

## CHAPTER 3

### 3. THE CRISIS OF THE SCHOOL IN THE 20TH CENTURY: NORTH AMERICA

#### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries in America witnessed great political, social, and economic changes. The Industrial Revolution, the destruction of the plantation South, the abolition of slavery, the opening up of the West, the rise of organized labour, the women's rights movement, and the development of a new conception of childhood were the main factors causing the changes in American life and thought during the 19th and the early 20th centuries. The changes were so tremendous that the whole fabric of American life was being altered (Drake, 1955:165 - 187).

However, education and schooling had failed to keep up with these revolutionary changes. Although some reform movements were undertaken<sup>1)</sup> before Dewey, they did not enjoy any special success. Public education was still based upon the traditions of rural and small-town America and the notions of rugged individualism. It showed no relation to the emerging conditions of industrialization and urbanization. It was unaware or unconcerned about the tremendous intellectual advances made by the natural sciences and the new social sciences. *History by J. Dewey*

It is, above all else, John Dewey who criticized the traditional school and also presented the "new" school idea in a systematic way. Based on the "new" philosophy of America, that is, pragmatism, Dewey severely criticized the existing public school and developed his educational and school idea

---

1. There was, for example, the Oswego movement which tried to apply the principles of Pestalozzian methodology, to substitute concrete experiences with common objects for the memorization of textbook content. In addition, the kindergarten movement that was introduced into America gave new inspiration to the belief that self-activity is the basis of all learning. The Herbartian movement was also ready to lend a hand by assailing the prevalent organization of content and by criticizing the outworn methods of teaching that were in use. Then there was the work of Parker who wanted elementary education to be built around a core of common experiences, and who wanted the elementary schools to follow the general educational plan of Froebel (Power, 1970:593).

in a "brilliant" way. It was also in connection with Dewey that the term "the progressive school" was first used to sum up the trend in education which started with Rousseau and was followed through in the work of Pestalozzi, Froebel and, at the beginning of this century, Dewey himself. Perhaps he has had the single greatest influence on educational theory and practice in the 20th century. *M. Dawson*

In the end, however, Dewey's efforts at reforming the school also could not solve the problems of the school of his time. Various reactions soon followed his pragmatic educational and school theory.

This chapter will focus, therefore, on the debate over the problems of the school with which Dewey had struggled and on the reasons why he failed to meet the crisis of the school of his time. In addition, attention will also be given to the three reaction formations to the progressive school, namely the scientific reformational view of the school, the counter-cultural view in the early sixties, and the return-to-basics movement of the eighties.

### 3.2 THE STATE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AFTER THE TURN OF THE CENTURY IN AMERICA

The pattern of public schooling of this century has mostly been an extension of the educational ideals of the previous century. Thus, in the first place, the process of education and schooling of the child was seen as a preparation for the responsibilities and privileges of adult life in society (Dewey, 1968:54). The child, who was not regarded as a social member in full, was to be equipped with knowledge and skills regarded as necessary for the future adult life in society, while he missed the joy of learning, and the skills of coping with his present problems. The immature experience of the child was treated as something to be quickly passed over so that the child might quickly grow up and be an adult. The period of childhood was regarded merely as a probationary stage for adulthood (Dewey, 1968:55).

In the second place, the main purposes of the school during the nineteenth century were to teach patriotism and citizenship, to develop good moral character, and to teach the three "R's" (Pounds, 1968:201). The aims of education and schooling were always determined from without, namely, by adults. The traditional school, according to Dewey (1972:67), thus failed to "secure the active co-operation of the pupil in construction of the purposes involved in his studying".

In the third place, the child was seen merely as a passive recipient of predetermined knowledge. The child, that is, the educand was treated in the school simply as the immature being who had to be matured. The gap between the immature and the mature should be filled in with knowledge and skills from without. For this purpose, the child had to sit quietly, study the lessons silently, obey the teacher promptly and unquestioningly (Rugg & Shumaker, 1928:2 - 3). This gap could be filled only when he was ductile and docile (Dewey, 1971(a):8). In short, the child was treated as being passive (Dewey, 1971(b):32; Dewey, 1972:18).

In the fourth place, the teacher was the means through which the knowledge and skills in the textbooks could be transmitted. The most important task of the teacher was the presentation of the subject-matter. He was unconcerned about the psychological conditions of learning, in terms of the child's interest, ability and stage of development, and the sociological factor in terms of the relevance of the subject for the social life of the child and the community (Akinpelu, 1981:149). The teacher was the agent "through which knowledge and skills are communicated and rules of conduct enforced" (Dewey, 1972:18).

In the fifth place, the subject-matter of education consisted of bodies of information and of skills that had been worked out in the past (Dewey, 1972:17). It was based upon what adults needed to know and do and arranged in a series of organized, compartmentalized subjects. Since it "consisted of subject-matter that was selected and arranged on the basis of the judgment of adults as to what would be useful for the young sometime in the future, the material to be learned was settled upon outside the present life-ex-

perience of the learner" (Dewey, 1972:76). Consequently, it had to be imposed upon the child. Each day the children would learn a certain portion of this material, and this process would continue until their formal education was completed and they were ready to enter the adult world.

In the sixth place, the needs of the child, his creativity and individual differences among pupils were not carefully considered in the method of the teaching. Rather, the traditional education tended to ignore the importance of the child's impulse and desire as moving springs (Dewey, 1972:70). Thus, hidebound methodology, formalism, emphasis upon meaningless drill and memorization were prevalent in the classroom. Dewey (1971(b):31) describes the classroom of the traditional school as follows:

... with its rows of ugly desks placed in geometrical order, crowded together so that there shall be as little moving room as possible, desks almost all of the same size, with just space enough to hold books, pencils, and paper, and add a table, some chairs, the bare walls, and possibly a few pictures, we can construct the only educational activity that can possibly go on in such a place. It is all made 'for listening'.

Creativity or choice was out of order. There was little evidence that the findings of the new psychology were being applied or even understood by the teachers of that time. The child learned more from fear of the teacher who talked 'down' to him rather than with him (Akinpelu, 1981:149). As Rugg & Shumaker (1928:4) say, "... memorize, recite, pay attention" were the keynotes in the classroom during this century.

In the seventh place, it was still a period of rigid and severe discipline, that is, there was frequent recourse to whipping the child and punishing him by other physical means to keep him in line. "The democratic idea of teaching the child to think for himself had not permeated the school. Such ideas were quite prevalent socially in the country but not in the schools" (Pounds, 1968:201).

In the last place, the main task of the school was to transmit the bodies of information and of skills, which had been worked out in the past, to the new generation (Dewey, 1972:17). There existed, therefore, a broad gulf between the traditional school and the society. According to Dewey

(1971(c):235), the educational system during the 19th century was totally unrelated to life itself and thus had no validity.

This does not, however, imply that the new educational ideas from the European continent were not being accepted and developed at all in America during the 19th century. Some of the newer ideas of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart arrived on the American shores. Pestalozzianism, although it did not get very far into the school systems itself, was to influence the normal schools, and Herbart was to influence secondary education through improved teaching methods. But, actual school practice did not evolve immediately from the acceptance of these newer theories of education (Crow & Crow, 1966:19). The majority of teachers only dimly knew about the ideas of Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart. "It was not until after 1900 that there was a decided improvement in the teacher education programs in the various states and even then the changes in teaching methods were very slow to trickle down to the classroom of the ordinary teacher" (Pounds, 1968:202).

The general state of the public education after the turning of the century in America is nicely remarked by Dewey (1971(b):31) as follows:

... I was looking about the school supply stores in the city, trying to find desks and chairs which seemed thoroughly suitable from all points of view - artistic, hygienic, and educational - to the needs of the children. We had a great deal of difficulty in finding what we needed, and finally one dealer, more intelligent than the rest, made this remark: 'I am afraid we have not what you want. You want something at which the children may work; these are all for listening'.

And this, says John Dewey, "tells the story of the traditional education".

### 3.3 PRAGMATISM: THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE "NEW SCHOOL" OF JOHN DEWEY (1859 - 1952)

#### 3.3.1 Orientation

Since Dewey's educational theory and practice are so closely interrelated with pragmatic philosophy, it is impossible to understand his "new school" idea clearly without having any knowledge about pragmatism. In view of the intention of the present study, however, it is not necessary to give a long discussion of pragmatism itself. A brief discussion of the main points of pragmatism which affords significance to our primary concern, namely, to the crisis of the school, will be sufficient. In this sense, the meaning origin, representatives, a few terms, and especially the religious ground motif of pragmatism are briefly discussed in the following paragraphs.

### 3.3.2 WHAT IS PRAGMATISM?

Pragmatism was the most influential philosophy in America in the first quarter of this century and still has many adherents today. It has influenced not only education, but also politics, economics, law, psychology, art and religion, to name a few areas.

It is however, difficult to define pragmatism in a few words, because there exist as many divergences of pragmatism as there are pragmatistic thinkers (cf. Wiener, 1973:551 - 553). There is no one general definition of pragmatism that covers all the historical doctrines that have been given that name. In this sense, Papini (1913:75) said: "Pragmatism cannot be defined. Whoever gives a definition of pragmatism in a few words would be doing the most antipragmatic thing imaginable".

Pragmatism can probably be best understood when one sees it against the background of the great diversity of intellectual trends of the USA.

Being more a method of philosophizing than as a philosophical system or body of doctrines (James, 1943:51), it came to the fore in the 19th and 20th centuries in opposition to certain long-established traditional forms of philosophy. It is critical of supernaturalism, rationalism, authoritarianism, and eternally fixed norms of belief and values (Wiener, 1973:552). It wants to be a kind of everybody's-philosophy, a kind of 'middle-of-the-road'-philosophy in which all views of life can feel at home. It thus does not adhere to any particular philosophical system, and for this reason it could be favoured in the USA with its multicoloured mixture of man and life-views (Van der Walt, 1980(a):88).

### 3.3.3 The origin of pragmatism

Pragmatism, as has been indicated in the previous paragraph, came to the fore in the 19th and 20th centuries as a reaction against all kinds of absolutism. Historically, Heraclitus and Protagoras of Abdera in ancient Greek times rejected the concept of the existence of an absolute truth.

The Sophists of the fifth century B.C. denied the possibility of knowing ultimate reality. Quintilian, a Roman orator, emphasized action rather than deductive reasoning or meditation as the pathway to learning. Bacon foreshadowed the scientific cast of pragmatic Epistemology. Kant used the word "pragmatic" to distinguish between ethical and "pragmatic" rules. Comte put stress on the social demension in a view consistent with that of the pragmatists.

Kant's distinction between ethical and "pragmatic" rules was further formulated and developed by Charles Peirce in the 1870's, then William James revived it and reformulated it in 1898 primarily as a theory of truth. It was still further developed, expanded, and disseminated by F.C.S. Schiller and John Dewey.

Various modern factors also prepared the way for pragmatism, especially the growing use of the inductive-experimental method, Darwinian evolutionism, Newtonian physics and the new psychology, democracy and the important role which industrial organization began to play (Van Wyk, 1979:37).

### 3.3.4 Representatives of pragmatism

The three greatest contributors to American pragmatism are generally recognized to be Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, all of whom differ in their methods and conclusions. Pierce's pragmatism is influenced by physics and mathematics. James's philosophy is personal, psychological and religious. Dewey's pragmatism is influenced by social science and biology.

#### 3.3.4.1 Charles S. Peirce (1839 - 1914)

Peirce first gained recognition in philosophical circles through his association with the Metaphysical Club in Cambridge. During 1877 - 1878, through the encouragement of William James who was also a member of the club, Peirce published two essays, "The Fixation of Belief" and "How to

Make Our Ideas Clear", in the Popular Science Monthly. In these articles, Peirce first systematized the exposition of pragmatism and thus, the publication of these articles might be said to mark the official birth of pragmatism.

In How to Make Our Ideas Clear Peirce advocated testing the meaning of an idea by putting it to work in the objective world of action. It was the concept of practical effects which would determine what an idea meant. "Consider what effects that might conceivably have practical bearing you conceive the object of your conception to have. Then your conception of those effects is the whole of your conception of the object" (Peirce, 1977:323).

In a somewhat clearer account he wrote that "in order to ascertain the meaning of an intellectual conception one should consider what practical consequence might conceivably result by necessity from the truth of that conception; and the sum of these consequences will constitute the entire meaning of the conception" (cf. Neff, 1968:67). True knowledge of anything, for Peirce, depended upon verification of our ideas in actual experience. Peirce was the first man who formulated the pragmatic and experimental method of obtaining knowledge. In this way Peirce laid the foundation of the later Deweyan pragmatism (instrumentalism).

#### 3.3.4.2 William James (1842 - 1910)

While Peirce was largely ignored during his lifetime, James succeeded in bringing pragmatism to the public eye. Moreover, while Peirce sought meaning in general concepts and formulas of action, James sought meaning in individual experience and plans of action (Edwards, 1967:433). In opposition to Hegelianism and the mechanistic scientism of the 19th century (Clark, 1963:10), James viewed the truth of an idea in terms of that idea's "workability". Truth was, for James, not absolute and immutable. Rather, it was made in actual, real-life events. Truth was not always objective and verifiable, but was found in concrete individuality. Thus, for James, there was the "inexpugnable reality" of individual existence. In the life of an individual, experiences occur which have meaning and

truth to that individual but which cannot necessarily be verified objectively by someone else. This view of truth - verifiability or "work=ability" and inexpugnable reality - is what James called "radical empiricism". By "radical empiricism" James (1947:41 - 44) meant that truth is inseparable from human experience, and that his thought takes into account only that which can be experienced.

Thus, for James, the primary datum was human experience. There was no Truth, Reality, or Absolute, but as his study of experience revealed to him, the universe was open-ended, pluralistic, and in process. By the free will of man, the reality develops endlessly (Ozmon & Craver, 1976:81 - 82).

Here, in the philosophical ideas of Peirce and James (also of Dewey, cf. paragraph 3.3.6), one can easily notice some of the irrationalistic characteristics of pragmatism, namely, the idea of denying any fixed, unchangeable world-order and of a self-determining free human being who plays a determining role in a changing world (see paragraph 3.3.7).

#### 3.3.4.3 John Dewey (1859 - 1952)

As has been indicated in the previous paragraph, American pragmatism had been originated by Peirce. Then James took up the pragmatic philosophy and developed it further. Dewey, however, took a more rigorous, logical, and analytical approach to pragmatism and developed it even more systematically.

For the purpose of this chapter, more attention has to be given to Dewey's concept of pragmatism, and especially to the irrationalistic trends of pragmatism. This will be done in separate paragraphs (see paragraphs 3.3.6 & 3.3.7).

3.3.4.4 Ferdinand C.S. Schiller (1864 - 1937) and  
Georg Kerschensteiner (1854 - 1932)

The pragmatistic idea of truth was expounded especially by the British philosopher Schiller. Experienced reality was, for Schiller, the only truth. He emphasized the fact that that which is the most precious for man is what he needs. Therefore, reflection must be focused on man and his needs (Schiller, 1912:204 - 223). In Germany, it was especially Kerschensteiner who introduced the pragmatistic practice in educational theory and practice (cf. Kerschensteiner, 1913; also 1915).

3.3.5 The terms pragmatism, pragmaticism, instrumentalism,  
experimentalism, operationalism, progressivism, and  
reconstructionalism

The term "pragmatism" is derived from the Greek root pragma which means "act, deed, affair, work, or practical matter". It meant for the Romans "skilled in business, and especially experienced in matters of law", hence, a pragmaticus was "one skilled in the law, who furnished orators and advocates with the principles on which they based their speeches" (Wiener, 1973:554).

Already in 123 B.C., the Greek writer Polibius used the word in the idea "pragmatic history" by which he understood that his historical study has the aim of the investigation of facts from the past to derive from it a certain practice, useful lessons for conduct and activity for the future. During the 17th and 18th centuries French writers of history used the word for their "rational" history. Immanuel Kant (in the 18th century) introduced the word in his moral theory: history is written pragmatically when one can learn something of value for life from it (Van Wyk, 1979:36).

Pragmatism has been known by a variety of names, from "pragmaticism" to "instrumentalism", "experimentalism", and "operationalism" (cf. Hart, 1974:37 - 63). It has been also closely related to terms like "progressivism," and "reconstructionism", particularly, in the field of education. Peirce came to refer to his own viewpoints as "pragmaticism" and "experi=

mentalism" in order to avoid having his ideas confused with those of James. For Dewey, ideas were always instruments to be used in the solution of man's problems. The important thing, for Dewey, was whether the ideas operate or function in the real situation of life to bring about practical useful results. Dewey applied this argument to logic and ethics, and so formulated his "instrumental" theory of truth - the idea that all knowledge is personal and is made by each individual for himself for the purpose of adapting himself to new situations (Curtis & Boulwood, 1977:471). Ideas were important insofar as they became instrumental to the reconstruction or reorganization of experience and of the environment.<sup>2)</sup> For this reason, Dewey's pragmatism is often expressed by "instrumentalism", "operationalism" or "functionalism". Pragmatism is also often called "experimentalism" in the sense that it tries to use the scientific method of experiment to determine aspects of human life. Basic to pragmatic philosophy is the concept of experimentalism.<sup>3)</sup>

### 3.3.6 Dewey and pragmatism

In his earliest philosophical phase, Dewey worked largely in the tradition of the idealism of Plato, Kant, and Hegel. While at the Johns Hopkins University Dewey studied with C.S. Peirce, who taught logic, and with G.S. Hall, one of the first experimental psychologists in America. However, the greatest initial influence on Dewey was George Sylvester Morris, whose philosophical outlook had been shaped by Hegel and the idealism, at the time so much the vogue on the Continent and in England. He was also influenced by the work of William Torrey Harris, probably America's most important and popular spokesman for the Hegelian idealists. Dewey's thinking, however, moved gradually from metaphysical idealism to a more functional and empirically-oriented idealism, and he later abandoned the notion of a universal mind and a universal selfhood and

- 
2. Dewey's work at the Laboratory school at the University of Chicago not only demonstrated his concern for education, but his belief that ideas should be tested in the crucible of real-life experience.
  3. The fact that Dewey called his school at Chicago the "Laboratory School" illustrates his view that education is by its very nature experimental.

moved from the idealist's camp to the beginnings of a pragmatic philosophy which he was to characterize with the name of instrumentalism<sup>4)</sup> (Neff, 1968:69).

A number of factors influenced the formation and the development of Dewey's idea of pragmatism. There was Darwin's<sup>1)</sup> biological theory of evolution<sup>5)</sup> which dispensed with the role of God as the Creator of man, but rather portrayed man as evolving gradually, through natural developmental processes, from the simplest cell to the very complex structure that he is now. The same theory assumes that man through his intelligence will continue to devise ways and means of improving his capacity for survival. From here Dewey derived his belief in the infinite progress of man through education (Akinpelu, 1981:142).

Another influence on Dewey's pragmatism was the socio-political situation of America at the time Dewey lived. Dewey was, just like Peirce and James, a product of his time. Dewey's age was one of rapid technological advance, gigantic expansion in industry and commerce, of the influx of immigrant populations. It was at a time that a growing America faced too many practical problems to rest content with a lofty vision of reality as a whole. There were cities to be built, social and legal systems to be established, problems of education and human welfare to be solved. America was preparing to exploit untold resources under the earth and to erect on its surface those giants of steel and concrete which were to become the universal symbols of American enterprise and engineering skill. Thus, attention was focused on the here and the now. To many it appeared wisest to forget about the Eternal and the soul of man in order to devote the fullest attention to the temporal and its demands. The situation called for a type of mind more concerned with changing things than with interpreting their superhuman value. It was, in short, time for a new kind of practical philosophy (Smith, 1974:115 - 116). In this situation, it was to an extent natural for Dewey to be concerned with the growing, developing, dynamic nature of life, and not with its speculative ultimates.

- 
4. For Dewey, knowledge and thinking were instruments in the solution of man's problems. Thus, he preferred the word "instrumentalism" to "pragmatism" to designate his philosophy.
  5. It is of interest to note that Dewey was born in 1859, the same year that Darwin's Origin of Species was published. Darwin's thought was to play an important part in Dewey's philosophy.

He thus accepted James' notion of experience and rejected absolutes, or universals, or everything which is above human experience as mere products of the imagination. Like Peirce, he sought to clarify ideas in terms of their consequences in experience. From this basis, Dewey developed his philosophy which was thoroughly in accordance with the tenor of American life. In such a philosophy there was no room for a Hegelian cosmology.

### 3.3.7 Pragmatism as a form<sup>6)</sup> of irrationalistic philosophy of the 20th century

In order to be able to see some irrationalistic trends of pragmatism, one must ask the question: "What is meant by the term 'irrationalism'?" Although it is clear from the survey of the literature that the term "irrationalism" is an exceptionally imprecise term which is used and applied in a whole variety of meanings and implications (cf. Van der Walt, 1983(b):15 - 19), two things, among others, can be noticed as perhaps being typical characteristics of the irrationalism of this century.

In the first place, irrationalism means that the ratio (reason) is still being accepted, but that a part of the -ism or the absolutization of reason is removed. Irrationalists usually argue that reason should be confined only to a certain area, but they differ about the area. They all agree, however, that reason should play second string.

Rationalism has a faith that there are apriori ideas inherent in human understanding, either actual or potential, which, independent of all experience, enables man to come to know the order of reality. On the basis of this apriori knowledge man is able to order his life. Man as a rational-moral being finds his humanity in this power of reason (Zuidema, 1961: 137). In this sense, Descartes could say Cogito Ergo sum that means "I think, therefore I am". However, people do not believe any more today in the general, speculative views or in the unbiased, objective calcula=

---

6. Other forms of irrationalistic thinking about the school is left liberal theories (cf. chapter 4) and left radical theories of schooling (cf. chapter 5).

tions of the reason. Already Hegel, Dilthey, Troeltsch, Comte, Marx, Freud, Bergson and others have shown that there can be but little talk about the autonomous self-decision and independent observation of the reason. In the contemporary world, reason is attacked on all sides. People no longer believe in the ability of reason as such, also no longer in the rational order of reality or in the purposeful course of history (Klapwijk, 1971:33 - 34).

But this does not mean that irrationalism is equal to anti-rationalism. The reason may no longer be absolutized or may not dominate the scene as in the case of rationalism, but has still not been shown the door. Reason can no longer be valued as such but must be relativized. According to the irrationalist's view, reason (and science) does not have any intrinsic value, hence it has value only as far as it can serve for "some purpose". In Freudianism, for instance, reason is relativized and consequently destroyed for the benefit of the Id and complexes; in Marxism, reason is relativized and destroyed for the benefit of the class struggle and more generally on account of economic conditions (Wahl, 1973:637). In New Marxism, reason is relativized and destroyed to change the late bourgeois, late capitalist and post-Christian society, and to bring on the socialist society which will hopefully solve all or most of man's problems (Van der Walt, 1983(d):273). Reason is not important an sich any more. Thus, for the irrationalist, reason has to become a little less important, but reason has not been banned. It is just no longer all-important. Rationalism might be criticized, but reason remains (Vollenhoven, 1956:40).

Another characteristic of irrationalism is its view of man: the (irrational) free man in the contingent situation.

There exists still, continually and all the way through, a full confidence in the free autonomy of man, but this free and autonomous man is, in fact, an irrational, understandable being. He is a person who does not act in accordance with general rational rules, but takes important decisions only in a concrete situation. Moreover, this irrationally acting man does not live in a rational, understandable world. The situation in which he finds himself is chaotic, or rather vague, without meaning.

It is the task of man to give meaning to it by his acts (Van der Walt, 1983(b):18).

The central problem of irrationalism is also different from that of rationalism: freedom is no longer reasonable and reality is no longer rationally explicable. The point at issue is now man who operates or creates or decides freely and according to circumstances in an unruly and contingent situation (Van der Walt, 1983(b):18).

The gap between man and situation is impossible to bridge. The situation is as it is. But man is not unchangeable: he can choose to intervene in a situation. In this way he can give meaning to himself and also to the world which has no meaning in itself. The fundamental theme of irrationalism is thus: irrational free man in the contingent situation (Klapwijk, 1971:31).

In pragmatism, one can easily find the above-mentioned irrationalistic characteristics. Reason plays a very important role in Dewey's pragmatism. Words like "logical inquiry", "problem solving", "scientific method", "reflective thinking", all of which Dewey favoured, clearly show how Dewey put great emphasis on the role of reason and science (cf. Dewey, 1933: 17 - 34). When Dewey talks about the question of habits and habit-forming in his Democracy and Education, it becomes clear that man is to him a rational being (Schoeman, 1978:33; cf. Dewey, 1968:49).

However, to Dewey, reason and science are not absolutized as such as in the case of Cartesian rationalism. This is clear from his (Dewey, 1957: 97) criticism of rationalism: "In like fashion, historic rationalism has often tended to use Reason as an agency of justification and apologetics. It has taught that the defects and evils of actual experience disappear in the 'rational whole' of things ... This course results in intellectual irresponsibility and neglect: - irresponsibility because rationalism assumes that the concepts of reason are so self-sufficient and so far above experience that they need and can secure no confirmation in experience".

Reason, for Dewey, is always experimental intelligence, conceived after the pattern of science, and used in the creation of the social arts. Thus, it has something to do. Science, for Dewey, did not mean the traditional search for knowledge for its own sake, but rather a body of ideas and hypotheses to be used for controlling the contingent environment. Instrumentalism actually means the doctrine that mind or intelligence exists as a problem-solving power and that this function is more important than pursuing the ideal of a purely theoretical and comprehensive knowledge of all things (Smith, 1974:134). In this way, Dewey also rejected Kant's emphasis upon reason as an arbiter of experience. "Reason, as a Kantian faculty that introduces generality and regularity into experience, strikes us more and more as superfluous - the unnecessary creation of men addicted to traditional formalism and to elaborate terminology" (Dewey, 1957:95).

In pragmatism another doctrine of science comes to the fore, different from which one finds in rationalism. It is a doctrine of science in which the forming of scientific concepts is most intimately connected with the scientific experiment, and scientific knowledge with scientific investigation, as in the laboratory. Thus, scientific results, for Dewey, can only be temporary, and the strength of these results cannot rise higher than their probability. Further, pragmatism demands that scientific inquiry and its results guide the practical life of the individual and society (Zuidema, 1961:140).

In pragmatism, one can also discern the irrationalistic view of man. The essence of pragmatism actually lies in its view that man is a free, undetermined and self-determined being who finds himself in a contingent situation. Man, says Dewey (1972:43), is always "interacting" with his environment. This includes his "physical" and "social" environment. In other words, man's situation is the world in which he lives and from which he cannot isolate himself. For the pragmatist, this situation is not fixed or unchangeable, but contingent. Reality, from the pragmatic point of view, is not a static, complete system, but a process of unending change and transformation. The world, said Dewey (1958:21), is a "scene of risk; it is uncertain, unstable, uncannily unstable". Childs (1956:18 - 19) describes the change aspect as follows: "In this universe

kontingensi

marked by process and novel emergents, contingency and uncertainty are ultimate traits, and an adequate philosophy of life and education must take account of the experimental character of human experience in a world in which change is real, not illusory".

The contingency of man's environment means that man in principle is under attack and unsafe in it. Man must struggle for his existence and future, since he is constantly in conflict with his surroundings. *dan lawannya*

However, human reaction to his environment, according to pragmatists, has a quality all of its own which is found only in man. The essence of man, for pragmatists, is his power to be free. This power of freedom includes the ability to arise above his surrounding world and to bend it to his will. This means that man is not an automaton, determined by the power of his environment, but has control over himself and possesses a certain principle of direction and self-determination by which he is able to create order in his contingent situation, to cultivate, adapt, control and master it. Thus, for pragmatists, man in principle is the free and autonomous lord of his environment and even of the future of himself and his milieu. Only thus can he fulfil his human calling. Everywhere and always man must be master and captain of his own destiny (Zuidema, 1961:134 - 135). The self-determining, free man in his contingent situation is the autonomous law-giver, the creator of all norms and principles which are valid for himself (Schoeman, 1978(a):22).

It is obvious enough from the above discussion that there exists in pragmatism a full confidence in the autonomy of man, but this free and autonomous man also acts in the concrete situation. This means that human freedom is also irrational. It is precisely pragmatism which claims that human freedom cannot function without contingency (Zuidema, 1961: 154). In this way pragmatism reveals the ground theme of irrationalism, namely, the characteristic of the "irrational free man in the contingent situation".

### 3.3.8 The religious ground motif of pragmatism

Before proceeding to the discussion of Dewey's criticism and idea of the school, there must be given some attention to another matter, namely, to the religious ground motif of irrationalism and, especially, to that of pragmatism. This is of importance for the correct understanding of irrationalism and therefore also of pragmatism. This will also disclose clearly on what religious ground motif Dewey's school idea rests and functions.

Although it is somewhat of an oversimplification of the real facts to state that modern philosophy since the pioneering work of the 17th century rationalist Descartes has been dominated by the apostatic, humanistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom, hence by determinism and indeterminism, it is certainly true that nearly all of the modern thinkers indeed are entangled in the dualistic tension of this religious ground motif. Up to the period of late rationalism, toward the end of the 19th century, it always seemed as if nature / the scientific ideal prevailed, and this was taken as an infringement on the personal, individual freedom of the persons involved. Reaction came, as could be expected, in the 20th century, from the freedom/personality ideal in the form of irrationalism, and this led to an intensification of the confrontation between the two elements of this dualistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom. In this new condition modern non-Christian/ secular philosophy is constantly being thrown to and fro between the interests of man on the one hand, and the interests of reason and the scientific ideal on the other hand (Van der Walt, 1983(d):273 - 274).

Closely related to the dualistic ground motif of nature and freedom is the humanistic tension between determinism and indeterminism. Determinism, Henning (1982(a):55) explains, means the absolutization of the law-side of the created reality with a resultant over-emphasis of determinism to the detriment of the universal. Indeterminism, on the other hand, forms the basis of the absolutization of the freedom of the individual personality and means as such a subjectivistic hypostitizing of the factual subject side of the created reality with an accompanying over-exertion of the individual. Determinism, he continues, as embodied in ratio=

nalism, is usually under the control of the nature extreme of the humanistic ground motif of nature and freedom and is identified with the humanistic (nature-) science-ideal. When, however, the science-ideal is taken seriously and reality is actually wholly determined by science in the fixed model of cause and effect, then there is no room left for man's freedom. The personality ideal has indeed called to the fore the science-ideal, but now the science-ideal works against its maker. Indeterminism, that is to say, the reaction which comes from the irrationalistic extreme against the mechanical determinism of the science-ideal, is the result of the primacy which is granted to the freedom extreme of the humanistic ground motif. In this freedom motif scope is allowed only for the so-called autonomous human personality, with an accompanying negation of each form of authority-binding and of any law which is not formulated and given by man himself, that is to say, by his reason (Henning, 1982(a):56 - 57).

In the case of irrationalism one has thus, in an overwhelming measure, to deal with the tendency towards indeterminism which is characterized by a (theoretical) dissolving of the law-side into the factual side of reality (Henning, 1982(a):57). According to the judgment of Dooyeweerd (1969, I:28) it can be valid as a general view that irrationalism also absolutizes the factual subject side of time. The irrationalist does not tamper with the conception of the "laws" as a product of thought or reason but falls into the opposite extreme of seeing in this "theoretical order" merely a pragmatic falsification of true reality. The latter, in its creative subjective individuality, is not bound to universally valid laws and rejects all "concepts of thought". In this way the absolutization of the laws in the case of rationalistic tendencies is replaced by the absolutization of the subjective individuality in the case of the irrationalistic trends of the humanistic immanence-philosophy (Dooyeweerd, 1969, I:110 - 111). In this way irrationalism is controlled by an irrationalistic turn in the freedom extreme of the humanistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom. With this theorem a full circle is made: irrationalism (including pragmatism) still wants to grant a place to reason but does not allow it to have the dominant role any more. Reason must in one way or the other be at the service of the free person of man in actual, concrete reality.

In the following paragraph (3.4), it will be shown how Dewey criticized the traditional school and developed his own idea of the school on the basis of pragmatism, and thus of the humanistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom.

### 3.4 DEWEY'S CRITICISM AND IDEA OF THE SCHOOL

#### 3.4.1 The school and social progress

In primitive societies, learning was carried on by the active participation of the learner as he imitated adult activities or was shown how to make tools, engage in the hunt, and fight in the wars. It was little differentiated from the daily life of the child. One finds very little formal teaching and training. There were no special devices, material, or institutions for teaching save in connection with initiation ceremonies by which the youth were inducted into full social membership (Dewey, 1968: 7; see also paragraph 2.2.1).

But as civilization advanced, learning by direct sharing in the pursuits of grown-ups became increasingly difficult. Much of what adults did was so remote in space and in meaning that playful imitation became less and less adequate to reproduce its spirit.

The school, thus, came into existence through man-in-society to meet a certain need, namely, the intentional teaching of specialized contents of knowledge regarded as necessary to the following generation. Without this formal education, it now became impossible to transmit all the resources and achievements of a complex society (see paragraph 2.2.1).

Here, however, certain conspicuous dangers are attendant upon the transition from informal to formal education. Sharing in actual pursuit, whether directly or vicariously in play, is at least personal and vital. Formal instruction, on the contrary, easily becomes remote and abstract (Dewey, 1968:8). This was exactly one of the serious problems or so-called crises Dewey had noticed in the school of his time.

During the lifetime of Dewey, American society was changing rapidly.  
The most important of these changes was the industrial one, the result  
of which had been giant production centres, huge marketing facilities,  
and fast means of communication between these centres. As a result, the  
entire way of American life had changed, physically, spiritually, and  
morally. Not too far back in years, says Dewey (1971(b):9 - 10), the  
home and the neighbourhood were the centres in which were carried on many  
of the activities now exclusively done in the factories. The problem  
is now how the schools can substitute the values attained from direct  
participation in the physical activities of daily life. Dewey (1968:  
9) puts this as the problem of "keeping a proper balance between the  
informal and formal, the incidental and the intentional modes of educa=  
tion".

To meet this problem, the traditional schools tried to introduce such sub=  
jects as manual training, shopwork, and housekeeping arts. Dewey (1971(b):  
13 - 14), however, could not be satisfied with the tendencies of the  
schools of his time. Because the existing schools were, in Dewey's mind,  
so weak in realizing the real importance or meaning of the subjects that  
the work was often done in a half-hearted, confused, and unrelated way.

This has not been done 'on purpose', with a  
full consciousness that the school must now  
supply that factor of training formerly taken  
care of in the home, but rather by instinct,  
by experimenting and finding that such work  
takes a vital hold of pupils and gives them  
something which was not to be got in any ot=  
her way ... the reasons assigned to justify  
it are painfully inadequate or sometimes  
even positively wrong (Dewey, 1971(b):13).

Dewey insisted that the subjects (like cooking, sewing, and shopwork,  
etc.) had to be introduced into the schools as types of the process by  
which society keeps itself going, as agencies for bringing home to the  
child some of the primal necessities of community life, and as ways in  
which these needs have been met by the growing insight and ingenuity of  
men.

*Shal*  
To do this meant to make the school a "miniature community, an embryonic  
society" which is Dewey's ideal type of school. Such a setting provides

a realm in which children learn to act together, understand each other, develop a common mission, and in which each child learns "to use his own powers for social ends" (Dewey, 1971(b):29; Dewey, 1974:430).

### 3.4.2 The school and the life of the child

The traditional school, according to Dewey's criticism, has always thought of the child as a listener and not as a worker or doer. Thus, the desks in the classroom were arranged in formal rows, all of one size, and crowded together. Space for constructive and creative activity was almost totally lacking. The important factor here was the passivity of the child. This also explains the sameness of the methods and the subject matter in the existing school. In this traditional school, learning consisted of the tedious memorization of data without a meaning being immediately clear to the child. All was keyed to a listening child. Therefore, the compelling force was outside the child, originating with the teacher and with books. This meant that the school life of the child was one thing and the actual life of the child was another. For this reason, the traditional school education had no real meaning for the actual life of the child (see paragraph 3.2).

Dewey's educational and school ideas were grounded in his conviction that there should be a definite integration of activities within the school with the activities going on in the larger community beyond the school walls (Childs, 1964:9). Thus, the ideal school, for Dewey, is the enlargement or the extension of the ideal home (Dewey, 1971(b):35). Dewey objected strenuously to the divorce of the school from the life of the child. For Dewey, ideas and experiences which were not woven into the fabric of growing experience and knowledge but remain isolated were a waste of precious natural resources.

"From the standpoint of the child," says Dewey (1917(b):75), "the great waste in the school comes from his inability to utilize the experiences he gets outside the school in any complete and free way within the school itself; while, on the other hand, he is unable to apply in daily life what he is learning at school".

To bridge this chasm between school and the life of the child, Dewey first urged that the school be made into "a miniature community, an embryonic society" which simplified but resembled the social life of the community at large (cf. paragraph 3.4.1). Then, he also advocated a method of teaching which utilized the impulses of the child, namely, the social impulse, the constructive impulse, the impulse for investigation, and the impulse to express oneself in art (Dewey, 1971(b):43 - 44). Dewey also contended that if we related school to the life of the child then all studies would be correlated because all studies arise from aspects of the one earth and the one life lived upon it. "We do not have a series of stratified earths, one of which is mathematical, another physical, another historical, and so on" (Dewey, 1971(b):91).

In this way, the school should be a place where the pupils can work and experience life and, at the same time, gather information and acquire self-discipline. It is the responsibility of the school to close the gap between education and society. The school must adapt itself to social change. It is futile to educate children for a society which no longer exists (Garforth, 1966:24).

### 3.4.3 The school as a place for reconstruction of experience

Dewey's criticisms of the existing school and his ideas of the school which were discussed in previous paragraphs (3.4.1 & 3.4.2) derive basically from his views of growth, experience, and education.

Dewey (cf. 1968:41) considers education as a process of growth, and defines growth as a cumulative movement of action toward a later result. An essential condition of growth is immaturity. This means that a person can develop only in some area in which he is still underdeveloped. But this condition of immaturity is more than just an absence or lack of something which may exist at a later time. It is a positive force - an ability to develop, a power to grow.

Dewey criticized the existing schools because they usually regarded the immaturity of the child as a mere lack, and growth a process of filling

the gap between immaturity and maturity. Accordingly, they considered childhood not for itself but as something to be quickly passed over so that he might quickly grow up as a mature person. In other words, the traditional school education ignored the intrinsic worth of the child and only thought in terms of what he was not and would not be until he was an adult (Dewey, 1968:42; see also paragraph 3.2).

Immaturity of the child, according to Dewey (1968:42 - 46), has two main characteristics, namely, dependence and plasticity. Dependence is accompanied by growth in ability and is thus something positive and constructive. It indicates a power rather than a weakness. Plasticity is the power to modify actions. It is the ability to learn from experience, to take from one experience something that will help to cope with future experiences. It is the power to develop what Dewey (1968:44) calls "dispositions". Thus, growth does not mean "adjustment" in the sense that it implies "conformity to the environment".

Experience, according to Dewey (cf. 1968:139 - 140), consists of two aspects, that is to say, the active and passive phases. The active phase stresses doing, "trying", "exploring", or "experimenting". The passive phase involves "undergoing". When one experiences something, he does something with it, and then he undergoes the consequences. There is an action and a reaction. How these two aspects link up measures the value of the experience. Thus to "learn from experience" means to make a backward and forward connection between one's actions and the consequences of them. Doing becomes trying, or an experiment with the world to find out all about it. Undergoing becomes instruction, or a discovery of the connection of things. Dewey criticized the traditional schools that they too frequently ignored this point. He said that pupils in the traditional schools were looked upon as spectators passively acquiring knowledge without having to undergo any experiences (Dewey, 1968:140).

However, not all growth or experiences are desirable or are considered to be educative. Truly educative growth or experiences are characterized by the two principles of "continuity" and "interaction". In Dewey's words, "the principle of continuity of experience means that every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and mo=

difies in some way the quality of those which come after" (Dewey, 1972: 35). If the experience a child has reinforces his initiative and gives him enough power and desire to go forward, then it is a good and desirable experience. Dewey's second principle is summarized by the word "interaction". By this is meant that there are two elements in experience: objective conditions and internal conditions. Between them, there is an interplay or the creating of a situation (Dewey, 1972:42). Both the outer objective factors and the inner subjective factors are of equal importance in the learning process. The inner and outer factors must interact for learning to occur.

*Def*  
Based on this concept of experience, Dewey (1968:76) defines education itself as the process of the reconstruction or reorganization of experience which would give it more value by means of the individual's effective or scientific experiences in solving his problems. In My Pedagogic Creed he defines it more briefly as "a continuing reconstruction of experience" (Dewey, 1974:434).<sup>7)</sup>

#### 3.4.4 The school and operation-method, logical inquiry, and scientific method of problem solving

All meaningful experiences, according to Dewey (1968:145), involve a degree of reflection, some more and some less. In the method of trial and error, the child keeps trying different ways of doing something until he hits upon one that works and then adopts that way for subsequent use. This method involves a minimum of reflection. In this method, the child perceives a connection between certain actions and certain consequences, but he does not see how and why they are connected. When the child carries thought or reflection further, he analyses more carefully to determine cause and effect relations or what binds activity and consequence together. By deepening his insight, the child makes foresight more accurate and comprehensive.

---

7. The same idea is differently expressed in his Reconstruction in Philosophy and in Experience and Education: "Getting from the present the degree and kind of growth there is in it is education" (Dewey, 1957: 184 - 5).

By uncovering the detailed connections between his activities and their consequences, by having a reflective experience, the child is engaged in thinking. Thinking is the intentional effort to discover specific connections between one's actions and the consequences that result, so that the two become continuous. In other words, thinking is an explicit rendering of the intelligent aspect of one's experience. It is a consideration of the connection between an occurrence and something which is not yet but may well be. Since the situation in which thinking occurs is contingent, its outcome is uncertain or problematic. Thus, thinking is a process of logical inquiry or investigation, and it is this seeking or looking into things which is significant (Dewey, 1968:148).

In the process of logical inquiry, one formulates a tentative solution or hypothesis. To perfect this hypothesis, he must carefully analyse existing conditions and the implications of the hypothesis. This process is called reasoning. Then the theory or ideas, the suggested solution, has to be tested by putting it into action. If it results in certain consequences, it is accepted as valid. If it fails, then it must be modified and other trials made. Thinking involves all these steps: the sense of a problem, the observation of conditions, the development of an appropriate conclusion, and the experimental testing. Although all thinking results in knowledge, the knowledge gained is less significant than its use in thinking. Since one lives in an ever-changing world, his prime task is to develop prospective thinking or foresight, so that he can properly deal with the future (Dewey, 1968:151; cf. Dewey, 1957:145; Park, 1960:32 - 33).

School, according to Dewey (1968:152 - 163), should be the place where the child's capacities/rational abilities for the operation method, logical inquiry, and scientific method of problem solving can be effectively fostered and developed in various ways. By doing so, the experience of the child can be constantly reshaped, reconstructed. Ideas or knowledge which are acquired apart from use in the solution of a problem can not be freely utilized upon any future occasion (Dewey, 1933:55 - 68). The experience of the child in the school should not be haphazard or mis-educative, but should be guided towards expanding possibilities of new experience. A teacher needs to recognize the conditions by which intellectual training of individuals is enhanced or thwarted. For this, formal

instruction in the school should follow the following pattern: in the first place, firsthand contact with the existential, out of which dispositions, interests and problems grow; in the second place, inquiry into the meaning, relationships and significance of the existential objects under consideration; in the third place, the reconstruction of the existential (Park, 1960:38). In this way, schooling can be a specialized form of experience whose aim is to guide the process in directions more profitable than if it were left to itself.

#### 3.4.5 The school as a social institution and its connection with both society and children

The school, as has been indicated in the previous paragraph, is a specialized social institution which guides the growing, reconstructing, and reconstituting experiences of the child. The concept of education as reconstruction of experience is social as well as individual. It is more than just aiding the young to catch up with adult society. If it is to be education or schooling toward progress, then the experience of the immature must be shaped to produce better habits rather than just to reproduce existing habits. In other words, if the school is to realize its full potential as a constructive social agency, it must be considered as more than a means of developing the young. Its role in developing the future society of which the young will be adult members must be recognized (Dewey, 1968:78 - 79). A question here, then, arises as to how intense the guidance of the school should be and to what extent it should become the controlling factor in the experience of the child. How can the school as a social institution guide the continual reconstruction of experience of the individual child for the future society without depriving him of meaningful experiences?

On this point, Dewey (1968:274) tries to show that experience itself primarily consists of the active relations existing between a human being and his natural and social surroundings. The distinctions of individuality (or subjectivity) and the social environment (or objectivity) come out of experience. He views individual and society, or subject and object in a transactional relationship. They are interrelated, and the one can not prosper without the other.

The pertinent elements in a democratic society, according to Dewey (1968: 86 - 87), are, first, the conscious sharing of numerous and varied common interests as a factor in social control, and, secondly, the free inter=  
action between social groups and the continuous readjustment of social  
habits to meet the changing relationships. In this democratic society, as the number of those who participate in an activity increases, there is an increasing need to refer one's own action to others and to take into account how the action of others gives direction to his own. This means that an individual has to respond to more stimuli and, consequently,  
must learn to vary his actions. In this way, individuality and sociality  
are interdependent and interrelated. In Dewey's mind there could be no true individuality without humane, democratic, and educative social conditions.

For this reason, Dewey (1972:56) insisted that the school should be a democratic institution and a living one, so that the school can be an institution where both the individual and the social capabilities of children can be nurtured. The school, through democratic education, would enhance the interplay of individuality and sociality, the one supporting and enlarging the other. "The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind" (Dewey, 1968:97).

#### 3.4.6 The school as a special environment

Even though the reconstruction of experience (education) can take place in practically any social institution, the school has a special function which distinguishes it from other social institutions in serving the educative and teaching process. Dewey (1968:19 - 22) describes the school as having four major functions: in the first place, to provide a simplified environment; in the second place, to provide a purified medium of action; in the third place, to balance the various elements in the social environment; and in the fourth place, to coordinate within the disposition of each individual the diverse influences of the various social environments into which he enters.

## *Jurkies van Skool*

Since civilization is too complex to be assimilated whole, it must be broken down into assimilable, progressively-graded segments. The school provides here a simplified environment appropriate to the learner's maturity and readiness. 2) The school also eliminates the unworthy or pernicious features in the social environment and emphasizes those parts of the cultural heritage that have the greatest social value. Further, the school strives to balance the various elements in the social environment so that each individual has the chance to be liberated from the limitations of the social group in which he was born and has the opportunity of coming into contact with a broader environment. The fourth function of the school, that is, the "coordinating function" is related to the first three functions. This function of the school actually reflects Dewey's concern for the pluralistic nature of American social structure and the need of each individual citizen to understand the various viewpoints of other ethnic, economic, and religious associations (Schultz, 1971:326).

The above-mentioned four functions of the school are certainly, for Dewey, normative functions. Dewey was well aware that the traditional schools of his time were not such institutions. Therefore, the four major functions of the school which Dewey describes are actually a normative statement. He argues that the school should be such an institution. The school should be, for Dewey, a simplified, purified, balanced, and coordinating special environment in which children encounter and solve problems of life that add to their educative growth or experience.

It is obvious from the preceding discussions that Deweyan pragmatic educational and school theory reveals the typical characteristics of an irrationalistic trend of the 20th century. There is on the one hand the acknowledgment that man has rational abilities or capacities at his disposal (see paragraph 3.4.3) and that science can accurately account for the experiences in the past so that the school can be a special environment (see paragraph 3.4.5). Reason and science are not ignored in Dewey's school, but must play second fiddle, which is a typically irrationalistic thesis. Reason is namely the way in which the child reorganizes and reconstructs his experiences for the sake of success, utility, and use-

fulness in the present situation. Science and the scientific method are also no longer, rationalistically, important for their own sake but exist to solve the problems which the child encounters. Education, for Dewey, is not unfolding/development of the inherited possibilities of the child/educand, but is the reconstruction of experience. Experience belongs also to the person, a person who is educated by the on-going reconstruction of his experiences.

#### 3.4.7 Dewey's experimental school

Dewey's experimental school, which was also known as the Dewey School, the University Elementary School, or the Laboratory School, was founded in 1896 with 16 children and 2 teachers. When it closed, it had 140 pupils, aged from four to fourteen, a full-time staff of 23 and 10 part-time assistants. Dewey himself was the director of the school, responsible for its general supervision; in addition there was a supervisor of instruction, Ella Flagg Young, from the Department of Education, and a principal, Mrs. Dewey, whose duties lay with parents, visitors and graduate students; there were also directors for the main branches of study - history, languages, and science (Garforth, 1966:60).

Dewey held the conviction that unless our ideas stand the test of workability, they are no more than so many vain phantoms. Philosophy, in order to grasp the real meaning for life, should also be tested in concrete situations, and the educational theory and practice were, for Dewey, such a testing ground for philosophical ideas. Such, among other things, was the reasoning which brought the Dewey School into being. The name "experimental" or "laboratory" school shows that Dewey regarded the school as the best testing place for his ideas about education, the curriculum, child development and levels of interest. Dewey (1971(b):96 - 97) himself made it clear that his experimental school was not intended to be a normal school for the training of teachers, nor a model school offering specific answers for the immediate problems of the public schools. Its task was, rather, to influence practice through creating a more firmly grounded theory and demonstrating its applicability in action.

The Dewey School attracted much attention. Many visitors came to see and were often horrified by what seemed to them to be a complete break with the traditional school. The Chicago newspapers reflected the hostility of such visitors and objected violently to what was going on in the school (Greene, 1966:77). However, for Dewey, it was precisely the radically new school environment which he considered worthwhile. It was from this experimental school that Dewey led an educational revolution. The essential elements of this revolution have been described, praised, and criticized in various ways. Basically, Dewey wanted to turn the schools back to a closer relationship with the life of the child (Power, 1970:592).

Dewey's Laboratory School was the forerunner of many other such schools. In Europe blossomed such experimental agencies as the German countryhome schools of Herman Lietz, the French École des Roches of Edmond Demolins, and the Belgian progressive schools founded by Ovide Decroly. In the United States appeared the Francis W. Parker School of Chicago, the Meriam School at the University of Missouri, the Menomonie School, Wisconsin; the Lincoln School and the Speyer School at Columbia University; the Fairhope (Alabama) School. These were just a few of the great number of experimental schools. The Progressive Education Association in the United States and the New Education Fellowship in Europe were organized to further the cause of this new type of socializing school (Wilds & Lottich, 1970:434).

### 3.5 DEWEY AND PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

The Progressive Education Association, organized in 1918, was an especially active agency in promoting and spreading the ideas of John Dewey. Dewey himself was regarded by many educators as a progressive and was, to some extent, associated with the progressive education movement. However, in later years, Dewey became deeply disturbed by the progressives with their oversimplifications or exaggerations which he condemned (Dworkin, 1964:113).

Even though Dewey himself recognized that the progressive educational movement originated from discontent with the practices of the traditional school, he thought that it was a great mistake to deny a positive and con=

structive education. Dewey criticized the fact that the progressives used education as a form of rejection rather than using it for the constructive development of philosophy (Dewey, 1972:20). Thus, he became a critic rather than an interpreter of progressive education.

It is difficult, moreover, to generalize about the characteristics of progressive education, since there has been a wide range of disagreement among the progressives. One tendency of progressive education has been romantic emphasis upon the needs and interests of the child. Of the leading progressives of the twenties, Kilpatrick rejected the teaching of each subject matter separately. In his "project method" the purpose and the planning by the students themselves are very important (Cremin, 1964:218). However, as a dissenter from Kilpatrick's Child-Centered School, Boyd Henry Bode, an influential progressive, emphasized the cultivation of the intellectual aspect of the child (Cremin, 1964:223).

In the early days of progressive education, the movement known as the Child-Centered School focused its emphasis on individuality, emotion, mental health, and personality development rather than the teaching of subject matter. Later, as a reaction to the concept of the Child-Centered School, progressive education placed emphasis upon society rather than the individual (Lee, 1957:148 - 150). In spite of the varying degree of emphasis in the progressive movement, a common factor is found in stress on the individual method rather than the mass, rigid, mechanical, determined and standardized approach to education (Wilds, 1958:597 - 598).

According to Dewey, (1972:17) the history of educational theory was divided into two: one was progressive education, which stressed development from within; and the other was known as traditional education, which stressed formation from without. If we emphasize development from within, we are apt to ignore instruction as an environment and pay less attention to the organization of the textbooks. Without organized subject matter for study, any form of direction and guidance by adults, and acquaintance with the past, the new education cannot solve any of the problems of the actual and practical conduct of progressive schools.

Of course, it is a merit for progressive education to emphasize the natural aspect of the child, his spontaneity, and individual interest. Education is not, however, an activity in itself. The denial of control and discipline is a denial of education, since human growth is only possible through the continuous and systematic accumulation of experience. Dewey accordingly advocated the principle of balance between progressive and traditional education. Thus, his philosophy is not "Either-Ors" but "intermediate possibilities" (Dewey, 1972:17). He was critical about the opposite extreme of progressive education.

Dewey also warned against the aimlessness and permissiveness of the Child-Centered Education. Education is not merely a trial-and-error method of doing without systematic thinking (Dewey, 1972:28).

Even though Dewey himself regarded philosophy as a general theory of education, the realization of a just society which maintains balance between freedom and social control on democracy was a starting point of his philosophy. According to him, education is the only indispensable means to achieve a society of welfare based on democracy. However, many of Dewey's followers over-emphasize the means rather than the end in Dewey's philosophy.

Irwin Edman has said that it was an accident that Dewey was well known as an educational philosopher rather than a general philosopher. Social philosophy, including ethics and political thought, was his deep concern throughout his writings (Dworkin, 1964:2). Thus, he was critical of the excessive emphasis upon individual freedom in the Child-Centered School in progressivism. To him, the educated individual means the socially-oriented individual, and society is also an association of individuals.

Dewey never approved those progressives who eliminated and minimized subject matter in the name of life adjustment or individual freedom of the child. While the expansion of freedom for children in the classroom may be needed, the elimination of subject matter is against the positive and constructive attitude of pragmatism. Dewey was dissatisfied with the negative attitude of the progressives in his day (Dewey, 1972:20 - 23).

Thus, even though Dewey regarded himself as a progressive in a broad sense, he was critical about the misdirected practices of education by the progressives among his followers.

### 3.6 CRITICAL COMMENT ON THE VIEWS OF THE DEWEYAN PRAGMATIC SCHOOL

3.6.1 In the first place, pragmatism holds a non-Christian view on the origin, essence and destiny of man/educand. The child, according to Dewey, is in the first instance a "creative" being - not a being of creation (Coetzee, 1939:24). It denies the creation of man by God according to His image. It denies the fall into sin of man, also his Divine calling, his redemption in Christ and his eternal destination. From the Christian point of view, the crisis of education, schooling and the school is, as has already been indicated in the previous chapter (cf. paragraph 2.4.3.3.4), also due to a misconception of man (through the absence of any reference to the Bible).

*Somehow it is all being*

3.6.2 In the second place, Dewey's school idea that the ideal school should be an extension of the ideal home, a miniature community or an embryonic society, obscures the typical internal structure of the school, which expresses itself characteristically in all aspects of temporal reality. Founded in the historical modality the school has its own structural identity which functions in its own unique way in all the cosmic aspects. When the school begins to resemble any other social structure (the parental home or society, in Dewey's case), then the unique character of the school is endangered (see chapter 6).

3.6.3 In the third place, Dewey elevated the social modality to the status of being the only norm and thus absolutized it in his school idea. He lived in an age of an extreme individualistic outlook which had grown out of the economic philosophy of free enterprise. The result was that there was excessive concern of the individual for his own personal success and achievement, and scant regard

for the interest and welfare of society. This explains the over-emphasis of Dewey on the social nature and social role of education in society. Furthermore, it is quite acceptable that the school situation can not be isolated from the social life of the child at all. It is, however, unacceptable to exalt "society" in an absolutistic way as the only guiding principle for education and schooling (Schoeman, 1978(a):25). "To absolutize one aspect of creation," says Rushdoony (1975:xii), "is to distort all of creation and render it void of meaning".

- 3.6.4 In the fourth place, the "doing school" and "listening school" do not stand, as progressivists wish to think, antithetically against each other; the school is both, because listening is also doing, thus an active action. Pragmatism overrates handwork; thought is just as valuable. The pragmatist over-emphasizes self-activity as a method of instruction and underrates in this manner listening as an activity. A listening child is not necessarily passive (Van Wyk, 1979:48).
- 3.6.5 In the fifth place, it is quite right and acceptable that education and schooling must, as the pragmatist demands, take into account the nature of the child (needs, impulses, talents, level of development, interests). However, when one allows these things to determine everything in the education and the school, as Dewey did, one falls into raw naturalism. The natural needs of man are basically sinful because human nature is evil. Therefore human needs can not be a guiding principle or a rule of conduct. The school must not orientate itself in the first instance to the natural needs of the child and create a milieu where the child can give free expression to his nature; the school must have the Word of God as its foundation and law and lead the child to voluntary or willing, obedient submission to it (Van Wyk, 1979:48).
- 3.6.6 In the sixth place, Dewey's view of the aim of education and schooling can hardly escape criticism. Since, for Dewey, there is no ultimate object in human life, there are only always approximating aims, always moving and changing, always a reconstruction of the expe=

rience by experience (Coetzee, 1939:20). Thus, the entire process of education and schooling seems circular in nature. Moreover, the glory of God is ruled out as the purpose, or end, of education (Cummings, 1979:v). From the Christian point of view, education and schooling should in no way be a matter of riding a "merry-go-round", clinging only to the present. Since intentional education presupposes a definite formative force from without directed to the child who is as yet immature, it should always be a directed or directive human act with a definite goal or end to be reached (Kim, 1980:257).

- 3.6.7 In the seventh place, since the school has the special task to form the child's analytical function (see chapter 6), Dewey's school idea, that is to say, that the school should be the place where the child's capacities for the operation method, logical inquiry, and scientific method of problem-solving can be effectively fostered and developed in various ways, is acceptable. However, for the Christian, the purpose of the unlocking of the scientific capacities of the pupil is not, as Dewey sees, for social utility only but always in the service of the kingdom of God.
- 3.6.8 In the eight place, Dewey sees the important role of the school as the developing of the future society of which the young will be adult members. The school, according to Dewey, constitutes future society in embryonic form. However, in Dewey's school idea, the society is also the final criterion according to which the school itself must be organized. Now, the question may be asked how the autonomous "formulator" of something can be bound to that formulated "something" as final norm for his forming-work? Thus, on close examination, it seems a circulus vitiosus (Schoeman, 1978(a):26).
- 3.6.9 In the ninth place, Dewey tried to keep a balance between individuality and the societal, namely, a balance between two poles of the modern humanistic religious ground motif, in his theory of the school. However, he could not succeed in keeping the balance in the end (cf. Schoeman, 1978(a):30 - 31). Dewey tried to keep a balance between two extremes by means of making his school a democratic institution and mode of living (see paragraph 3.4.5). How=

ever, anybody whose life is not determined by the true Christian religious ground motif cannot escape the ensuing inevitable tension between two poles of the modern humanistic religious ground motif. Thus, Dewey oscillates between the science-ideal (clearly to be seen in the pragmatic science-theory and the ideals which are required for instruction and learning) and the personality-ideal (evident from the importance attached to the experience of man as individual in the present situation) (Van der Walt, 1983(b): 27).

3.6.10 In the tenth place, the over-riding norm in education and schooling, according to Dewey, is the experience of the child. Dewey did not discard authority altogether; he simply shifted the source of authority from the external teacher to the internal experiences of the child. Thus, Dewey advocated learning through experience rather than texts and teachers. He stressed that education was the continuous reconstruction of experience. Of course, the experience of the child plays a great and important role in the process of education in the school. It is, however, erroneous from the Christian standpoint to hold that education is a development "of, by, and for experience" (Dewey, 1972:29) and nothing more. This view of experience in education stems from Dewey's underlying empirical naturalism in which he repudiated the belief in an authoritative moral or spiritual truth. To accept the experience of the child as the core of authority in education is to accept a subjective and therefore unreliable norm. It drops education into the quagmire of experimentalism, and leaves man without any infallible source of truth (Zuck, 1972:95;cf. Van Til, 1974:79).

3.6.11 In the eleventh place, Dewey's idea that education or schooling is the process of living, not preparation for future living, is unacceptable. Of course, education or schooling is part of the process of living, but to say that it is not preparation for future living, makes no sense. Teachers cannot "make" children learn, but they should spend a great deal of energy helping children to learn. Schools are in the first instance for teaching and learning. The primary function of schools is the facilitation of learning. By the process of teaching and learning at school children are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills for their calling on earth.

3.6.12 In the twelfth place, the school, for Dewey, had to be a pedo-centric institution. This was in essence his revolt against the traditional curriculum-centered school. However, the dilemma of modern education whether to be child-centred or curriculum-centred, arises out of the nature-freedom dialectic (Fowler, 1980(a):53). From the Christian standpoint, the problem or the crisis of the school, as has already been indicated in the previous chapter (cf. paragraph 2.4.7.6), is (was) due to the fact that education and schooling in schools are (were) not theo-centric but teacher-centred, subject-centred, or pedo-centric. The school must be theo-centric in all its articulations and should refuse to become entangled in false antitheses.

3.6.13 In the thirteenth place, the Deweyan progressive schools were, in the final analysis, élite schools. These schools were actually for the children who had a certain degree of logical ability and could use it for solving problems by themselves. Furthermore, the progressive schools were closely tied to middle-class values and were more attended by the children of upper and upper-middle-class liberal parents than by working-class children, whom they were supposed to liberate from élitist theories of mind, knowledge, and education (Broudy, 1979:20).

### 3.7 SPUTNIK I: THE "TURNING POINT" IN THE AMERICAN VIEW OF THE SCHOOL

The reformational efforts of Dewey and the progressive movement were put under grievous restraint in the 1930's, 40's and 50's especially by extra-scholastic conditions like the Great Depression, World War II, following which came the so-called Cold War and the general spirit of disillusionment about progressivism (Bowen, 1979:314).

During this time, many critics were strongly against progressive education. Lynd (1950), for instance, attacked progressive education in general. Bestor (1953), among others, asserted that progressive education had become regressive education since it had undermined the great traditions of liberal education and substituted for them "lesser aims", con=

fused aims, or no aims at all. Much of the educational problem, according to Bestor, was due to the progressivists who had destroyed faith in the schools by substituting vocational education for liberal and providing trivial and ineffectual training in the tricks of a given trade. He warned the American schools that they would be undermining the intellectual strength and industrial prosperity, along with the military security, of the nation, if they did not train scientists, scholars, engineers, physicians, and other professionals. Mortimer Smith (1954) also asserted that the primary function of the school should be the traditional one of transmitting intellectual and cultural heritage. However, American educational theory in practice, he criticized, had become a pragmatic one of adjustment of the individual to the group, rather than the traditional view of development of individual intellectual potential.

To all of these critics, progressive education meant actually "lack of direction", "children's interest", "do whatever you please", or "without discipline". They suggested that youngsters were being shortchanged by schools that failed to provide them with knowledge and skills regarded as necessary. These critics attracted many followers. As a consequence, by the middle 1950's, support for life-adjustment education, had diminished greatly.

However, the most severe attack on the progressive education and school came after the advent of Sputnik which actually changed the American view of education and the school (cf. Rice, 1958:33; Cremin, 1959:46; Michael, 1958:72; Nixon, 1958:47; Van Til, 1962:56; Doll, 1966:3). Sputnik shattered the American national ego to the bottom by challenging the presumed American technological supremacy. And when the American effort to launch its Vanguard ended in a scandalous fizzle, the world press treated this abortive attempt in the most sarcastic and ironic terms. "The British referred to it as the American 'Flopnik', the French called it 'Kaputnik', the Japanese suggested that it be renamed 'Rearguard', and the Germans dubbed it 'Spottnik', meaning laughing stock" (Read, 1960:165). The Russians themselves gleefully proclaimed that the failure of the American satellite was the failure of American science and engineering (Read, 1960:165).

The national agencies involved, however, refused to take responsibility for the failure. A scapegoat had to be found for the failure. Thus they pointed their collective finger first at government bureaucracy and then transferred the blame to the American school. America had fallen behind the Russians because, they said, John Dewey and his fuzzy-minded disciples had failed to teach the children enough science to enable them to build space rockets (Moynihan, 1959:15).

Criticism of the schools became intensified during the Fall of 1957 and most of 1958. Rice (1958:33) noted the deluge of newspaper stories blaming the schools because Russia beat the American in launching a satellite, "all of them shouting that Russia got ahead of us because our schools and colleges aren't turning out enough scientists" (Rice, 1958:33). During this time, Cremin (1959:46) said, no daily newspaper was complete without its report of someone's most recent advice about whom, what and how the schools ought to teach. Halverson (1958:336) described the school of this time as the whipping boy for the loss of American prestige.

Especially, the critics of the progressive education and school now moved in with a vengeance and had a field day. Criticism of progressive education reached a climax. The critics blamed the American schools that they were too soft, failing to provide children with ability with a challenge, and expending too much effort on education for "life adjustment" and personality development (Doll, 1966:3). Mortimer Smith was reported as saying that if the nation had not fallen for soft testing, soft guidance, soft language requirements, soft teacher preparation, soft curricula, and soft standards of performance, education would not be in the current state of needing cash and crash programmes (Bosak, 1977:46). Latimer (1958:iii) pointed out that the American public schools had failed to see the vital connection between education and national security.

Similar notions were expressed by many critics who felt that American schools had to be "tougher" schools; the schools should return to the high seriousness and standards of the curriculum of former days, and specifically to a new trivium of science, mathematics, and foreign languages, intellectual subjects befitting a new education for technologists who would manage the technology of the Space Age.

### 3.7.1 Three reaction formations

#### 3.7.1.1 General orientation

Rarely can change in education and the school be attributed to a single event. But Sputnik so changed the public's perception of education, and the role or function of the school that many subsequent reforming efforts of education and the school can be traced back to this single seminal event (Bosak, 1977:39). In the following paragraphs, the three main efforts to reform the school, namely, the scientific reformatory view, the countercultural view, and the return to basics movement, are discussed.

#### 3.7.1.2 The scientific reformatory view of the school

##### 3.7.1.2.1 Orientation

As a result of the unexpected success of the USSR with Sputnik there was in the West, and particularly in the USA, made available an enormous amount of money by the state and also by the private sector not only to overtake the Russians but also to surpass them in the race for world domination (Bowen, 1979:315; cf. Eisenhower, 1958:3). Reacting to pressures to "do something" about the schools, the federal government in 1958 passed the National Defence Education Act. This legislation resulted in a massive infusion of federal funds meant to improve science education.

President Eisenhower in his address of November, 1957, had urged school boards and PTA's across the nation to scrutinize their schools to see whether curricula and standards met the stern demands of the era they were entering (Cremin, 1959:46). In his State-of-the-Union Message of January, Eisenhower (1958:3) asked Congress for a billion dollars over a 4-year period to enable new activities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation in order to encourage an improved quality of teaching and student opportunities in the interests of national security, and to stimulate and improve science educa-

tion. In the Budget Message of January 13, the President (Eisenhower, 1958:3) noted that the security and continued well-being of the United States, in the face of Soviet challenges, depended on the extension of scientific knowledge.

The central issue now became: how could the schools, and the education/teaching which was provided there, be best utilized in the service of society and the state? There were, thus, increasing demands for more attention to mathematics, science, and foreign languages in the schools to meet the Soviet challenge and to improve the academic quality of American schooling. There was, as Husén (1979:334) said, a preoccupation with the question: What does the school "produce" in the interests of science and technology? This had, in its turn, brought great concern as to whether academically talented students were being identified and provided with adequate challenges in the schools. The American schools now swung back to a so-called more academic direction with special provision being made for the gifted child.

#### 3.7.1.2.2 Education and schooling for excellence

The demands of the post-Sputnik era upon the schools - the high standards and high expectations of performance from students, more attention to mathematics, science, and foreign languages, and special attention to the potentially gifted scientists - brought back the pursuit of the individual excellence in the schools. In the meantime, as the scientification of society increased, the so-called dual school system (grammar schools, and so forth, for the privileged and public schools for the labour class) had been slowly breaking down and a more democratic ethos began to take root among people (Bowen, 1979:316). Thus, education and schooling for the pursuit of individual excellence as it might be applied in a democratic society began to assume central importance and became a slogan for the schools (cf. Gardner, 1961).

Works by the Rockefeller Foundation (1958), Rickover (1959), Conant (1959), Bruner (1963), and Gardner (1961), among others, stressed the pursuit of individual excellence in the schools, with varying meanings being ascribed

to the term "excellence".

The Rockefeller Report put great emphasis on the importance of pursuing excellence, especially in the field of science education because of the urgent need to meet the military threat at hand. However, the conception of excellence of the Rockefeller Report embraced many kinds of achievement at many levels (Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 1958:16 - 17; 45). Differences in the individual talent and ability, the Report asserted, led to different individual contributions to the society.

The Report (1958:1 - 10) also warned the American school not to fall into the danger of forgetting the individual behind the huge impersonal institutions, or of glorifying science and forgetting the scientist. While there was an urgent need to meet the military threat at hand, the ideal of individual excellence had, the Report cautioned, to be maintained as ends, not as mere means.<sup>8)</sup>

Gardner's conception of excellence is somewhat similar to that of the Rockefeller Report. He also advocated many kinds of achievement at many levels. Individual excellence, according to Gardner (1961:91), had to be sought in a context of concern for all. Every form of education and schooling, Gardner (1961:101 - 102) said, should stretch the individual child to the utmost of his potentialities; one had to expect each student to strive for excellence in terms of the kind of excellence that was within his reach. Thus, society and the school should provide all the possible opportunities and rewards for all levels of ability and kinds of achievement.

After wide visits, surveys and study, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, Conant (1959) endorsed the unique character of the comprehensive high school, that is, a high school endeavouring to serve "all American youth", the reluctant as well as the willing, the mediocre as well as the talented. He insisted that the Comprehensive high school was characteristic

---

8. The Rockefeller Report showed clearly that the American schools of the post-Sputnik period were strongly caught up in a tension between the two poles of humanistic religious ground motif, namely, freedom and nature, or the personality ideal and the science ideal.

of American society and was able to offer diversification of curriculum and educational services to meet the widely varying differences in needs and abilities among typical large public high school populations. However, he also laid special emphasis on programmes for the academically talented, urging them to study the solid academic subjects, not for the outmoded discipline of the mind, but because their difficult intellectual content was necessary for personal fulfilment as well as national welfare and security.

Bruner asserted that every student in the school had to be helped to develop his intellectual potential to its fullest, and that the achievement of that kind of excellence was the aim of education and schooling. "We may take as perhaps the most general objective of education that it cultivate excellence; but it should be clear in what sense this phrase is used. It here refers not only to schooling the better student but also to helping each student achieve his optimum intellectual development" (Bruner, 1963:9). If all students were helped towards the full utilization of their intellectual powers, Bruner (1963:10) said, "we will have a better chance of surviving as a democracy in an age of enormous technological and social complexity".

With his somewhat narrow concept of excellence, Rickover(1959:15) asserted that the future prosperity and freedom of America could only be ensured by a massive upgrading of the scholastic standards of the schools. The schools had to turn back to the traditional aim of formal education, transmission of culture, and training of the intellect. Every child had to be trained to develop his intellectual powers to the highest level possible, instead of merely being allowed to sit "parked" at his desk, having a good time. In order to save America, Rickover (1959:115) said, the schools needed to identify talented youth at an early age and unshackle them by providing them with separate education.

The educators and teachers in the school, however, were more inclined to implement the narrow concept of intellectual excellence,<sup>9)</sup> which they interpreted as a stress on hard subjects, high grades, and voluminous

---

9. This trend is, doubtless, due to the Sputnik shock.

homework for all pupils, even in the elementary school. Nearly all students should take hard subjects, in which they were forced to try to do their best. The youth revolt which became known as the counterculture was partly due to the great "dehumanizing" emphasis on the schooling for intellectual excellence (see paragraph 3.7.1.3.2).

### 3.7.1.2.3 The curriculum-reform movement

In order to keep up with the "new" educational line, or a hard line or "counterprogressive" line (Cohen, 1971:39) of education and schooling for the pursuit of intellectual excellence, a large-scale curriculum-reform movement was launched, first in mathematics and physical science programmes and later in the social sciences.

The general spirit of the movement was clearly expressed by Jerome S. Bruner (1963) in reporting some of the findings of the Woods-Hole Conference attended by thirty-five prestigious scientists, scholars, and educators: "We begin with the hypothesis that any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development" (Bruner, 1963:33). Acting on this hypothesis, concepts which previously had been reserved for the upper grades were introduced earlier. This became readily apparent in what came to be known as the "new math".

The Conference revealed that many of the failures of American education resulted from courses that were little more than random collections of isolated information. What was needed was a reorganization of school courses to teach not these isolated "facts" but the organizing ideas or principles that represented the structure of each discipline. The understanding of this structure of disciplines, according to Bruner (1963:23 - 26), in the first place, makes a subject more comprehensible, in the second place, causes the detailed knowledge not to be forgotten easily, in the third place, is the main road to adequate "transfer of training", and in the fourth place, enables one to narrow the gap between "advanced" knowledge and "elementary" knowledge by constantly re-examining material taught in elementary and secondary schools for its fundamental character. This structure is the fundamental building block of a discipline and the source from which new knowledge is generated. Facts no

longer were learned for their own sake but were used to illustrate the findings produced by intellectual manipulation of the structure in search of knowledge. Thus, the structure of the disciplines and intuition in learning became as central to the jargon of the new era as the whole child and life-adjustment had been to the progress era (Goodlad, 1976: 10).

During the 1960's, there were a tremendous number of new curriculum projects that were attuned philosophically with the structure-of-disciplines approach. Groups of leading scholars who were specialists in physics, biology, mathematics, and other subjects began to prepare textbooks and other material that would, they said, bring quality to the schools. Among these projects were the following: the Biological Science Curriculum Study (BSCS); the Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC); the Earth Science Curriculum Project (ESCP); and the Intermediate Science Curriculum Study (ISCS); the School Mathematics Study Group (MSG); the Chemical Bond Approach Project (CBA); the Chemical Education Materials Study (CHEM). The government and some educational foundations spent money to send teachers to special workshops which were held on campuses across the nation during summer terms to upgrade their teaching skills of the "new science" and the "new mathematics". There were high hopes that a revolution in the schools could be carried to a successful conclusion (Armstrong, et al, 1981:39).

Without question, the curriculum-reform movement did result in some important changes. The school curriculum in the sciences, mathematics, the foreign languages and, to a lesser extent, other subjects was brought up to date in certain American schools. Teachers who attended summer workshops, though a small minority of all teachers participated in the programmes, became more proficient in the use of new techniques and materials.

However, the curriculum-reform movement was initiated and developed, from the beginning, by the subject-matter specialists who had little if any experience of working with public school youngsters. Consequently many materials were written at a level of reading difficulty that was simply beyond large numbers of youngsters, and most students could not find some of the new instructional materials very interesting. Further, many

teachers who did not participate in summer courses found themselves ill at ease with many of the new programmes, and a majority simply did more of what they were already doing. Even the teachers who had attended summer courses sometimes assigned work in merciless quantities (Armstrong et al, 1981:39).

It should also be pointed out that this curriculum-reform movement was actually a middle and upper-middle-class affair, primarily embracing college-bound students. An expanding, prosperous middle class of ambitious young men and women saw education/schooling as the means to even better things for their children. They turned to their schools with great expectations (Goodlad, 1976:9). Thus, the parents who wanted their children to get into the most prestigious colleges were afraid to plead for a let-up in school assignments. Whether they liked it or not, thought the parents, students of the 1960's would be in grinding, deadly competition, and they would simply have to become accustomed to it (Doll, 1966:4).

In this way, perhaps improved quality had now become a part of the school curriculum, but with it had come an intense pressure on the child. This hard pressure on the child, demanded by the new needs of the technocracy, now "created" groups of alienated youth in the schools, and contributed partly to another kind of the so-called crisis of the school, the counter-culture, which will be briefly discussed in the following paragraph and in more detail in chapter 5.

### 3.7.1.3 The counterculture in the early sixties: a general survey (see also chapter 5)

#### 3.7.1.3.1 What is the counterculture?

The counterculture was originally designated by such titles as the "hippie culture", the "rock-and-drug culture", and the "adversary culture"; now it is better known as the "new culture" (Battle, 1974:3), or "new humanism" (Broudy, 1979:18).

Anyway, this culture, as the term implies, was a culture that pursued values and a life-style counter to the dominant modes of the society. As Battle (1974:3) says, the counterculture "continues to assault the traditional power structures, value structures, and life-styles of the American people and perhaps of the people of the world, for whatever happens in America is likely to happen elsewhere in the world".

It is not just the traditional sources of power in America that the proponents of the counterculture were resisting; they were challenging the very values that had been the foundations of these and other American institutions. As Simmons and Winograd (1966:12) say, they repudiated, or at least questioned, such cornerstones of conventional society as Christianity, "my country right or wrong", the sanctity of marriage and premarital chastity, civil obedience, the accumulation of wealth, the authority and even competence of parents, the school, and the government to head and make decisions for everyone - in sum, the Establishment.

Although the counterculture has many characteristics, the most striking characteristic seems to be, among others, the restoring of the value of human selfhood in a highly mechanized and technologized society. Surely, a variety of causes contributed to the emerging of the counterculture (this is the subject of discussion of the following paragraph). However, it may safely be said that the countercultural movement was actually a reaction through personalism against the impersonality of the technological society.

In this sense, Mumford (1970) saw elements of the younger generation as leading a revolt against the megamachine which their parents had created and maintained without fully understanding its evil potential. Seeing the modern society where machines have become masters instead of being the servants of men, the proponents of the counterculture put great emphasis upon the value of the human being and human life. They protested strongly against the society which treated people as products of a technological system and subordinated human needs to industrial and technological needs. They believed, said Reich (1971:2), one of the "high priests" of the counterculture, that only the "new" culture could promise a more humane community, and a new liberated individual.

Thus, the newly liberated individualism, integrity of the person, and a more humane society, for the proponents of the counterculture, became the new goals of social reform, and in this way, the ideal of the free human personality, one of the poles of the modern humanistic religious ground motif (namely, nature and freedom) emerged decisively in the counterculture. In the counterculture, man again confirms his freedom over against technology, social control measures and the primacy of things and objects, that is to say, as opposed to the deterministic nature-pole of the humanistic religious ground motif (Van der Walt, 1983(b):39).

The counterculture tried to restore the self of man in his rightful place of honour, especially as it manifested itself in the affective and volitional aspects of human life. In this way, the counterculture linked up with movements as diverse as anarchism, socialism, pacifism (Gish, 1970:18), Zen Buddhism, existentialism (Kierkegaard, Marcel, Camus, Heidegger), New Marxism, New Hegelianism, Maoism, oriental philosophies, magic, the occult, consciousness-raising drugs, existential psychologists and Third-world revolutionaries (Frantz Fanon, Kwame Nkrumah, Ernesto Ché Guevara) (Broudy, 1979:18).

#### 3.7.1.3.2 Origins of the counterculture (the cultural revolution)

It is difficult, perhaps impossible to single out one factor as the cause for the emergence of the counterculture of the young. A variety of factors, in fact, contributed to the emergence of the counterculture: the affluence of American society created by science and technology; many of the ill-effects of the technological society, that is, the impersonal bureaucratization, large corporations, depersonalization of life, and industrialism; parents' lack of love and affection for their children; permissive child-rearing and schooling; the intellectual rigidity of the school after the Sputnik shock; and the protests against the Vietnam War (cf. Roszak, 1970:23; Battle, 1974:4; Keniston, 1971:25 - 26; Broudy, 1979:18).

Science and technology brought a growing affluence to American society during the 1950's, and this unprecedented affluence of the society allowed

most of the young to be free from economic worries and thus able to devote their energies to idealistic concerns. To growing numbers of young people the long-sought economic affluence and security could no longer be legitimate objects to be achieved. They were simply taken for granted. Consequently, the young were convinced that the core values of the older generation, that is, the cultural values of the industrial ethic, were outdated and irrelevant to their lives. As Keniston (1968: 240) says, "... without material affluence, the restlessness, mobility, and 'wastefulness' of today's youth could hardly be understood".

The counterculture was also a revolt against many ill-effects of the contemporary technocratic society. Science and technology created a more affluent and a mobile society in America. But, in this "new" society, the institutions like the home, the church, and the community, which had provided people with the traditional values for so many centuries, became less and less effective. The social, economic, governmental, and educational institutions of the society were also becoming too large and too bureaucratic to offer human warmth and meaning to those who would seek help from them. The young, thus, began to seek, outside the traditional American institutions, the basic human needs; to be useful, to be wanted, and to be loved. All the characteristics of the contemporary technocratic society like depersonalization of life, impersonal bureaucratization, large corporations, and industrialism seemed intolerable to the young, who sought to create new forms of association and action opposed to the technologism of the contemporary world (Battle, 1974:4).

Some psychologists have attributed the emergence of the counterculture to the fact that the parents of the American adolescent had in many cases offered their children money and what money can buy instead of love and affection. A generation that had been almost abandoned spiritually by its elders and who grew up with the Bomb threatening the existence of all life, says Battle (1974:4), could certainly be expected to be lonely, insecure, and anxious.

Permissive changes in attitudes toward child-rearing were accompanied by progressive school reforms having to do with "creativity" and "self-expression". These changes caused a prolongation of the period of an already permissive infancy. Such an infantization of the middle-class young had a corrupting effect. They were kept in school longer and longer, but remained ill-prepared to face the real world of the techno=

cracy and its unrelenting power (Roszak, 1970:31 - 32). In this way, the American public school system became increasingly alienating for the young.

Moreover, the pressure for intellectual excellence demanded by the new needs of the technocracy for mounting numbers of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers also contributed its share to the emergence of the counterculture. After the initial Russian success in the race for space, the teachers in the American schools proved unable to think clearly about what they could do to overcome their difficulties. So they simply did more of what they were already doing:

A 1957 study of homework in grades five through twelve in thirty-five public school systems showed that the majority of teachers who did anything to respond to the scare assigned about as much homework as they had assigned before; their twenty sentences in language now grew to forty, and their fifteen mathematics problems became thirty. But the teachers assigned the same old sentences and the same old problems. Thus, the quality of what children were learning was obviously no better than it had been previously (Doll, 1966:3).

Further, with the curriculum-reforming movement, the curriculum in the sciences, mathematics, the foreign languages and, to a lesser extent, other subjects was brought up to date in certain American schools; but the trend toward more work, with attendant pressures, seemed to increase proportionately.

Mathematics which was formerly labeled for seniors in high school now moved down to the ninth or the tenth grade. Eleventh graders in high school were studying college chemistry and college mathematics. Reading lists from college courses in history and literature presently cropped up in the tenth and eleventh grades of high school (Doll, 1966:4).

However, parents who wanted their children to enter the "best" colleges were afraid to plead for a letup in school assignments. Rather, they approved the pressure, and sometimes increased it by adding their own

systems of punishments and rewards for grades (cf. Heffernan, 1966:26 - 27).

The results of this pressure for intellectual excellence have become apparent: dropouts increased; pregnancy among unmarried girls flourished; and there occurred a widening status gap between low-achievers and high-achievers (Doll, 1966:4 - 5).

Thus, ironically, the (new) reforming effort of the school, that is, the scientific reforming effort over against the permissive tendency of the progressive school, again contributed directly to another problem of the school or the so-called crisis of the school. It called for criticism of the school from the countercultural side which emphasizes the personality-ideal of the humanistic religious ground motif and irrationalistic indeterminism.

#### 3.7.1.3.3 The criticism of the school and proposals for school reform from the counterculture

The criticism of the school and proposals for school reform from the counterculture differed in both degree and kind among the high-school age and other youthful critics, but they might be stated under four main issues: firstly, personal freedom; secondly, humanization of school education; thirdly, educational bureaucracy, and fourthly, relevance of learning material.

In the first place, criticism of the school from the counterculture was mainly focused on the issue of personal freedom or liberty. The counterculture, as indicated in the previous paragraph (cf. paragraph 3.7.1.3.2), was a revolt against the highly technocratic society which put so much emphasis on the science ideal of the humanistic religious ground motif. Consequently, the proponents of the counterculture rejected all the things which they considered as restricting the free expression of personal freedom. They criticized the school as an institution which taught apathy,

dull conformity, and blind obedience, which endangers democracy. The school was, for them, oppressive, and deprived students of personal freedom or liberties. The dress code was probably one of the most vehemently protested issues. They objected that the school should not be able to dictate what, when, and where to wear anything (Bosak, 1977:126). Besides, prescribed studies and curricula, respect for the authority of the teacher, the right of the school to make rules for behaviour, tests, grades, and similar devices were all questioned as both symptoms and causes of oppression of individual freedom (Broudy, 1979:19; cf. Gross and Gross, 1971:148 - 150).

The proposals for school reform with respect to the issue of free expression of personal freedom are all negative: no more suspensions, no involuntary transfers, no exclusions from classes, no detention, no discharges, no harassment of students; no cops in schools; no programme cards; an end to general and commercial diplomas; open admissions to college; no military recruitment in schools; and so on (cf. Birmingham, 1970:142 - 147). Also they demanded the right of all students to attend school, whether married, activist, or pregnant; and freedom of speech, press, and assembly. The open classroom, human relations, group therapy, role-playing, self-expression, expression of feeling, the study of non-Western cultures - all of these were, according to the countercultural critics, to help liberate the pupil from oppression (Broudy, 1979:19).

The school was also criticized by the countercultural side as an agent which had critically negative and utterly destructive effects on human beings. According to Montgomery County Student Alliance (cf. Gross & Gross, 1971:147), school education was dehumanizing and alienating; the educational process stifled curiosity, creativity, confidence, initiative, individuality, and self-respect. Montgomery County Student Alliance (cf. Gross & Gross, 1971:148 - 150) listed the specific negative and destructive effects of school education as follows:

- \* The school system was based upon fear from the first grade onward. Punishments took the form of bad grades, punishment from authorities, humiliation and ostracism, and disciplinary actions;

- \* Schools compelled students to be dishonest. In order to be "successful", students had to deny and suppress their true feelings that were not acceptable to the system;
- \* Students quickly learned what types of responses were likely to be successful at playing the school game. Thus, their approach to problems changed from honest inquiry and desire to learn, to that which would earn the grade;
- \* The school system destroyed the desire to learn by replacing the natural joy of discovery with an immediate set of rewards, which became ends in themselves;
- \* The school system, with its dishonesty and premium on dutiful obedience, caused resentment and alienation among students;
- \* Schools fostered conformity and blind obedience to authority. Students were forced to adopt the values and priorities of the educational system;
- \* Schools stifled honesty of feeling and self-expression through their artificial system of rewards and punishment;
- \* Schools, through their isolation from all cultural values other than those of the surrounding community, solidified and perpetuated local prejudices. They thus prevented students from developing broad perspectives of the world;
- \* Perhaps most tragic, the schools fostered self-hate in students by labelling them early on as failures. This labelling tended to act as a self-fulfilling prophecy which resulted in hatred of the self or of others.

Since the school education was viewed in this way by the countercultural critics, the humanization of school education was strongly advocated by the countercultural critics as the antidote to the increasing alienation

not of the student alone, but of the whole society. For this purpose of the humanization of school education, they demanded or proposed, firstly, the change of the teacher-student role from rigid, dishonest, stereotyped, and inhumane roles to humane and co-learning relationships among persons with mutual goals. Secondly, they requested the renunciation of tests, grading, and competition. Thirdly, textbooks and other such materials should serve as mere tools, not as bases of authority.

In short, they proposed, students should be free from fear of the now obsolete, traditional weapons of the teacher-grades, promotions and forms of credentialling (Bosak, 1977:164).

Educational bureaucracy was another issue of criticism from the counterculture. According to the countercultural critics, the school community was composed of three main groups, namely, administration, faculty, and students, and a really effective school policy had to be one attained through the mutual decisions of those groups. For all that, they said, students had little or no power in educational decisions (Bosak, 1977:127). Therefore, they called for community control of the schools and student power within that governing framework. Especially, they demanded the right of students to organize, manage, and distribute their own press and to form real student governments. Their goal was autonomy and freedom from the vested educational bureaucracy. Only a radical redistribution of power could bring about the ideal learning community, where the influence of the White middle-class teachers was broken (Bosak, 1977:491).

The countercultural critics attacked school education as irrelevant, rigid, and dull. With the discontent of young people everywhere over official policies toward Vietnam and with the particular frustrations of economically concerned blacks in the cities, the ground was not fertile for a curriculum that appeared to be yet another effort to force the values of the "Establishment" on the young. The countercultural critics questioned the relevance of school curricula that seemed bent on teaching esoteric intellectual subjects at the expense of more immediate and more personal and social concerns. One of the countercultu=

ral critics, Battle (1968:89), for instance, criticized the American school and education as follows:

With the leaders of our educational and political life giving so little attention to the serious problems created by technology it is no wonder that our society is running amuck, seemidly possessed with a homicidal mania.

Thus, most countercultural critics advocated student involvement in real personal and social problems as the basic curriculum for relevant education. The most relevant learning had, among others, to have to do with space travel, urbanization, the communications media, nuclear energy, cybernetics, and hitherto unexplored resources of the oceans. Pupils had to come into contact with the life and not with ready-made answers from handbooks which dated from the bygone times. If the last mentioned happens, man becomes alienated from the life and society. Knowledge should not remain "raw" in the school, but had to be integrated with the pupil's values, thought, and behaviour. Only in this way, says Battle (1968:90), could education and teaching remain relevant to life.

It is difficult or even impossible to assess the effects of the countercultural reforming effort of the school with any accuracy. There did occur during the late 1960's and early 1970's a relaxing of school regulations regarding personal liberties, for example in dress and grooming codes. The curriculum was opened up to include courses in ethnic studies, environmental and social issues, and other more "relevant" subjects. Curricular requirements and grading practices were relaxed, generally, and more elective courses were allowed. Teacher-student roles became less rigidly prescribed (Bosak, 1977:142).

This does not mean, however, that the countercultural reforming effort of the school solved or contributed to the solution of the problem or the crisis of the school. On the contrary, in turn it caused another crisis of the school. It brought about, amongst others, two big problems of the school, namely, the problem of lack of discipline and the general relaxation of academic standards. The return-to-basics movement is

really a revolt against the countercultural proposals for school reform.

#### 3.7.1.4 The return-to-basics movement

##### 3.7.1.4.1 Origins of the return-to-basics movement

The return-to-basics is one of the latest innovative movements of the school which began in the early 1970's and has grown rapidly. In the United States, there are more than 5 000 fundamental schools (the name given to schools that emphasize basics), and their numbers are still growing (Rich, 1981:325). The concerns voiced by the proponents of the return-to-basics parallel, to some extent, those voiced immediately after Sputnik. However, the call is less for academic excellence and rigour than for a return to basics.

The return-to-basics movement was initiated by parents and local citizens who were alarmed over the general relaxation of academic standards in the 1960's and 1970's and declining student achievement in the three R'S (Ornstein, 1982:405). A relaxing of school regulations, lack of discipline, automatic promotion of marginal students, and the dizzying array of elective courses for which the countercultural critics strove, are frequently cited as reasons for the decline in basic skills.

In addition, various socio-cultural factors (the Vietnam War, the Watergate event, rapid social change, and numerous value conflicts) and educational factors (the failure of many innovations, employment opportunities, accountability movement, and the general social tendency of establishing alternative schools) contributed, directly or indirectly, to the emergence of the return-to-basics movement (Rich, 1981:326 - 328).

Especially, because of the lower testing scores and lack of discipline, parents and concerned citizens were quite dissatisfied with the quality of learning taking place in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. The seventh annual Gallup Poll revealed that nearly 60 percent of all parents would, if given the option, send their children to alternative

public schools that emphasized strict discipline, the three R's, and dress codes for students and teachers (Wellington, 1977:527).

#### 3.7.1.4.2 Proposals for school reform from the return-to-basics movement

According to Wellington (1977:529), the fundamental schools have the following five primary goals:

1. To teach students to read, write, speak, spell, and compute accurately and effectively.
2. To teach students to know and understand their history, heritage, and governmental structure, and to reason in a logical and objective manner.
3. To challenge each child to do his best. The child's work is to be done properly and on time. It is to be corrected by the teacher, so that the child may experience success and satisfaction, which are to be regarded as the true rewards of endeavour.
4. To ensure accountability. Examinations, grading, and reports are essential so that each student may come to know his own powers and limitations.
5. To reinforce parental teaching of citizenship, respect, discipline, and personal responsibility.

Here, one can notice that the proposals for school reform from the return-to-basics movement are concerned mainly with two important issues, that is to say, strengthening schooling for raising academic standards in basics and the reinforcement of discipline of pupils.

For raising academic standards in basics, the proponents of the return-to-basics movement proposed to put high emphasis on the three R's and on other solid subjects like English, history, biology, chemistry, and

physics. Teaching logical reasoning, one's history, heritage, and government structure is also of importance. Although the return-to-basics movement means different things to different people, it usually connotes an Essentialist curriculum with heavy emphasis on reading, writing, and mathematics. Elective courses in such areas as scuba diving, transcendental meditation, and hiking are considered by the proponents of this movement as nonsense. Some even consider humanities or integrated social science courses too "soft". They may grudgingly admit music and art into the programme - but only for half credits (Ornstein, 1982:405). For the improvement in quality of learning, they also stress competition, comprehensive and systematic assessment of pupils' learning achievements, letter grades, ability grouping, and homework (cf. Ebel, 1982:375). Students in fundamental schools are rewarded for achievement but not for effort (Rich, 1981:316).

The issue of discipline is, for the advocates of the return-to-basics movement, at the core of much of the problem. Because, without discipline, they are convinced, there will be no learning. Thus they strongly advocate strict discipline including corporal punishment and detention. In fundamental schools, special emphasis is placed upon moral standards, courtesy, respect for adults, patriotism, and dress codes.

It should be now pointed out here that the actual ground for the return-to-basics movement was prepared by the countercultural critics who reacted themselves against the scientific reforming efforts of the school. It becomes clear from the following words of Bartlett Giamatti (1976), who is a professor at Yale University:

Today's college students ... have lost touch with the language. They are the products of the anti-structures of the time. They have come and are coming out of the 'open classrooms,' vertical grouping, modular buildings with 50 pupils to a room. They have come out of 'new math' and its concepts, its logic and set theory, not knowing how to multiply. They have come out of 'individualized instruction' and 'elective systems,' not knowing how to listen to anyone else, not knowing how to take a direction. They have come out of the sentimental sixties, where 'repressive' and 'arbitrary' grades were done away with, not

able to take the pressure of grading. They have come out of a primary and secondary world where 'personal development' was said to be worth more than achievement, where 'creativity' was the highest goal, and were often completely at a loss about how to cope with their work, with their time, with themselves (Wellington, 1977:528).

Thus, it seems quite natural for the return-to-basics advocates that all their proposals for school reform are concerned with everything which was once rejected by the countercultural critics as obstacles to the way of free expression of human freedom or the personality ideal.

### 3.8 CRITICAL COMMENT ON THE THREE REACTION FORMATIONS TO THE PROGRESSIVE SCHOOL

- 3.8.1 In the first place, the scientific reformatory effort of the school revealed Neo-positivistic or Neo-rationalistic trends in its approach to education, hence not acceptable to Christian educationalists. The so-called scientific school was a strong reaction against the anchor-looseness, weak discipline and the soft-method of the progressive child-centred school. It called for the basic concepts, logical structures and scientific methods of the various disciplines to structure the school programme. In the face of the massive criticism of the public school (actually of the Deweyan school which put the experience of the child at the centre of school activities), the "scientific school" responded with a reaffirmation of its trust in science, technology, and efficiency (DeGraaff,1978:23).
- 3.8.2 In the second place, the "scientific school" regarded school education as a function of the state. The achievement of individual excellence was the aim of schooling. Thus, training the intellectual potentialities of the child to the highest level possible was highly valued in the process of education and schooling. It was, however, for the service of society and the state. The "scientific school" was far from attaining the true and real learning purpose but became an instrument of state and only a means of social advancement.

- 3.8.3 In the third place, it is evident from the preceding discussion that the "scientific school" also became entangled in a tension between the two extremes of the humanistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom (or science-ideal and personality-ideal). Reacting to the progressive school which gave preference to the personality-ideal, the "scientific school" swung back to the other extreme, the science-ideal. In this way, the "scientific-school" contributed its force to pave the way for the countercultural critics who swung the emphasis again to the personality-ideal of the humanistic religious ground motif.
- 3.8.4 In the fourth place, the countercultural critical movement of the school was a reaction against the impersonality of the school and also of the contemporary technocratic society. It is quite worthwhile for the Christian educationalists to listen attentively to what the countercultural critics say today, namely, that present-day man is increasingly in danger of losing his freedom as a human being in the face of science and technology which threaten him. One should, however, always keep in mind that this movement is radically humanistic, man-centred, instead of God-centred. It even contains certain Marxist elements, especially in its criticism of modern society (Van der Walt, 1983(b):39).
- 3.8.5 In the fifth place, the countercultural critics, as has already been indicated in the previous paragraph (paragraph 3.8.3), are motivated, controlled and determined by the humanistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom.
- 3.8.6 In the sixth place, the countercultural criticism of the school shows clear irrationalistic trends. The countercultural critics are not dead against science and technology. Science and the scientific method must remain, but must be at the service of the individual being. In this sense, the indeterminism of the irrationalistic trends of the 20th century reigns supreme in the countercultural movement.

3.8.7 In the seventh place, the countercultural critics have rejected everything which they thought confined the free expression of personal freedom. The concepts of freedom and authority are totally distorted by the countercultural critics. It is exactly a result of their indeterministic solution of the law-side of the pedagogical reality into the factual side of it that they want to lead the child to supposed autonomy and to negation of authority with accompanying scorn for ideas like duty, rules for behaviour, authority of the teacher, achievement, adjustment, subjection, consideration, sacrifice, loyalty, nation, country, tradition, culture, and so on. From the Christian standpoint real freedom is not freedom from the things the countercultural critics rejected. It is freedom from sin and evil, and further, freedom to serve the Truth, the Lord Jesus Christ. The teacher in the school should also be recognized as a person of authority and as indicator, positivizer and actualizer of norms; namely of the universal norm side of reality. Indeterministic thinkers (like the countercultural critics) reject all kinds of authority because they confuse the exercising of authority by the qualified person in authority with so-called deterministic manipulation (Henning, 1982(b):139).

3.8.8 In the eighth place, the return-to-basics movement is a reaction against the countercultural critical movement of the school. The return-to-basics movement has, thus, actually been meant by the proponents of the movement to be the school's turning back to there R's, hard discipline, corporal punishment, teaching of basic democratic values. From the Christian point of view, the real meaning of "returning-to-basics" is making education, schooling and the school turn back to and once again stand on the Scriptural ground motif of creation, fall and redemption. In this sense, says DeGraaff (1978:25), the return-to-basics "ultimately means repenting of our secularism and, through our changing ways, teaching our young ... the meaning of discipleship and living by grace". "Return-to-basics" has become the new slogan for this decade's educational crusaders. This movement is, however, as DeGraaff (1978:23) rightly shows, a superficial, reactionary and dishonest response to fundamental educational problems.

### 3.9 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the problems or crisis of the school in the contemporary Northern American regional context have been sketched. For this purpose, Dewey's pragmatic educational and school theory was first discussed and then a discussion of the three reaction formations to the progressive school, namely the scientific reformatory view of the school, the countercultural view, and the return-to-basics movement, followed.

It became evident from the preceding discussion that the underlying philosophy of the Deweyan progressive school was secular humanism. God had no place in Dewey's school idea. Experience (thus man) was at once the source and end of all school activities. Man was the criterion of all truth. The Deweyan school was humanistic in its essence. It was determined, motivated, and controlled by the humanistic religious ground motif of nature and freedom. Thus, Dewey's school idea also could not succeed in solving the problems or crisis of the school. Rather, it contributed another element of crisis to the school: the problem of a "lack of discipline"; a permissive tendency in schooling, among others, was brought to the school by Dewey and his ardent followers.

After the Sputnik debacle, education and schooling for the pursuit of individual excellence began to take central importance and a large-scale curriculum reforming movement was launched. In this way, the quality of intellectual education and schooling has been improved to a certain degree, but it has put intense pressure on the child. The return to "hard" education after Sputnik contributed significantly to the radicalism of the countercultural movement, which then again partly contributed to the advent of the "return-to-basics" movement of the 1980's.

This clearly shows that the pendulum of school reform oscillates to and fro between the two extreme poles of the humanistic religious ground motif, that is, the science or nature pole, on the one hand, and the human freedom or personality ideal pole, on the other hand. The critics and the reformers of education and the school in North America have so far never truly stood on the sound and true anastatic Scriptural religious ground motif of creation, fall into sin, and redemption in Christ. In view of the Scriptural perspective, this is the one of the main reasons why they have so far failed to meet the crisis of the school.