages. Much of my work continues to be devoted to the study of one group of languages, now nearing extinction. I and a colleague are the last to work intensively with fully fluent speakers, and like others in such a situation, we have obligations both to those who have shared their knowledge with us and to those who later will want access to it. The work has its contribution to make to respect and self-respect for Indian people. The disproportion between what most linguists do and what most needs to be done is not here. There have never been trained scholars enough, and much has been lost unrecorded in consequence. With all its wealth our country has sparsely supported knowledge of the language that first named the continent. The fact is telling. We have barely managed to study languages that fit our image of the noble Redman, let alone begun to notice the actual linguistic makeup of Indian communities.

The knowledge one needs to start where Indian children, any children, are goes beyond varieties of language, of course, to patterns of the use of language—customary community ways of answering questions, calling upon others, taking turns in conversation, speaking or remaining silent, giving instruction by verbal precept or observed example, all the ways in which etiquette of speaking and value of language may take distinctive shape. Many Indian children come to school, speaking only English, yet encounter difficulty, not because of language difference, but because of difference in patterns for the use of language. Children found 'shy' and non-talkative in class may be as talkative as any, if observed in situations where the rights and duties of speaking are those of the community from which they come. In such a case one needs to know not a language, but a community way of speaking.

The issue and language most prominent today are bilingual education and Spanish. I cannot attempt to treat this complex situation here, except to note that the general difficulty is the same. Too little is known as a basis for policy and practice in schools. The widespread resistence to such a thing indeed may cause bilingual education to be attacked as having failed before it will have had a chance to be understood and fairly tried. Efforts to provide equal educational opportunity to Spanish-speaking children must proceed with a minimum of information as to the Spanish the children speak, in relation to the varieties and uses of Spanish in the community from which they come. No simple general answer can be laid down in

advance. There are several national and regional standards, Cuban, Puerto Rican, northern Mexican, Colombian, etc.; in many communities there is a range of varieties from a standard to colloquial vernacular and an argot, as well as a way of mingling Spanish and English in conversation that can count as a special variety among intimates. The attitudes of Spanish-speakers toward the elements of this complex language situation are themselves complex. Clearly it is not enough to advocate "Spanish." It is possible to have Anglo children doing well, Spanish-speaking children doing poorly in a Spanish class in a school. There are problems of the fit or conflict between the Spanish spoken by children and the Spanish taught, between community and teacher attitudes, between the language-linked aspirations of cultural traditionalists and the job linked aspirations of some of the working class; the desire of some speakers to institutionalize Spanish as a language of higher education and professional activity, versus the needs of children for whom Spanish is primarily a vernacular of the home and community; problems of children educated in Puerto Rico coming to the mainland with inadequate English and children educated on the mainland going to Puerto Rico with inadequate Spanish.

There are problems of assessing the language abilities of children both for assignment to classes and for evaluation in programs. Assignment to classes is sometimes being done under mandate of law in a begrudging rough-and-ready fashion, minimizing the number of children to be assigned. Sometimes the availability of monies to a district prompts forced assignment to special classes of bilingual children who have no English problem at all. Valid assessments of language ability require naturalistic observation across a range of settings, but such methods have been little developed in explicit form. Formative evaluation of programs in bilingual situations needs ethnographic knowledge of the community language situation, and summative evaluation needs ethnographic monitoring of the process by which a program comes to have particular meanings and outcomes for participants and community. Such success as bilingual programs have, will be best attested in the debates ahead, not by test scores, but by case-history accounts that show convincingly the benefits to children and communities, and how they were achieved.[6]

Ethnic Heritage and Usages of Language

The situations of Black Americans, Native Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans are salient but not unique. Bilingual education is an issue for communities of Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, and others. Many European languages in addition to Spanish are maintained to a significant extent. Immigration renews some of these communities. All of them participate in a climate of opinion that is world-wide. The general truth would seem to be that about twenty years ago, when those who spoke in the limelight foresaw an end to ideology, and an endless technocratic future whose chief problem would be leisure, many ordinary people around the world were drawing a different lesson from their experience. They had been caught up in such a vision of the post-war future for a while, only to begin to find that their place in it was not worth the giving up of all that they had been. 'Progress' came more and more to seem the 'dirty word' that Kenneth Burke has called it—less an engine carrying them onward and upward, more a juggernaut about to run over them, their place, their customs, their speech.

This general revival of concern with ethnic heritage is not merely a part of the annual tourist laundry ring around the world, each countryside emptying out in summer to take in someone else's carefully staged culture while on vacation. It is a shift in outlook that has to do with what one is for oneself, as a member of a family with a certain name, a certain history, a knowledge of certain places, certain ways

of meeting sorrow and sharing joy. Many of you may know personally the price that can be exacted in acquiring a lingua franca at the cost of a language of the home.

Some repudiate concern of this kind as nostalgia and sentimentality, even as a dangerous refusal to face present realities. I think that something profound is involved. Any one concern may seem particularistic and limiting; when all such concerns are considered together, one sees something general, a deep-running tide. It is a vision limited to a national lingua franca that begins to appear old-fashioned, limited, sectarian.

The deep-running tide seems to me a shift in what is regarded as the dominant obstacle to a way of life in balance with human needs. A century, even a generation ago, it was common to think that the dominant obstacle consisted of traditional ideas and customs. Except when compartmentalized in diminished form, as objects of intermittent piety and curiosity, specific cultural traditions, beliefs, conventions, identities, seemed brakes from the past on progress. The future lay with a science and mode of production that could realize the control of nature, and the plenty, of which mankind was capable. Now we are far less sure. Some critics of contemporary society consider the very idea of incessant technological change to be itself the dominant obstacle to a way of life in balance with human needs. Not that material progress is irrelevant, but that the quality of life is seen more clearly to depend on other things as well. What seemed a policy in the interest of all has come to seem an instrument of profit to some at the expense of others in many cases. Uncontrolled, it threatens community today and even sustenance tomorrow.

There is an essential linguistic dimension to this. It is hard to specify, but necessary to address. Let me try to suggest something of its nature.

The internal structures of language and the structures of use to which languages are shaped alike show two fundamental, complementary general kinds of function, of meaning, at work. They are intertwined in reality, but our way of thinking about language has separated and opposed them.[7] One can be roughly indicated as concerned with naming, reference, sheer statement, the technical, analytic, logical uses of language. Modern linguistics has built its models on this aspect of language. Modern science, technology, and rationalized bureaucracy give its preeminence. For a time the uses of language characteristic of literature, religion, personal expression, were neglected and on the defensive. For a time the pinnacle of knowledge appeared to many to be a single logical language to which all science and legitimate knowledge might be reduced. That ideal has been largely given up and replaced by recognition of a plurality of legitimate uses of language. The seminal figures in philosophy of course were Cassirer and Wittgenstein, and there have been related developments in poetics, anthropology, sociology. Interpersonal, expressive, aesthetic uses of language come more to the fore. In part it is because an ideal of language that seemed the touchstone of progress, of the advance of reason, has been too often traduced. The idioms of objective knowledge, of science, mathematics, logic, experiment, statistics, contracts, regulation and control were once seen as common bases for progress for us all. We have too often seen claims to authority, couched in such idioms, turn out to be rationalizations of special interests, elite excuses, outright deceptions, as with the Vietnamese war. Idioms of moral concern and personal knowledge that had at first no standing came to be seen as more accurate guides than the trappings of elaborate studies and reports. A little later it was general discovery of the personal voice through transcripts of tapes that decided, I think, the public verdict on a president. I could not prove the point, but I think these two experiences have had complementary, decisive effect on our sense of validity in the use of language.

I sense a more general drift as well. Increasingly we are concerned to have a place for things that cannot be said without distortion, or even said at all, in the idioms of elaborated, formal, purportedly rational and referential speech that take pride of place in public science, public government, linguistic and pedagogical grammars. There are things we know and need to be that have no standing there. A sense of this is a reflection of the central problem of the role of language in modern society, the crisis of language, namely, what the balance is to be between modes of use of language. The old dichotomies—correct vs. incorrect, rational vs. emotional, referential vs. expressive, fail to capture the nature and complexity of the problem, for it is not a matter of mutually exclusive opposites, but of the interweaving of mutually indispensable functions.

Education and Linguistic Foundations

I am sorry not to be precise, concrete and clear about this. It would require far more than one lecture to try to explain the ramifications of this point for the study of language, to trace the implications at different levels of the organization of language, to appraise the efforts that are being made now to devise an adequate general model. I can try to say clearly what this complex situation means for the future of language in education. It is this. Linguistics developed out of a situation in which the study of language was loosely distributed across a variety of disciplines. It became the central discipline by development of general methods for the formal study of language structure. The methods and the associated conception of language structure focused on an essential, but partial, aspect of the organization of language. Other aspects remained secondary or eschewed. The focus of attention, having started with phonology, and proceeded through morphology and syntax, has now reached semantics and even 'pragmatics', (that is, the interpretation of meaning in context of use). From every side it begins to be recognized that linguistics as we have known it is inevitably part of a larger field.[8]

At the first, language structure was divorced from language use. Now language use is included along with language structure by most. Eventually it will be generally recognized that it is not use that is a derivative of structure, but structure that is dependent on use. That one can never solve the problems of the organization of language in social life without starting from social life, from the patterns of activity and meaning within which linguistic features are organized into styles and ways of speaking. A linguistics that is truly the science of language, linguistics that is truly a foundation for education, will be a linguistics that is part of the study of communicative interaction. It will understand linguistic competence as part of communicative competence. It will understand the character of competence in relation to the social history and social structure that shape it in a given case.

Such a linguistics, should the day arrive, will have an essential property. Its practice and theory will be adequate to all the means employed in speech and all the meanings that speaking (or another use of language) has. Its theory of English phonology will attend not only to the features that make a consonant /p/ instead of /b/, but also to the aspiration that can make the word angry. Its theory of syntax will attend to isolated grammatical sentences as but a special case among the intelligible, acceptable sequences of discourse. Its theory of meaning will attend not only to words and constructions, but also to the meanings inherent in choice of dialect of variety, of conversational or narrative genre, of occasion to speak or be silent. Its theory of competence will go beyond innate and universal abilities to the kinds of competence valued and permitted in a given society, to opportunities and obstacles of access to kinds of competence. It will recognize that the very role of speaking, of

language and use of language, is not the same in every society; that societies differ in their ideals of language and ability in language, that use of language, like sex and eating, is a universal possibility and necessity of society, but without power to determine its place or meaning. Its relative importance among other modes of communication, its role as resource or danger, art or tool, depends on what is made of it.[9] Two things follow. First, the relation between education and linguistics cannot be a matter simply of joining the two as they are now. We do not yet have the kind of linguistics just described. Second, we are not likely to get it if linguistics is left to itself. The prestige of formal models as against empirical inquiry remains strong. The pull to continue to concentrate on familiar ground will be great. To get the linguistics we need will take pushing by others. Educators ought to be in the forefront. If you should remember just one thing from this occasion, please remember this: Do ask yourself what linguistics can do for you, but even more, demand linguistics that what it can do *be* done. And do not apologize for the demand, or assume that it diverts the study of language from pure science to murky application. The fact is that the study of language does not now have the knowledge on which much of application should be based, and cannot get it without new theoretical, methodological, and empirical work. To demand attention to the needs of education is not just a demand for applied linguistics. It is a demand for change in the foundations of linguistics. The struggle for educational change with regard to language, and the struggle for scientific adequacy in the study of language, are interdependent.

I have used the word 'struggle' advisedly. It would be misleading to suggest that the kind of linguistics we need is an apple almost ripe, ready to drop at a tweak of the stem. There is indeed a diffused slow drift in the right direction, such that work entwined with practical problems has low status, such that the more abstract and remote from practical problems, the higher the status. Some leading linguists, such as William Labov, want to reverse this polarity. Educators can help, and may have some leverage these days when conventional positions for linguists are hard to find. The fact that linguistics itself is evolving in a direction that makes work in educational settings germane is a help, as is the fact, just mentioned, that new theory is part of what is needed. Still, a second great difficulty remains. This is the difficulty of seeing language in education in the context of American society, steadily and whole.

Seeing our Language Situation

The history of attention to language situations within the country points up the difficulty. Black uses of English have been evolving in the United States since before the Revolution, but have begun to be adequately studied only as a consequence of the Civil Rights Movement and the federal attention and funding that responded to it. Spanish has been here for centuries as well, but Spanish bilingualism and language situations have begun to be studied adequately only as a result of the socio-political mobilization of Spanish-speakers. American Indian communities have had multilingual situations and distinctive ways of speaking for generations without much attention. The interest of many Indian people in maintaining and reviving traditional languages fits into the traditional approach to the study of Indian languages, but it has taken the Native American mobilization of recent years to make academic scholars think of the preparation of materials useful in education as something they should do. Indian English and ways of speaking still remain relatively little studied.

In general, educationally significant aspects of a language situation have come into focus only after the community in question has been defined as a social problem, and more especially, as a social force. Previous attention to the languages involved focused upon what seemed most exotic and remote. Immigrant and Indian languages alike have been viewed mostly as something lingering from the past.

We need to begin to think of the linguistic heterogeneity of our country as continuously present. The United States *is* a multilingual country, with great numbers of users of many languages. American multilingualism is not an aberration or a residue. If anything, it has increased in recent years, especially with regard to Spanish, Vietnamese and perhaps a few other languages. We need to address the linguistic heterogeneity of our country as a permanent feature of it, discuss what shape it will and should have, anticipate the future. To do so, we have to address the linguistic ethnography of the United States as sustained, central scientific task. Ad hoc responses after the fact of social mobilization connected with language come too late and provide too little help. And ad hoc responses are too easily distorted by the immediate terms of social and political issues. Members of language communities themselves may have a partial view. We need sustained work that provides both knowledge of language situations and an independent, critical assessment of language problems.

Educators have a stake in the mounting of such a program of study, since mobilization around issues of language so commonly turns attention to schools. Educators have a special stake in making sure that a sustained program of study includes independent, critical attention to the nature of language problems. That attention should include study of the process by which something having to do with language does (or does not) become defined as a problem in our country in the first place. It is not to be assumed that there is a fit between public recognition of problems and actual language situation. (To repeat, teacher failure to recognize the structure and role of Black English Vernacular still handicaps many Black children, and did even more before it became recognized as a 'problem' in the 1960's. Some of those who resist such recognition continue to be Black.)

I suspect there are four kinds of case. That is, there are indeed situations recognized as problems that are genuinely problems (bilingual education, for example); there may well be situations not defined as problems that can be left alone. But I suspect that there are also situations not now defined as problems that ought to be so defined—situations taken for granted but at possible cost. For example, very little has been done to study communication in medical settings, especially between professional personnel and patients.[10] What are the effects of difference in idiom, terminology, semantic system? or even of difference in native language, there being so many medical personnel of foreign origin? and in some regions so many patients with little command of English? Perhaps there is no recognized problem because those affected have little visibility or consciousness of common concern. Yet a series of articles in the New York Times might make this situation, itself unchanged, suddenly a 'problem'. Finally, there may be situations defined as problems that ought not to be, the issue being falsely or superficially posed—e.g., the supposed problem of children with practically 'no language'. Any of us may be subject to cultural blinders and public fashions. We need comparative, critical, historical perspective to transcend them.

We need, in short, to be able to see our country in terms of language, steadily and whole. To do so is to go beyond questions of diversity of languages and language-varieties. Black-English, Navajo, Hopi, Zuni, Spanish, Italian, German, Slovenian, the many, many languages of this country are salient and important. The

diversity they comprise is so great, so neglected, as to be almost overwhelming by itself. Yet there is something further. There is a unity that has also escaped us. I do not mean political and social unity. That is not in question. To be sure, the drive for homogeneity has been so great that even today the thought of diversity being accepted can frighten some. Street signs in Spanish, even in a Spanish-speaking neighborhood, can attract ire. A telephone company may refuse to hire a Spanish-speaking operator, to answer emergency calls, in an area with many Spanish dominant speakers. To argue for recognition of ethnolinguistic diversity seems troubling to many, as if the ties between us were so fragile as to break beneath a crumb of difference. But the forces making for integration, the economic and communicative ties of the country, are irreversibly dominant. To argue the right to diversity is to argue only for breathing space within the hive.

The unity in terms of which we need to see our country is the unity in its dominant groups and institutions that gives it a certain cut and pattern, regarding language, regarding the value on language, the way in which language enters into life. We need to be able to imagine the United States sociologically as if it were a small country, a Belgium or Switzerland, a single entity of which one could ask, as one can ask of any society: what are the basic patterns of the use of language? what are the values, rights, responsibilities, associated with language? what is the outlook of the culture with regard to language? how did it come to be that way? how does it seem likely to change?

We are able to think of the Navajo or the French in this way. We need to be able to imagine ourselves in this way as well, to find, through comparative, historical and descriptive study, a mirror in which to see the United States as possessed throughout its history of language policies, of predominant attitudes towards language and its role, that give it one place among many possible places in the roster of the world's cultures.

Even if there were only English the unity to be seen is not simple. Imagine that the only language in the country was English, even standard English. Situations, roles, activities, personal characteristics such as age and sex would still affect and shape ways of using language. The occupational and class structure of the society would still be there as a source of heterogeneity, on the one hand, and hegemony, on the other. Let us consider heterogeneity first.

Inherent heterogeneity. Even if everyone used some form of standard English, all the manifold ways of talking as a person of a certain kind, of using language to do a certain kind of thing, would be present, needing to be discerned and described and their consequences considered. Many of the judgments made of persons in everyday life, many of the opportunities one has or does not have, involve command or lack of command of these styles and genres, of being able to talk like an X, or being able to use language to do Y. Such diversity is inherent in social life. Research has barely begun to address it adequately, relating linguistic devices and patterns to social meanings and roles. It is the same here as with differences of whole language or language-variety. Research mostly follows the flag of social mobilization. Sex-related differences in language hardly appeared for the first time a few years ago. Yet until recently one would have had to conclude that men and women talked alike in every society except for a few American Indian tribes, the Chukchee of Siberia, and some scattered others, so far as the published literature could show. Again, status-related differences in language are hardly the monopoly of the Japanese, Koreans and Javanese, yet until recently linguistic theory treated them as facinatingly special.

There is a general lesson to be drawn. A linguistics that starts from grammar can see socially relevant features only when they intrude within the grammar. If the

very units of phonology or morphology cannot be stated without reference to the sex or status of a participant in speech, then the social fact is taken into account; indeed, the case may become celebrated as an instance of "men's and women's speech" or special concern with the expression of status. Yet sexual roles and status differences are universal in society, and assuredly come into play when people speak to each other. Starting from grammar, one does not see how they come into play; one has to start from the social feature itself, and look at the use of language from its vantage point. Then the features of language that are selected and grouped together as characteristics of speaking like a woman, speaking like an elder, and the like, can be seen.

A final example: many are aware of the interesting ways in which choice of second person pronoun in French (tu: vous), German (Du: Sie), Russian (ty: vy), etc., can signal lesser or greater social distance. Many is the paper written on such pronouns and related forms of salutation and greeting. Yet it is a safe assumption that variation in social distance is universal, and universally expressed in one or another way in use of language. Management of social distance may well be one of the most pervasive dimensions of language use. One has to start from recognition of social distance to begin to see thoroughly and accurately how it is accomplished as a function of language.

Even if only standard English were found in the United States, then, there would be many socially shaped patterns of language use to discover and consider. Still, the diversity would have a certain unity. Not "English", but the history, values, and social structure of the United States would give a characteristic configuration to them.

Hidden Hegemony. Schools would not find their problems of language resolved in the situations we are imagining now. Concern to develop the full potential of each child would lead to recognition of language as involving more than command of a standard. For example, I suspect that there is a pervasive dominant attitude that discourages verbal fluency and expressiveness in white males. It ought to be food for thought that in most known societies it is men who are considered the masters of verbal style, and indeed often trained in its ways, whereas women are subordinated and even disparaged. In our own country, as we know, it is commonly girls who show most verbal ability, who learn to retain foreign languages, etc. Men in public life whose work depends on use of language may be heard to disclaim any special knowledge or command of it. The hint of homosexuality seems not to be far from aesthetic mastery of language in a man. Again, I suspect that many persons spend much of their lives in what might be called 'verbal passing', the maintenance of the public verbal face that is not chosen, but imposed. And that is the fate of narrative skill in our society? There seems some reason to think that the expressivity of traditional narrative styles has often been disapproved by the upwardly mobile and middle class. One sees a loss between generations of a vital narrative style in some people of Indian communities. People continue to relate accounts and narratives, of course, we are storying more and enjoying it less?

Most serious of all, and most difficult for schools perhaps to accept: I suspect that our culture is so oriented toward discrimination among persons on the basis of language that even a society of 200 million speakers of standard English would show a class and occupational structure much like the present one, matched by a hierarchy of fine verbal discriminations. In other words, we must consider the possibility that schools, along with other institutions, have as a latent function the reproduction of the present social order on the apparently impartial ground of language. Given the inherent variability in language and language use, even a society of standard English speakers would show detectible differences in pronunciation,

diction, preferred constructions, and the like. Are we so convinced that language change is language decline (as many of our educated elite appear to be), so predisposed to correctness and correction, that most of that society of standard English speakers would still leave school with a feeling of linguistic insecurity and inferiority?

Perhaps not, but in order to see our society, and the place of language in it, especially the place of language in education in it, we have to ask such questions. To what extent are the inadequacies and senses of inadequacy about language in the society to be explained by the backgrounds and characteristics of those who pass through schools? To what extent are they unwittingly produced by schools themselves?

Equality-Implementation

Perhaps our society can never come closer to equality of opportunity, to a treatment of language in schooling that starts where the child is, that develops the fullest linguistic potential of the child. Still, those are the goals in terms of which one often speaks. It is only that the change required to come closer to them is so pervasive—change in knowledge, change in attitude, ultimately change in social structure itself. Change in what we know can never be enough, yet without it the other changes are impossible. One sees some change in the treatment of Black English Vernacular that would not have come about without the research of the past decade or so. Knowledge of other situations can have effect too, especially in the context of a view of the history and direction of the role of language in the society as a whole.

My call for such knowledge in relation to schools amounts to a call for an educational linguistics, as a major thrust of schools of education, departments of linguistics, and all concerned with language and with education. Let me add that it should be shaped not only by educators and linguistics, but also by members of the communities concerned, teachers and parents both. It is inherent in adequate study of language that one must draw on the knowledge that members of a community already tacitly have, and the same is true for ethnography, for knowledge of ways of speaking in relation to cultural contexts. And insofar as the work to be done involves policies and goals, members of the communities affected must necessarily play a part. The educational linguistics envisioned here is in part a community science.

Such an educational linguistics entails change in both linguistics and education. In a sense, its goal must be to fill what might be called a 'competency' gap. There is a gap in the sense of a lack of persons able to do the kind of research that is needed. The gap exists because the need to fill it has not been recognized, and recognition of the need depends on overcoming a 'competency' gap in another, theoretical sense. Both linguists and educators may use the term 'competence'; the gap between their uses is at the heart of what needs to be changed.

In linguistics the term 'competency' was introduced by Chomsky a decade or so ago. Its ordinary meaning suggested a linguistics that would go beyond language structure to the linguistic abilities of people. The promise proved a bit of hyperbole. The term was used in a reduced sense as equivalent to just what portion of competence involving knowledge of a grammar, and grammar itself was defined in terms of an ideal potentiality, cut off from any actual ability or person. Grammar was to explain the potential knowledge of an amalgamated everyone in general, and of no one in particular. Social considerations were wholly absent from such a 'competency'. The result has been conceptual confusion that has led some to aban-

don the term altogether; others to tinker with it; still others to denounce its use as partisan apologetics ('that's not 'competence' was used to mean 'what you are interested in is not linguistics'). In Chomskyan linguistics, in short, 'competence' has meant an abstract grammatical potential, whose true character and whose relation to realized alike remain quite uncertain. The image of the language-acquiring child has been one of an immaculate innate schemata, capable of generating any thing, unconstrained and unshaped by social life.

In education the terms 'competence' and 'competency-based' have become associated with a quite different conception. The emphasis is upon specific, demonstrable, socially relevant skills. No one can be against demonstrable skills, but there is fear that the notion reduces education to a very limited conception of ability and potential. It suggests an image of an externally shaped repertoire of traits that does not allow for going beyond what is already given. It suggests that success in transmitting basic skills is something that was once in hand, lost, and now to be gone back to.

Each polar notion of 'competence' treats as basic something that is derivative. The simple linguistic notion treats formal grammar as basic, and use of language as unconnected, or dependent, whereas in fact the opposite is the case. What we conceive as grammar is a precipitate of a normative selection from among the ways of speaking, the true verbal repertoire, the full organization of means of speech. Grammar began that way in the service of Hellenistic cultural hegomony and continues that way in the service of a certain conception of science. A valid notion of verbal competence reaches out to include the full organization of means and meaning of speech, and becomes part of a notion of communicative competence.

The notion of 'competence' that has gained currency in education treats distinguishable skills as elementary, underived, whereas any prescribed set of skills is a precipitate of a complex of assumptions and understandings as to the nature of society, its present and future opportunities, and the probable or prescribed relation of a group of students to it. There is a tendency to focus on instrumental, vocational ingredients of verbal skill, perhaps at the expense of the full range of verbal abilities valued and possible.

In both cases the limited notion of competence is bound up, I think, with a limited ability to see the nature of the language situations in the United States. That limitation is academic. I want to suggest that the problem of language in education is not to go back to basics, whether in the grammar of the linguist or the grammar of the schoolbook, but to go forward to fundamentals. How does language come organized for use in the communities from which children come to schools? What are the meaning and values associated with use of language in the many different sectors and strata of the society? What are the actual verbal abilities of children and others across the range of settings they naturally engage? What is the fit, what is the frustration, between abilities and settings—where is an ability frustrated for lack of a setting, a setting unentered for lack of an ability, in what ways are patterns of personal verbal ability shaped by restrictions of access to settings, on the one hand, culturally supported aspirations, on the other?

When we consider where a child is, what its potential is, we are considering abilities for which 'competence' is an excellent word, if we can understand it aright, in something close to its ordinary sense, as mastery of the use of language. To use the notion in education, we need to know the shapes in which mastery comes in the many communities of speaking that make up the country, and we need to be able to relate those shapes to the larger historical and social factors that constrain them. Ethnolinguistic description can at least enable us to see where we truly stand with regard to linguistic competence in the United States. The knowledge it provides is indispensable for those who wish to change where we stand.

To see the need for knowledge of the language situations of our country; to support training and research to obtain such knowledge; to change the relations between linguistics and education, so as to bring into being an educational linguistics that can foster all this—these are the imperatives for change, the fundamentals to which we must move forward.

The key to implementing such changes, I think, is in the hands of Schools of Education. There is little chance of success, little change of results relevant to schools, if educators do not play a principal role in shaping the growing concern of students of language with the social aspects of language. At the University of Pennsylvania we are expanding a Reading and Language Arts program into a general program of Language in Education, and including in it a specialization in Educational Linguistics as a foundational field. The purpose is both to train researchers and to influence the training and outlook of those in other parts of the School. The new program is possible partly because of the cooperation and support of some linguists outside the School. Each School of Education may find its own particular pattern, but a successful pattern ought to have these three ingredients mentioned: training of research specialists, influence on the training and outlook of others, cooperation between educators and linguists.

The greatest challenge to research, the research of greatest benefit to schools now, will be to domesticate and direct the skills of ethnography and descriptive linguistics, of sociolinguistics or ethnolinguistics in broad senses of those terms. We need programs of research that can function within a limited frame of time, say a year, and provide through linguistics ethnography a usable sketch of the ways of speaking of a community or district served by a school. For the most part linguistic ethnography has flourished abroad with studies of cultural uses of language in Mexico, Africa, Panama, the Philippines. We need to bring it home to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. The support of Schools of Education will be essential for this. The models of research that are needed are not wholly ready to hand: practical relevance and research development must grow together, in the sort of environment that a School of Education can provide.

It is not too much to imagine, indeed, that language in education can be an integrating focus for many aspects of a School. The ties with Reading and Language Arts, with developmental psychology, with English Studies, are obvious. When one considers the way in which problems of language are shaped by cultural assumptions and attitudes, it becomes apparent that there are ties with the historical, sociological and anthropological foundations of education. There is a complex of spurious and genuine problems of language diversity in relation to special education and school counselling. Issues of curriculum and instruction arise as well. With a bit of luck and a lot of initiative, education might find itself a major force in shaping the study of language in the United States.

NOTES

1. The contribution of each of these men, and something of my debt to them, is indicated in Hymes 1970, 1974, ch. 8, for Sapir; Hymes 1974: 85-86, 121-122, 204, for Marx; 1975, for Jakobson; 1974, ch. 7, for Burke.

3. This point is developed more fully in my Introduction to Cazden et al. (1972). In introducing my lecture, Donald Henderson quoted a very apt passage from that essay, framing what I had to say perfectly, and I am grateful to him for it.

4. See Hoover (1975).

5. The pioneer in this work is William Leap. See his article (1974); a book-length collection of studies of Indian English is now being edited by Leap.

6. I try to address these issues in some detail in a paper called 'Ethnographic Monitoring', written for a symposium on 'Language Development in a Bilingual Setting', March 19-21,

1976, organized by Eugene Briere for the Multilingual/Multicultural Materials Development Center of California State Polytechnic University. Plans for publication are not yet definite.

7. Let me stress that I do not suggest that every aspect of language structure and use can simply be assigned to one or the other of the two generalized types of function. They are not either-or catch-alls. They are interdependent; their nature is not quite the same at one level of language as at another; their manifestations enter into a variety of relationships as between levels of language. The essential point is that an adequate study of language cannot be built on attention to just one of them. I speak of generalized *types* of function because there is no agreement on the specific set required in a model of language structure, and a good many specific functions may need to be recognized, some universal, some local. I do think that at any one level there are fundamentally just two kinds of means, and organization of means, roughly a 'what' and a 'how'. The principle of contrastive relevance within a frame that is basic to linguistics applies to both: the 'same thing' can be said in a set of contrasting ways, and the 'same way' can be used for a set of contrasting 'things'. A key to the organization of language in a particular culture or period is restriction on free combination of 'what's' and 'hows' " the things that must be said in certain ways, the ways that can be used only for certain things. The admissible relations comprise the admissible styles. In effect, the study of language is fundamentally a study of styles. There is further discussion in my Introduction to Cazden et al. (1972) and my essay, "Ways of Speaking", in Bauman and Sherzer (1974).

8. See Hymes 1968.

9. This point should be obvious, yet seems hard to grasp, so deeply ingrained is a contrary assumption. I have been trying to make the point for almost twenty years. See Hymes 1961a, 1961b, 1964a, 1964b, 1974, ch. 6.

10. Roger Shuy has pioneered in this regard. For discussion of the general issue of language problem. I am indebted to members of the Committee on Sociolinguistics of the Social Science Research Council, especially Rolf Kjolseth.

REFERENCES

Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer (eds.). New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Cazden, Courtney; Vera John-Steiner; Dell Hymes (eds.). *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Hoover, Mary E. R., "Appropriate uses of Black English as rated by Parents." Stanford University, School of Education, *Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. Technical Report No. 46*. 1975.

Hymes, Dell. "Functions of Speech: An Evolutionary Approach." In Fred C. Gruber (ed.), Anthropology and Education, pp. 55-83. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. Reprinted in Yehudi A. Cohen (ed.), Man in Adaptation, (1961). Chicago: Aldine, pp. 247-259.

Hymes, Dell. "Linguistic Aspects of Cross-Cultural Personality Study." In B. Kaplan (ed.), *Studying Personality Cross-Culturally*. (1961). Evanston: Row, Peterson (later: New York: Harper and Row), pp. 313-359.

Hymes, Dell. "The Ethnography of Speaking." In T. Gladwin and W. Sturtevant (eds.) *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. (1962). Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, pp. 15-53.

Hymes, Dell. Directions in (ethno-) Linguistic Theory." In A. K. Romney and R. G. D'Andrade (eds.), *Transcultural Studies of Cognition*. (1964) Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, pp. 6-56.

Hymes, Dell. "Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication." In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), The Ethnography of Communication, (1964). Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, pp. 1-34.

Hymes, Dell. "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity." In W. Bright (ed.), *Sociolinguistics*. (1966). The Hague: Mouton, pp. 114-158.

Hymes, Dell. Linguistics—The Field. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. (1968). New York: Macmillan, 9: 351-371.

Hymes, Dell. "Linguistic Method of Ethnography." In Paul Garvin (ed.) *Method and Theory in Linguistics*. (1970). The Hague: Mouton, pp. 249-325.

Hymes, Dell. Foundations in Sociolinguistics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, (1974).

Hymes, Dell. "Pre-War Prague School and Post-War American Anthropological Linguistics." E.F.K. Koerner (ed.). *The Transformational Generative Paradigm and Modern Linguistic Theory*. (1975). (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, I). Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V., (1975).

WILLIAM H.E. JOHNSON
University of Pittsburgh

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIETY: PERSPECTIVES FROM EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

JUNE 2, 1976

The Historical Perspective

During a period of nearly one thousand years of history, the Russians developed a trilogy of concepts known as ORTHODOXY (one church), AUTOCRACY (one ruler), and NATIONALISM (one people). It is my belief that these same concepts continued to dominate Soviet thought and action even today. The 1917 Revolution, it is true, produced a new religion (Marxism), a new sovereign (whoever heads the Communist Party) and a new patriotism. Yet the demands of these institutions upon the ordinary Soviet citizen bear an astonishing resemblance to those long imposed by Altar, Throne, and Fatherland.[1] A brief comparison of developments in the two spheres of Europe during the past few centuries may help to explain this phenomenon.

Orthodoxy. At about the same time that heresy and heterodoxy were growing within the Roman Catholic Church of Western Europe (the period 1400-1700), a stringent and rigorous orthodoxy was being clamped on the Russian Empire. While other denominations such as Moslems and Roman Catholics were permitted to hold services, only members of the Russian Orthodox Church were deemed eligible for high political office or, indeed, even for salvation! No dissent from religious doctrines was permitted members of the church, and prominent citizens were frequently accused of laxity in this matter.[2]

As the Russian Empire extended eastward and southward, still other religious sects (Buddhists, Taoists, Confucianists) fell under its sway, and all were required to conform, at least outwardly, to the dicta of Russian Orthodoxy. In the case of the numerous Jews in Russia, the history of pogroms and restrictive pales is too well known to need repeating here.[3]

Autocracy. Thus, by 1917, the Russian Empire was effectively dominated by one Church in much the same way as it was dominated by one central government in Petrograd. And here we come to another contrast between East and West. Throughout the sixteenth century, while England enjoyed the enlightened rule of Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth, Russia was in the grip of Ivan the Terrible. The seventeenth century—noted in the West for such figures as Shakespeare, Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Descartes, and Locke—was marked in Russia chiefly by the enthronement of the Romanov dynasty which was to rule to the end of Tsardom.[4]

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when in Western Europe and America revolts against tyranny were becoming widespread and even fashionable (and, in a few cases, successful), the iron heel of Autocracy was being held upon the peoples of Russia by Peter, Catherine, two Nicholases, and all three Alexanders. For example, when Tsar Peter I set up his Naval Academy in the new St. Petersburg in 1715, he not only chose the site and designed the building, but he also established the curriculum and wrote the qualifications for all nine of the original professorships.[5] (It is true that our own Thomas Jefferson did much the same thing at Charlottesville, Virginia, a century later, but many institutions of higher learning already existed in the USA, while the Naval Academy was the only such establishment in Russia.)

The Empress Catherine II also had a large measure of confidence in her own ideas and power. Even though she had invited the great French Encyclopedist, Denis Diderot, to her court to be her "adviser on education," she sent him home in 1775 for daring to suggest that Russian girls should study anatomy! But no one can deny Catherine's interest in learning: in the course of her 35-year reign she spent 30 million rubles on schools, and only 25 million rubles on her various lovers.[6]

Her attention to the emergence of new nations, however, was not as evident. In December 1780 the new U.S. Congress sent Francis Dana to St. Petersburg to seek recognition of the USA. Dana waited in the anterooms of the Imperial Palace for nearly two years, and never even saw Catherine! He once offered to see her at night if she were too busy during the day, but was told that would be impossible because the Empress was even busier at night! When the great lady did finally get around to discussing the new nation with her foreign minister, Potemkin, she explained that she could never recognize a government which was atheistic (because it denied the divine right of kings), was made up of "the common rabble" (meaning the bourgeoisie), and which wouldn't survive anyway because it was contrary to human nature. It is an interesting irony of history that these were almost exactly the same reasons Woodrow Wilson gave for refusing to recognize the Soviet government in 1918.[7]

Nationalism. We now come to the final watchword of the trilogy: Nationalism—one people. Despite the fact that the territories of the Russian Empire which bordered Germany and Austria-Hungary were inhabited by millions of non-Russians such as Ukrainians, Poles, Latvians, Estonians, Jews, and Lithuanians, all of these peoples were forced to study the Russian language. Russian was the language of instruction in all state schools, and in all courts of law. The many national minorities of the Caucasus, Central Asia, Siberia, and the East were much more difficult to "Russify," but even there all power was held by Russian governors and officials sent out by the Tsar and his ministers. Every effort was made to stamp out the inherent sense of *their own* nationalism in these peoples, and to substitute adherence to the codes of the Russians. It is no wonder that the Russian Empire in 1917, with its perhaps 150 ethnic groups, was called a "prison of nations."[8]

How has this trilogy of concepts fared under the Soviet regime? Undoubtedly, the content and meaning of all three terms has undergone considerable change during the past sixty years. Orthodoxy is no longer a religious matter, but political. The Holy Scriptures have been replaced by a carefully edited series of selected works by Marx, Engels, and Lenin—bolstered from time to time by ephemeral writings of current Communist Party leaders. There have been, for example, at least four "official" histories of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and upon the appearance of each, the preceding version has been banned. As a leading observer has said: In the Soviet Union, the present and the future are secure; it is the past that keeps changing. "Truth" is what we read in *today's*, not yesterday's.

PRAVDA. Actually, this political orthodoxy is much more rigidly enforced than ever was the doctrine of the Russian Church, and the penalties for heresy more violent and more frequent. One need only recall the famous "treason trials" of 1935-39, when thousands of Soviet citizens were executed and literally millions sent to prison camps, to realize how seriously the Gospel must be taken in the Soviet Union today.[9] The cases described in the works of Alexander Solzhenitsin are real, not fantasies, and they continue to the present day.

If Orthodoxy is stronger under the Soviets than under the Tsars, what then of Autocracy? What has happened to the power to *enforce* Orthodoxy throughout the realm? Alas, that too has become much stronger and even more ruthless. Thousands of dissenters in Tsarist Russia found it easy to evade the nets of the policy by fleeing abroad, as did Lenin himself. Or to escape from inprisonment, as did Stalin. Or, if incarcerated for long periods, it was possible for rebels to write political tracts of even a scholarly nature, since books and materials were permitted. The death sentence for political heresy was seldom imposed even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Catherine II defended her resolve to execute Alexander Radischev by declaring him to be "more dangerous even than Benjamin Franklin," but she relented and sent him to Siberia.[10] And Fedor Dostoyevsky was reprieved from a firing squad at the last moment when the captain of the guard discovered that he really was a famous novelist.

Thus enforcement of doctrine has been strengthened enormously by combining the Tsarist techniques of secret police, personal passports, and Siberian camps with modern techniques such as drug usage, mechanical surveillance, widespread informers, and the deeply rooted Soviet suspicion that everyone is a possible traitor. As a result, more people in the Soviet Union have endured political persecution during the past half-century than in all previous history since the Edict of Constantine forbade religious persecution in the Roman Empire.

Has Nationalism fared any better in the new regime, or has it too become more violent and coercive? Here we can see at least a partial change for the better. Even though the Russians now constitute a very slight majority of the total population (53% in the 1970 Census), their power over the other nationalities is enormous. Despite the democratic appearance of the Supreme Soviet, where all large minorities except Jews are represented, the real power in all matters resides in the Central Committee of the Communist Party and especially in its twenty-man Politburo, almost all of whom are Russian. Although textbooks for the elementary and secondary schools are printed in forty different languages, all but a few of them are written originally in Russian, by Russians, and then translated. Native language is the medium of instruction in all elementary schools in the non-Russian republics, but Russian must be studied every year from the third grade onward, and parents can choose for their children either Russian or native language schools at the secondary and higher levels of education. In the Russian republic (RSFSR), comprising 76% of the area and 53% of the population of the entire nation, all schools at all levels (except for the autonomous sections already mentioned) offer all instruction only in the Russian language. Moreover, the RSFSR possesses 28 out of the total 51 universities and more than half of all other higher educational establishments. Therefore, if a student wishes to increase his or her chance of admission to higher education, that student had better learn the Russian language very well. Add to these facts the axiom that Russians determine the *content* of all education in all the schools, and we see that, again, old Russian nationalism prevails in a greatly expanded form.

But it is in this great expansion that the Soviet regime can lay claim to one of its greatest accomplishments: the dissemination of education to all its peoples. Left

with a population in the European part of Russia only 60% literate in 1917, and only 5% literate in Central Asia, the Soviet government has lifted the median educational level above eight grades throughout the nation, and hopes soon to provide at least 90% of its young people with a complete ten-year formal education (equivalent in class hours to our twelve-year school). The real force of the Soviet educational effort can best be seen in Central Asia, where total literacy and a *minimum* of four years of schooling have been provided about thirty million people who, if left to the normal efforts of the Tsars, would have reached this stage only in the year 4000![11]

The Philosophical Perspective

The basic doctrines of the Soviet Union are known as Marxism-Leninism, and these doctrines usually act as guides to all major Soviet policy. Taken altogether, the doctrines constitute the Communist philosophy or, as the Russians call it, the "Communist World-View." It is in strict accordance with these principles that the Soviet government, beginning in November 1917, inaugurated a series of programs toward the establishment of Socialism in that country and ultimately Communism all over the world. Among the most important of these programs in accordance with Marxism-Leninism are:[12]

Complete abolition of private property in the means of production. Nothing that produces wealth can be in private hands, but individuals *can* own any articles of consumption. Thus one can own one's house or apartment, provided he does not rent out any part of it or use it in any sort of manufacture, but he cannot own any land whatever. This proscription also applies to media of exchange such as stores and banks, and to means of distribution (railroads, bus lines, etc.), as well as to all communications systems.

Establishment of a dictatorship in the name of the proletariat but actually controlled by the upper echelons of the Communist Party, which Marx called "the vanguard of the proletariat." There is considerable evidence that Marx, as well as Lenin and Khrushchev, saw this "vanguard" as the 200-member Central Committee of the Party rather than the small Politburo, but the latter emerged as omnipotent under Stalin and remains so at present.

Creation of a highly industrialized nation with a huge working class all employed by some state or collective agency. In two generations, the Soviet Union has passed from 65% rural to 65% urban which, for a population of 160 million (in 1917) and a present 250 million is a tremendous achievement in social mobility.

Establishment of a wage system based on Marx's own dictum: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." The initiation of the "piece-work" system in Soviet economy during the First Five-Year Plan (1928-32) offended many classical Marxists who misunderstood the difference between the socialist and communist "stages" of economy, but it was completely in accord with the slogan quoted above. Marx also allowed for quality of work as well as quantity, which is why teachers and doctors receive more pay per hour in the Soviet Union than do street-sweepers and other unskilled laborers. Marx also said that "he who does not work, neither shall he eat," and it is hard for an able-bodied person to find a place to live or get enough to eat unless he *does* work for the state.

The Soviet Constitution defines two forms of public property: state and collective. The first includes most factories, stores, railroads, etc. and a great many large farms. There is no doubt that this is just as Marx wanted, but the "collective" type seems to have been developed by Lenin and Stalin as a transitional stage, particularly in the area of agriculture. Here wages are calculated on the basis of the number of days worked by each family unit, rather than on individual production.

The collective farm system has been tried out by everyone of the East European nations which has fallen under Soviet influence, and all have given it up (as in Poland and Yugoslavia) or modified it considerably. Even in the Soviet Union it has proven to be the least efficient of all types of production, yet the Russian leaders persist in retaining it in much the same way as American leaders continually encourage and promote aspects of private ownership which have long since passed into obsolescence.

The use of Machiavellian tactics and "power politics" in international relations. Both Marx and Lenin held the view that "whatever serves the cause of Communism is good," and therefore all bourgeois moral and ethical precepts were to be ignored unless they conformed to this rule. Even the notorious Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939, which permitted Hitler to begin his war against France and England with his eastern border secure, had to be extolled by all Communists throughout the world as a boon to mankind because it diverted the Germans from attacking the Soviet Union.

The institution of large-scale reforms such as the improvement of working conditions for the laboring class, social insurance, health care, sex equality, and education—all of these would be applauded by Marx. However, as we shall see later, Marx might have thought some of these reforms have failed to go far enough.

Utilization of the selective system in education, based on abilities in specific areas rather than a broad, general and liberal program of studies. In many of his works, Marx spoke of the waste of educating persons for jobs which suited neither them nor the society. He would greatly admire the Soviet system where all education above the uniform and compulsory eighth grade is specialized in one way or another. Even the last two years of the ten-year school, where the curriculum tends to be a continuation of the eight years of general education, actually lead to a rather narrow professional education in the universities. The universities themselves number only 51 with a present enrollment of only 510,000, while the 750 specialized "institutes" are training four million students in more than fifty specific fields. Mention was just made of the non-general nature even of secondary education: at present there are more than 4000 specialized secondary schools enrolling 4.5 million students in 3-4-5 or 6 year courses of study in the same fields as the institutes.[13] In Soviet education as in Soviet life as a whole, Marx's slogan of "from each according to his ability" holds true: one's whole education must be geared to the needs of the state, not the wishes of the individual. The leaders believe that to educate a person *beyond* his ability to serve society is just as wasteful as failing to educate him at all. Naturally, the Soviet leaders view *our* educational system as having no plan, no tangible direction, no uniformity of purpose, and no intelligent process of selection.

In delineating the Soviet practices which do NOT conform to Marxist theory, a large degree of subjective interpretation is unavoidably present. Marxist scholars themselves often disagree on major aspects of the theory, and certainly we must permit the Soviet leadership as much leeway in their interpretations as is accorded Tito and Mao. However, a careful analysis of certain major areas of Soviet policy indicates that Russian tradition and contemporary social pressures have forced or persuaded the Politburo to depart from the guidelines of classical Marxism in several instances:

Long-time retention of severe restraints on civil liberties, which Marx thought would be employed only during the early stages of the "proletarian dictatorship." As a matter of fact, Marx and Engels wrote that, in time after the new regime was established, "the state will wither away, and the government of men will be replaced by the administration of things." Yet, after sixty years, the government of men is as strong now as it ever was in Russia.

Reduction of trade-union authority. This would particularly have disturbed Karl Marx, but it cannot be denied that Lenin himself began the process when he defined the role of trade unions *after* the revolution as mere "schools of communism." Stalin finished the job by divesting the unions of all bargaining power, and turning them into simple "transmission belts" for the imposition of Party policy.

Creation of elite castes in government, management, diplomacy, the military, and even the arts. The "in-groups" in these and other areas of activity enjoy many special privileges denied (and even unknown to) the great mass of working people. Among these benefits are the personal use of chauffer-driven automobiles, the right to buy at special stores whose entrances are disguised from the public, prompt fulfillment of requests for tickets to cultural performances, admission to special restaurants and clubs, and—perhaps most important of all—the ability to travel abroad. What makes the situation even more disgusting to "true believers" in socialism, is that these privileges are usually passed on to the children of the elite, who often become the playboy (or playgirl) parasitic type which Marx said must not be permitted to exist.[14]

Failure to make a higher standard of living a "real" goal in any of the several Five-Year Plans so far adopted in the Soviet Union. Marx was sure that two generations of socialism, by converting all profits into social services and wages, would put a nation into the top rank of consumer goods. Actually, the main argument for Marxian socialism has long been that it will raise the standard of living of all the people. While there is no doubt that the people of the Soviet Union are better off today than they were under the Tsars, and that there are few unemployed and no starvation, nevertheless, the Soviet leaders cannot claim that their country is a model of the good life.

Increased contradiction between mental and manual labor, and between urban and rural life. At one time or another Lenin called both these phenomena "the most hateful aspect of capitalism," and Khrushchev echoed the condemnation. Yet the groups who are now in real control of all aspects of Soviet life never do—and most never have—done any form of manual labor and also strive to see that their children never do. Highly skilled manual laborers draw high wages in the Soviet Union, but they do not make the important decisions or enjoy the privileges accorded the elite who live by their wits. Also, even though the nation has been urbanized to a large degree, there are still aeons of difference between the collective-farm peasant and the industrial or office worker, and the system of selection in education is widening rather than narrowing these differences.

Dissolution of the Communist International and the failure to preserve a united front of the socialist nations. Even though Western peoples welcomed the break-up of what appeared to be the Communist monolith, in Eastern Europe and Asia, Marx would regard the event as a tragedy of the first magnitude. He actually believed that, after the Revolution in one country, the workers of other nations must immediately come to its aid in overthrowing their own governments. In the period 1917-1926, Lenin constantly preached his own doctrine that "socialism in one country" *could* survive, even though he was opposed by nearly all the other "true Marxists" of the world. And Stalin repeatedly stated that, without kindred socialist nations to support it, the Soviet Union was totally exposed to attack by surrounding capitalist states. When Hitler proved him right, Stalin determined that his borders in the post-war period would be protected at least against another invasion from the West. But the termination of friendly relations with Communist China would be regarded by Marx as a most severe blow to the cause of "workers of the world, unite!"

Toleration of religious practices and the restoration of the Church to active participation in social affairs. If there was one institution which Marx hated as violently as capitalism, it was Religion. He castigated primitive religions for blinding mankind to its deprivations, Judaism and early Christianity for their warped view of the origin of the world and of Man, medieval religion for its brake on scientific thought, and modern theocracies for their aid to oppressive governments. He would have applauded the first act of the new Soviet government in appropriating all the property of the Russian Orthodox Church (a store of wealth, by the way, which far exceeded the amount in the state treasury), and he would have endorsed the creation of the Society of Militant Atheists with its large headquarters and publishing plant in Moscow. Marx must surely have turned in his grave when Stalin (yes, Stalin!) restored the Patriarchate which Peter I had abolished in 1721, gave it the Atheist edifice for its offices, and turned over to it paper and the press so that it could publish Bibles! The fact that in return for these favors the Church agreed to cease its opposition to the government would be regarded by Marx as simply another example of religion supporting an oppressive regime.

The Social Perspective

Persistent problems which sixty years of Soviet socialism have failed-even to ameliorate:

How to encourage truly creative thought in an atmosphere of dogma, repression, and fear. The process of inhibition starts in the elementary grades, where school children are taught never to doubt or contradict the teacher, and where the Young Pioneer organization (ages 8-15 years) indoctrinates the political infallibility of the Party leadership.

How to utilize the skills of millions of tenth-grade graduates who will not attend any kind of higher educational establishment. The rigid admission requirements permit only one out of four urban applicants, and one out of ten rural school graduates, to be accepted in universities or institutes.[15] This discrepancy also aggrevates the contradictions between town and village mentioned above.

How to increase the productivity of labor in Soviet industry and agriculture. The fact is that, despite great gains over the record of the Tsarist regime, the Soviet Union lags far behind the achievements of the West. Both the USA and the USSR, for example, have 25% of the labor force in industry, yet Soviet productivity is only 41% of ours. We have only 6% of our labor force in agriculture, as against 31% in the USSR, but our farm productivity is nine times theirs. Each American farmer feeds sixty persons; each Soviet farmer only five!

How to eradicate the many remnants of sexual inequality, such as "sexism," chauvinism, puritanism, and the extremely low power status of women. In some respects the Soviet regime has provided *real* emancipation to many women. Females constitute 70% of the medical doctors (*not* including nurses), 80% of the school teachers, 33% of the professors and 51% of students in higher education, and even 30% of all engineers.[16] In all these capacities women get equal pay with men. But one looks in vain for female university Presidents, or hospital Directors, or large factory Managers, of Cabinet Ministers. There are women in the Central Committee of the Party, but none in the Politburo or the Secretariat. A recent study reveals that of the 140 most important posts in the entire Soviet Union, not one is held by a woman. Nor has the situation ever been greatly different in all the years of Soviet history. During that time only four women have really held even limited power: one was the wife of Lenin, one was the wife of Molotov, one was the mistress of Khrushchev, and one was the early advocate of "free love" who practiced with

several male leaders and died recently after having served for twenty happy years as the Soviet ambassador to Sweden. In one of his rare attempts at humor, Karl Marx (obviously paraphrasing J.S. Mill) declared that "social progress can be measured exactly by the social position of the fair sex, including the ugly ones." Measured in terms of participation in the labor of society, Soviet women are emancipated to the point of exploitation, for they still bear the children and do all the household chores. But in terms of power and policy-making, they are no better off then were their grandmothers.

What to do about the persistence of Religion, and the seeming willingness of the officially atheistic government to permit its growth. It is very true that the Church is no longer permitted to proselyte, and that all religious instruction, even in the home, is forbidden for youth under 16 years. Nor can the Church oppose any state policy, although it is permitted to voice agreement. Finally, of course, the Church cannot impede the advance of science and so its greatest fault, according to Marx, is removed. Nevertheless, the few remaining active churches in the Soviet Union (perhaps 5,000 out of the 50,000 in 1917) do act as an opiate in that they distract minds from the grave problems of the day, offer solace in the next world, and by indirection acquiesce in the continuation of the *status quo.* Reliable reports indicate that church attendance is growing, especially among young people despite the known fact that the secret police record such items in the dossiers. It is remarkable that after the early violent struggle of the state against religion, the atheistic tenets of all the Soviet leadership, and the active anti-religious campaigns of the Party, the youth organizations, the schools, and the press—religion still appeals to millions of Soviet citizens. The phenomenon is not only painful to the Soviet leaders, but also to many Western liberals who saw in the new Soviet regime a determined effort to erect a system of morals and ethics based upon enlightened human relationships rather than on ancient mores and superstitions.

In conclusion, one would like to draw a "balance sheet" on the successes and failures of the Soviet Union, but obviously such an act is impossible. What some people see as progress, others view as retrogression, and standards of Good and Evil vary in time, in space, and in individuals. But we might make a case for attempting such an analysis by citing the example of a young Frenchman who in 1835 produced a remarkable prophecy based on his studies of the United States and the Russian Empire:[17]

> There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend towards the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations, and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time. All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. The American struggles against the obstacles which nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the American are therefore gained by the ploughshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the

> Russian centres all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting-point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

If, by our own careful attention to Soviet affairs, we can see that far into the future, the effort will surely be worthwhile.

NOTES

1 William H.E. Johnson. *Russia's Educational Heritage*. New York: Octagon Books, 2nd edition, 1969. p. ix.

2 Raymond Beazley, et al. *Russia from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1918. *passim*

3 Abram L. Sacher. *A History of the Jews*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 5th edition, 1967. pp. 309-22.

4 Frederick L. Schuman. *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946. pp. 109-13.

5 Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

6 *Ibid*, pp. 46 and 307 n.

7 A coincidence discovered by Professor Albert Parry of Colgate University.

8 Dozens of histories of Russia bear witness to this program of "Russification."

9 Schuman, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-69.

10 Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 330-31.

11 *Ibid*, p. 283.

12 *Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 2nd edition, 1963.

13 *Narodnoe Xozyaistvo CCCP 1922-1972* (National Economy of the USSR 1922-1972) Central Statistical Administration, Moscow, 1972. pp. 425-445.

14 *U.S. News and World Report*, August 4, 1975, pp. 35-36.

15 Reinhard Meier. "Success and Limitations of Soviet Schooling" in *Swiss Review of World Affairs*, May 1975, pp. 13-15. Also *New York Times*, August 31, 1975, p. E7.

16 *Narodnoe Xozyaistvo, loc. cit.*, pp. 425-45.

17 Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America*, 1935.

KEITH GOLDHAMMER
Michigan State University

EDUCATION IN THE HUMANE COMMUNITY

MAY 5, 1977

Some weeks ago, as I was sorting out materials that I might want to consider in framing my remarks today, I chanced upon the speech which Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered to Congress on July 6, 1941. You who are of my generation will recall those tense and anxious days which preceded the tragedies which beset us for so many years. We needed some hope and an inspiration of what life might be like following the exacting sacrifices which so many of the population would be called upon to make. Many found it in Roosevelt's declaration of principles. It occurred to me that it would be of value today to read those words of the President, keeping in mind the basic question that I will pose later in my remarks, "What is education for?"

President Roosevelt said,

> "In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.
>
> The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.
>
> The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.
>
> The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.
>
> The fourth is freedom from fear, which translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough manner that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.
>
> That is no vision for a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called "new order" or tyranny which dictators seek to create with a crash of a bomb.
>
> To that new order we oppose the greater conception—the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

It has been thirty-six years since President Roosevelt delivered that famous speech on the four fundamental freedoms of the democratic world. Three questions come to mind as I review these statements. The first is, "what is our scorecard on these four freedoms, thirty-six years after they were formulated as the primary goals for which we were striving through what was to become the most devastating war in the history of mankind?" Freedom of speech is a rare commodity in the world today, and more people in more lands are constrained from speaking their minds and are languishing in prisons for opposing the official policies of their governments, than was true at any other period in man's recorded history. There is still religious discrimination, violence arising from intolerance, and the restriction of free travel and freedom of access within countries based upon religious differences. There is still religious discrimination in many parts of the world and even in our own land, because of what people believe and hold sacred.

There is more poverty in the world today, in spite of our technological genius and our capability to produce vast amounts of necessities for life; and there are more children who grow up with nutritional deficiencies because they live under the most extreme forms of poverty in today's world than was ever true before at any time in recorded history. The blight of the twentieth, and particularly the last half of the twentieth century, is that in every country, irrespective of its general affluence, there are large segments of the population who live in want, and there are more nations today which do not meet the test of having developed the economic understanding essential to insure healthy, peacetime lives for their inhabitants than existed in the world at any other period of recorded time.

In a world beset by aggression, irrational violence, hysteria and the arrogance of the individual who has the gun, there is no freedom from fear. One cannot board an airplane today to go just a few miles from his home in peace-loving land without experiencing the fear of the terrorist who would defile human dignity to achieve his twisted political ends. There is no freedom from the armaments race. The major growth industry in the world today is armament manufacturing, and the munitions burden drags nations into abysmal economic poverty where the masses of the people cannot be fed because nations are in a race for bigger, better, more expensive, more destructive armaments; and this is a fact everywhere in the world today.

Even on the domestic scene, there is no freedom from fear. Our great cities are human jungles, with fear and violence prevalent around every corner and in every alley. There is fear of person, threat to life and property, and, because of economic instability, a constant, gnawing insecurity which threatens continuation of livelihood.

If this be our tragic, humiliating scorecard, the second question must be asked: "Why? What has happened? Why has that moral order which Franklin Delano Roosevelt envisaged never come to pass?" I suspect that to attempt to answer the question "Why the failure?" would take many more hours and much more speculation than we have time for today. The basic answer, however, is that this failure is a human failure. Either we did not wish it enough, or we lacked either or both the skill and the integrity to pursue these ends. Other things sidetracked the effort to achieve everywhere in the world freedom of speech, freedom to worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

If we accept the proposition that our miserable scorecard on the four freedoms is the result of human failure, the third question to which we must respond is, "in what way is education responsible for either helping to create this dilemma, or, at least, not preventing its occurrence and reaching the present magnitude?"

My response is that this nation still has to come to grips with what it wants its educational systems to accomplish. It is generally held that we are ambiguous about

our goals for education. Although this is partially true, it is even more accurate to state that our goals are confused and we are prevented from arriving at a reasonable agreement because there are so many vested interests which want to control education for their own ends. Every interest group wants our schools to become handmaidens to serve its purposes. Children are the pawns which adults try to use to achieve their ends.

The great contribution of American educational philosophers has been to enunciate clearly the implications of democratic values for our educational systems. They have held that, since the democratic society is based upon a fundamental belief in the integrity of the individual, the school system must become an instrument for helping all children achieve their legitimate purposes as they seek to become effective participants in the communal life of the society in which they live. As historians like Charles Beard and Henry Steele Commager have noted, the greatest contribution of the American school system from the post-Civil War period through the Second World War has been its concentration upon helping all children, regardless of race, religion, the background of their parents, the social-economic status, or their intellectual abilities, to develop their potentialities to achieve greater fulfillment in their lives. Yet, we who control their destinies, argue about issues to protect our domains and transform the entire educational system into agencies to serve our purposes.

Almost a century ago the social philosopher, Herbert Spencer, asked the question, "What knowledge is of most worth?" He was concerned about how to construct the curriculum of schools not only best to serve the needs of the students as human participants in their communities, but also the social needs of a society which was emerging out of its agrarian past and into a great technological age. I don't think anyone has improved upon Spencer's statement, even though his conclusions seem to have been derived more from his prejudices than from his astute analysis.

After viewing all the domains of human activities, Spencer came to the conclusion that the major purpose of an educational system in an emerging, democratic, technological society was to help individuals live more effective lives. In one of the most memorable passages of his brilliant essay, he said:

> "How to live? That is the essential question for us, not how to live in the mere material sense only, but in the widest sense, the general problem which comprehends every special problem is—the right ruling of conduct in all directions under all circumstances. In what way to treat the body? In what way to treat to mind? In what way to manage our affairs? In what way to bring up a family? In what way to behave as a citizen? In what way to utilize those resources of happiness which nature supplies?—How to use all our faculties to the greatest advantage of ourselves and others?—How to live completely? And this being the great think needful for us to learn is by consequence the great thing which education has to teach. To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge, and the only rational mode of judging an educational course is to judge in what degree it discharges such function."

If we think in terms of an educational system that promotes effective living, then the curriculum of the schools should be built around the basic needs of human beings and designed to help all children develop those skills essential for their performing their roles effectively.

The turmoil about educational goals still boils with the same diversity of education primarily the transmission of knowledge? Is education the knowledge

business? Is the education primarily the transmittion of knowledge? Is education the knowledge business? Is the basic function of the teacher the reproduction of himself? The production of scholars and professionals and the other elite occupational categories? Is the function of education the transmission of the cultural heritage? Or is it all of these, but centered primarily upon the capacitation of all individuals to become effective, involved, participating and contributing citizens of their communities? Does education have a role to play in finding the solutions for the essential issues of human survival today? What is the role of school in helping human beings not only to confront, to cope with, but even to solve the ecological crisis, the biological crisis, the cultural crises, the socioeconomic crises, and the political crises of this era?

The traditional view holds that education is only the transmission of information. But for all the generations that we have had this as our central goal, somehow we have never been able to achieve a broad enough dispersion of understanding and knowledge to enable us effectively to build that moral order established out of our recognition of the importance of Roosevelt's four freedoms.

A few years ago the following story appeared in the *New York Times* under the dateline Honolulu, Hawaii:

> "Oblivious to the glory of life around him, Levi Kaupu's ears were deaf to the seabird cries above the whisper of the waves on the lava beach and the snuffling of pigs in the pen across the road. Nor could he see the stunning colors of the tropical sunset. His polynesian soul was torn by the need to leave the village of Milol where he was born, the house that he pointed to "there on the hill." The world had failed to open a place for him when he graduated from high school last spring, so frustration and disruption are his lot at the age of seventeen.
>
> He had just come from telling his girl friend that he will enlist in the army—the reason? "Nothing to do," the young man said. And when he brought up his glance from the beached outrigger hull, his dark Hawaiian eyes were full of agony and sorrow and shame. His is one measure of the problems of social unrest that now shakes the foundation of society in these islands. He is the young Hawaiian descendant of the Polynesians, who once held this land, and he is jobless, landless and untrained for a highly competitive society."

Why is Levi Kaupu jobless, landless and untrained, but yet, the possessor of a high school diploma? And the still greater question remains—unless he learns a skill and how to cope in the army, what is his future likely to be? One can speculate that Levi Kaupu graduated from a high school where the staff felt that their primary responsibility was the dissemination of knowledge through concentration upon the academic disciplines regardless of their relevance or meaningfulness to his life. The goal, seemingly, was to provide some knowledge, expecting no consequences from it, and assuming no responsibility to help students become contributing and participating citizens of the society of which they are a part.

The research, scattered and inconclusive as it may be, on the unemployability of youth, shows that there are nine main factors involved. Some of them are obviously more important than others. One is a poor self-concept, basically the belief that one isn't capable of performing any particular services adequately. The second is the lack of marketable skills. One has never learned how to do jobs that others are willing to pay to have done. A third is the lack of capability to use elementary techniques in solving problems. Schools evidently have never helped them to learn how to solve problems or to find the means through which they can

realistically attack the problems that confront them. Other factors include poor job market information, poor motivation, lack of proper credentials—there is no market for the skills which they do have. There is discrimination in the market or for the particular jobs for which individuals do have the skills. And individuals find themselves in conflicts over values with respect to the market of employment.

Recognizing that an essential element of youth becoming contributing and effective participants in today's society is that they have marketable skills, that they be employable, we must, then, ask whether or not there is any justification in the schools' avoiding this particular issue. Some of you may recall that the great scientist, T. H. Huxley, in the latter part of the 19th century, was a member of the London School Board. He became so much concerned about the nature, quality, and relevance of the programs in the London schools that he devoted the major portion of his latter life to the problems of education in that huge city. And once, reflecting on these problems, he said, "The world is full of artillery, and we turn out our children to do battle in it equipped with the shield and sword of an ancient gladiator."

Youth need the weapons and tools to compete in today's world. What should schools teach to produce effective living for all children and youth? What kind of curriculum is needed to help students gain the competences and knowledge they need to find their places and cope with the problems of living in the modern world? What should the schools do to help citizens of our communities throughout all the periods of their lives remain effective and secure the fulfillment that is essential for their finding satisfactions in living?

I think there are four basic hallmarks for the kind of education needed throughout the entire life span of every human being, to which the educational program can relate. The first such hallmark is that the basic ingredient of an educational program, designed to help individuals live effectively and become contributing, participating, involved members of society is a program which helps them to find and maintain their places in the economic order. It helps the students acquire the skill and knowledge they need to earn their own livings and to support those who are dependent upon them. The greatest social pathology besetting our society today arises from the increasingly larger portion of the society who are the economic wards of the state. We are a society that is impoverished through our having to provide sustenance for individuals who do not earn a living even though the vast majority of them have the capability to learn how to earn a living.

As I say this, I am fully cognizant of the debate between the proponents of "liberal education" and the advocates of "career education." The question, "Shall it be liberal or career education?" is about as meaningful as the debate on how many angels can dance on the point of a needle. Such questions are an inheritance from a time when education was for the leisure classes and the process of education was that of finding enough intriguing, irreconcilable, intellectual puzzles to keep the students occupied in their leisure time. We might just as well debate the issue, "Is eating more important for a biological organism than breathing?"

On the one hand, it is through work that persons find their places in society, achieve a sense of their creative capabilities, pride and respect for themselves, identity with the social purposes of the community in which they live, and meanings that give significance to other human endeavors in which they are engaged. It is through work that one finds dedication, in the classical definition of the term "vocation," and significance in life.

It is true, in a technological society, not all work provides this meaning to the human being. Some work is drudgery. Some has no purpose beyond that of enabling individuals to earn a living. But modern society provides alternatives in other

pursuits for those who do not gain fulfillment in their occupational roles. At the same time that the human being in contemporary society must find meaningful work roles, it is also imperative for the individual who is to achieve fulfillment to be able to understand the phenomena around him; to be able to appreciate beauty; to participate in ennobling activities; to be able to deal with ethical questions; to refine appreciation of the aesthetic and enlarge capability to handle the intellectual. There is no contention about the importance of these activities for the human being, but there is little opportunity in contemporary society to so engage, to become so involved, if one cannot find a role in the world of work. Fortunate, indeed, is the person whose work and fulfillment as an intellectual, aesthetic, searching human being are one. Most of us will not have the pleasure and privilege.

The second hallmark of the kind of educational system we need is one which helps all individuals to cope with their problems of living, of adapting, of surviving within the modern world. People who can fully participate in contemporary affairs are the ones who know their own capabilities and how they can use them, who have developed their cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor skills so that they can use their endowments as human beings effectively to achieve their purposes. Self-awareness, coupled with social and economic awareness, forms the basis for personal, rational decision-making. More people, actually, fail in becoming effective human beings because of their inability to cope with themselves, to know themselves, and to deal with the problems of living within the diverse environments of which they are a part.

The third hallmark of such an educational program is that it helps all students achieve appropriate balance between their aspirations and their potentials for fulfilling them. Although it is true that all the human capabilities are needed in the world today and we can find a place for their fruition, it is a fact of life that not all human capabilities are evenly divided among all people. In spite of our egalitarian perspectives, our school system has been based upon an elitist model. It has been designed to create an intellectual aristocracy, and it has largely succeeded. The greater prestige and remuneration for one's services are associated with a professional hierarchy which, in turn, is characterized by the levels of educational attainment essential for occupying each particular level. The only change in this pattern occurs when individuals with certain essential job skills are able to form a monopoly in the performance of their skills and achieve restricted entry to the field. People are lured away from the consideration of jobs for which they may be eminently qualified, gain some fulfillment, and maximize their potentialities primarily because those jobs are not totally legitimated by the reward systems either of the school or of the society in which it is located. Speaking at Ohio State University a couple of years ago, President Gerald Ford said,

> "This country needs a renewed dedication to the work ethic, which can be achieved under two conditions: First, that we teach everyone to work as skillfully as he can with satisfaction and at a level of job undertaking in which he or she can be successful; and, secondly, that we provide a job for everyone. The greatest relief from alienation and despair is to help rebuild that job ethic with the understanding that every person is good for something, and our society must find a role in the economic order for everyone to perform."

I firmly believe that the chief ingredient in our capability to achieve a society which adheres to the moral principle which President Roosevelt described depends upon our freeing our communities from the debilitating effects of extreme poverty. But the experiences of so many nations since World War II, in a mindless quest for

economic security, has taught us that the pursuit of this end *alone* can be disastrous. There is no freedom and seemingly precious little humanity in the most advanced communist nations in the world. The advance of socialism in Great Britain has reduced that once proud nation, which has made so many fundamental contributions to intellectual, cultural, aesthetic, as well as technological progress, to almost sheer incapacitation. These nations have recognized the fact that people must find their places in the economic order of society. But they have neglected to recognize that they must also be able to cope with the problems of living, far beyond the limitations of their economic roles.

The fourth hallmark of the kind of educational system that we need to build is one that helps all persons acquire the skills, the knowledge, and the meaning necessary to perform all of their life roles effectively, not only as producers of goods or renderers of services, but equally as members of the family, as citizens, as participants in the avocational, aesthetic, moral, and religious sectors of society.

Levi Kaupu's alienation cannot be relieved as long as he remains jobless and landless But neither can it be totally relieved if only a job is provided for him. It is not less knowledge and understanding of the cultural heritage that is needed. It is more. But it is not needed in the discrete little capsules provided for those who are scholars and professionals in their fields. The knowledge that Levi Kaupu and all who are like him need is that which is *instrumental* for them to achieve their concerns for becoming effective in all the areas of human existence. This is the point at which career education and liberal education come together. The great need in the world today is for an enlightened citizenry who can contribute not only to the economic health of society, but to the moral, aesthetic, and political well-being, as well. No intelligent person claims that less knowledge of the diverse human environments is needed, nor that the schools should place less emphasis upon building understanding of our cultural heritages in order to comprehend and cope with the current affairs of our country and other nations. Enlightened, intelligent participation in social affairs demands a higher level of ability to use knowledge and experience effectively both in personal and communal decision-making. Hopefully, we will be able to maintain the values and meanings of a civilized, democratic society, in spite of the eclipse of decency, compassion, and human rights, which seems to prevail over so much of the world today. But, unless we can build assurances that there is a meaningful and constructive place in the economic order for all citizens, it is ridiculous to believe that the goals of an enlightened, civilized, democratic, and humane society can be achieved.

This society cannot persist if half or more of the adult population have no salable skills and are doomed to endure as the economic wards of the state. Nothing could be more debilitating, incapacitating, humiliating, or alienating. Neither can a free society exist without a population which has developed the intellectual and the moral capacities to form judgments through reason and humane principles. These are the *sine qua non* of civilized societies, and our failure to recognize this has contributed to the failures and the frustrations of the contemporary age.

The imposition which this makes upon us is great, indeed, The proper education for effective living—the maintenance of both economic and intellectual and moral viability—cannot be allocated to a single institution or be a concern for only a particular period of one's life. At any period of one's life access to the means for satisfying needs for change, for re-education, for further enlightenment must be provided. An educated community is also an educational community. Such a community provides multiple opportunities through both formal and informal channels to maintain the total capacitation of its citizens.

In addition to these guidelines, the objectives of the most meaningful education for present and future human and societal needs requires some changes in instructional processes and strategies.

First, the most significant change must come about through the development of educational strategies, which encourage involvement of students in the life of the community, rather than the characteristics approaches which have encouraged disengagement. Following the medieval tradition, education has been viewed as a disinterested study of institutions and phenomena. It has been cloistered in the walls of the school, isolated from the world of daily affairs. In teaching citizenship, we have really taught students only about the forms of government and the structure of society. They have not learned the strategies of action and participation. In teaching vocational skills, we have more frequently used the laboratory and school workshop, rather than the office, garage, and factory. More than skill is required, and more than academic knowledge must be acquired. Experience where the action is, outside of the sheltered haven, must become the main means of instruction.

A second essential emphasis should be upon helping students use their studies to make significant decisions about their lives and particularly about their future careers in the world of work. Dewey emphasized that education is life, not just preparation for it. But the main part of the life of an immature person is preparation for the time when he or she is "out there on their own." Many individuals have remained either or both economic and psychological wards of the state, because they haven't been adequately prepared to make the decisions and to cope with the realities of being "out there on their own." Individuals who have thoroughly mastered the essential curriculum of the contemporary school will have developed the knowledge and the capability necessary for finding their places and being able to cope in the world of affairs. To achieve these ends, all education must be integrated to prepare students to use the best available knowledge and experience in all fields to make wise decisions. The issue is to learn how to use knowledge and experience from all disciplines effectively to serve one's purposes.

A third strategy is that of building curriculum around each learner's individual needs. The printed curricula in catalogs and handbooks are evidence of how learning experiences have been organized to suit the convenience of teachers and administrators. Learners are committed to conform to their expectations. The basic curriculum is that which helps each learner stretch and grow in his ability to cope and discover his capabilities. The only prescription that is educationally justified is the careful designation of the competencies and knowledges that an individual may be expected to attain before receiving his credit or diploma, and even these may be subject to individual variation. The school of the future must be viewed as a clinic where the individual and his needs are placed in central focus, and prescriptions and interventions are devised as a result of individual examination and analysis.

Although there are other changes which can and should come about, let me mention only one more. We have allowed a separation to take place between guidance and instruction in our schools. The early advocates of guidance and counseling in the schools saw a danger in this separation and advocated a system which recognized teaching as guidance and guidance as teaching, but this didn't happen. Guidance became specialized and increasingly apart from teachers in the classroom setting. Teachers are not only separated from the guidance and counseling situation, but rarely even know what assistance is rendered. What the teacher does isn't recognized as helping children make wise, personal decisions. And what the counselor does is rarely recognized as being a part of the instructional situation. The result can be confusion and contradictory effort. Instruction, guidance and coun-

seling should have the same purpose and be a part of the instructional clinic where diagnosis, evaluation, prescription and examination of student needs take place. The desirable educational setting is one where all educational personnel are working together as an instructional team to maximize the benefits for the learners who are affected.

Indeed! Education has not responded to the challenge of the four freedoms! As a consequence, there are growing numbers of Levi Kaupus who are leaving school landless, jobless and ill-prepared to cope with the problems of civilized and enlightened living in a complex society. I think educators can change this if they use what they know how to do with a determination and a dedication to create a higher level of humane understanding than ever before—anywhere in the world.

PATRICIA ALBJERG GRAHAM
National Institute of Education

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SCHOOL PRACTICE: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

MAY 11, 1978

I am honored to be able to deliver the Horace Mann Lecture. My remarks today were shaped by reflecting on the career of Mann, on his vision for American education, and on the complex ways in which that vision has worked out in practice. Mann promised much for public education. We are not a bit chastened because we have not been able to guarantee all the social marvels he offered as inducements to the Massachusetts citizenry when he asked their support for public schools. In some respects, we have not done as well in public education as Mann promised. In other respects, we have vastly outstripped even Mann's expansive ideals.

In general, many of the issues that Mann recognized in Massachusetts nearly 150 years ago are with us still. This is both a tribute to his insight and prophetic skill and a comment upon the persistence of some themes in American history. However, in my view, there have been three key historical changes since Mann's time that have shaped the role of American education. First, our society has altered from a homogeneous rural population to one of ethnic and social diversity. Second, schools have changed from small units enrolling a fraction of our children to large formal organizations with nearly universal attendance. Third, the importance of educational skills has vastly increased. They are now vital if one is to function effectively in today's society. All three factors make the job of educators more complex and difficult. As the clientele of schools becomes more dissimilar in background and learning style, teaching is more demanding. The growth in size and the bureaucratization of schools may also have limited the ability of teachers to meet their students' diverse needs. The stakes for students and educators have, ironically, been raised at the same time as their jobs have become harder to do. I will argue that these three shifts have not only affected the practice of education, they have also influenced educational research and the ideology of public education in this country.

My choice of an historical perspective shows my own professional training, my recent experience in the Federal Government, and my recognition of the commemorative title of this lecture. Much of my time in the past year has been spent speaking to a wide variety of individuals involved with education. I have been struck by the concern of many Americans for the excellence of the education they provide for their children and themselves. But, I have also noted an occasional "amnesia" in some people involved in the debates about our educational system. We seem to be unwilling to comprehend that education is shaped by historical trends more lasting than the latest magazine article offering praise, blame, or an instant

panacea for our nation's schools. This swirl of conflicting advice and analysis often tends to obscure or divert our attention away from the most essential and, in many ways, most challenging job of schooling. My purpose in taking a long-range, retrospective view on the role of schools is not to suggest that history provides direct solutions to our present problems. Indeed, history often shows that our contemporary worries have no counterpart or analogue in the past. I do believe that through historical analysis, we can gain a sharper focus on what our roles as educators are, and a more balanced and refined notion of the sources of some of our current quandaries.

Horace Mann's view of American Society was one of relative homogeneity. In the small towns and rural areas that dominated Massachusetts, populations were relatively similar, both ethnically and socially. The principal source of resistance to public schools came from farmers who failed to see the utility of education for their children. Mann's tenure as Secretary of Education in Massachusetts occurred prior to the Potato Famine in Ireland which brought the first great wave of 19th century immigrants to the Commonwealth. He also left the state before the development of major industry, although the textile mills at Lowell presaged those subsequent developments.

Mann was much impressed by the model of educational efficiency documented by Victor Cousin in Prussia, a similarly textured region of farms and small towns. Mann perceived the role of schools to be to teach fundamentals of reading, writing, arithematic, and history—at least to those children who were inclined to learn. Thus he charged the nascent public schools with the momentous responsibility of assuring children in the late 1830's and 1840's access to the world of literacy. He believed this was valuable, and so do I. However, he also argued that a key social benefit of extending schooling would be increased morality among citizens. I am less convinced that this is an appropriate or potentially successful role to assign to public education. American society is too diverse; too subject to a multiplicity of deep changes; and too rich in viable moral patterns to ask any single institution to impose any single ethical structure upon its younger citizens. Moreover, fundamental research, in psychology and other fields, is beginning to teach us that we know comparatively little about the ways in which children learn morality. It would be wasteful and wrong to establish a standard moral curriculum ugless children could absord it, even if it were possible to determine what that curriculum might be.

From the perspective of Mann's aspirations for universal schooling, the growth of public education in the last 130 years has been a success story. Enrollment and levels of educational attainment have moved steadily upward. In 1876 less than 4% of American young people had completed high school. By 1950 the figure had increased to 59%. Today the level is over 75%. Attendance patterns have also shown steady growth, from an average proportion of 60% of enrolled students on an average day in 1870, to a figure over 90% in 1970. It is also worth noting that the school year was much shorter in those earlier days.

A parallel expansion in higher education has occurred over an even shorter period of time. Fifty years ago less than 10% of the nation's youth attended college. In recent years college has become accessible to almost every interested high-school graduate. Since 1960, the number of undergraduates has risen from less than four million to more than twelve million. The proportion of the 18 to 21 year old age group attending a post-secondary institution in 1972 was over 50%.

The nature and results of this trend have been central to debate among educational historians over the last fifty years. The lines of battle are drawn between the consensus historians who celebrate the schools' role in advancing equality and economic mobility, and recent "revisionist" historians who paint a picture of economic elites drafting youthful masses into school for cultural indoctrination and

training as willing workers. Neither school of analysis is wholly correct, nor wholly complete. However, my purpose is neither to adjudicate that debate nor to analyze the board social effects of increased school participation. Rather, I want to focus on what happened to educational practice.

My first point is that these increases in numbers were accompanied by greater diversity in the backgrounds of students. The patterns of immigration, urbanization, and industrialization altered classroom composition in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In more recent years, the drives for racial integration, mainstreaming of special needs students, and bilingual education have added to the diversity of student characteristics.

Higher education has undergone similar changes. For example, reporting on his fellow students in the class of 1879 at Amherst College, just 100 years ago, Frank Jameson observed that of his 102 classmates, one was Japanese, one Negro, and six were Europeans. All the rest (over 90%)—were of old American stock, of English descent, and nearly all of New England origin. A third came from the cities, the rest from the country or from small towns in New England. More than three-quarters of them were Congregationalists. Of course, all were male. The scene of today's campuses is vastly different. Colleges currently attract almost a third of their students from families headed by a blue-collar worker. In a little over ten years the number of minority students has quadrupled and now equal 11% of total college enrollment.

It is clear that the general increase in school participation made teaching harder. In more elitist days, teachers confined their attention to the economic and social cream of the crop and to the quietly diligent. Sometimes there was an overlap between the children of the prosperous and the group of quietly diligent students—but sometimes there was not. Students who were difficult or deviant tended to drop out or be pushed out. Thus, the seeming success of schools in the "good old days" may be due more to their natural selection of successful students than to successful teaching and learning of the three R's or to the use of rigid disciplinary techniques. However, as educators won their battle to extend school and make attendance compulsory, they were confronted with the challenges of teaching those students with less academic aptitude who would have previously been eased into unskilled jobs, and students with varying learning styles due to differences in temperament, language or culture.

In higher education, we can again see a similar pattern. When only ten or fifteen percent of the population attended college, every graduate could be reasonably assured of a professional career with a variety of options. This was particularly true when one eliminated most of the female graduates from the job market, since society assumed they were not expected to support themselves. It became natural to believe that a college diploma entitled every graduate to a high level career in his area of personal interest. When such positions were assured, then it was easy to believe in addition that the excellence of the college curriculum was responsible, although other forces may well have been much more important.

The majority of our young people, including women and minorities, are now a part of the process of higher education. They must be prepared for an increasingly complex and competitive job market, as well as for the more nebulous—but not less important—business of giving individuals the skills for a fulfilling personal life. We can see several types of evidence of the influence of this change. Some economists have questioned the assumption that college represents a sound financial investment in terms of lifetime earnings. Students have responded by emphasizing career-oriented programs and questioning the value of traditional liberal arts programs, by applying to professional schools such as law and business in increasing numbers, and perhaps by turning away from the political and social activism of the mid-sixties.

In sum, in the past schools were never seriously challenged by the task of educating an entire, increasingly diverse population. The methods and rhetoric that may have led to success in educating a homogeneous segment of students for a short time proved much less effective in meeting these larger and more complex demands.

My second point is that expansion in enrollments was accompanied by a shift in the institutional quality of schools. Schools become larger in unit size, more formal in organization, and more professional in staffing. The new emphasis placed on school attendance plus the population increases, put an incredible burden on existing school systems to provide the necessary facilities for their new pupils. The professional wisdom of the late 19th and early 20th centuries pointed to one solution for the growing schools: the elimination of the small, one-room schoolhouses of an earlier time and the replacement of them with graded schools. It was widely held that by arranging the children in separate classes, according to their age level or by their demonstrated educational accomplishments, much more carefully planned curricula could be followed and the learning of the children could be considerably enhanced. The assumption was that in the upgraded, one-room school, the teacher's responsibilities were too divided among the many children at the various grade levels. It was hoped that if the teacher could concentrate all her attention on only one grade level, much more rigorous and effective instruction could occur. Such an option was not possible, of course, until the numbers of children attending a school were great enough to divide the school into grades.

Such a necessary concentration of children obviously occurred much earlier in urban areas than in rural ones, accounting, many contended, for the reputed inferiority of rural education. The problems that rural teachers faced were immense, beginning with lack of funds. Their difficulties—such as those of a Marquette County, Michigan teacher who had to contend with a balky stove for heating, outside toilets, and a classroom of 50 to 60 children of assorted nationalities and ages who were to be instructed in all subjects from the primary through the elementary grades, were immediately obvious to everyone concerned with educational policy. An eminently reasonable solution seemed to be to bring the children together in large enough numbers so that an adequate school with heating and plumbing facilities could be constructed and the children could be divided into grades. The marvels of the graded school and, later, of school consolidation, were preached throughout the American educational establishment at normal schools, at summer institutes, at Chautauqua, and in the universities. In these schools, it was claimed, each teacher would only have to master the curriculum of one grade. Her classes each day could do the same subjects, each child presumably doing what every other child was doing. How much easier for the teacher! The problem was solved!

But was the problem really solved? Has it not simply been transferred to the students, to whom educational leaders have generally been much less responsive than they have been to teachers? Both these efforts, grading of classes and school consolidation, pointed toward establishing a more rigid classroom organization than was ever possible in the inevitably chaotic one-room school. Furthermore, the grade isolation emphasized the problems of those children who were not promoted and thus were forced to remain in the primary grade with children much smaller than they. In the one-room school, the assortment of ages and sizes varied, and a nonreading ten-year-old could, at least, mix with his age mates in the classroom and at recess, possibilities that were not open to him in a school in which all non-readers were left with the six-year-olds in the first grade. Similarly, an immigrant child who knew no English might be absorbed into a rural, one-room school at age nine and permitted to move at his own rate through the curriculum, an accomplishment that was much more difficult in most graded schools where promotion came semi-

annually and few allowances were made for children doing work ahead of that prescribed for the entire class.

In view of the increased diversity of students I identified earlier, the move towards the bureaucratic values of uniformity in method and content of instruction would appear to be particularly open to question. Undoubtedly, there were many problems with the one-room schools, many of which concerned the teachers, who were poorly paid and often equally poorly educated. However, there is also an element of irony in many of the recent efforts to reform our perhaps overly-systematized schools. In effect, such "experiments" as cross-age tutoring, open environments, mini-schools, and even decentralization and parent involvement efforts reconstitute the old one-room school.

My third point is that as education became nearly universal, we developed higher levels of required skills for employment and "survival" in society. High educational attainment has become a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for success in life. I can see these changes within my own family. My grandfather was illiterate in English for his entire lifetime. He worked as a farmer in the United States and drove his horse and buggy twenty miles into town once a week. He spoke to me, his grandchild, only in his native language. One generation later, his children needed to be able to read to pass a driving test, or else they would be forced to walk those twenty miles. Literacy, in the broad sense of a variety of essential life skills, including the ability to read, to work with mathematical symbols, and to make critical judgments, is no longer a choice. It is an obligation.

The first component of this shift is the need for higher skills and credentials to get a job. We are all familiar with the decline in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs over the last fifty years, with the "inflation" of educational requirements as higher education was easier to come by, and with the growth of jobs in highly technical and professional fields. A related process has occurred in the nature of certification procedures in many professions. In teaching, for example, throughout much of the nineteenth century, one could become licensed simply by passing an examination. However, with the development of normal schools in the early twentieth century, certification became based on completion of a series of courses at an approved institution. More recently, we seem to be taking a "double protection" approach, with many states requiring both completion of a prescribed set of courses, and a passing grade on the National Teacher's Examination.

The second way in which the demands on education have increased is in non-academic areas. Churches, communities, and families have relinquished many responsibilities. With the historic decline in these and other supportive institutions, schools are called on to provide health and sex education; preparation for political life as voters; competence in surviving increasingly complex challenges such as preparing income tax forms and buying life insurance; and exposure to choices in using leisure time. As we move towards longer periods of preparation for careers, early retirement, shorter work weeks, and flexible part-time careers, how we "employ" ourselves outside of our job environment becomes more important to our sense of self-worth and to the quality of our lives. These issues, vital as they are, cannot be resolved with specific courses. Rather, they require more comprehensive general education. In 1918 we were told that one of the "Seven Cardinal Principles" of education was to prepare youngsters to make worthy use of their leisure time. We responded, instrumentally and often not satisfactorily, with "courses" on various leisure activities, treating them as we did vocational training. The danger for both vocational training or leisure time training is that excessive specificity. We need more imaginative solutions in both areas, and I suspect that answers lie in more general, less specialized approaches.

I have conducted an extremely rapid overview of three historical issues in the expansion of education in America. I have glossed over many details, such as important regional differences in the timing and patterns of the trends I have outlined and their impact on various sub-groups of our population. However, the main point of my analysis should be clearly relevant to many of our current difficulties in education. As schools expanded numerically they were faced with a more heterogeneous set of clients. Social demands increased to prepare students for a highly technical, competitive job market and an equally complex set of roles as parents, consumers, and citizens. The early adoption of bureaucratic structures and methods by the educational system may have limited its ability to respond effectively to its diverse clientele and the changing requirements of society.

These changes altered the goals or ideology of public education and the conduct of educational research. As I noted earlier, Horace Mann's chief argument for the extension of schooling was its contribution to public morality. His claim of a broad social benefit from education is similar to that of earlier advocates of public schools such as Jefferson, who argued that society would gain effective citizens and voters, and the Puritans, who advocated schooling to produce religious salvation. As education became universal, equality of opportunity became the key rationale and goal. Education was viewed as the key to individual mobility and as a solution to national problems of poverty and racism.

These goals share the problem of viewing education as a means to a social end rather than an end itself. They represent unrealistic expectations and divert attention away from the legitimate expectations we should hold for our schools. For better or worse, educators have learned to take advantage of this situation. When schools had difficulties with students, they reacted by blaming family structures, social structure, or the media for student failures. However, when similar students succeeded, educators took credit for the accomplishments. In my judgment, it is time to equalize this division of responsibility. Public schools alone cannot be expected to eliminate poverty, or racial discrimination or to stabilize the American Family system; schools can and should be held responsible for the job of education for literacy—for *all* students.

In the past, research was useful but not vital to the practicing teacher or administrator. Because of the types of students and level of social expectations, virtually any methodology or program would work fairly well. Research provided statistics to document success and justify expansion. In a sense, the scientific trappings of research may have contributed to a false sense of security for educators. Studies that explained success by spurious variables of technique served to obfuscate the fundamental truth that schools only dealt with a relatively success-prone body of students.

In recent years, the partnership between researchers and practitioners has suffered severe strains. Volumes of past studies on specialized curricula and teaching techniques proved to be invalid as student bodies changed and demands for literacy increased. Research has focused on evaluation of large-scale reforms and assessment of often unrealistic social goals for education. The results have been summarized as a theme of "nothing works." Practitioners have reacted by charging, often with considerable justification, that research was inadequate, misguided, and irrelevant to the problems of professionals in schools.

I am profoundly committed to the value and practice of basic research. However, in large part, I agree with the reactions of practitioners to educational research as it has been conducted in the past. All too often, research agendas are driven by the theories and methodologies of academic disciplines rather than by the significant problems of practice. In addition, researchers tend to prefer to "do-able" to the significant topic. Only in the past could we afford the luxury of an

academically-oriented research effort that might have evaded one of the great virtues of the academy: its ability to hew to the fundamental. Nonetheless, I am definitely optimistic about the future of educational research. It can offer the most important sort of assistance in reaching our goal of universal literacy.

The creation of the National Institute of Education (NIE) by the Federal Government was based upon the principle that the development and application of knowledge for and in the educational *process* is a primary responsibility of the Federal Government: Federal funds are central, and the role is direct and general. NIE's legislation states this explicitly: "While the direction of the education system remains primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to provide leadership in the conduct and support of scientific inquiry into the educational process." There are at least three reasons that the Federal Government takes substantial responsibility for the development and use of educational knowledge. Because the products of such research are nationally usable, the costs development ought to be nationally shared. Next, those costs of development are reduced when the available resources are coordinated in such a way as to avoid both duplication and gaps. Finally, it is in the Federal interest to ensure that State, local *and* Federal dollars invested in the education system are made with the fullest possible knowledge about the education process, since this knowledge is the best insurance that the tax dollars will achieve the greatest possible results.

To be more specific, let me suggest how research in two areas might be reoriented. The first area is the practice of teaching. There is no dearth of work here, but several substantial questions of practice have received insufficient attention. For example, as I have stated, a key characteristic of today's classrooms is a diverse group of students, in terms of social class, cultural backgrounds, and styles of learning. We need to know much more about how successful teachers work in these settings and how such knowledge about the craft of teaching can be passed along to other staff. Another problem on which to focus is the motivation and career patterns of experienced teachers. Due to enrollment decline in most districts, the average age and experience of the staff is rising. What supports or new opportunities for career growth would be helpful to these teachers? Clearly these are not easy issues to address through the traditional methodologies of social science, but they are as crucial as they are difficult.

Next, in the area of desegregation, the vast majority of past research has concentrated on the effects of such a public policy. Oddly, given this interest, we have given too little attention to what happens in the classroom itself. We have insufficient documentation, and thus insufficient material for analysis, of what happens in that arena. What kinds of teachers, what kinds of administrators, what kinds of parents are most conducive to student progress in integrated schools? How can we best have racial justice and Americans who have both learned and learned to value that process itself?

It might be interesting to speculate on the ghost of Horace Mann and its response to my remarks. Would it feel betrayed, or pleased, or simply interested and curious on this development of his legacy? In a real sense, the muddles, tasks, and opportunities I have described are a result, over time, of the success of Mann and other pioneers of public education in this country. Their advocacy of a system of public education that was universal and free took several generations to come fully to fruition. Only recently have we begun to confront directly the fact that universal literacy is the logical consequence of their hopes and the principal goal of our schools.

At present, the difficulties for practitioners and researchers often seem enormous. Our heritage is also our burden. However, we should take heart. History can

teach us how far we have come, and a modest good sense can help us to recognize the vitality of our work. Many of us have friends who believe their jobs, if they have them, to be meaningless, unimportant, or remote from issues critical to society. We in education need not suffer any such sense of isolation. We provide our students with the skills to transcend the boundaries of their personal experience and, I hope, the confidence to judge that experience as well. We provide one way for them to strengthen their individual potentialities; to move from becoming into being. We must be realistic in assessing our failures and our inadequacies, but we should also take pride, if without arrogance, in the manageable significance of our enterprise.

SHOU-SHENG HSUEH
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

JUNE 6, 1978

This is my first trip to Pittsburgh. I bring you sunshine and greetings from Hong Kong.

Let me begin on a personal note. For reasons I do not fully understand myself, I have been interested and involved in international education for the last 20 years. When the famous School of Public and International Affairs at Pitt was started, I felt very honored and flattered to receive a personal letter from the late Chancellor Litchfield asking for my personal views and suggestions for the new school, and I was pleased this morning to be able to visit the office of the School of Public and International Affairs in person.

I am delighted and grateful to be here with you this afternoon. This is a very memorable occasion as we are assembled here in this elegant hall to honor a distinguished American educational leader, Dr. Paul Masoner, Dean Emeritus of the School of Education of the University of Pittsburgh. To us in Asia, Dr. Masoner is a distinguished educational leader of world-standing. I am indeed fortunate to have been invited to attend this important occasion, and especially privileged to be the speaker in the prestigious Paul Masoner International Lecture series for this year. It is indeed a very great honor to my university and myself, and for this I am grateful to my Pittsburgh colleagues, particularly Dean James Kelly and Dr. Wilma Smith. In fact, the Planning Committee took a very great risk in extending the invitation to me to address this distinguished assembly.

Needless to say, the University of Pittsburgh is well known to the academic community in Asia, especially for its significant contributions in the field of international education. As some of you may be aware, the University of Pittsburgh and the Chinese University of Hong Kong have maintained a very special relationship since our university's foundation in 1963. We have greatly benefited by our institutional ties and personal relations with Pitt scholars and administrators. A number of my colleagues, especially in the field of sociology, have either obtained postgraduate degrees or undertaken advanced research at this famous university. Professor C.K. Yang, a Distinguished Service Professor in your Department of Sociology, has served in various advisory capacities in our university and as an eminent member of the Fulton Commission, whose report, published in 1976, served as the basis for the reorganization of the Chinese University. Other prominent Pitt colleagues such as Chancellor Wesley Posvar, Dr. Charles Peake, Dr. Burkart Holzer, and others, are well known and close to us. Moreover, our Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Choh-Ming Li, was the recipient of an honorary degree of Doctor of Social Science from

Pitt. One of my colleagues, Dr. Ambrose King, Head of New Asia College, is also a Pitt alumnus. Thanks to Dr. Masoner, cooperative relations between our Schools of Education are also being explored. I hope that my visit will, in some small way, further contribute to the strengthening of our academic collaboration and personal friendship.

Now, please allow me to turn to the main task which has been assigned to me, to deliver this year's lecture on international education. As you all know, the lecture series was inaugurated in 1972 to honor Dr. Masoner for his unique contributions in international education. I understand that this year's lecture has a special significance because this occasion also marks his retirement. I am, therefore, doubly honored to be invited to deliver the lecture, which provides an opportunity not only to examine or re-examine international issues with reference to higher education, but also to reiterate our deep appreciation to Dr. Masoner for his contributions in the field of international education, and to present to him our very best wishes for even more productive years during his retirement.

The subject of my lecture is "International Education: Problems and Prospects." It is understood that the emphasis will be placed on higher education and that the lecture at best reflects an Asian viewpoint. Within the time assigned to me for the delivery, I propose to tackle my subject by sharing with you my thoughts on three related topics, namely: expectations of higher education; international education in a changing world; and international cooperation in higher education.

A large number of colonies throughout the world have achieved independence since the end of the Second World War. With political independence, people in newly emerging states have acquired a new consciousness of the importance of higher education, which used to be the prerogative of young men and women of wealthy families. As a consequence, the social foundation of higher education has broadened considerably and higher education has become an integral part of democracy. Urgent demand is thus created for places in institutions of higher learning. Leaders of new nations have placed great emphasis on higher education as a means of meeting the need for more highly qualified citizens and for economic, political, and social development.

Against this background, there has been an unprecedented expansion of universities, not only in industrialized countries, but especially in developing countries. Higher education invariably constitutes an increasingly important item in the national budget, resulting in rapid growth in the number of universities as well as in the student population.

All the territories in Southeast Asia with the exception of Thailand have been colonized by Western powers in the past, and only became independent after the Second World War. In all these countries, a key factor in their development has been to expand and improve higher education. For example, the whole of Indonesia, believe it or not, did not have a single university at the time of independence, and now that country has a total of 360 institutions of higher education, including 41 state universities and 319 private universities, colleges, and other tertiary institutions. Another instance is the Republic of the Philippines, which had only one university at the time of independence, namely, the University of Santo Tomas, founded in 1611, the oldest university in Asia. Today, the Philippines has 10 state universities, 40 private universities, over 30 state colleges, and about 650 private colleges, with a combined university enrollment of approximately 800,000 out of a population of about 40 million. The largest is the University of the Far East with a student population of 60,000. Similar developments can be found in all the other countries of Asia and also, I am sure, in other parts of the world.

Despite the great efforts made by various governments to meet the rising expectations in the field of higher education, serious problems have been encountered in most countries. A number of problems in Southeast Asia may be mentioned which are by no means new or uncommon. I am sure that similar problems are being faced in other parts of the world, including the United States of America.

University spaces are in extremely short supply in spite of the great increase in numbers of places in Southeast Asia, and admission is subject to competitive entrance examination and interview. In Hong Kong, for example, there are two universities with a total student enrollment of about 9,000 for a population of 4.7 million. For the coming year, some 13,000 applications were received by the Chinese University for its matriculation examination, and about 9,000 applied to the University of Hong Kong, whereas the number of spaces available in each institution is approximately 1,000. In other words, the combined student intake is less than 10% of applicants, causing a great deal of disappointment and frustration on the part of those who fail to obtain admission. A small number of them may enter universities abroad or reapply for admission into the local universities in the following year. The majority enter post-secondary colleges, technical institutions, or the work force in Hong Kong.

By and large, most countries in Asia are facing a serious shortage of funds. Not every country can afford a 30 million dollar quadrangle building as you have at Pitt. We are short of buildings, teaching and research facilities, and qualified teachers. Many universities lack adequate classrooms, library resources, and laboratory equipment. Because of the shortage of qualified teachers and the rapid increase in the student population, classes tend to be extremely large, and it has become a common phenomenon for classes to be attended by hundreds of students. Relations between teacher and student have become impersonal, and sometimes almost nonexistent, apart from contact in class with large numbers of students.

Another serious problem is related to teaching methods. Both teachers and students rely heavily on textbooks. Most teachers are busily engaged in day-to-day teaching and have little time for research or writing textbooks. Therefore, university teaching depends largely on imported textbooks, especially from the United States of America and England, as English is the first foreign language in many Asian countries.

In spite of the various difficulties I have briefly outlined, international education has become a very important component of Southeast Asian universities. This, of course, is largely due to the realities of world politics, plus the fact that regional cooperation has almost become a necessity in the new international order. As a result, many regional organizations, associations, and societies have been established, notably: The Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning, which is the oldest regional association of its kind in Asia. This association serves as an effective channel of communication and cooperation among the various universities in Southeast Asia. Every year there are general conferences and specialized seminars on selected topics in the field of university administration as well as on academic subjects. During recent years, there has been a tendency to encourage more lasting academic cooperation. This association has encouraged the establishment of regional learned societies, including the Southeast Asian Social Science Association and the Southeast Asian Mathematical Association. There is a growing consciousness of international education in our part of the globe.

I now turn briefly to international education in a changing world. To quote a world famous American educationalist, Dean James Kelly, "international education has now come from what may be termed educationally desirable to what is educationally mandatory."

International education has a relatively long history. Over recent years, it has undergone significant change with the time. Historically speaking, international education was a logical product of the common desire among educationalists in different parts of the world to learn from each other in the development of international relations. As a result of Western colonization of overseas territories in Asia, close ties, notably in economic, trade, and political fields, have been cultivated. Along with the expansion in trade relations, there emerged groups of educationalists and missionaries who were dedicated to the development of education in their colonies, and in the process, scholars from different cultures began to sow the seeds of international education.

In the development of international relations, American educationalists have played a crucial role. Since the discovery of America by Columbus, the New World has attracted large numbers of immigrants from nearly all parts of the world. The United States of America is basically a plural society with a multi-cultural population. By virtue of their history and character, Americans, and especially American educationalists, are internationally-minded people. Besides, American business interests are established on a world-wide basis, and the American dollar is an international currency. Americans are among the most widely-traveled citizens in the world and have contributed significantly to Hong Kong's tourism, economy, and trade. American scholars are readily available in many countries, and American professors and students teach and study in various parts of the world.

American influence on higher education overseas has been particularly strong in certain academic fields such as education, the social sciences, business administration, and applied sciences. American contributions are evident in developing countries, so much so that textbooks and reference materials written by American scholars are widely used in Asian countries. It is clear that the American impact on world education has been a very real and significant one.

The creation of the United Nations Organization at the end of the Second World War ushered in a new era in international education. A large number of new states have emerged. At the time of the San Francisco Conference the number of original members of the United Nations Organization was 51, and today its membership has more than doubled. Political independence has stimulated educational consciousness, and in turn it has advanced the frontiers of knowledge and has enriched national and international education.

The scope of international education has broadened over recent years owing to a number of factors. Firstly, internationalism has become a way of life. The United Nations Organization and specialized agencies have made great contributions to closer relations among nations and among the peoples of the world. Secondly, countries in the modern world have become more interdependent than ever before. This means that major world developments of whatever nature, wherever they may happen, are likely to produce varying effects on the rest of the world. Thirdly, the globe, in a manner of speaking, has become smaller with the advance of science and technology. For example, traveling between Hong Kong and San Francisco by sea used to take several weeks. Today with modern aviation, one can have breakfast in Hong Kong, lunch in Tokyo, and dinner in San Francisco, all within a matter of about 15 flying hours, which can be further reduced by one-half by supersonic Concorde services flying at a speed of one mile per three seconds. In other words, human mobility has never been so great, and has had an obvious effect on international life in general and on international education in particular. Fourthly, communication technology has made tremendous advances. Through live satellite networks, news of world events is transmitted within split seconds, and international repercussions become almost instantaneous. I am reminded of the story of Dr. Masoner and Dean Kelly in Korea last year watching the famous Pitt-

Penn State football game on television. Of course, you all remeber that the star player was Tony Dorsett. The result of the game was a foregone conclusion—Pitt won. The above factors combine to affect international life and have obvious bearings on international education. The impact need not be over-emphasized.

From the historical viewpoint, international education began with the study of the humanities, including language, literature, history, philosophy, and religion. The social sciences have assumed an important role in international education, mainly due to the emphasis placed on economic and social development after the Second World War. This role has been further strengthened by inter-governmental organizations and major foundations, which have spent vast amounts of money on the development of social sciences to meet the needs of economic and social progress in the developing countries in particular. Science and technology is another important area in which there have been historic achievements. In a nutshell, technological development has had a far-reaching impact on the world, and thus, on international education.

Lastly, may I say a few words on international cooperation in higher education. Mankind has learned the hard lessons of the last war, which not only destroyed lives and property but also broke down the international order. With memories of the war still fresh, nations began to recognize that in order to repair the damage done and to restore harmony to the world, they must work together. Political leaders and the peoples of different countries started to build, hand in hand, the foundations of a new world order, and one of the fundamental principles was to strengthen the international community of nations and peoples. In response to the political situation of the time, a host of international organizations, both private and public, has been created. Along with the numerous inter-governmental and private organizations, higher education has taken the lead in establishing the various channels of cooperation among scholars in different parts of the world. As I mentioned earlier, Southeast Asian universities, in keeping with the intensity of worldwide activities, have developed their own international academic programs. For instance, departments of international relations are common in many universities; and institutions or centers of international studies are likewise fashionable in academic circles. As a result, international studies are fully incorporated into the curricula not only in the social sciences, but also in the humanities, science, and technology. Amid these developments, international education has been integrated into academic programs. More and more universities have offered the subject as a field for teaching and research. Comparative studies have also been developed in many universities as part of international education.

International education in Western countries is largely based on data from developing countries. Likewise, international education in Asian countries is heavily dependent on Western methodology. Given our common interest in international education, it is obvious and essential that educationalists of the East and the West should seek full cooperation. Although international education may seem to be more advanced in Western countries, the nations of Asia have been equally important partners in its development. Therefore, Western and Asian scholars should share their experiences in international education.

On this basis, prospects for international education are more than positive. The promotion of world peace and progress depends, among other factors, on international education. Given its magnitude and complexity, international education needs to be strengthened by more closely coordinated efforts.

The Paul Masoner International Lecture Series provides a fitting occasion to reaffirm our dedication to the cause of international education. In this connection, may I describe to you our experience in the International Asian Studies Program, which may serve as a channel for cooperation between our universities.

The Chinese University, since its inception in 1963, has taken up as a mission not only the promotion, but also the enrichment of Chinese culture. Over the last 15 years or so, we have been making every effort to integrate teaching and research in the field of traditional and modern Chinese studies on an interdisciplinary basis. Last year we felt that the time was ripe for us to initiate a modest program whereby we could share our resources, facilities, and above all, our intellectual environment with foreign scholars–professors and students alike. The response was very encouraging. During the first year of its operation we had about 50 scholars and students from ten countries, including the United States of America. The Program caters to the needs of three types of scholars: undergraduate, postgraduate, and faculty members. They usually come for one academic year and study whatever they want on the basis of their own requirements and interests. Most of them take an intensive Chinese language course amounting to approximately 15 periods per week in small classes. In addition, they choose a number of other courses in Asian studies, including Japanese and Southeast Asian studies. The program not only emphasizes the academic side, but also the cultural aspects. We make it a point that all students, especially undergraduates, share rooms with our own Chinese University students, so that friendship and understanding can be cultivated throughout the academic year. Because there are also departments of Japanese, French, and German studies in our university, we try to arrange for students from these countries to share rooms with our students minoring in the respective national studies, so that they can practice their French, German, Japanese, and vice versa. The experience has been found to be of tremendous value.

We have been successful in persuading foreign scholars to learn at least one Chinese musical instrument, whether it is a flute or drum, and also to do a bit of Chinese painting and calligraphy. It is fascinating to see that after six months students and scholars from the United States, Japan and Norway, can converse with each other in Chinese. I mention this program as a possible channel of cooperation between Pitt and the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

In my conversations with Pitt faculty members during this visit, much interest has been generated in the possibility of organizing a program for Pitt faculty and students at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. We hope that some arrangements can be worked out when Dr. Masoner comes to Hong Kong in July.

In conclusion, may I once again express my warmest appreciation to the University of Pittsburgh and all the faculty members involved for their gracious invitation and warm hospitality. I shall leave Pittsburgh with a warm heart, and I shall treasure the happy memories of my visit for many years to come.