

M. A. Raywid  
Hofstra College  
March, 1962

## SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, SOCIAL SYSTEMS, AND EDUCATION

A conception of the good society--a social philosophy--underlies many if not most proposals for what schools should be and do. And this social philosophy, in turn, seems to rest on conceptions of knowledge, man, and value. Indeed, for many thinkers, the ideal way to arrive at a set of educational principles and purposes would be something like this: First, decide what man is--his nature and purposes--and what knowledge and value consist in; then, on the basis of these, one can determine what sort of social system is desirable; after this has been done, one can formulate a system of education. In oversimplified form, this is the procedure which Plato followed in setting up his educational system. The educational system was justified and defended in terms of the social philosophy. His social philosophy was, in turn, justified on the basis of his general philosophy--his views on man, knowledge, and value.

Although not all philosophers would agree with the procedure which Plato suggests, it is still possible to discover views about the nature of the good society implicit in many of their statements on education. For instance, it should later be clear from their views on schools that Boyd Bode's conception of the good society would be quite different from that of the Daughters of the American Revolution--whether or not either of them would agree with Plato as to the logic of establishing an educational system.

We have already suggested one of the primary concerns of social philosophy: characterizing or defining the good society. In this connection, the social philosopher is concerned with what constitutes the ends pursued and, in a general way, the means whereby these ends are sought. Some social philosophers have advanced their conceptions of the good society as a standard for the measurement of any society. Others would claim that no single ideal could apply so broadly. Some would say that any conception of the ideal must grow out of a specific society at a given time. Irrespective of the position taken on this question, however, these are the general issues with which social philosophy deals. Now it seems clear that the dominant social philosophy would influence and in some measure determine a social system. As here used, a social system consists in the institutions and other arrangements by which a society carries on its affairs. So conceived, a particular political system--including its means of law-making, its voting arrangements, Congress, Court system, etc.--would be one part of a social system. The economic system and its various parts would be another. Education would constitute still another part of a social system.

Obviously, the social system as a whole, as well as its various parts, will be influenced by social philosophy. For example, our political system provides for universal suffrage as a result of various of our social philosophical commitments. But a social system is ordinarily determined also by factors other than social philosophy. Extreme penal for stealing, for example, may stem not from social-philosophical commitments, but from such a severe scarcity of goods that "cruel and unusual punishment" is employed as a means for coping with conditions.

Both social philosophy and the social system strongly influence education. Insofar as education is to constitute preparation for life within a given society, its purposes must be consistent with the social philosophy of

that society. Ordinarily this is the case, and social philosophy has played an important role in setting education's aims and, to some extent, its means. But if, according to the prevalent social philosophy, the good society were marked by extreme competitiveness among its members, and the schools deliberately sought to inculcate cooperation in lieu of competition, they simply would not be preparing children for life in that society. (We might as well want to say that in such a case the schools were paving the way for a better society. But the point here is that under such circumstances, education simply would not offer preparation for life in the existing society. Its purpose would be consistent with revolutionizing the social system and philosophy, not with perpetuating them.)

If social philosophy determines to a considerable extent a great deal of what is done in schools, so also does the social system. Moreover, it is probably inevitable that the importance of the American school's relationship to our social system and the closeness of that relationship, will increase even more than it has done in the last 60 years. This seems likely because technological advances make each of us increasingly dependent on others--that is, on society--and the increasing complexities of a technological society make it less and less possible for us to pick up on our own, what we need to know about society. To an ever increasing extent, the life of modern man must be life within a society. Hence, insofar as the schools are to help individuals with their own lives, they must prepare students to live in a particular social system. And insofar as the schools seek to make possible the continuation of a particular school system, they must enable their students to understand it.

Thus, a steadily growing emphasis on social philosophy and the relationship of schools to society has been one of the most outstanding features of Twentieth Century educational thought in this country. Indeed, the major complaint underlying the revolution in education which began at the turn of the century was that the school was unrealistic: it did not prepare its graduates for life in this society. Throughout the last 60 years, a great deal of the criticism directed at schools has been to the effect that education was not adequately serving the appropriate social philosophy. All the way from John Dewey's efforts to show previously-unnoticed implications of democracy for education, to the John Birch Society's exposure that the "proper" social philosophy is undermined in the nation's schools--the essence of much criticism has been the divorcement of education from social philosophy.

The response of educators has been a growing concern with the social system and with social philosophy. Some have even gone so far as to maintain that the schools are the appropriate agency for selecting and building a social philosophy, hence system--not merely for teaching it, but also for determining what it shall be.

There are two major reasons why such a presumptuous proposal was made. First, even the most ardent patriot must admit that life in this country is not perfect. Particularly as national catastrophes such as the Depression have struck, some began to question whether our social philosophy needed modification. They asked, in effect, whether the new conditions making such catastrophe possible had also rendered our social philosophy outmoded and obsolete. If so, then educators were in a key position to point out this obsolescence and to urge the need for a new social philosophy.



The second reason why some educational thinkers began to suggest that schools devise social philosophy was that it became increasingly evident that we lacked a nationally agreed-upon social philosophy. Here again, the facts were impressive. The sharp contrast between the social philosophies of the Liberal and the Conservative - the chasm dividing an Adlai Stevenson from a Barry Goldwater - illustrates that the American people do indeed differ intensely and fundamentally on social philosophy: not merely as to means - (politics) - but also as to ends -- the society to be sought (or social philosophy). As social scientists began to suggest the importance to social and individual stability of a single, widely-shared social philosophy, some educators began to conclude that the schools should attempt to build commitment to a single philosophy. In the nature of the case, of course, this meant abandoning neutrality in the interests of one position, to be determined by the educators themselves.

Whether or not one chooses to agree to the course of action urged in this reasoning, the facts involved in the argument are hard to deny. Our living conditions are vastly different from those of a century ago, and Americans do seem to espouse a number of quite different social philosophies. The questions on later pages provide abundant evidence of this variety and diversity.

Now as the above suggests, one of the ways in which social philosophy is seen to relate to education is in the role of content. One of the major reasons for the establishment of any public school system, in any society, is to preserve that society. And one of the things most definitive of any group is the goals and ideals it espouses for the group as a whole. Thus, one of the things any public school system would be certain to teach is social philosophy. Beyond these goals and ideals, there are other things which the schools must teach if they are to contribute to the preservation of society.\* They must instill the knowledge necessary to that society's continued existence. The thought of what would happen if one American generation were to grow up without knowledge of machines shows the dependence of our society's continuation on the transmission of certain information. Thus it is not only social philosophy which provides content for schools to teach. Information related to societal needs and conditions also dictates educational content. So the facts which serve as content, as well as the philosophies, show one way in which a particular social system affects an educational system. There are also other ways.

---

\* It is possible, of course, to deny that it is a purpose of schools to contribute substantially to society's preservation; but no public, or governmentally-supported school system has ever done so, nor in the nature of the case is this ever likely to occur. It would be hard to justify the expenditure of public funds unless public purposes were prominent. (It can be argued that even the predominantly religious schools of Colonial Massachusetts aimed prominently at the perpetuation of a religiously-dominated earthly community.)

The entire organization of the school, and the relations which that organization prescribes - among school personnel, and between teachers and students - is likely to be affected by the social system. Whether the school administrator occupies the all-powerful role of the ship's captain, or whether his function is seen as more analogous to the very different role of the hospital administrator, may be determined in part by the social system and philosophy. Whether students are encouraged to look to teachers as the very fount of truth, or as qualified experts in certain areas -- or, for that matter, as having little more right to speak than the student himself -- this also rests, in part, on the social system and on the social philosophy which prevails. Thus it can be seen that the effects on education of a given social system and philosophy are far-ranging indeed. They are not limited to the two kinds of illustrations given here -- their effects can and do extend far beyond educational content and the quality of relationships within the school. In fact, there is little about education which is wholly exempt from influence by the social system and social philosophy. These can and often have pervaded everything in education, all the way from the most detailed classroom practice to the most abstract formulations of educational theory.

It has been the purpose of this introduction to sketch the relationship of a social philosophy, to education. First, the sources or grounds of social philosophy were examined, and its relationship to a social system. Then some of the effects, on education of the social system and philosophy were outlined, along with the ways in which some educators have conceived the demands of this relationship. We then saw two examples of specific aspects of education and how these might be affected by the social system and philosophy.

The following pages offer a number of statements about the role of the schools with respect to society and in relation to the specific social system in which American education operates. These statements reveal seven different conceptions of the school - society relationship, and they advance seven very different courses of action as appropriate for public education.

As you read these statements, it should become clear that a conception of the good society -- a social philosophy -- underlies many if not most of these proposals for what schools should be and do. Look for the particular conception of the good society underlying each educational proposal. And try to relate this position in social philosophy to specific views on knowledge, man, and value. Think also about what the proposal would mean for education, if put into action: How would it affect curriculum and content? school organization? general methods of teaching?

The material which follows has been taken from an article titled "The Role of Education in the Present Social Situation," by John L. Childs and William H. Kilpatrick.

\* \* \* \* \*



1. VIEW THAT EDUCATION MUST BE AUTHORITATIVE, BASED ON TRUTH SUPERNATURALLY REVEALED

"Educating the young is in its nature one of the most serious occupations, as it is practiced one of the most frivolous. Its purpose is to fit human beings for living. But you cannot fit people for living, unless you know what the purpose of living is: you can have no reasonable understanding of any activity--living as a totality or any of its departments--if you do not know its purpose. Therefore the first question as an educator must ask himself is whether he knows the right purpose of life, the right purpose of the living human being. The questions which occupy most of the discussion space are secondary to that and depend upon it for their answers: conditioning the child, the best subjects to teach, the best arrangement of society, the validity or otherwise of the profit motive--not one of them can be answered intelligently, till you can say what man's purpose is. You do not even know (save on the most obvious questions) what is good or bad for a man till you know the purpose of his existence. That is good for him which helps, that is bad for him which hinders, the achievement of the purpose of his being. The first of all questions in the practical order is this of the purpose of human life."

"But for an educator to impose upon he is educating his own personal view of the purpose of human life is a tyranny. No one who knows what knowing means can pretend that he knows the purpose of human life as a result of his own examination of human beings and human history: he can claim no more than probability. And I repeat that the educator who proceeds to shape human lives according to his own guess is exercising a tyranny."

"The Catholic position is that man has a maker and that the maker has said what he made man for. Therefore--not of himself but by the revelation of God--the Catholic knows the purpose of man's life and, if he be an educator, he has the answer to what we have seen in the first question. He may be a thoroughly bad educator--perhaps through being a born fool--but he has the first requirement. Has anyone else?"

- F.J. Sheed, The Social Fronteign  
Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 10,11.

2. VIEW THAT THE SCHOOL SHOULD SERVE AS THE AGENT OF THE STATE WHICH AUTHORITATIVELY DETERMINES ITS AIMS AND PROGRAM

A. "We want no teachers who say there are two sides to every question, including even our system of government; who care more for their 'academic freedom of speech' and opinion (so-called) than for their country. Academic freedom of speech has no place in school, where the youth of our country are taught and their unformed minds are developed. There are no two sides to loyalty to this country and its flag. There is nothing debatable about allegiance to the flag and the Republic for which it stands. Freedom of speech does not give the right to teach disloyalty to our children and college youth."

- Address by President-General in  
Daughters of the American Revolution  
Magazine, 57:270 (May, 1923) Quoted  
in Kilpatrick: Source Book in Phil-  
osophy of Education, p. 27.

B. "Democracy provides education for all of its children as a long term investment to insure its own perpetuation and to promote its own interests. Realizing that the children of today will be the citizens of tomorrow, democracy does not dare entrust their direction and training to others who may have different ideals. It must insure that these new citizens have faith in the principles on which it is based and that they are prepared to contribute effectively to its continuance and improvement along the lines that society has approved. It would be suicidal to train them differently; it would be foolish to leave to others the decision as to what sort of education the youth of today shall have. Whether clearly understood or not, this is the reason why the State--that is, organized society--is so jealous of its right to control education and so sensitive to all attempts by others to interfere."

Thomas H. Briggs: Secondary Education, p212

"The basic function of education is, therefore, to make youth better disposed and better able to contribute to the betterment of society, either by participating with their maximum effectiveness in the accepted modes of life or by perceiving other and better modes, which they are active in convincing their fellows are superior. The principle now being elaborated, it will be seen is far from justifying a static society. It assumes that changes will constantly be needed and that as they are needed they should be made. But changes should first be approved by adult society and then taught to youth along with the justifying reasons. It would be the same of folly for society to maintain schools for perpetuating and promoting its ideals and then to permit any individual teacher to use his strategic position for indoctrinating youth with ideals hostile to those approved by the majority of the supporting public.

Thus conceived, education is of such importance that society not only must support it, society must control it and insure that every youth comes under its influence. If private schools of any of the several kinds are to continue, it follows that they cannot be allowed to be wholly independent. It is essential that they be controlled at least to the extent of insuring that they likewise contribute to the perpetuation and the promotion of the interests of society as the public have decided them to be.

Thomas H. Briggs, Teachers College Record,  
Vol. XXVI, No. 7, p. 595

C. "There is an irony and a moral in the social insignificance of the American school in the present social crisis. No school has ever been more popularized, praised, potted, or pampered with money. It has been the kept darling of the plutocracy and the idolized plaything of the masses. In the main, neither group has numbered many devotees of any scheme of civilized values. Serious interest in the school has centered around getting a technical preparation, or useful connections for money-making, or else around getting a job in the schools. For the masses, the school is a necessary process to enable them to read signs and advertisements. For the more favored the school has been a playground. The moral is obvious. The school realizes its highest possibilities only as the instrument of a dominant elite who not only have cultural values but who also are prepared to express them in the manifold enterprises of social control, which include fighting and governing as well as teaching. The American school will come into its own when it becomes alive with the spirit of men of strong convictions and iron wills to achieve. The school will be an instrument of a high culture, when it recognizes fulfillment, achievement, and deds to be the text of truth, right, and beauty, not normative verbalisms the precise meaning and correct



application of which men can and will go on disagreeing about to the end of time. In short, the school can only attain its highest dignity or fulfill its noblest destiny as an integrated part of the creative machinery of a civilization."

Lawrence, Dennis, The Social Frontier,  
Vol. I, No. 4, p. 15.

3. VIEW THAT THE SCHOOL, ESSENTIALLY A CONSERVING AGENCY, SHOULD TEACH ONLY THOSE IDEAS AND VALUES COMMONLY ACCEPTED IN SOCIETY. IN ADDITION TO COMMUNICATING THESE TRADITIONAL OUTLOOKS, THE SCHOOL SHOULD SEEK TO DEVELOP HABITS OF CRITICAL AND THOROUGH THOUGHT.

A. "That our schools can do more than they have done in the past to develop in pupils a critical attitude, but a critical attitude warranted only by mastery of knowledge, to weigh evidence, and to arrive at judgments cannot be denied. Can the school, however, go beyond this and throw its class-rooms open for the discussion of controversial issues on which the greatest intellects of the day have so far failed to reach decisions? To what extent would society permit its schools to discuss critically not the workings of government but the character of existing political and social orders; it may even allow its schools to analyze the shortcomings and defects of our present economic order, but how long would the schools be allowed to advocate the substitution of a new order? Such limitations on what it claimed to be the right to professional freedom may be deplored, but so long as the educational situation remains as it has always been and is, teachers must enter the profession with a full knowledge of the limitations which society placed upon them. No doubt there are aspects of education in which the teaching profession may rightly protest against external interference, but in the long run most social and national systems establish schools for the preservation of their culture.....

The school, then, cannot build a new social order nor should teachers combine as a group to penetrate from within. This is not a matter of courage or cowardice; it is a question of fact which all history of education has proved and which the study of any educational system, even the most radical and revolutionary, confirms. The school can only build the social order which society desires and derives its coloring from the social scene; it does not create or modify, it but strengthens and gives reality to it. This condition does not detract from the task which teachers can perform and that is to devote more attention to the meaning of the culture and ideals, the hopes and ambitions which society expects to gain through the school, to discover the reasons for the break in gauge between school and society, to analyze the causes for the failure of the school to fulfill the duties which it has professedly assumed, in a word, to make the public more conscious of the ideals which it fundamentally does desire for its children, to dignify and ennoble them.

For the teachers as a profession there still remains the imperative duty of visualizing and giving reality to the dream of America, to discover whether there is an American culture which can furnish ideals and reality for the school; without this, preoccupation and methods and curricula, with techniques and devices for the improvement of the school, and with developing a so-called science of education, is meaningless. Without embarking on a utopian vision of a new order, the American school still has much to achieve, if it can instil into the minds of the growing generation ideals of freedom and equality, tolerance and open-mindedness, and an attitude of criticism and intellectual sensitiveness to the situation as it is, based not on sentiment and theory but

on ascertained facts and knowledge; if it can cultivate enlightenment based not on scepticism but on inquiry and thought; and if it can develop an idea of individualism which recognizes that one's own interest lies not in success at the expense of others but insistently demands a sense of social responsibility and cooperation.

In this sense, because these are fundamentally American ideals, the school can build the social order; in a constituted society the social order is changed by a slow process whose manifestations are incalculable; the school reflects social demands but does not initiate social change. A new education can be developed when the public has determined what the nature of the new America will be; to reverse the process would be to plough the sands. This is not a counsel of despair nor does it mean that education and the school have no concern with social progress; it does, however, mean that they are confronted with the task of discovering how social progress can best be promoted within the fabric of society as it is. It might be well to recall Thomas Arnold's words when he undertook the reform of Rugby.. 'Another system,' he said, 'may be better in itself, but I am placed in this system and am bound to try what I can make of it.'

I.L. Kandel, The Kandelphian Review,  
Vol. XII, No. 2, 150-153.

B. "When the consensus of the American people shall have decided the kind of social order they want, I think the schools are prepared to give instruction in that social order."

Frank Ballou, Meeting the Department of  
Superintendence, National Education  
Association, Atlantic City, February,  
1955. Quoted in The Social Frontier,  
Vol. I, No. 7, p.5.

#### 4. EDUCATION VIEWED AS A SOCIAL PROCESS OF CONTINUOUS CRITICISM AND RECONSTRUCTION OF VALUES WITHOUT EFFORT ON THE PART OF THE SCHOOL TO WEIGHT TO OUTCOME.

A. "The lack of a fixed and final end shifts the spotlight from the result to the process. The important thing in education, as we are frequently assured, is 'growth'. This end is secured by encouraging pupils to engage in personal undertakings in which they learn to rely on their own intelligence. With increasing maturity they are expected to deal increasingly with the reconstruction of beliefs and attitudes, in the same general way. If this is done with sincerity and seriousness of purpose and with increase in power, the result is growth, regardless of outcome. The achievements of today become the basis for further growth tomorrow. In one important respect, therefore, this position is distinctive. It cannot prescribe conclusions without contradicting itself. The whole business becomes hypocrisy if it is decided in advance which conclusions are to be reached. This is altogether too much like letting a small boy think he is driving the team if he is permitted to hold the lines behind the hand of the real driver."



"If this latter kind of education is to be called indoctrination it is indoctrination of a distinctive kind. It is indoctrination in the belief or attitude that the individual has the right to a choice of beliefs. Stated negatively and in terms of paradox, it is indoctrination in the belief that the indoctrination of beliefs is wrong."

Boyd H. Bode, The Social Frontier,  
Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 21,22.

B. "The development of a scientific attitude toward social problems, rather than indoctrination, is the goal. While controversial issues of social life should define certain of the materials of the good curriculum, this does not mean that the schools should teach children what to think regarding these issues. Indeed such indoctrination would be contrary to the very spirit which demands a study of such issues. The understanding that such indoctrination would defeat the very purpose of education makes the problem of centering the curriculum in the social studies more approachable. To think, not what to think, is the good curriculum's objective for the child."

The Tenth (1932) Yearbook, Department  
of Superintendence of the N.E.A. p. 191

C. "Indoctrination is probably an essential and inevitable function of education in the broadest sense of the term. Social cohesion and the very notion of a 'society' may depend upon some such process of 'making' citizens. The real question is not whether we should have freedom or indoctrination in the schools, but rather whether we should make a conscious and deliberate attempt at imposition there. There will be plenty of unconscious indoctrination resulting from the fact that the school operates in a given social setting. Society has other agencies - such as the family, the church, the press, and the political party - to attend to the process of conscious indoctrination. Is there not peril to the school and to society in a program that seeks to make the school an instrument of conscious inculcation of purposes and of values? Can an educator who subscribes to the purpose of deliberately propagandizing his students according to his own particular insight and values really object to the sort of propaganda that currently swamps curricula from the side of vested interests of a social, commercial or 'patriotic' sort?"

Harry D. Gideons, The Social Frontier  
Vol. I, No. 4, p. 15.

5. EDUCATION VIEWED AS THE CONTINUOUS PROCESS OF CRITICISM CARRIED ON WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF A POSITIVE SOCIAL ORIENTATION, BUT WITH CARE TO PRESERVE THE RIGHT OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TO CRITICIZE AND TO REJECT THE SOCIAL VIEWS OF THE EDUCATOR IF HIS THINKING SO INDICATES.

"The teaching profession is now faced with choice between two social orientations. Of these two orientations, one looks to the past, the other to the future. And this is but a part of the story. That which looks to the past, looks also by the necessities of the situation to the interests of a small class having a highly privileged position maintained at the expense of the masses. That which looks to the future is in line with the scientific,

technological, and industrial forces of the present, and, what is more, it is in the interest of the freedom, security, and cultural development of the masses. Everything that the editors say about the reality of the contest between these opposed interests and groups, I believe to be also true. In one way or another, teachers as a body and individually do and must make a choice between these opposed social orientations and all they practically imply.

But the more these things are admitted, the more urgent becomes the question of method. And method is much more than a matter of method in classroom instruction. It includes all the items already mentioned: architecture and equipment of buildings; the composition and control of and by school boards; the relations of administrators to classroom teachers; the prevailing modes of 'discipline' and drill and use of memory, of texts and subject-matter. The tendency of these things by and large is toward undemocratic social consequences, and the almost automatic maintenance of the privileges of the small class.

When we face the problem of method in relation to a new social orientation, the place of intelligence looms as the central issue. I cannot agree with those who think that making intelligence central in education signifies a neutral, aloof, and 'purely intellectual', not to say mechanical, attitude toward social conflict. How do those of us who believe that the advance of science and technology is creating a new pattern of social life, and is producing a new type of social conflict between the privileged and under-privileged, come to that belief, Did we arrive at it by a process of inculcation or by what we regard as an intelligent study of historical and existing forces and conditions? If the latter, and if the method of intelligence has worked in our own case, how can we assume that the method will not work with our students, and that it will not with them generate ardor and practical energy? The realization that the school has and must have some social orientation raises but does not settle the question of the method by which a new social orientation shall be brought about. Till the latter issue is faced, the whole subject of indoctrination remains ambiguous."

John Dewey, The Social Frontier  
Vol. I, No. 5, p.9.

6. EDUCATION VIEWED AS THE INCULCATION OF A POSITIVE SOCIAL OUTLOOK INCLUDING THE AIM OF DEVELOPING AN INDIVIDUAL WHO CAN COOPERATE IN THE FURTHER CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS OUTLOOK.

A. "Education is a form of action on the part of some particular social group; it is not a species of contemplation removed from social life and relationships.

Education always expresses some social philosophy, either large or small, involves some choices with respect to social and individual action and wellbeing, rests upon some moral conception.

Conceived in a large and clarified frame of reference, education is one of the highest forms of statesmanship: a positive and creative attack upon the problems generated by the movement of ideas and interests in society.

More specifically, in the case of the schools, the social sciences as



bodies of empirical data contain no inner logic which determines clearly and positively either the scope, the content, or the structure of social science materials to be taught or the social activities to be encouraged. Scientific method should condition, but it cannot determine, the selection.

If education continues to emphasize the philosophy of individualism in economy, it will increase the accompanying social tensions. If it organizes a program in terms of philosophy which harmonizes with the facts of a closely integrated society, it will ease the strains of the transition taking place in actuality. The making of choices cannot be evaded, for inaction in education is a form of action.

Recognizing the necessity of living in an integrated economy and aware that such economy may be made to serve either some privileged minority or the entire population, the Commission deliberately presents to education, and affirms the desirability of, an economy managed in the interests of the masses, as distinguished from any class or bureaucracy."

Conclusions and Recommendations,  
Report of the Commission on the  
Social Studies, American Historical  
Association, pp. 9-10, 30, 37, 38.

B. "If the teachers are to play a positive and creative role in building a better social order, indeed if they are not to march in the ranks of economic, political, and cultural reaction, they will have to emancipate themselves completely from the domination of the business interests of the nation, cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers and promotion agents, repudiate utterly the ideal of material success as the goal of education, abandon the smug middleclass tradition on which they have been nourished in the past, acquire a realistic understanding of the forces that actually rule the world, and formulate a fundamental program of thought and action that will deal honestly and intelligently with the problems of industrial civilization. They will have to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the school, and redefine their own position in society. Such measures will of course require fundamental changes in the methods of teacher training and the assumption on the part of the profession of an increasing burden of cultural leadership.

Our philosophy of education should be securely rooted in the democratic-revolutionary tradition of the American people, but should bathe its branches in the atmosphere of industrial civilization and the world of nations. It should aim to foster in boys and girls a profound sense of human worth, a genuine devotion to the welfare of the masses, a deep aversion to the tyranny of privilege, a warm feeling of kinship with all the races of mankind and a quick readiness to engage in bold social experimentation. It should also accept industrial society as an established fact, cease casting nostalgic eyes towards the agrarian past, take up boldly the challenge of the present, recognize the corporate and interdependent character of the contemporary order, and transfer the democratic tradition from individualistic to collectivist economic foundations. It should point toward a productive and distributive system managed in the interests of all who labor, and toward a society marked by comparative equality of material condition and dominated by the ideal of guaranteeing to every child born into the nation the fullest opportunities for personal growth. This would

This would involve the frank abandonment of the doctrines of laissez-faire, the administration for the common good of the means of production, and the wide adoption of the principle of social and economic planning.

A Call to the Teachers of the Nation,  
Committee on Social and Economic Problems,  
Progressive Ed. Association, pp. 20-21.

7. EDUCATION VIEWED AS THE MOLDING OF MINDS SO AS TO MAKE THEM CONFORM TO PATTERNS OF BELIEF AND CONDUCT NOT NOW CONTAINED WITHIN THE OPERATING PATTERNS OF EXISTING SOCIETY: THE VIEW THAT THE SCHOOL, BEING AN INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE PRESENT STATE, CAN DO LITTLE TO FURTHER BASIC SOCIAL CHANGE.

A. "Those of us whose analysis of the crisis of capitalism leads us to the revolutionary solution, and who see the institutions of learning as inextricably involved in this crisis, must therefore be pardoned for our scepticism toward any program of social change which relies upon the school system as an important instrument in bringing that change about. The school system must itself be revolutionized, before it can become an instrument of revolution - or of any serious social change.

A revolutionary proletarian system of education necessarily involves indoctrination as an essential feature (indoctrination being defined, not as the preaching of a body of doctrine, but as the inculcation of a positive attitude in favor of a specific type of social activity). In the present educational system of the United States, however, the general trend of indoctrination is, because of the capitalist control, necessarily reactionary in character. Thus it comes about that all progressive forces in the educational field, insofar as they must work within the generally established institutions, find themselves in conflict (more or less sharp) with the trend of indoctrination. Those who frankly recognize and admit that their struggle is against capitalist indoctrination, do so at the peril of their professional careers; they are quickly identified as 'dangerous doctrinaires' to be eliminated from the educational system as quickly as possible. Hence arises the theory of education above doctrine, or independent of doctrine, that is, above or independent of any positive views of life, a reactionary theory used as a protective cover for the weak and timid progressive forces which must work in an environment dominated by deadly enemies."

Earl Browder, The Social Frontier,  
Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 22-23.

B. "We are not supporters of the thesis that an existing society can be changed through the school. To make the school the embryo of the future socialistic order is impossible for the simple reason that the school cannot be independent of its environment. Moreover, the school should be most intimately related to the contemporary life; it should study, observe, and participate in an organized way in that life. The school will of course reflect the existing situation; and children because of their imitativeness and suggestibility are naturally influenced by their surroundings."

A.P. Pinkowitch, New Education in the Soviet Republic, pp. 153-54.