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CHAPTER I

THE DEMAND FOR A PHILOSOPHICAL DETERMINATION OF METHODS, SUBJECT MATTER, AND OBJECTIVES IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

One of the most pertinent questions with which educators have been concerned is that of stating clearly the need for a guiding philosophy in the determination of methods, subject matter, and objectives in the field of education.\(^1\) In the past, persistent and consistent appeals have been made to science (statistics, tests and measurements of various kinds, and psychology) with a view to securing the answer to the multiplicity of baffling problems imminent and intricate. It was discovered, after some time, that even science knew some limits, and that beyond these limits, it could not go.\(^2\) Science, it is admitted from all sides, had much to offer, but that alone was not sufficient. That the school should in desperation, in the face of social disaster, seek other fields for the alleviation of its burdens is obvious and natural. Science is accurate in aiding in the discovery of that which already exists. But what is imperiously demanded at this time is a technique for discovering or creating something telic—something by which the old ship of education

---


can be steered into a not-too-certain future. Thus, an insistent, persistent appeal has been made to the indispensable source, philosophy.

Up to date, there has been an inordinate amount of time spent, books written, theses produced, and articles published concerning the employment of worthwhile methods, living subject matter, and practicable goals in the field of education. There are some very recent theses and dissertations completed which show the growing importance of the present need of a philosophical determination of every aspect of education. One of the outstanding studies is the book written by J. L. Childs, Education and the philosophy of Experimentalism, a doctor's dissertation. In this study, the author makes a very close observation of the employment of philosophically determined procedures in every aspect of education. "The Present Day Demand for a Philosophy of Education" is a thesis written by Marcellus C. Felter, at Catholic University. In this study, the writer makes a critical and unbiased statement of the conditions which convince one of the need for a philosophical determination of all phases of education. "The State and Modern Theories of Education", a doctor's dissertation, by Harry L. Ouse is another study which adds to the increased importance of such a problem.

Many articles, text-books, and theses are evidences of the relative importance of the growing interest in such a study as the one proposed. However, as far as the knowledge of the writer is concerned, none of these studies has been chiefly concerned with showing the indispensability of an effective philosophical determination of educational methods, subject matter, and objectives. They have merely been concerned with stating the relation between education and philosophy. As in the field of science,

---

it is inadequate to know merely the effect and relation between science
and life, without seeing the need of applying its basic principles and
methods to what the individual does, so it is most inadequate for the
teacher and educator to know the relation between education and philo-
sophy and not, at the same time, see the need for employing them at the same
time in their various duties. Foremost emphasis will be placed upon develop-
ing a felt need for such a relationship. It is well to know the text-
books an instructor in English, let us say, employs; but most important,
it is worthwhile to know his philosophy, because his philosophy is very
often the modus operandi of his teaching act.  

This study is therefore, intended for anyone capable of teaching anything at all. For one must have
a well-formulated practical philosophy in order to do the best teaching.

And after all, the method by which a child learns a subject determines
largely the use to which such knowledge will later be put. Philosophy
should determine both the what and the how of teaching. Then again, it is
not enough for educators to know that they are on their road and going
fast as far as science is concerned. They must know where they are going
as well, and more so.

The unique character of this study, at least as the writer intends, is
to make an intensive research into the facts concerned with that phase of
philosophy which specifically deals with the determination of subject
matter, goals, and methods, these three phases being so closely allied that
one is practically inseparable from the other. It is argued by outstanding
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educators and philosophers of today that education can never be successful
unless it has a workable philosophy. Following this argument, much has
been written concerning the problem at issue. Many writers concerned
with other problems have touched rather dramatically upon this subject.¹

Purpose of this Study.— My avowed task shall be to assemble data
pertinent to this study and from such material, discover: first, is there
an increasing demand for a philosophical determination of the methods,
subject matter, and the goals of education? Second, what are the basic
social factors responsible for this demand if such a demand does exist?
Third, to circumscribe, if possible, the changes that might be made if
philosophy is so applied to the field of education.

The impetus to make this study comes as a regretful realization of a
felt need (in my own experience as a beginner in this field) for the study
of philosophy as it is related to education. Similar attitudes observed
among my classmates and co-teachers assure me that I was not alone in
feeling as I did. Thus knowing that one will benefit more if he feels
intensely the necessity for that in which he is engaged, the above stated
incentive offers added stimulus for delving into this study.

Plan of the Study.— All available references on the subject including
original source material, historical, philosophical, and educational will be
studied, analyzed, and woven into a unified whole, thereby pointing out as
clearly as possible how insistent this need for a philosophical determination

¹Roes L. Finney, A Sociological Philosophy of Education, (the book) New York,
1933, and W.R. Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, (the book),
New York, 1917.
is, why there is a growing need for such a determination, and what its
effect will be in the field of education.

The materials will be critically treated and related in an expository
manner, that being the best method by which to narrate a detailed study
such as will be found in the following pages. In order to give the most
complete and lucid account throughout, the historical narrative will be
employed at certain points, indicating the evolutionary character of cer-
tain of the present day educational practices and theories.

While this study is intended to be original in its treatment, at no
time will a mere uninformed opinion of the writer be relied upon. Out-
standing educators, sociologists, and philosophers such as Locke, Lovey,
Finney, Childs, Counts, Rush, Puma, Kilpatrick, Taylor, etc., will consti-
tute the unretiring group of authorities. This group, however, will by no
means exhaust the list of writers to be consulted persistently throughout
the study.

This study falls into four parts. The first part will be concerned
with recent trends in education. One hears much concerning the need of
philosophy in the field of education. The purpose of the research in
part one is to see if there is a substantiation of this very prevalent
belief. If this is true, there will be an attempt, also in part one, to
show what are the distinctive features of the philosophic method which
make it possibly the most practicable in solving the conditions now
undeniably admitted to be found in the schools.

In part two, there will be an attempt to discover what social and
mental factors are responsible for such a widespread insistence for the
employment of philosophy; to see what their educational implications are;
and to ascertain how philosophy may aid in the discovery of a "way out".
for the school. Perhaps these environmental and mental factors are responsible for the conflicting tendencies in American life and consequently in education. In this chapter, there will be an attempt to discover what these conflicting tendencies are, and how philosophy may possibly aid in harmonizing such conflicts.

In part three an attempt will be made to see how the school might be affected if the philosophic method is the guiding factor in the determination of the goals, subject matter, and methods of instruction. What will be the methods employed? Will the goals be changed? What subjects are to be taught and why? Will the subjects remain the same, and be taught by a different method? Will the general direction of all education be altered? These are some of the rather fundamental issues to be attempted throughout this part.

The last section will be a general survey and explanation of the findings integrating in a concentrated fashion the entire study.
Recent Trends in the Field of Education

Recent trends in the investigations throughout the field of education show that of late an inordinate amount of attention has been given to matters of school organization and to the technique of teaching and that too little attention has been given to an interpretation of the social and psychological factors which affect the nature of the educative process and indirectly the use of administrative and teaching procedures. Yet, in recent times, there are significant steps noted in an opposite direction. Kinneman expresses this trend as follows:  

During recent decades some significant movements have developed in the field of public education. One of the most important of these is the movement for the selection of satisfactory curricular material with a view to meeting the greatest social utility. Curricular revisions have been numerous. It remains for them, however, to adapt their material more closely than has been done to the demands of society and to the current functioning of society.  

Another writer of import has a suggestion expressing a similar view, and for added emphasis, the substance of his thoughts is here posited. According to him, the task thus set for education is work at the upbuilding of a civilization. In his words,  

It is customary to think of education more narrowly, especially as confined, to the younger and now irresponsible and ineffective members of society, and these shut up in school houses, separated from society and its life, and having with it only remote and preparatory connection.  

---

In addition, the same writer states

A different view is meant here, that education is actually life desirably carried on with ever more conscious intent to improve itself as it goes. Such an education begins, of course, with the tender years but should continue throughout the years that follow, building itself more and more on the insistent problems of social life. Being life, and so inextricably interwoven with surrounding life, this education will—in the degree that it is sincere and alert—not consent to stay within any one house nor be cut off from its surrounding life. On the contrary, it will ever seek to enlarge its view and its consequent intentional connections with the world about. This education will use the school but will at all times extend beyond it and for each individual will eventually outgrow it. In every experience this education will seek to unite thought and action in their essential life unity, for otherwise thinking has neither adequate origin or test and educative responsibility has neither point nor possibility. This process carried on ever more and more broadly and efficiently is the plan herein conceived for discharging our educational task.

Recent investigations also show that it is the conviction of some prominent educators that professional education has as yet only dimly realized its responsibility for the use of fundamental cultural materials as the basic method of preparation for the service of teaching or school administration. Bode, in his Fundamentals of Education, expresses this idea in forwarding the view that the school does not avowedly undertake to prepare the child for adult life as it actually is, but for adult life "as idealized and refined". The school, according to him, is employed as an institution both for conserving the past and for reform and progress.

More than is true of other forms of social service, professional education requires vast understanding of social organization and of child nature. That there is added emphasis within these fields in modern times,


is established by the following statement from Dewey.

In consequence partly of the effects of educational reformers, partly of increased interest in child-psychology, and partly of the direct experience of the school room, the course of study has in the past generation undergone one considerable modification. The desirability of starting from and with the experience and capacities of learners, a lesson enforced from all three quarters, has led to the introduction of forms of activity, in play and work, similar to those in which children and youth on the outside of school, modern psychology has substituted for the general, ready-made faculties of older theory, a complex group of instinctive and imitative tendencies. Experience has shown that when children have a chance at physical activities which bring their natural impulses into play, going to school is a joy, confinement is less of a burden, and learning is easier.\(^1\)

Recent Social Trends and the School.– Moreover, modern tendencies point to the fact that the present social crisis, with its connotation of a much needed orientation in education, now makes it appear that a majority of current, practical proposals for changes of practice has been with particular aspects of the larger problem without first envisaging the larger educational problem itself.\(^2\)

These proposals have ignored very largely the problem of the continuous improvement of the individual in all the aspects of his life after formal schooling of the usual sort has ceased. Where such continued education has been emphasized, it has appeared under the heading of "adult education" and has been thought to occupy a separate province.\(^3\) But it is possible as now seems obvious, that a great social cataclysm can endanger the very foundations of civilization without the slightest warning from the school and without a single agreement regarding the way to future security. Then why it not be that the public school has conceived too

---

narrowly its larger social responsibility? Is it possible that the
interest in immediate practicality has run the school into a side track?\(^1\)

But surely, if social disaster can creep upon us quite unheralded
by schools already committed seriously to a program for the efficient
achievement of useful results, there is something fundamentally wrong with
education. May it not be that the results, earnestly and efficiently
sought are not so important after all? The situation at least suggests
that, since there may be so little causal connection between the influence
of the school and the stronger forces that are shaping society
of the social habits of individuals and groups, the school might easily
afford to pause long enough to consider where it is going.\(^2\)

The Growing Need for Planning in the Field of Education.— There is
today, more than ever before, a need for careful planning in all aspects
of the educational field. A statement from Zede gives added significance
to the preceding statement. Concerning this need for planning, he says:

There is danger of overlooking the big issues in fatuous admiration
of our achievements in detail. Unless we knew where we are going, there
is not much comfort in being assured that we are on the way and traveling
fast. The result is likely to be that much of our progress is not
seeing. \(^3\)

In recent times, then, when business and industry are considering
the importance of planning for their own future safety and security, is
it not well that the school should re-examine its own direction? Shall
education follow in the wake of institutions designed for other purposes

\(1\) S. Counts, Were the School Build a New Social Order, New York, 1930, (Book

\(3\) Ibid., p. 141.
than the education of individuals, or shall it step boldly forward with
the determined will to give direction and reality to the course of civili-
ization? The modern trend is herein indicated by a statement posited
by a prominent educator. According to him, as conscious education,
whether of young or old, faces such a situation as our "hand-over eco-
nomic system"; it cannot be neutral. To do nothing is in so far to perpetu-
ate out-worn and now hurtful doctrines. Further, he continues, that most
American schools, probably, do in effect thus join hands with reactionary
influences to maintain the status quo of present quality of attitudes,
feelings, or social experience of the individual. Thus, he concludes,
that the school has therefore, whether it has meant to do so or not, not
only supported existing social cleavages or conflicts, but has also pro-
ceeded consistently with their perpetuation.3

In accepting responsibility for social planning, then, the education-
al process can no longer refer to such things as administration or the
organization of a scheme of school subjects narrowly considered.4 It
must refer to the way administrators, supervisors, and teachers observe
the wider range of conditions that affect the quality of children's in-
dividual and group experiences. A statement, pointed and brief, from
Evans, conveys this idea emphatically. He writes:

More in keeping with the new activity conception of education is
a variety of forms of approach that have been classified under the
general head of 'developmental method'. In this procedure emphasis is

12, S. Counts, Here the School Build's New Social Order? New York, 1930.
laid upon teaching pupils rather than subject matter. The purpose of such a method is not to test what has been memorized by the pupils, but to enable them to form their own judgments and work out difficulties in their own way, with only such assistance as is genuinely economical of time and energy.¹

Elsewhere there lurks, at present, the notion that the educational program emerges quite automatically from the findings of numerous, particular investigations. It is assumed that educationists need have little concern about program. It is thought that this will take care of itself as the mounting results of scientific studies find their way into practice.² But history shows this to be a most naive assumption. The history of the sciences is particularly suggestive here. Consider for a moment the history of physics. What was it that directed Galileo in the making of particular experiments with rolling balls on an inclined plane, the swinging of the pendulum, and the dropping of balls from the Leaning Tower of Pisa? What degree of intelligibility would have attached to such acts except as they were connected with a scheme of general thought about falling bodies and the constitution of the universe which suggested what measurements to make and how to interpret them? In The American Road to Culture, George S. Counts speaks concerning our faith in a Science of Education forwarding these thoughts:

The Americans, with few exceptions, have the utmost confidence in the applications of the scientific method to the field of education. Many prominent educators seem even to believe that there is no educational problem which is incapable of objective solution. They contend, moreover, that insistence on the employment of any other method is to waste time and obscure thinking. In support of this position they point to the centuries of fruitless speculation about education and to the general dispute into which such speculation plunged the entire subject of pedagogy.

They consequently demand facts, and yet more facts; and the surest and quickest way of achieving academic reputation among them is either to collect or to devise some instrument for collecting new facts. They, however, never define very clearly just what they mean by facts, and how facts are to be distinguished from ideas. Because of this deep distrust of speculation there are great university departments of education in the United States in which no general courses in educational philosophy or the general theory of education are offered. The Americans thus hope to make education an exact science and remove its problems from the realm of dispute.1

The writer continues, pointing out the trends in modern times, stating that

This complete absorption in educational science, however, is beginning to relax. Many able students of the question are contending that the solution of educational problems does not follow automatically from investigation and that provision must be made for a process of synthesis and evaluation which lies somewhat beyond the confines of science. They argue that while facts are absolutely essential to the solution of an educational problem, the same facts may with different sets of values lead to different solutions.

Recent conclusions, then, show that just as a scheme of relationships constituting a gross attitude toward certain important aspects of the physical phenomena of the universe has been the very foundation upon which modern developments in physics have gone forward, so, in education there is needed some more basic, controlling hypothesis regarding the manner in which individual and social development takes place. This suggests that particular instances of education as forms of practical direction of learning are highly complex and subject to subtle influences that are minute and immediate, on the one hand, and pervasive and remote in their connections, on the other hand. Reference must constantly be made to an underlying scheme of values to give direction and meaning to immediate instances of educational art.

---


2Ibid.
According to present day educationists, an adequate basis for an educational program can only come from an interpretation of children's behavior, for, "the most characteristic thing about life," these educators argue, "is behavior, activity." But modern day sociologists force us to admit that the behavior of children is constantly mingling with the behavior of others, especially of adults. Thus, the unnoticed contents of the social mind largely compose the framework of all our social structures.

Of course, adults were here before the children arrived on the scene. Adults were here with their own desires, habits, expectations, requirements, and standards before the children. They had skills, abilities, techniques, habits, customs, institutions, in short, ways of doing things and of using things. They had beliefs, prejudices, ambitions, failures, successes, aspirations, problems and ideals. All these were active and insistent.

To understand the child, then, means to understand how these adult ways or modes of association catch the child up within themselves and mold him into their own likeness. But the need of an educational program implies that many of these existing adult influences are undesirable. Some we wish to perpetuate; some we prefer to eliminate if possible. At this point we discover that those educationists who think that they do not stand for the school as a reforming agency really do not mean what they say. For not a single one of them would stand for just anything in the school. The fact that we will not allow just anything to happen in the school is an indication that we are at least dimly aware of the need of the educational program that is selective in that it fosters only certain features of social life. Even now we try to keep the children from


practicing such traits as selfishness, nagging, dishonesty, snobbishness, poor methods of work, and the like. We realize that children will get too much practice in such traits from the influences which are very active outside of the school.¹ "As in such a situation we seek a defensible positive program, two things must characterize our educational endeavors. On the one hand, we must distinguish a proper education from anything that is in effect prejudice building or mere training; we cannot in general rest content with the unthinking acceptance of what is learned. On the other hand, we must help any we touch, whether old or young, to study the rival claims of contending new ideas that progress in thought and action may more surely take the defensibly best road, while the individual himself shall in the process thereby best learn to help forward such progress."²

The Philosophical Approach to Education.—Just how is this defensible program or scheme of education to be developed? Many educators express a deep faith in the basic features of philosophy. Therefore, a careful consideration of philosophy and its outstanding method will be set forth.

The term "philosophy" is employed so frequently, and variously, that it is well for the sake of immediate clarity, to set forth the significance of the word when employed in this particular study. And, inasmuch as much confusion may lurk within the pages over and beyond the control of the writer, it is therefore most necessary that any such clarifications be made at the very outset.

One hears a vast amount of discussion concerning a philosophy of life and, indeed, of a philosophy of education. Just what is meant may be

²W.H. Kilpatrick, Educational Frontier, New York, 1933, p. 146-47.
ascertained if one has a knowledge of this often-employed word.

Philosophy, according to one outstanding authority, is an attempt to think truly about all of human experience as a whole. It is an attempt to make our whole experience intelligible.¹

One infers, naturally enough, then, that everything in the universe is of interest to the philosopher, because human experience enters into everything. The universe is inexhaustible; so is philosophy. The universe is unintelligible; so is philosophy.² Problems continually arise in the world about us; thus, philosophy is continually striving. It is a continual attempt to fathom human experience.

But, philosophy cannot be explained in a few sentences—so comprehensive is its meaning, and so far-reaching are its implications. In the other sciences, one has no doubt as to what their peculiar subject matter is to consist of. Astronomy is about the stars; geology is about the rocks; botany is about the plants; and psychology is about the mind. But, what one frequently asks, can philosophy be concerned with? It does not appear to have for its theme a perfectly definite group of facts. So at first, one feels somewhat lost in this subject and wishes that it could be explained quite clearly just what philosophy is.

Cannot this very reasonable demand for a clear definition of philosophy be satisfied? To the writer, there can be no clearer picture of philosophy given that that visualized mentally by one if he considers philosophy to be a circle of all the sciences; it is a part of, it is an integration of all the sciences.³ Set forth a philosophy devoid of

¹J.L. Childs, Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism, New York, 1931.
²C.T.W. Patrick, Introduction to Philosophy, Riverside Press, 1924, p. 5.
³C.T.W. Patrick, op.cit., p. 5.
any of the sciences, and you show forth an incomplete philosophy.

The supreme aim in philosophy, then, is for well-rounded conclusive interpretations. The philosopher wishes to view the landscape from a certain objective, well-informed point of view, and to a certain extent, he achieves this end. But, because our existence is transcendental, the philosopher must rest within the limits of his finiteness. Philosophy has often been defined as the cultural study of meanings and values, or as the interpretation of all life. Matthew Arnold puts it in a striking yet meaningful fashion when he says that it is an attempt "to see life steadily and to see it whole." In his telling phrases both the aim and the method of philosophy are presented. The philosophic aim is to see life as a unity not with the slant of the specialized scientist or the business man or the clubman, or as the artist, or as the poet, or as the university professor, nor with any single slant, but, instead, to see it as it would be seen by the "spectator of all time and all existence;" and the method is to see it steadily, neither biased nor prejudiced with half-knowledge. It is an attempt to understand the world in which we live, with the careful aid of all the sciences. This effort to understand the world, to combine the results of the special sciences into some kind of consistent, meaningful world-view, has always been the aim of philosophy from the days of Thales, the first Greek philosopher, to the present day. A statement of the method and the technique of philosophy has been well stated by one of the outstanding sociologists:

It is that careful, critical, systematic work of the intellect in the formulation of beliefs, with the aim of making them represent the highest degree of probability, in face of the fact that adequate data are not obtainable for strictly demonstrable conclusions.

---

3 Ross L. Finney, *op. cit.* p. 3.
Brief mention of the philology of the word is of worthy significance. It has a Greek origin and comes from the two words, 'sophia' and 'philein' meaning 'love of wisdom'. It is an attempt to gain a coherent unity in all of our thinking. Hibbens says that "the problems of philosophy are, in fact, the problems of life, the burden and mystery of existence, the origin and destiny of man, the relations which he sustains to the world of which he is a part, and to the unseen universe which lies round about him." Thus one readily sees that the problems of a philosopher are deep, and of now narrow concern.

Necessarily, the goals of the educational philosopher are idealistic. He never completely attains his ends. That for which he strives lies just beyond. "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?" That, in essence is the manner in which the philosopher views his problems—it is something forever to be achieved, continually pursued, but never completely attained. His pleasure is consonant with his ever-perfected strides toward his stated goals. His emphasis is upon how improved his attempts are as over and against the attempts of philosophers of a century ago. He is never satisfied with the world as it is; he seeks for a circumscribed, continuous, and needed change which he discovers from the circumstances within his social existence. Thus, educational philosophers are intrinsically concerned with the improvement of human affairs.

The Genesis of Philosophical Problems in Education.-- One wonders, and reasonably so, what all the previous definition, and delimitation can possibly have to do with the aims in education, or indeed, with any aspect of education. It is evident, or at least desirable, that one understand that philosophy arises from the social environment. With this thought

1Grier J. Hibben, Problems of Philosophy, New York, p. 3.
foremost in mind, what Horne has to say at this point, may, in an economically intelligent manner, clear up the question previously stated, namely, what has all the discussion immediately preceding to do with the determination of aims, or of any aspects of education. A lengthy exposition of the matter is inevitable. According to him,

... We shall see that philosophy, truly viewed, is resolving the conflicts arising in social life. We have hitherto presented philosophy in terms of the problems with which it deals. These problems all arise in the difficulties of social life. The genesis of philosophy is social. The lineaments of social practice reappear in philosophical systems. It is the quality of current experience which determines what men already think about nature, themselves, and the reality supposed to include or govern both. The philosophical problems whose solutions record the social practices of the period are such as these: the relations of mind and matter; of soul and body; of humanity and physical nature; of the individual and society; of knowing and doing; of theory and practice—just such matters as have engaged our attention.

It is generally recognized that one of the most significant social enterprises is education. Since social practice gives rise to philosophical theory, it is suggestive that it was the pressure of educational questions among the Athenians, that gave rise to European philosophy. As philosophy is understood today, it began with the Sophists of Greece. Prior speculations of the Greeks in Asia Minor and Italy belong rather to the history of science than to the history of philosophy. True, these speculations are recorded in our histories of philosophy but the topics are scientific, such as how the things of nature are made and changed. Those thinkers dealt with the action of nature, not the conduct of man. Succeeding these natural philosophers, were the Sophists, traveling teachers who applied the methods and results of the earlier thinkers to the problems of conduct. Their story is worth following in some detail.1

The writer continues, pointing out the fact that while the Sophists were the first professional educators in Europe, they demanded pay for their services, instructing the youth in "virtue, politics, and the management of household and city. Philosophy began to deal with the relation of the individual to some group, some comprehensive class, or some universal, such as nature, or tradition." These teachers raised

---

various questions as: "Can virtue be learned? Can approved excellence in any line be learned? What is learning? What is knowledge? Is knowledge acquired through the senses, or through a logically disciplined reason, or through apprenticeship in some specific form of doing?"

Intriguing questions as these all originally had very practical bearings on education.

...The stream of European philosophical thought arose as a theory of educational procedure. This fact is eloquent witness to the intimate connection of philosophy and education. True it is that in the course of two or three generations these questions were cut loose from their original educational setting and were discussed on their own account. Thus came about what never should have happened, viz., philosophy became an independent branch of inquiry into matters of theory apart from practice. The objectional classical tradition in philosophy began.

Thus from the situation of the Sophists one can see how the concept of philosophy and education may be remotely connected. In a similar manner, one sees that the origin and purpose of educational practice and philosophical theory are the same, viz., how to form right mental and moral habits concerning the problems of nature and the current social difficulties of man. Philosophy, historically viewed, is just a general theory of education. Similarly, the philosophy of education is simply a formulation of the problems involved in securing these socially useful mental and moral habits. It is not, in the external application, a set of ready-made ideas alien to educational procedure.

2Ibid, p.462.
3Ibid.
Thus appears the intimate connection between philosophy and education. They are reciprocally serviceable. Education saves philosophy from the artificial and makes it vital; philosophy saves education from routine and makes it socially effective. To amplify these views somewhat, we note that education is interested in the human, in distinction from the technical, significance of philosophical discussions. A philosophical theory which makes no difference in educational practice must be artificial. The student of philosophy needs warning not to take it as so much nimble or severe intellectual exercise or as something said by philosophers that is of concern to them alone. Philosophic issues really formulate life situations; this is apparent when we ask, to what mental disposition do they correspond? What differences in educational practice do they make? The educational point of view enables the student to see philosophical problems in the practical social settings where they arise, thrive, are at home, and make a difference. . . Philosophy indicates what social changes are desirable; education produces the mental and moral attitudes necessary to bring about these changes. 1

With the original, and indeed the rightful connection stated between the field of education and the field of philosophy, the immediately succeeding questions to be raised will not appear ludicrous.

Philosophy at Work in the Field of Education.—Why need the teacher philosophize? Why is there so great a task presented to the present day educator? Why need the administrator be concerned with the philosophical aspects of the situation? What place can philosophy have in the very practical task of guiding a class of forty children through the tribulations of grammatical usage or the facts of the Louisiana Purchase? What has philosophy to do with fractions? What has it to do with bank discounts, or the geography of Asia? By what freak of intellect can it be supposed that philosophy has even a remote connection with the problems of teaching children to read with reasonable speed and comprehension, to spell with ninety percent accuracy, and to write up to standard 15 on Dr. X's handwriting scale? Certainly the really practical matter in these everyday tasks of the teacher is the derivation of systematic devices and techniques which insure reasonable economy in the mastery of such

Any educational doctrine that slurs over these matters in the interest of some high sounding ideal or vague progressivism is bound to perpetuate its own increasing disfavor. Furthermore, it is sure to meet with disillusionment when it confronts from five to seven or even eight sections averaging around forty pupils each meeting daily in the typically over-crowded school building of our congested city areas where space, time facilities, administrative arrangements, and building programs are themselves unable to keep abreast of the rapidly expanding school population. Such a doctrine or theory will speedily learn that what is at present imperiously demanded in the typical American school room is an individual who can do a bit more for this mass of children than deal with them like numbers in a prison or as isolated individuals who are required to "cover" prescribed amounts of particular subjects as the basis of promotion. It will be necessary to recognize, first as last, that efficient methods simply must be used in the handling of large groups coming in quick succession with too little time for real teacher-pupil contact and mutual understanding.

In the face of this insistent practical situation, one frequently observes at the present time a tendency to offer apology for statements or attitudes admitted to be philosophical in character, and therefore, harmless or irrelevant, particularly when such statements are made after what is set forth as a straightforward, practical exposition of realities. It is apparently supposed that practical considerations are in no proper sense connected with the philosophical. Anyway, can we not

dispense with so much theory, now that we have the aid of the instruments
of science for discovering important abilities, facts and principles, and
for the efficient teaching and measuring of specific learning products?

Why not get down to earth in practice and go ahead with the job of teach-
ing boys and girls those things which common sense aided by consensus of
opinion and the methods of science unmistakably suggest as products which
education should achieve? Are there not certain skills to be developed?

And do we not have appropriate techniques for the ordered spelling or
addition? Are there not certain problematic situations in the subject
matter of our social-civic life, as well as in the courses of study or
text-books? And do we not have problem techniques? Are there not cer-
tain appreciations to be cultivated? And do we not have appropriate
procedures here also?

Again, are there not also certain constructive, manipulative, or physi-
cally overt sorts of responses to be cultivated? And do we not have
the "project" techniques of instruction in order that the child may be-
come increasingly effective in those situations of home, occupation, or
communication that require particularized abilities or skills, those
situations that require thoughtful response to the social, civic, and
moral phases of life, and those situations that require habitually ef-
f ective response to the health needs and to the worthy use of one's
leisure time? Is not the child's education about as simple as this?


2C. Melvin, op. cit., p. 269.

3W. H. Kilpatrick, The Project Method, Teachers' College Bulletin,
10th section, no. 3, October 10, 1918.
in view of this practical situation, is it at all strange that there should remain in educational thought a sort of irritating unwillingness to admit that there is anything in the philosophy of education which only those specifically trained in this field can adequately understand, or that there is any considerable need for spending precious time philosophizing about matters that could be dealt with on the basis of practicality and efficiency? To some who hold that in order to administer an intelligence test one must be specifically trained, it must be rather annoying to keep on insisting that a certain ordered philosophizing is necessary in order to reach a defensible position on such a matter as, say the kind and amount of freedom to employ in classrooms where the sorts of specific, measurable efficiencies and knowledges are being developed.

While it is rather generally conceded that a same sort of freedom is both desirable and necessary in schools now-a-days, it is either implicitly or explicitly denied that anything more than one's practical sense is needed to supply. It may be even conceded that such a question is one of values and that by no stretch of the imagination could the usual efficiency methods that are applicable in teaching and measuring learning products be made to answer it. Yet it is hardly admitted that there is anything distinctive in the teacher's method of reaching a proper personal view in the matter. Perhaps this is because such questions as freedom and the like, do not seem to admit of objective analysis and a standardized treatment. At any rate, the question is apparently regarded as being of

---

1H. H. Horne, _op. cit._, p. 460.

such minor importance that mere personal opinion may decide.\textsuperscript{1}

This same attitude may be found wherever philosophic questions arise. Consider the question whether education should emphasize what is precious to the child or prepare him for his "fifty years of adulthood." Here the urgent demand that we teach that which is useful, that nothing be included in the course of study for which "a clear case cannot be made out", has resulted in a speedy practicality in reaching decisions.\textsuperscript{2} It is one of the strange paradoxes of the present situation that this general attitude seems to be an actual hindrance to educational progress. It seems to be a hindrance because its very practicality blinds educators to its essential short-sightedness. It is apparently overlooked that a thing may be immediately practical or useful, from an adult viewpoint, without at the same time being deeply or permanently useful to the learner because it has not been incorporated into his disposition or general method of action and thought.

Teachers are faced, then, with the need of deciding the kind of usefulness to emphasize, the kind of freedom to employ, and the like. Usefulness for what? And does not the way a child comes to know a thing determine largely the use to which he will put it? We wish children to be good. But does not the way they come to be good determine what they will be good for? May one's goodness not be, on the one hand, a drab, colorless conforming docility, or on the other hand, a positive, constructive, dynamic force that takes proper account of social relations— all depending upon the way individuals come into possession of their traits of goodness?


\textsuperscript{2}J. L. Childs, \textit{op. cit.}, chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{3}John Dewey, \textit{loc. cit.}
A child may know perfectly (so far as conscious awareness is concerned) that he should be cooperative or that he should brush his teeth, and yet the knowledge may not have been incorporated into his disposition or general method of action. This situation is sometimes falsified on the basis of an outworn psychology by insisting that the child must first learn the thing and then learn to apply it. Of course, the truth of the matter is that he has not learned it if it does not get to work in subsequent situations. The philosophic issue thus becomes: Shall learning be conceived as a quantitative matter of developing numerous, specific products, or shall learning be regarded as a qualitative affair? If the latter view is taken, it means more freedom for the child. But what shall the teacher mean by freedom? Is freedom something to be granted the child? Does it mean allowing the child to do as he pleases in choice of action or procedure? Or is freedom an achievement? Is freedom acquired like other desirable traits, or is it a concession? These and similar pertinent questions concerning other traits of character are being continually asked by the alert educator.

The Distinctive Features of the Philosophic Method.- The moment that questions like these are raised, the whole question of the place of philosophizing takes on a new light. Mere common sense, one readily sees, is not enough. In the field of education, as in others, there are times, as in the case above, when educators are compelled to decide what to do in an educational situation. They are confronted with the need of making a choice among two or more possible lines of action. If this were not so, they would have no occasion to choose. Now the essential

---

point to note here is that they are dealing with choice of action. Something pulls them in one direction; something else pulls in a different direction. These are not mere, cold intellectual events. They involve an emotional element. We have a conflict of desires as well as the intellectual perception of different directions which our actions might take. Indeed, the emotional element of desire appears as part and parcel of the perception of different directions which our action might take.

One sees, then, that the matter of choice of action involves the need for integrating the emotional, the intellectual, and the active aspects of behavior in order that some policy or program of action may be adopted. This also means, of course, that all pertinent, known facts from whatever source should be available in order that they may be perceived as relationships in the decision. But, here, one notes that the discovery of such facts, (as this process is usually conceived in the use of the scientific method), has no connection with the decision in action.

The scientific method, in its usual sense, tries deliberately to divest itself of such emotional factors as choice, prejudice, likes, dislikes, desire, and the like. Horne expresses a similar idea in stating:

... But there is one interest left over which is not so bound up and clearly marks off a personal subjective realm; it is the interest in interests, the interest in introspection. There is no occasion to deny interests in our ongoing objective social and physical environment. Neither should we deny the indisputable fact that we are interested in our emotions, ideas, and acts, themselves. Here is something one step removed from the ongoing process, something transcendent, personal, and subjective.1

The philosophic method is an effort to integrate the more personal, emotional, intellectual, and active elements of behavior in those situations where competing directions of possible action or desire present themselves and where something must be done.2

According to Childs:

The experimentalist also finds that a revised conception of experience keeps him from the errors of abstract intellectualism. . . Man has developed mind, but he had an affectional and volitional nature before he came to possess mind. He is still far from being a mere passionless reason. Desire, preference, active seeking and avoiding are basic qualities in all experience. . .

Holding this view of that form of experience called thinking, the experimentalist is not seriously disturbed that clinical psychology shows thought to be largely a rationalization of desire. Originally it was the radical error of abstract intellectualism to suppose that thought and desire were antithetical. It is probably inevitable that the fresh discovery that thought and desire are intimately connected should lead many to react to the other extreme, causing them to assume that thought is the mere servant of already existing desires. . . What is wanted is that desire, preference, bias may become more intelligent. . .

The educator wishes to manage things in such a way that the individual will make the best choice of which he is capable, all things considered—his prejudices, his habits, limitations of knowledge, and all such. In short, the philosophic method takes the individual and confronts him with situations of action. It tries to get him to consider all pertinent facts, of course. One sees from the foregoing, that the philosophic method places considerable emphasis upon the functional learning and use of knowledge in relation to situations of conduct or choice of action where conflicting interests are present. The value of the method, is, therefore, in the contribution which it makes to the individual's power to deal more adequately with situations of choice in his life. The philosophic method is essentially the individual's method of growth in meeting and deciding upon questions of policy or action.


3Ibid.
where all sorts of factors, emotional, intellectual, and social, must be brought together in an effort to reach a satisfactory working attitude.\(^1\) One sees, then, that the distinctiveness in the philosophic method is its effort to deal with the delicate business of revising personal choices, viewpoints, and outlooks. It wishes to help the individual grow in the direction of a more complete or total perception of what is involved in situations of choice. It also wishes to help the individual achieve a certain unity or wholeness of view in connection with the particular problems of life. But the philosophic method recognizes the difference between movement toward unity of outlook and reaching such unity. It realizes that it is the direction, not the consummation that is the goal.\(^2\)

In making explicit the distinctiveness of philosophy, necessarily, one must set forth what the source of such problems is. The peculiar character of philosophic problems and also their great difficulty appear only when account is taken of the present situation of conflicts which seem to grow out of the very structure of life itself.\(^3\) Naturally, then, one understands how these life conflicts will be reflected in education.\(^4\) Some illustrations of these conflicts are, for example, the problems raised by the current emphasis upon children's interest or activities as the center of the curriculum. Here the contrasting doctrine is that which emphasizes a logically organized course of study, "specific objectives," definite teacher direction, definite assignments, and the like.

---

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 116.
The philosophic issue appears as spontaneity versus external direction. In this case, it is perfectly obvious that both sides represent values which society cherishes for every individual. On the one hand is society's growing interest in respecting the personality of the individual, of treating both old and young as ends in themselves, and, accordingly, of respecting what is precious to them. On the other hand is society's equally worthy, if more insistent, interest in the conservation of its achieved values, an interest which has been so great that at times there has seemed a willingness to sacrifice initiative and spontaneity in order to insure the efficient transmission of these values.

The philosophic concern in such apparent suppositions is at once of immediate interest. The difficulty arises when it is thought that for educational purposes a choice or compromise must be made between these values. One does not need to go far to discover here a deep-lying historic assumption which influences this practical view. It is the ever-recurring question of the individual versus society. There are many educators, for instance, who propose seriously that the inborn tendencies of children are opposed to anything that is social.1 On the one hand attempts have been made to determine the locus of value within the individual, thus reducing social institutions to an instrumental value. Philosophy holds that there is a way of conceiving these opposites which unites them and reduces to an absurdity the notion that one is diametrically opposed to the other. It is only until recently that society and the individual have been conceived as being two stages in a single process. Thus, one sees what the intrinsic value of

---

philosophy is, what its source is, and how it serves the educator. At the present time, there are definite trends towards philosophy, as an aid in the solution of these baffling problems facing every alert educator today. There is the greatest interest in the manner that philosophy will affect the goals, the methods, and the subject matter to be used in the education of children. Will the increased employment of philosophy in education change radically the present goals and objectives? Will the goals remain the same, but be achieved by a different method? What of the subject matter, will new courses find their way into the curriculum because of philosophy? Will the same subjects remain in their time-honored places, and be taught in a new manner? What of these modern theories of education and their exponents? These are the insistent issues to be treated with a view to using all available pertinent sources of information now so widely discussed.
CHAPTER III
THE NATURE AND CAUSE OF PHILOSOPHICAL DETERMINISM
IN MODERN EDUCATION

It has been pointed out, in the preceding chapters, how modern trends turn us definitely and unmistakably away from an exclusive use of "pure science", toward philosophy as a method of educational guidance. To know the pertinent factors underlying these deep-seated, intricate yet obvious changes, one must, of necessity, turn his attention to the social conditions out of which they grow. Any criticisms of our educational systems redound upon the present day social conditions, for (at least if one accepts the thesis of Dewey) the school is but the materialization of the philosophy and environment in which it is found. Hence, any demand for reform or reconstruction in educational practices, methods, goals, or subject matter terminates in a demand for a reform in the educational philosophy which, of course, emanates from the attending circumstances upon which it is based.

Today, one needs only to study the work of outstanding educators, philosophers, and sociologists to discover that is is precisely these factors, (the interaction of contemporary philosophy, and social environment upon the school), that complicates any discussion of educational problems and consequently of educational philosophy. These factors

are so numerous, so insistent, so crucial, and education has been so
directly affected by them, that they have been termed, appropriately
enough, "demands". These demands present themselves in such an exacting
manner that to consider them by any haphazard method would be insomuch as
to ignore them; and to ignore them is the same as perpetuating them. So,
face to face, in a critical, systematic, procedure, the school is gradu-
ally coming to grips with the forces.

The conditions, because of the complexity of the situation from which
they rise, are baffling, intricate, and challenging; they are innumerable
and not easily circumscribed. They may, however, be rather conveniently
summed up under two general captions; namely, those which are traceable
to an outgrowth of a changed mental attitude during the last centuries;
and those which are traceable to an outgrowth of a changed environment.¹
Both of these phases, essentially allied in their nature, are the keys
for the solution of educational problems. Thus, a detailed study and
presentation of these factors are of tremendous educational significance.

The Changed Mental Attitude.—There will be a discussion of these
basic subjective or mental factors making a philosophical determination
necessary especially within recent times. A copious supply of literature,
investigations, researches, etc. lend debatable witness to this fact.²
In Education for a Changing Civilization, Kilpatrick makes a similar

¹William H. Kilpatrick, Education for a Changing Civilization, New York,
1926, p. 16.

²Alfred Weber and R. B. Perry, History of Philosophy, New York, 1925,
pp. 223-227.
assertion in a manner at once convincing:

A changed mental outlook is evident on all sides, even though we may not all agree on how to describe it. The older attitude, found equally among the two great divisions of Western Christianity, emphasized the untrustworthiness of man's natural faculties, the unreliability of his thinking. Unaided from without he could not reach trustworthy conclusions. However, if properly aided, he could without the use of empirical checks build authoritative systems which could and should be accepted. Reliable faith thus could be located only outside of man. As to man himself, what he could do of and for himself, there was, officially, for thought at any rate, complete skepticism. Man was "unable to do or even think any good whatever".

It would be too much to say that this old skepticism is dead. Certain current manifestations point only too clearly to its still active presence. But certainly in the realm of thought there has come a very different attitude. Here there is a positive faith in man's power to think and by testing to prove his thought correct to within the limits of the testing. In scientific method there is a new kind and sense of security. From this vantage point the modern mind looks on untroubled at the breaking up of the atom or the overthrow of Newton's law. Instead of being a defeat of tested thought, each such instance is a positive victory for it. The method has vindicated itself by testing more accurately...

That this changed mental outlook is distinct and characterized by specific attitudes peculiar to it and lacking to the earlier mental outlook is clearly manifested when one considers them comparatively. Whereas, the present tendency is for individuals to criticize, doubt, and question all theories, assumptions, procedures, and occurrences, in the earlier days there was a humble acceptance of all things. The words of kings, philosophers, etc., were accepted undebatably, and their words were as divine messages to be accepted without challenge. Today, there is gradually emerging the tendency to test thought before accepting it. These subjective changes are of immediate importance. Schorling and McClusky express this view thus concisely:

Recent changes... in attitudes and ideals as well as customs and institutions, point unmistakably to certain present trends of social forces that are creating new and problematic situations for the school.

---


That these mental changes are multifarious and deep-seated is partially indicated by the very complexity of their social origin. A detailed discussion of these changes is to be made with a view to discovering whether or not, at the present time, there is any real necessity of reconstructing the policy or philosophy of education as a social institution. If there is, does it arise partly out of maladjustments caused by rapid, general and profound changes in American mental outlook? What then, are these changes?

In the first instance, there have been noticeable changes in the intellectual status of our entire population. People are now, more than in any preceding century, constantly augmenting their intellectual qualities. There is a growing number of people filling the school houses. The radio and the newspaper play their part. This makes for an outlook that is critical and well-informed, typifying the group as a whole. The unquestioning acceptance of all things has gone. People demand to know a why for every what that exists. The result is that intellectual satisfaction is to be had only on a scientific basis. The attitude of testing and doubting thought before acceptance is the prevailing characteristic of the times. There is gradually emerging the pragmatic tendency to judge the worth of things by their consequences. It is this attitude of critical mindedness which has served as a catalytic agent to the advance of science.


2Robert Rusk, Philosophical Bases of Education, Boston, 1929, pp. 80, 93.
Another phase of these subjective changes which are observable is that of the development of scientific outlook. It is a familiar old, yet interesting, story how the advent of science has radically altered man's method of thinking. This scientific spirit has been greatly encouraged, and its results have been pronounced in every field of human interest and activity. Man, in recent times, has come to believe that the ultimate source of all authority, as well as the criterion for all his beliefs and conduct, are to be found in ordinary experience. It is this same attitude which has brought man to think that, empirically, out of his own resources and ingenuities he can best ascertain the proper rules of guidance, and indeed of living.\(^1\) Thus his relentless employment of hypotheses and tentative solutions can be understood. Man, because of his newer attitude, is coming to think that knowledge itself is merely a form of experience and therefore, that thinking and experimenting are entities in a single process. Because of this strong belief in experience, testing, etc., he has come to think that there is nothing final or fixed for all times. Thus, his employment of hypotheses and continued testing are unending. To him, all is change, nothing being permanent save change itself.\(^2\) With the inception of this idea comes the destruction of innumerable assertions formerly held as infallible. Continued scientific research and the accumulation of scientific knowledge, and the development and influence of the theory of evolution upon modern thinking have enriched this changed outlook. The concept of evolution


has penetrated into and become characteristic of practically every type of human thinking during the past quarter of a century. It was this concept that has weaned man from the fixities and inflexibilities of the past and given us a world that is plastic and malleable. More than anything else, this concept has helped men to familiarize themselves with the notion that all our functions, even the intellectual, are to be regarded as adaptations to the needs of life and to the realization of life's values.

One of the most obvious outgrowths of this changed outlook is the abolition of certain fixed sets of moral beliefs and traditional ideas. They have literally been shattered into absurdity and ultimately into oblivion. Men have grown into the opinion that there is rarely one best way out of any situation. Therefore, in moral situations, as in all others, it becomes a matter of sizing up a particular case, and of choosing the best way out. Ultimately then, there emerges this distinct shift from external to internal control which gives way, eventually to a waning authoritarianism especially prevalent today. This shift is discernible in modern times, in the activities of the youth as it attempts to solve the problems which arise. It is observed how this group manifests a slight irritability to too much outside interference especially in the moral sphere. Less and less do they accept existing customs and standards as binding and unalterable.

The implications of these changes have been taken into consideration by the schools. There are many educators who have accepted these changed attitudes on the part of the child and realize that they are a natural outcome of the spirit of the times. On the other hand, are those educators looking more to the past than present or future who would cling
tenaciously to the set of fixed beliefs established long ere this. And because of this conflict of opinion in the schools, the educational significance of this attitude is increased.

This changed outlook is evidenced by another factor. There is now a growing emphasis upon the objective, impersonal, valid method by which man has come to judge his experiences and consequences. This is in contradiction to that formerly held. An exponent of this changed method is one of our earliest scientists, Galileo. He was an early example of what is more universally true in modern times. He drew conclusions from experiments and thus disproved generally the utter absurdity of too much armchair thinking. One can realize the importance of Galileo's contribution when he considers the significant bearing that it has had on modern life and thinking. The three main tendencies of present day civilization are outgrowths of his contribution; those tendencies being: industrialization, critical mindedness, and the democratic tendency.¹

The tendency to test, criticize, analyze, doubt, etc., has become so accentuated as to grow into complete skepticism on the part of many. People, (a large majority) have come to doubt all of mundane existence. There is a lack of faith in both God and man alike. This spirit has been continually spreading since 1600. The words of so-called authorities have fallen victims to this scathing scrutiny. Men have, through the enormous growth of science, reconciled their minds more or less to the idea that approximate truth is about as near as one can ever get. The so-called laws of nature are continually being put to the acid test. Because of these changes, all science, philosophy, and religion are even being called

upon to justify themselves by their effect upon life, and finally their effect upon the school. There is also a growing insistence on applying the new and more adequate interpretations to life in every field of human endeavor. The result is a growing need and emphasis on the social sciences.

In leading universities one finds this general attitude. There is a feeling that science must not only render intellectual satisfaction to those who pursue it; it must render service to humanity as well. Knowledge is no longer regarded as an end in itself, but as a means to something higher. Today, there is a prevalent conviction that the chief purpose of life is to live, and our knowing and learning are for the sake of improving our living.

Environmental or Objective Changes. To the thinking mind it is not difficult to see how exacting and how numerous are the burdens placed upon the school because of a changed mental outlook. However, inasmuch as the environmental changes are interwoven so intricately with the mental aspects, it is at once problematical to ascertain, in every case, which is cause or which effect. Many writers have termed some of these changes as "mixed" ones indicating that they are part and parcel of each other. The main factor, however, for the school to remember is that they exist, no matter what the kind. There will be an attempt to show the relationship of the environmental to the subjective changes after a relating of the environmental changes shall have been completed. More important, there will be an attempt to discover how both these aspects make exacting demands upon the school for a philosophical determination of the goals, methods, and subject matter.
The Demands from Without.- This section will be devoted to the discovery of those objective changes occurring in man’s environment which make bids for the need of philosophy for guidance. The confusion found in the school has been thought to arise from the chaos existing in the society of which it is a part. Thus, there is a tendency to examine these factors with a view to determining a policy more in keeping with the needs of a democratic society.

These conditions which we face have been summed up by one of America’s leading educators. According to him: “Two major problems confront the American people, and in the efforts to solve both of these problems, education must be vitally interested.”¹ The two major problems to which he refers are “Industrialization” and “Individualization.” It will be immediately noted that the one, individualism, is a philosophic problem traceable throughout the history of thought and prominent in the past century from which it has come down to us as a heritage under the guise of the naturalistic philosophy popularized by Rousseau and Spencer to mention but a few of its exponents. It is evident, then, that because individualism does represent a philosophy of life and because of its widespread popularity, one notes its all pervasive influence not only in every aspect of human activity, but in the school as well. Thus, the other of the two major problems, industrialization, is traceable, if not entirely, at least in part, (in so far as many of the evils of the system are induced, augmented, and complicated by this philosophy of life) to the individualistic philosophy which dominated the period of the industrial revolution. The terms “Individualism” and “Industrialization” as used by Bagley are a convenient summary of many of the

economic and social forces which Kilpatrick has characterized as "demands from without". 1

There will be an attempt in the pages immediately succeeding, to present a detailed account of these "demands from without" and simultaneously to point out their implications in the formulation of an educational philosophy more in accordance with the needs of the time.

**Individualism.**—The alternating cycle of individualism and collectivism is a phenomenon observable throughout the annals of history. Following its history closely, one observes a periodic pendulum swinging first from one extreme to the other. Thus in the Protestant revolt with its disrupting and disintegrating influences, there is readily discernible the extremist reaction against collectivism of the late middle ages. This was followed by a period of drastic exploration and pioneering in the new world, the period of scientific research and invention which had much to do with originating the industrial revolution. The natural consequences of these occurrences were to create personal independence and to apotheosize human achievement.2

It was with such a philosophical and social background that the American nation came into being. The driving cause of the American nation was the search for civil and political liberty and for individual freedom which was already stirring in the minds of Western Europeans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These two forces have been continually at work, and from the earliest times immigrants came to the new

continent as individuals and, as individuals, moved westward to the Pacific. This fact offers sufficient explanation for the apotheosizing of human achievement and indicates why "the ideal of individual success has consequently come to be defined in the terms of material prosperity." 1

It is obvious that these conditions which confronted the heterogeneous groups coming to America would accentuate the forces of individualism and disunion. Distances were great; communication was difficult; various racial and national antipathies and old world feuds served as catalytic agents in speeding along this process. The dissimilar social status and ideals, the economic differences, and even more, the religious dissension and the tolerance of all sects tended to force the struggling colonists further and further apart. While the war for Independence did in some measure serve to draw the colonists together, it did not, however, kill the seeds of social disunion, and dissension. The continued expansion westward, sectional interests, the Civil War, the new economic development and its resultant class conflicts—all these factors united in separating the interests, ideas, and actions of the colonists. It was out of this group that the material for a nation has come.

With the factors attending these evolving circumstances, socialization and industrialization, comes the "Changing Civilization" about which one hears so much today. There is another interesting factor easily detected today, also. The pendulum is beginning to swing in an opposite extreme. According to one of the leading educational sociologists:

The swing toward individualism continued until after the middle of the nineteenth century. Then came the turning point with the nationalistic political movements in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere, a period of unionism in churches, the interpretation of cultures through world travels,

internationalism and scientific and cultural organization.\(^1\)

Concerning our present civilization, Shreves reinforces the above assertion in the following statements: "Our age is characterized by commercialism and industrialism" he states, and notes "the objectivity of our individual and national mind."\(^2\)

That industrialization has had its innumerable effects upon our present conditions cannot be denied, so obvious and insistent are these in our society.

**Special Features of Industrialization.**—It does not detain one long to see that there are certain general factors which are direct outgrowths of our industrial age. The limitations as well as the dangers of our material prosperity are induced by industrialization. Many results are disastrous to human life; many are a boon to civilization as a whole. The most significant question under discussion today is the problem of properly combining and controlling these factors for the general welfare of all mankind. To do this, of course, involves various underlying social and economic factors.

When the entire situation is viewed, one can see certain prominent features of these changes being wrought by industrialization. One very distinct feature observable through the general chaos is the interplay of mind and matter. The pendulum continues to swing from individualism to collectivism. Thus, these new problems, continually arising out of the social conditions, are so interrelated that their origins are difficult to ascertain.


New factors continue to make bids for attention. Thus the problems are forever accumulating and thereby making already complex conditions rapidly more complex. The conditions are such that is is difficult to state whether there is a new philosophy shaping social forces or whether the new social factors necessitate the emergence of a novel philosophy. To Smith, the latter is the case. According to him, individualism in thought culminated in Carlyle and Herbert Spencer. The return towards a social philosophy has been commenced by the pragmatists and is particularly evident in such social philosophies as Mackenzie and Dewey, along with other leading thinkers in the field of sociology. Smith concludes this thought, however, with the idea that even the majority of educators still think in terms of the former; namely, that a new philosophy is shaping social forces.\(^1\)

Out of the turmoil today, one sees from the writings of men foremost in the field of sociology, that there is a trend towards social mindedness and away from individualism. This same feature is evidenced in the work of educators who are forcefully convinced that this trend must be taken into account in all school procedures. The result of the industrial changes, social, economic, and political is one that the schools cannot ignore so closely allied is its success with these very changes.

**Industrialization and the Changed Environmental Factors.**—A complete meticulous description of the present situation would prove a task so wide in its scope, and so involved in its nature that it would detain one too long in just that particular aspect alone. The attempt, on the other hand, will be to give an accurate over-view of the present

---

situation in order to discover what implications there are for a philosophical determination of the subject matter and methods and goals of education.

Growing Social Integration.—One of the most obvious, distinct effects of our rapidly developing industrialization is the growing social integration with quickening interdependence.¹ Prior to the days of power machinery each little community was, in a great measure, self-sustaining. Shelter, food, clothing, all simple enough to be sure, were practically secured within the immediate region. Even for the wealthier families who perhaps lived in cities, the same conditions were largely true, few added luxuries forming the principal exceptions. One notes that the family was the chief industrial agency, augmented and supplemented in the cities by the guilds. For years, this condition held true. However, with the coming of inventions, quick and numerous, power machinery wrought fundamental changes which were destined to shake the stability of the entire social and economic order.² Consider how the advent of the spinning-jenny and the power loom in the factory took precedence over the home. Note also how the invention of the cotton gin and the rapidly increasing means of transportation produced even more complications. The effect of these inventions is seen when a picture of the commercial innovations is presented. Consider how woolens and cotton materials are produced in America and elsewhere; how they are then shipped again to be woven, then


again to be spun, again to be made into garments, and still again to be purchased by customers. Over hundreds of miles, into thousands of communities, and for millions of people; is the life cycle of a single piece of material. Raw materials of all kinds are brought from near and far, manufactured into marketable products, then shipped along numberless other radii to all parts of the globe.\(^1\) It is through such a process that one part of the globe inevitably and increasingly is connected with every other section. Mutual interdependence characterizes every state of affairs. In a similar manner, and from a similar cause, accelerated by the growing division of labor, every person is more and more dependent upon others. Modern tendencies evidence an accelerated rate of speed taking place. Thus increasing integration and interdependence are correlative aspects of the same social process.

**Communication.**—Communication, the very nervous system and the intellectual side of this same integration, has increased with startling amazement. This has meant a growing facility and ease in the spread of ideas.\(^2\) Incidentally, it has also meant much in necessitating more interdependence. A comparison of modern communication with that of earlier modes serves as an illuminating example of this drastic change caused in this particular aspect. Contrasting the methods of Julius Caesar or Napoleon Bonaparte with those of today gives a picture of what actually has taken place within a few centuries. Both these persons had similar poor methods of conveying messages. The roads were poor. Travel was tedious and boring. It was slow and uncomfortable. The roads were, by

\(^1\) M. G. Kelty, *The American People*, Boston, 1931, p. 594.

no means, conducive to speed or convenience. Since their time, however, four distinct methods of communication serve to make transportation and spread of ideas, verbal and written, i.e., the railroads, steamships, aero-planes, and automobiles. Along side these inventions come also the tele-phone, telegraph, cable and the wireless, all of which inventions have played dynamic roles in bringing about the environmental conditions prevalent in society today.¹ In order to ascertain just how important these factors are, their implications will be fully related.

One of the greatest effects of these devices for communication has come a proximity of relationship between cities, between states, between nations. It is natural that such inventions should have such an effect. Along with this comes other economic results. The small factory has been forced gradually into the larger ones; factories have merged into colossal corporations, massiveness becomes speedily more massive. A factory town grows up around the newly established factories. Then factories multiply and magnify. The city expands as a result. The people from the country populate the more urban sections. Increased immi-gration augments the already growing situation. Consequently, a larger population can be supported by this enlarged production. Many organizations emerge, ever more successfully. Bigness continues ever bigger until it overwhelms. Thus the individual is swallowed up in the eternal process, and he thus tends to count increasingly less and less. With continued expansion of big business, there comes also a constant amalgamation in the proportion of people who work as subordinates to others instead of controlling their businesses. Being thus dependent, and speedily becoming more and more so, the individual inevitably finds

¹ W. R. Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, New York, 1917, p. 44.
himself being unmercifully engulfed by the enormity of all aspects of this industrial society.\textsuperscript{1} And still the vicious cycle goes on and man cannot escape its crushing effects. Man is being swallowed up in the massiveness of all things, and he suddenly becomes as a drop of water in the ocean and he can about as much prevail. There is decreased opportunity as well as less encouragement for one to understand the way of those things which go on round about him. The "rank and file" have concluded that their thinking is being done for them, not with their entire consent, however. Their welfare is precarious and significant. It is under these conditions of dissatisfied feelings, intense resentment, and impoverished conditions that the growing majority are being so subjected. The conditions are widespread and generally prevalent. It is the common knowledge of many.

**Political Situation.** This same gloomy condition is characteristic of the political affairs. Consider how this is true. While the complexities of the economic aspects of life continue to multiply, so also the intensification of the political problems necessarily loom larger, and at a preposterous rate. Note the revolution that is taking place in America today. It literally commands the attention of all.\textsuperscript{2} The increase in crime; the growth in wealth on the one side, and extreme poverty on the other; the overproduction of goods; the inability of many to purchase; the situation of permanent unemployment; the clash between capital and labor; the perplexing problems of racketeering; the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Philip W. Cox, *Curriculum Adjustment in the Secondary School*, Philadelphia, 1925, p. 9.}
\footnote{I. L. Kandel, in *Teachers College Record*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 5, Feb. 1933, pp. 359-367.}
\end{footnotes}
disintegration of family life, the increase in divorce and home incompatibility, the deadliness of war,—these all but cause politics to fade into insignificance, at least so it is insisted. The importance of all these factors has been felt in politics. However, it will be well to view the effects of crime and lawlessness in some detail inasmuch as frequent references are made to its educational importance, W. Chandler Bagley, in a recent work, calls attention to the two factors of greatest import in our country. They are (1) our national tradition of individualism, and (2) our material prosperity. These two unite in causing our country to be the most lawless of all others. He posits these ideas concerning these two factors: "If this be a valid diagnosis," he states, "the educational problem becomes one of modifying or transforming two very powerful national mores, the influence of each of which are, in a fundamental way, dominant forces in the individual and collective thinking of the American people."

World War. — Another cause of the widespread political discord and of great educational significance is the World War. It was this event more than any other which has called attention to American educational philosophy. Its educational significance has been variously yet significantly interpreted. It was the source of much discontent which continues even today. A narration of a few of these serves as illustration of the general character of this disturbance resulting from the war;

The restlessness and discontent of vanquished nations, the turmoil of the Orient, the menace of Russia, the inhumanitarian struggle between capitalism and socialism, the rapid spread of science for the good and evil

of man, and the cutting racial antipathies accompanied by unexplained racial prejudices... all outgrowths of the last Great War. To Smith, it appeared as a turning point in the reaction against individualistic extreme giving "a foretaste of the enlarged cooperation of cosmopolites towards which we are headed in material affairs, and social organization." Other educators see in the war, and rightly so, a dread omen and an evil that must, at all cost, be prevented, an actual demonstration of the dangers of past philosophical and educational ideals. "The challenge of war and social crises," says Leonard, "is education... for cooperation, for good will, for mutual service, for undertaking, and self-realization. This is the challenge of today. How shall we meet it?"

Class Conflict.- Another significant aspect of the environment is the emergence of the prevalent evil, class conflict, or capital against labor... a condition found the world over. The industrial revolution increased the productivity of labor. The rise of the factory system, with its minute divisions of labor, accentuated this marked social stratification. The result was a perpetual discord between capital and labor. Along with this situation is the development of large industrial cities with their glaring extremes of poverty and riches, discussions of which are freely and fully given in the pages of many books. Thus the everlasting temptation of the stronger to exploit the weaker social beings is a tale so inhumanitarian

as to defy every possible belief were it not contested by facts overwhelming and infallible. The rise of the vicious wage system, with its emphasis upon pecuniary rewards and its complete dehumanization of work gives added force to this class conflict spreading like a wind-blown incendiarism, throughout the world. The entire system has exalted the acquisitive impulses, and gives "essence of commerce" to our entire social fabric, the school not excluded.¹

It is just such outcomes as these which cause us to scrutinize our economic order which is now being likened unto a popular game among children. One writer expresses this idea in the following statement:

Our economic system in its practical working is not unlike a game of marbles which stops ever so often because the larger boys have won most of the marbles. Our efforts have been directed toward keeping the game from stopping quite so often and toward developing ways and means of absorbing the shock when it does stop.²

One can more adequately understand how wealth itself served to accentuate this class stratification. It is estimated that more than half of America's industrial wealth is being controlled less and less by smaller firms and more and more by voluminous financial corporations. The wage check of several thousands of families, upward over one half million, is directly or indirectly, written by two of America's largest corporations.

History shows that in the earlier days, the complete social system was controlled by the Church. It was the dominating factor. There arose a struggle between the Church and the State leaving the State in control. Today, however, the development of modern corporations threatens to usurp


²R. Schorling, and H. Y. McClusky, Education and Social Trends, New York, 1936, p. 35.
even the State's control. An appalling picture presenting what is forecast for our economic order if present conditions continue, is the popular fancy of many artists in the field of economists.

This continued concentration of wealth with its stratifying effects may not be entirely condemned, however, if it makes for simplification of our social order, and if society were convinced that such corporations were sure to operate for the best interests of all. Even to the non-expert economist, it may not be difficult to understand that the "buying power" of the laborer perhaps is increased if he can get more and better food for a cheaper price. All of this, of course, presents the need for gross production and meticulous organization. In order, however, to supervise expertly this organization, and in order to see that this careful supervision is practiced, there is a growing tendency among economists and social planners as well, to believe that the government may need to take a greater share in this phase of the social welfare.

As this class conflict continues to grow ever more distinct and ever more vitally important, there is a corresponding indifference on the part of those people gradually being submerged into nothingness. This growing indifference is accelerated as times become continually more complex. In the field of politics, this lack of interest in voting is evident. The number of actual voters considered in relation to the number who are eligible grows relatively less and less and rapidly so. There is a certain marked indifference concerning the choice of capable leaders. The expert is apparently disregarded, at least, so it seems; and there follows this increasing mediocrity in our leadership. Politics seem decreasingly effective and correspondingly less important. As a natural consequence, law and order wane and general chaos reigns.

Science and the Machine. There is another noteworthy feature of the environment, that of the role of science and the machine. So great have been their influences that most of the other factors discussed are rather direct and emerging results of just these two. Historically, when one reviews how the first inventions were produced and how happily these were welcomed, it is rather difficult to view the present situation. The economy of labor and human energy were tremendously reduced. As science developed, however, there was so vast an output of machines that more and more, men were robbed of their jobs. This fact would not be so fundamental were it not for the reason that the condition appears to be a stubborn, persistent, permanent one. Consider how men, supporters of large families have been released from their jobs; how these men have searched relentlessly for work. Further, view their appalling conditions as, in final desperation and utter starvation they have humbly had to turn to the government for support or be left to starve.

A more adequate picture is presented when one turns his attention to some of the work of modern machinery. Recently, a newly invented machine threatens to displace upward over 5,000,000 cotton pickers in the South. Even now, the services of many farm hands have been dispensed with merely by employing tractors and night plowing. It is proven also, that if all the knowledge of soil chemistry, which is now available, were applied to the growing of foodstuffs, our present crops could be grown on 20% of our present acreage. Thereby, the entire occupational life of the world is gradually being fraught with dangers multiplying in rapid succession. The precariousness of our existence becomes an undebatable fact for this

---

encroachment of the machine upon the work of man has dealt a serious blow to the security of life.\(^1\) It is observed, in concluding this aspect of the environmental changes that the leisure time of man has been greatly augmented. In this way, life, even for those persons fortunate enough to possess jobs, becomes more than a mere grappling for existence. There comes this added opportunity to enjoy a fuller, more enjoyable life because of this added leisure time. The working day of the majority of firms has been cut short.\(^2\)

All of these factors, previously mentioned, the growing interdependence, improved methods of communication, increased aggregation of the population, the results of the World War, the increase in crime, the prevalence of class conflicts, the unusual manner of development in our economic system, and the part of science and machines—all of these unite in increasing economic insecurity and bringing on a growing complexity and strain to which the individual must adjust. It is a popular conclusion that life now is much more complex than it was even a century preceding. These multitudinous changes in the patterns of society increase the already numerous conflicts of life. These numerous complexities and conflicts make greater demands for adjustment. These complexities increase and make even greater demands upon each individual. The innumerable addition of mechanical and physical stimuli, the noise and roar of traffic, the drone of the aeroplane, the blare of the radio, the ring of the telephone, are ever present factors which require added energy and nervous control. The drastic competitive system of our existence, the inescapable dependence upon others—these have made for crime, insanity, incompatibility, etc. These are merely growing indications of man's inability to properly adjust himself.

\(^1\)E. A. Kinneman, *Society and Education*, New York, 1932, Chapter 43.

The Shifting Character of the Home and the Church. Another environmental factor which has had far reaching influences upon the lives of individuals is the weakening of controls for the integration of the child's personality—a duty formerly exercised by the home and the church. The control of both the home and the church has decreased quantitatively. There is a decrease in the number of children who attend churches, as compared with the total number of the population. Similarly, the home is losing its influence. It has, in the majority of instances, not only lost its economic function to industrial business, but its position as a social unit. It no longer exerts control over the child's personality. The moving picture theatre, the parks, and other amusement agencies replace the old functions of the home. This change has placed a very large burden upon the school for character development. According to Warden Lewis E. Lawes, the schools have not adequately met this demand. He states: "There is a missing link between education and character which our public schools have not been able to discover."2

This aspect of the environmental changes has very significant implications for the school.

The Present Social Crisis and the School. The present social crisis has brought forward in a most insistent form, a problem, or a group of problems which must be given careful attention by the school leaders. Such problems as: What effect does the rapid industrial and economic development have upon the schools? What is the relation of


of this development to changes in mental attitude? The influence of concentrated capital and cooperative methods? The rapid growth of wealth and the problems resulting? To what extent is the problem of luxury a problem of education? What effect has the emphasis upon material values had upon education? What effect has the struggle between capital and labor to do with the school's program? Does the rapid urbanization of the cities make any demands upon education? With the rapid changes taking place in society, what position must the school take? How shall the school determine the total outcome of its instruction?

These and many other questions of a similar nature cannot be totally ignored by the school, if it is to keep pace with the times in which it exists.

History shows that when institutions, educational or otherwise, function in such a way that most of us feel fairly secure in our personal lives, there is less thought given to the future than when some great social upheaval seems to throw things out of proper working order. It requires some unusual cataclysm to remind these institutions that their old methods are not entirely perfect. A search then is made for more reliable institutional arrangements. At such times there are, on the one hand, that group of thinkers who are so impatient at the ill-workings of some of our institutions that they wish to throw them overboard, even if it causes a social revolution. They see no alternative to the perpetuation of existing institutional arrangements or the complete substitution of new ones for them through coercive measures. Because the inequities of life force themselves forward so dreadfully, there is difficulty in perceiving any possibility of bringing about a more equitable distribution of human happiness through a gradual, even if painstaking, improvement of the methods of procedure we now have.
Hence, at the present time, one finds the greatest diversity of proposals and movements for the restoration and permanent establishment of social stability. Thus, today, one hears much about "Social Planning," "Planning Commissions," "Education for Social Change," and the like. The growing complexity of modern life is partially accountable if not wholly. The consequences seem to be that our social problems outrun our solutions.
The Conflicting Tendencies in American Education.- There are today many controversial issues facing the school as direct outcomes of the present factors in our social environment. Today, education is at cross-purposes with itself because it is a cross section of certain conflicts that persist in society. One of these issues found in the school today is the tendency on the one hand to instill rather than form habits of action apart from reason (indoctrinate) and, on the other hand, to build conduct controls that are sensitive to intelligence and, therefore, flexible and adaptive. At a time when there is much demand for adaptability to social change, there are those who wish to so teach the child that he may intelligently size up various situations, and adjust himself accordingly.¹

This attitude is expressed clearly in the following quotation:

It is the duty of the teacher and of every man of inquiring mind to stimulate the same sort of mind in those younger than himself, whether his students, his children, or his friends. It is the business of such a man, not to hand out rigid bodies of doctrine, whether Socialism, Home Market Club protectionism, or anything else, but to train those to whom he speaks to think for themselves... He is more like the leader of a group of miners going into partially opened country. He has been there before; he knows more than they do about the technique of exploration and detecting the metal they seek, but he cannot give them definite directions which will enable them to go to this or that spot and strike it rich. He can only tell them what he knows of the lay of the land, and the proper methods of search, leaving it to them to explore and map out for themselves regions which he has never visited or rivers whose course he has erroneously conceived.²

There is another view in contradistinction to this. Both of these views are found in the school at the present time.

The transmission of fundamental institutions is primarily a matter of habituation, and that before children arrive at the age of reasoning. The habituation upon which the permanence of institutions depends precedes


thinking and deliberated choice upon the part of the younger generation to whom the institutions are being transmitted. The social processes to be transmitted should be selected after much deliberation and choice, as has just been pointed out, but deliberation and choice upon the part of the child's elders, not upon his own part. It is as silly to expect the child to select the social processes which he is to inherit as to expect him to build for himself the city into which he is to be born. . .

To be sure, we have no right to impose institutions and the habits of which they are constituted upon our children, except such as racial experience makes it reasonably certain that they will thank us for when they do arrive at the age of discernment. Precisely what those habits and institutions are it is our bounden duty, therefore, to know; and for the performance of that duty they will hold us responsible. Nor can we shirk that responsibility by giving them, instead, a "problem-solving" attitude. For if we give them only attitudes instead of the sound solutions which they have a right to expect from our generation, they will be swamped with the problems of their own day plus those of our day that we have left unsolved for them; for there are problems that cannot be postponed without growing like a rolling snowball. . . But having once decided what institutions and social processes are to be transmitted, the first process in the pedagogy of that transmission is habituation. Children must first be habituated to what racial experience has demonstrated to be good; later the habit should be rationalized for them.1

Culture and Materialism—Another outgrowth of our modern society is the conflicting tendencies arising from divergent views concerning vocational and cultural education. On the one hand, are those educationists who firmly believe that vocational training should be what the words suggest; specific abilities and information needed for efficient performance in occupations which already exist; definite inculcation of certain set skills.2 According to the views of Saucier,

This elimination of the cultural from vocational education places emphasis on specific training. . . Since the routine procedure of selling patent medicines, toilet articles, and stationery in a drugstore is different from that of selling cloth, hats and shoes in a drygoods store, the training for the two kinds should be different. General vocational training will not suffice.3

---

In the same group are those educators who insist that in cultural education there is a difference of approach, emphasis, aim. They regard culture as merely a possession, a polish, or a badge, its principal use being to distinguish the upper crust of society from the lower. The term culture, tends to be associated mainly with refinement of the imagination—a sort of inner perfection. This tends to become a sort of goal in itself. Consider the two together in a side by side comparison; how human existence is then divided into two categories, the cultural and the useful; how one of these tends to frown upon ordinary productive effort, and the other tends to regard experience as a means of obtaining something more valuable than itself.

Consider further, how these two very distinct views are found side by side in the school, and how the educational leaders are beginning to desire an intelligent "way out."

**Freedom and Security.**—Very closely connected with the precariousness of our social life and its demands upon us for bringing about stability in our institutions is the widely discussed problem of guaranteeing to the individual an adequate quality of personal freedom.

On the one hand, are those educators who regard freedom as mere physical unrestraint. In such schools, one finds the appearance of numerous prohibitory regulations and minutiae of controls which teachers employ in their daily dealings with the young. They are convinced, so their beliefs lead one to conclude, that:

Freedom means chance; you are free, because there is no reason which will account for your particular acts, because no one in the world, not even yourself, can possibly say what you will, or will not, do next. You are "accountable", in short, because you are a wholly "unaccountable" creature.

We cannot escape this conclusion. If we always can do anything, or nothing, under any circumstances, or merely if, of given alternatives, we can always choose either, then it is always possible that any act should come
These same educators rely and insist upon "reasonable" orderliness, silence, punctuality, and obedience. It is not always recognized, therefore, that such immediate measures are really the manifestations of deeper social pressures. Even physical unrestraint or freedom of movement is sometimes insisted upon as a necessary prerequisite for better application in study and mastery of subject matter.

There are others in the field of education who say that since times are changing, and there is an increasing need for critical mindedness and adaptability that the child must be able to make intelligent choices for himself. Freedom, to them at least, is an achievement into which the individual must grow gradually. They believe that:

Freedom or individuality, in short, is not an original possession or gift. It is something to be achieved, to be wrought out. Suggestions as to things which may advantageously be taken, as to skill, as to methods of operation, are indispensable conditions of its achievement.

The crucial educational aspects of this social conflict appear in connection with such matters as the extent to which children shall be allowed to determine their own choices of work, the extent to which they shall be free to discuss questions of a controversial nature, the extent to which the course of study should be organized in advance of use, and the like. What the school wishes at this time is a method of harmonizing these views. Whereas in the past, the larger method aspect of the school


2 J. L. Childs, Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism, New York, 1931, Chapter VI.

has really been an affair of authority and obedience; there is a gradual
turn in an opposite direction.

It is not difficult to see how the problem of moral education is an
outgrowth also of the social and mental factors in the changing civiliza-
tion.

There are some who think that one may be a good character without being
a good citizen, or a good neighbor without being a good provider for a
family, etc., narrowly confining their meaning to certain abstractions.
They refer to the distinct realms as honesty, truthfulness, cooperation,
etc. They treat these abstract terms as if they had a separate origin and
development. In the schools, there is, in many instances, the practice
of separating the moral education from the rest of the child's acts, es-
pecially those having to do with his intellectual development through the
studies, and more especially the deeper, personal responses of the child
in his daily relations to other children and adults.¹

This idea is clearly set forth by one writer who states:

Usually moral education has been restricted to training in the
observance of a particular set of customs and rules of conduct taken
from a "moral universe". It has been confined to ethical training. To
be concrete, it has been limited to teaching the child to refrain from
cheating in examinations, playing truant, keeping over change, bullying,
fighting, using vulgarity and profanity, stealing, destroying property,
and so on. The training advocated has been for particular kinds of
behavior and according to absolute standards of conduct. This suggests
that some conduct should always be regarded as wrong and some always
as right, while still other conduct is outside the moral realm and accord-
ingly is non-moral. Thus conduct has been separated and fenced off...²

This briefly, is a clear picture of the manner in which the subject
of education is viewed by a large group of educators.

² W. A. Saucier, Introduction to Modern Views of Education, Boston, 1937,
p. 188.
On the other hand is a growing number who think that:

Moral education, on the contrary, is as broad as life. The fencing off of conduct from the field of morals has been a large factor in checking social progress. Sentiment and custom often permit freedom to the inefficient or even dishonest banker who is responsible for a bank failure which causes suffering in thousands of families. Teaching children vulgarity or dishonesty is considered immoral, but disregarding their proper physical development is sometimes dismissed lightly, with little or no realization of moral obligation. A person who earnestly attempts to find the owner of a ten-cent handkerchief may take advantage of an ignorant person in a business deal. A man may refrain from stealing, profanity, sexual immorality, and so on, and yet be worthless in providing for his family or in contributing to the improvement of his community.

A brief statement from Dewey emphasizes this view.

The recognition that conduct covers every act that is judged with reference to better and worse and that the need of this judgment is potentially coextensive with all portions of conduct, saves us from the mistake which makes morality a separate department of life. Potentially conduct is one hundred per cent of our acts.

It is no strain on the mentality to see that the latter group of educators regard character development as an integral aspect of all of the child's life and educational development; that it is even futile to attempt to regard special traits as the main thing; that we can hardly draw a line between a so-called trait like sincerity and one like cooperation and honesty, since each such trait is inside every other one (as when I act honestly, sincerely, cooperatively, and respectfully, all in a single instance of behavior where I have a piece of property belonging to someone else).

In many schools, these two views clash with very obvious outcomes. As the conditions of our social world (in both mental and environmental aspects) accumulate, these views must be harmonized. It is to this end that the schools are now striving.

Individualization and Socialization.—Just as insistent and just as confusing is the problem of individualization and socialization of instruction. One the one hand, are a large group of teachers who do their teaching and instructing on the "large scale" social basis. A class of forty pupils is regarded as a class of one so far as any individual differences are concerned. Their work is not designed to care for any particular needs of any child in the group. The child is given an assignment and left to work it out for himself. There is no opportunity given for him to work cooperatively with his neighbors at any time.¹

On the other hand, there are those educators who advance the idea that inasmuch as this is a world in which everyone is extremely interdependent, that it is not only wise for the child to work individually but socially as well, thereby attempting to adjust or aid in caring for individual differences.² Their idea is expressed in the following quotation:

The socialization of the person consists in his all-round participation in the thinking, the feeling, and the activities of the group. In short, socialization is "personality freely unfolding under conditions of healthy fellowship". Society viewed from this aspect is an immense cooperative concern for the promotion of personal development. But social organization is not the end of socialization; the end and the function of socialization is the development of persons. The relation is even closer: personality consists, almost wholly, in socialization, in this mental interaction of the person and his group. The person is coming to realize that in achieving his interests he must at the same time achieve functional relations with all other persons. In this achieving of right relations with his fellows, in this capacity of fitting into "an infinitely refined and complex system of cooperation", the development of personality consists.³

² Ibid., pp. 242-244.
Philosophy and the Conflicting Tendencies in Education. In so far as our schools are controlled by educational viewpoints which represent nothing more than a body of miscellaneous doctrine, their philosophy must grow out of a genuine attempt to harmonize certain forces and conditions of life which seem to be divergent or in conflict. The conflicts first manifest themselves in our daily lives in what seems to be opposed sets of interests, and later they are found in our most immediate attitudes toward school practice.\(^1\) The school has always managed to catch up within itself the great diversity of interests found in life. Today, however, their problems are more grave, they are more complex, because of the cumulative method of their growth. This makes ever increasing demands upon the school because it must make rapid, careful adjustment with the social changes, or these conflicting tendencies will loom larger and larger as the times continue to change. For, these conflicts arise when certain groups think in terms of the past and wish so to direct the school, while there is another group who would seek to change the policies, the procedure, the tools, the general character of the school because it would seek to have the school retain its power to aid in adjusting the child to meet the numerous new problems presented by society.\(^2\) Another manner of viewing this situation is in the light of the philosophies used. There is one group of educators who would seek to employ the same philosophy in the school today that was employed years ago, regardless of the rapid mental and environmental changes which have occurred in society.

---


On the other hand are those educators who would seek to change their philosophies to make it more consonant with the changes in the mental and environmental alterations now widely admitted to prevail. The one group has a rather static, unchanging conception of the school, and the other group, a more progressive, more evolutionary conception of educational procedure; thus, the conflict.

Research in the history of education reveals the fact that there has always been this close relationship between the school and society, the social conditions being largely the determining facts. A brief sketch of the systems of education and the societies at various periods reveals the fact that this is true. The simple primitive life of the ancients, was similar to the very simple system of education. This was, to a certain extent, true also of the Roman and Greek education and society, the latter being somewhat more complex. When the social structure of those peoples became more and more complex, there was also a corresponding change in their educational systems. Again, then, one sees how the static period of the Dark Ages had its effect upon education, Then came the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation and the scientific movement followed by rapid changes in the curricula of the schools. And, so on down to the present time.

Therefore, it is evident that when the interest in the security and perpetuation of our social institutions has seemed to be at odds with the desire for change, readjustment, and progress, there has been found in the school, a corresponding conflict between an emphasis upon preparation for the status quo and an emphasis upon the principle of freedom or an appeal to the interests of the young. For a long time, therefore, there have been those leaders in the school who, on the one hand,
have been strong advocates for a type of practice which placed chief emphasis upon teaching to children the values that adults cherish. On the other hand, there have been those educators who have been ardent supporters of a type of practice which would encourage freedom in order that the child might grow up to criticize and even to reconstruct our social institutions. The one side has emphasized such things as external dictation, obedience, orderliness, a rather fixed course of study, definite standards of accomplishments, and the like. The other side has emphasized pupil participation, spontaneity, informality, flexible standards, and a tendency to build anew the curriculum out of the experiences of the new. We have seen how out of these more basic conflicts of life, have come numerous conflicts also for the school. It has been pointed out how the demand for making a living has often seemed to get in the way of cultural attainments or leisure; how the interest in social and practical efficiency has seemed to be opposed to the democratic emphasis upon respect for personality; how the trend toward standardization, seems out of harmony with the demand for creative individuality; and how propagandist and indoctrinaire methods of inducing habits of action and belief are at variance with the more legitimate methods of reflective thinking. It has also been implied that it is the peculiar duty and province of the school to resolve these conflicts, and that it is not the business of the school to serve such interests in their diversities and contradictory spheres, but to discover their common denominators philosophically.

1G. S. Counts, Dare the School Build a New Social Order?, N.Y. 1932, pp. 27-37.
3Boyd H. Bode, Fundamentals of Education, New York, 1926, Chapter XII.
Specific Educational Implications of the Social Crisis and the Need for a Philosophically Determined Education.-- The numerous demands placed upon the school within the past century or two have been carefully analyzed and found to be of a very specific nature. These demands have been delineated and can be rather definitely stated. In a carefully chosen set of demands the following list is found.\footnote{H. E. Horne, "Books and Literature", School and Society, March 3, 1928, Vol. XXVII pp. 370-371.} The school is to meet these--

1. By having schools which are life itself for children
2. By better science teaching
3. By cultivating critical mindedness
4. By teaching the child to become more than a specialist
5. By developing world mindedness
6. By studying the social questions of the future
7. By substituting internal for external control
8. By being guided by a philosophy of change
9. By cultivating independent individuality

These same demands are expressed in a more profuse manner by many educators. Their theme is that education has not had a guiding philosophy. When the great social upheaval arose, then, this lack of a general scheme was made more evident. John Dewey expresses this in a convincing fashion when he says:

The sum of the matter is that at the present time education has no great directive aim, but it grows from specific pressure exerted here and there, not because of any large and inspiring social policy. It expands by piecemeal additions, not by the movement of a vital force within. The schools, like the nation, are in need of a central purpose which will create a new enthusiasm and devotion, and which will unify and guide all intellectual plans.\footnote{John Dewey, "Some Aspects of Modern Education", School and Society, October 31, 1931, p. 583.}
Education, we are forced to consider is today in dire need of a well outlined, thoroughly understood program of direction. Reisner conveys a similar idea in the following:

...With all the wealth of scientific knowledge of the educative process which is available we are going no place in particular because we aren't sure of the larger objectives that we ought to seek. The most urgent thing to be accomplished in education today is not the extension of technical knowledge of the processes of education, but a clear delineation of the direction in which the procedures of education are to lead. In other words, we need to discover and affirm and put into operation those programs of social improvement which are discoverable, with good intention, in the world about us, and make them the direction posts for teacher and pupil in the schools...

It is, then, the very nature of the educational problems which seems to turn thinkers to philosophy for their tool of guidance. These special features of philosophy may be listed under five general characteristics. Philosophy has been seen to be a useful factor in giving general directive educational procedures. Inasmuch as the school is woefully in need of guidance, it would be beneficial to employ philosophy in all of its program.

Secondly, philosophy is employed as a means of giving valid criticisms to scientific experiment. Science is frequently to determine which of two plans, processes, experiments, etc., is the better for achieving certain goals. It will not tell, however, whether both of them should be discarded. That is the province of philosophy.

---


Thirdly, philosophy is necessary in questioning basic assumptions. Today, when there are many assumptions and problems of questionable nature being employed, the school is gradually awakening to this valuable feature of philosophy. There are numberless plans and conclusions in the school's program which may need to be discarded. Philosophy will render the assistance needed to ascertain just which of these traditional assumptions will remain.

Fourthly, philosophy is useful in proposing theories of education, or indeed theories in any field. It is absolutely essential. The scientist, the businessman, and the architect employ philosophy to forecast, to look ahead, to give them a proposed sense of direction, even before they attempt the actual task. ¹

Fifthly and last, philosophy harmonizes and seeks to bring harmony out of discord. In the words of one writer this feature of philosophy is set forth in the following manner:

Finally, philosophy furnishes integration. Science depends on analysis, and the scientist is a specialist in a particular field. The restrictions of science on the scientist limit his view of life as a whole and thereby his ability to consider his accomplishments in a broad setting. There is the probability that his little world will become his whole world. Moreover, conclusions reached under laboratory conditions may not hold true in varied and complex situations of life. Only as philosophy views the experiment in its relation to the needs of a particular child and the demands of society as a whole may the desirability of adopting its results be determined. The broad perspective of the philosopher enables him to make decisions based on the consideration of all competing values. Philosophy integrates the findings of science through seeing each research project not only in connection with other investigations but also in the light of the demands of the good life. ²

Because of the broad province of philosophy and its particular merits as delineated, it does not appear that the schools, facing a devastating crisis, can afford to be without it. ³

³Ibid. pp. 446-447.
CHAPTER IV

PHILOSOPHY AND THE GOALS, SUBJECT MATTER, AND METHODS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

The changed mental and environmental factors have been numerous, divergent, and of indescribable significance to the entire field of education. Their effects have had far-reaching, underlying implications for the determination of a school policy.

These changes have made for a complete revolution, or at least, a marked transition from the medieval and ancient civilization to our modern times.\(^1\) This transition in our social order has meant also a corresponding transition in our philosophy for the genesis of philosophy is social.\(^2\) The social conditions have always bred the philosophy of the times, a philosophy which, because of its inherent nature, has, in turn, influenced the social order, the educational outlook, not excluded.

In a period of transition in any social system, when conditions are in a flux, when the basic economic, industrial and political problems force a change, then philosophy undergoes an accompanying renovation or reconstruction.\(^3\)

\(^3\)W. A. Saucier, Introduction to Modern Views of Education, Boston, 1937, Ch. 2.
It is pointed out, at the present time, that our entire social order is in a period of general change, or transition. This is no longer debated. The debated question is whether or not our philosophy of education will be adequate enough to steer the schools and other educational institutions sturdily, and successfully through this period. The issue then, which commands immediate attention is, how can the school so establish its goals, so select the subject matter, and so determine its methods as to render them of maximum value for successful living in a changing world? It is this trenchant question about which much of our educational discussions are concerned. Educators, however, wisely enough, have arrived at the conclusion that because of the perplexity and uncertainty of the general social condition, they cannot know exactly where this general transition will lead. As conditions become increasingly more complex, and as the nature of the individual with the social world becomes so inextricable, there emerges the philosophic idea that the individual must have a growing social consciousness.¹

Thus it is safe to say that most educators have agreed that education is so vital a part of life itself, there must at no time be an attempt to consider the social order lightly when constructing a practicable educational program. Moreover, as these planners attempt to establish goals for the school, there are very significant assumptions which are essential in such a task. First, educational theorists have pointed, with fruitful evidence, to the fact that its goals, the chief outcome, the basic aims of the school are determined by, and are an outgrowth of what is conceived of as educational values. Secondly, they are largely agreed that what

we conceive as educational value grows out of our educational philosophy. Further, they assert that what we formulate as our educational philosophy springs from our philosophy of life; and necessarily our philosophy of life materializes from our social order. That which we consider to be the supreme, most significant ends for an enriched, fully developed life, ultimately becomes the end of our educational systems.

The school realizes these conditions, however, at a time when social changes have not kept pace with the economic, industrial, and political movements which have not failed to alter every aspect of our social fabric, so far-reaching and inclusive have been their effects. Thus, the school, building its program upon conditions of an earlier civilization, is just now beginning to observe that the results of its teaching do not hold a bright outlook for the school. They assert, therefore, (with the history of education reinforcing their assertions\(^1\)) that the ancient and medieval civilizations have definitely and completely passed. In its place, issues a new age entirely different, and an age necessitating a different type of adjustment. Even man's outlook is changing as pointed out in the chapter preceding. The general character of our existence is markedly held in contrast to those of earlier times.

Hence, it is not at all strange then, that out of this changed outlook, or philosophy of life would emerge an educational philosophy novel and apparently more in accord with other shifting phases of life.\(^2\) And as these philosophies attempt to become more effective in the

---


quickest, most practical manner possible, they have embodied what to them appear to be the most pertinent factors in formulating their philosophy. They wish to establish a philosophy which is at once effective and practical in order to head off any further disaster for the school.

It was pointed out in chapter one that certain trends in modern education and in our social world make a growing demand for a philosophical determination of the school's entire system. It is not surprising then, that this philosophy should embody all, or as many as possible, of these pressing needs—thereby deriving a utilitarian aspect, a philosophy expressly to take the school from one place to another more desirable and more profitable as well. The present social outlook is admittedly precarious and uncertain. In an attempt to initiate the surest, the most economically satisfactory adjustment, a modern philosophy has been formulated.

As the school organizers, therefore, have been working upon a defensible program, they have pointed out the fact that there is observed at the present time a wide gap between what is a worthwhile goal and what has been the actual outcome of education. That which is considered of educational value has not been, only in rare and exceptional cases, the demonstrable outcome. Because of the growing accentuation of this gap between what ought to be and what really is, has come a virtual army of leaders who express the desire for a philosophy which will, in every respect, be dynamic. They, accordingly, clamor intently for a school program which will be, not haphazard, and incidental to its teaching, but more specific, and definite in the accomplishment of its established goals. In other words, what they want and insist upon, is a philosophy that is to render all educational procedure telic—purposive
contributive, preconceived.¹

As these educational planners have attempted to solve our problems, they have seen in the recent trends certain factors which are to be considered. These factors must be considered in the formulating of a philosophy of education, if the philosophy is to be capable of working in the midst of a socially excruciating condition.²

In considering the implications of the recent trends and this modern philosophy, it is stated that this modern outlook must be one which embodies all of the social and psychological factors which affect the nature of the educative process. It must enhance and facilitate the teaching for social utility. The new philosophy must be one which will act as a catalytic agency in working at the general upbuilding of modern civilization, and simultaneously aim at eliminating the cultural lag observed in important features of our modern social fabric. It must be capable of broadly envisaging the entire scope of education, its purposes, its methods, and its subject matter. It must fulfill the demand which insists that the school build itself upon the insistent problems of social life; a philosophy which will facilitate the matter of adapting curricular materials to meet the demands of society and its current functioning.

Recent trends further show that there is a growing insistence for a philosophy that will attempt to unite thought and action in their essential life unity; and assist the school in assuming increased responsibility for


the use of fundamental cultural materials as the basic methods of preparation for the service of teaching and school administration.

Furthermore, this philosophy must be one which, in the presence of a social crisis, can assist the school to educate for a changing world; an outlook which is not set on educating for a status quo. Another characteristic of this philosophy is that of attempting to furnish the school with a well-defined, meticulously formulated program of procedure. It must be one in accord with the cumulative effect of the massive industrial, economic, and political problems increasing in geometric ratio. Finally, this outlook must be one which is workable in a democratic system, one which would extend equal opportunity to all.

These features, delineated above in a concentrated manner, have not been found heretofore, in satisfactory proportions to solve the present social problems now facing civilization at large. Evidences for such a conclusion lie in the fact that our social problems should never have accumulated at such a monstrous rate, as has been the case in modern times. Our problems have much exceeded our ability to solve them. The deduction, and logical enough, is that something has been wrong with our tools with which we have been working, or else, our method of handling them. At least, our outcomes in the schools have been tried and found deplorably wanting. Thus, our transitional times have given birth to a philosophy which, at least so its exponents hope, will cope successfully with the exigencies which baffle even our experts. The fundamental test of this philosophy will exist in its ability to give immediate service to education.¹ It must not only work, but it must work rapidly and efficiently,

¹William James, Pragmatism, New York, 1908, p. 58.
that being the partial reason for its formulation. Today, this test is constantly being applied to it. Because of this criteria, some educators vie for its practicality, others cling tenaciously to the older philosophies, idealism, naturalism, and so forth, and with strong support do they offer their assertions. Because of the importance of these older philosophies and their place even in the transitional state of modern education outlook, a brief treatment of these will necessarily have to be made. If there is a transition, one must be able to discern clearly, the point of beginning to appreciate adequately where the progress or or where the shift now takes one.

Histories of philosophy show that there have been many philosophies throughout the ages, monism, dualism, materialism, naturalism, skepticism, idealism, and others.\(^1\) The two which are of most significance and have held the most prominent positions in the minds of great philosophers have been naturalism and idealism.

Naturalism is often considered to be a philosophic doctrine the same as materialism.\(^2\) It received its greatest impetus from Bacon. The materialists believed that one should turn to nature for all educational procedures. They believed that if one followed nature, they could not err. According to these educators, those subjects which administer to self preservation should receive first place in the curriculum. They therefore exalted science and held that for intellectual and moral

---


discipline. Comenius, a contemporary of Bacon held the same view. Spencer and Rousseau have been strong advocates of this view also. 

Naturalism regards all behavior from the biological or animal standpoint and therefore places great emphasis upon the part that instinctive activity plays in the life of a person. According to Spencer, education is or discipline is an outcome of natural consequences.\(^1\) Materialism is the doctrine which specifically asserts that there is nothing which is not reducible to material element; that there is no ultimate spirit of the universe.

Idealism is that doctrine which asserts that man has a spiritual quality and that because of this fact, man is a superior being with ever expanding possibilities. The writer makes the following statements:

He believes that life—true life—is man's free creation; that in it, therefore, human aims should gain an ever fuller realization; and that these aims, these ends will not be attained unless thought, which is man's specific force, extends its sway so as to embrace nature, penetrate it, and resolve it into its own substance. He believes that nature, thus turned into an instrument of thought, yields readily to do its will, not being per se opposed or repugnant to the life and activity of the spirit, but rather homogeneous and identical with it. He believes moreover, that this sway can only be obtained by amplifying, strengthening and constantly potentiating our human energy, which means thinking, knowing, self-realizing; and that self-realisation is not possible unless it is free, unless it be reduced from the prejudice of dependence upon external principles, and unless it affirms itself as absolute infinite activity. This is the Kingdom of Man, prophesied at the dawn of modern thought.\(^2\)

These philosophers forward the idea that through man's sensory impressions he has the power of clarifying that which is real and that which is not real. They assert that the "true method of obtaining knowledge of the true reality is the speculation of our reason, that is,

\(^1\)R. Rusk, The Philosophical Bases of Education, Boston, 1929, p. 38.

\(^2\)Ibid. p. 95.
mental or spiritual vision.\textsuperscript{1}

Skepticism, too, has had its place in influencing the thinking of past periods. It was the doctrine which concluded that the human mind is incapable of attaining any degree of certainty concerning the ultimate reality. The skeptics say that one can never really know things as they actually are, that our knowledge, our conceptions are always relative.

In attempting to set forth the immediate background of modern philosophy, however, it is necessary to concentrate briefly on the medieval philosophies. The medieval period was one characterized by the type of philosophy termed classical idealism or scholasticism. The slogan in that period is set forth in a statement by one writer. He describes it as a period thus: "I do not seek to understand in order that I may believe, but I believe that I may understand. For this, too, I believe, that unless I first believe, I shall not understand."\textsuperscript{2}

The Schoolmen of the medieval period were strongly steeped in monism. Their whole thought was colored by religious beliefs of one kind or another. They referred many questions of import to the Bible for final solution; Christianity was elevated to the supreme position.

The advent of evolution and behaviorism gave added emphasis to an earlier atomistic doctrine formulated previously by Diderot.\textsuperscript{3} These two doctrines, holding much importance and underlying factors for the thinking of that period and our times, are responsible for many changes in science, especially biology and psychological theory.

\textsuperscript{1} M. Demiashkevich, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 67.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 81.
The Distinctive Features of Pragmatism.- Even the history of the word reveals a great deal of meaning for a complete understanding of the term as well as its application. The word philologically considered is derived from the same Greek word πραξις, meaning action. Our words 'practice' and 'practical' are direct outcomes of this Greek conception.¹

Mr. Charles Pierce, in 1878, first introduced the term into philosophic realms. In one of his articles entitled "How to Make Our Ideas Clear", the writer forwards the view that one's beliefs are really his rules for procedure, that in order to materialize fully a thought's deepest significance, one need only ascertain what conduct it is suited to produce. He asserted that the tangible fact at the basis of all our distinctions, however minute, is a difference of practice. Pierce stated that to ascertain perfect clarity in our conceptions of objects, we have only to consider its conceivable effects. Thus, our particular understanding of these effects would for us prove to be of the ultimate significance. This view of Pierce, is then the view of the pragmatist.

It is of interest, however, to know that while Pierce was its chief exponent for twenty years, it was popularized by James in his lectures after which the idea spread with great alacrity. The time seemed to be ripe (1898) and the idea had general acceptance. Today, John Dewey is the chief exponent of this view, his Democracy and Education being the most illustrious expression of his stand.

The chief ideas of this philosophy are that all realities influence our practice, and that influence is their meaning for us. They further assert that the ideas which solve our problems best are true. Ideas

¹William James, Pragmatism, New York, 1908, p.46.
work for us because they are true. It is an individual matter. Whatever best solves an individual's problems at a particular time, is, for that person true. It is a spirit of method, not a fixed set of beliefs. In the words of one writer:

Pragmatism represents a perfectly familiar attitude in philosophy, the empirical attitude, but it represents it, as it seems to me, both in a more radical and in a less objectionable form than it has ever yet assumed. A pragmatist turns his back resolutely and once for all upon a lot of inveterate habits dear to professional philosophers. He turns away from abstraction and insufficiency, from verbal solutions, from bad "a priori" reasons, from fixed principles, closed systems, and pretended absolutes and origins. He turns towards concreteness and adequacy, towards facts, towards actions, and towards power. That means the empiricist temper regnant and the rationalist temper sincerely given up. It means the open air and possibilities of nature, as against dogma, artificiality, and the pretense of finitude in truth.

There is then a clear move away from dogmatism and absolutism. There is emphasis upon the instrumental value of all formulated beliefs which may themselves be changed as time makes a demand for such an alteration. Thus the pragmatic method means "the attitude of looking away from first things, principles, categories, supposed necessities; and of looking towards last things, fruits, consequences, facts." 3

Pragmatism and Experimentalism. Pragmatism, because of certain unfavorable conceptions of the term itself, has gradually assumed another nomenclature, namely experimentalism, a philosophy which embodies fully the older meaning of pragmatism but carries it a step further asserting that all that is of significance to individuals can be derived from his experiences and has definite metaphysical implications alien to the pragmatic philosophy. Elsewhere, the two philosophies are the same.


2 William James, op. cit., p. 51.

3 Ibid., p. 55.
These philosophies hold certain significant implications which make a gross difference in educational procedure. Perhaps the most remarkable influence has been exerted due to the subordination of thinking to practice. In the pragmatic conception, knowing is the prelude to doing, and thought is secondary to action. Cognition is thus incomplete in itself until it has been discharged in act. The full import of this belief is that the pupil must work out the practical applications of theories, etc. It emphasizes the inadequacy of passing on to the child merely theoretical exposition. These philosophers assert that in order that a pupil derive the most comprehensive understanding of a principle, theory or rule, he must view it in its application to facts. That is, the student must see a value, feel a need, have a directing purpose in all that he does. He must see a meaning, a felt inner compulsion for that which he is attempting. Therefore, there is offered a practical criterion for all that the child does; teaching and learning will be expected and provided for, but in a rather incidental manner. There will be, of course, an accentuated emphasis upon psychologizing the approach to material rather than exercising the logical approach. All education will therefore serve as a means to an end, the deepest realization of the child through his continued reconstruction of his experiences being the paramount point of departure.¹

Thus, there is the frequent reference made to this philosophy as being instrumental. It always places importance on values as their final outcomes are viewed. It judges only by observable consequences, not by the motive. Thus, in this school, one finds that whatever

is found to be useful in attaining desired outcomes, becomes of value to these thinkers. There is avowedly no teaching subjects which are of value in themselves. Therefore, the entire school will not be of intrinsic value but only as it assists the student to a fuller, more complete life. The student himself, according to these philosophers, will constitute the center of all the school’s activity, all teaching being individually meted out, adequate provision being made for social participation.¹

Pragmatism and the Newer Meanings of Experience, Knowledge, Thinking.—According to these educators, there is nothing to which life is to be subordinated.

Life is its own sanction. Whatever of guidance and inspiration man requires to meet the exigencies of his life is to be sought from the resources within experience and not from some supra-empirical source. The very corner-stone of experimentalism is the faith that experience is able to develop from within its own process all necessary regulative standards and ideals.²

With this broad meaning of the value of experience one can readily see fundamental challenges to much of our traditional modes of thinking. To the experimentalist, knowledge can be achieved from one’s life activities. Thus, he defies the fact that there is any such thing as knowledge in general. It is always of specific, definitely delimited bounds. The experimentalist considers that knowledge grows out of thinking which in turn grows out of activity, experimenting. "Knowledge comes after something and out of something, and for the sake of something."³ According to the experimentalist, even knowledge is a matter concerned with

²J. L. Childs, Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism, New York, 1931, p. 96.
³Ibid., p. 99.
the consequences, the ends of our situations. We understand an object by its effects, its connections which it has with our investigations with them. "Attainment of the relatively secure and settled takes place, however, only with respect to specified problematic situations; quest for certainty that is universal, applying to everything, is a compensatory perversion. One question is disposed of; another offers itself and thought is kept alive."¹

The experimentalist believes that cognitive experience is secondary and must always be so. In its primary form, then, it is more 'aesthetic' in character. It is more active, meaningful, because it is derived out of one's more immediate life experiences. Thinking then takes place concurrently with activity, and experimentation.²

Because of the very nature of these assumptions education will be of a very different type in these schools. There will necessarily be a more tentative nature regarding all that the child learns. Nothing will be held as fixed for all times. Whenever an individual's experiences warrant a change in something previously learned, then there arises the need to change. Truth itself is continually changing, so these philosophers argue, and therefore what is true one day may not be found true another. Learning will thus be formulated into hypotheses which by their inherent nature will be open for much question and continual testing.

¹ John Dewey, Quest for Certainty, New York, 1929, p. 228.
The school is therefore to be thrown wide open to continued criticism
even on the part of the student regardless of his maturity or immaturity.
MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

The Question of Freedom and Its New Meaning for the Modern Education.

With the increase in the precarious character of our present social life and its multitudinous demands upon social institutions for bringing about stability, the question of freedom, personal freedom for each individual becomes a serious matter for the educator. These modern philosophers insist that a supreme condition of social stability and progress lies in great liberty of thought and action. They argue that in a democratic society, it is necessary that the child be trained to take advantage of the freedom allowed him, if he is to learn successfully to direct his freedom unselfishly for the good of all. This idea is convincingly stated by Graves when he writes:

The interpretation of education in a democracy brings before us another element in our philosophy, which was probably not so seriously considered during earlier years of our federation. At that time citizenship was quite engrossed in nationalistic aims. This second factor is the need of adequately training every individual in the nation, and is quite as essential as the preservation and prosperity of democracy itself. To be democratic, education should endeavor to reach all and to furnish as far as possible equality of opportunity to all for their development. The aim of democracy is the provision of like advantages, and not of like possessions. Effort should be made to secure for each individual and each school group the chance to make the most of whatever possibilities are available in each case as the result of natural endowment and legitimate effort. Only thus can everyone adequately serve the democratic society of which he is a member.1

Not only do these educators seek to have the children use their freedom for the good of others, but the newer concept of freedom is also of interest. They assert that freedom is a mental achievement, and that one grows into the fullest meaning of it just as he matures in other aspects of life. Moreover, they remove this question from the category of mere

physical unrestraint, although they even hold the idea that physical unrestraint or freedom of movement proves to be a necessary prerequisite for the better application in studying and mastering subject matter.\(^1\) The larger aspects of this question appear in connection with such matters as the extent to which children should be allowed to determine their own choices of work, the extent to which they should be free to discuss questions of a controversial nature, the extent to which the course of study should be organized in advance of use, and the like. They insist that the student shall be granted the sort of freedom that is most conducive to maximum self-realization, that being largely the chief end of all their education. In this respect, then, freedom itself is employed as a means to some further end.\(^2\)


MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND THE GOALS OF EDUCATION

Criterion for the Selection of Educational Goals. - It has been stated how, and I reiterate for added emphasis, the goals of education are the outcomes of what we consider of educational value, otherwise we should not select them as educational outcomes as ends.¹ Accordingly, Bode expresses this view concisely saying: "When we set out to realize an aim, we may do so because the end that is sought has a value on its own account, it is something that is directly appreciated."² That which we conceive to be of educational value is the outcome of our educational philosophy, for it serves as the modus operandi of our educational policies. This view is forcefully expressed by William James. He states that our philosophy is our rule for acting, and that we all have a working basis or a philosophy.³ Our educational philosophy is an outgrowth of our philosophy of life, a fact evidenced by the very purpose of our educational institutions. Our philosophy of life is an outgrowth of the basic social factors underlying our existence in modern times. Indeed, this is vouchedsafed by the history of education, and has always been true.

As the school has progressed and become increasingly more conscious of its true purpose, it has begun to formulate its philosophy, its final outcomes by the interpretation of the basic factors in its society.⁴

¹ Sir Percy Nunn, op. cit., chapter 1.
³ William James, Pragmatism, New York, 1907, p. 13.
Education is more and more conceived to be as broad as life itself; and no longer to be isolated from all that is life-like and most pertinent to the growing young. As conditions continue to change, and as the school continues to view its position more broadly, there is a growing tendency to place the supreme value on the ability of the organism to adjust itself to its environment. To do this, of course, the fundamental social factors must be critically analyzed, the educational implications determined, and a working procedure established.¹

Realizing this need, therefore, educators have made extensive use of educational sociology, sociological philosophy, and so forth. This drastic emphasis upon the social studies has ever had its effects upon the curriculum of all the so-called progressive schools.² Even the methods have been predominantly the socialized, cooperative manners of procedure.

Every phase of our existence is searched in order to establish a criterion suitable to the needs of our present day society. The effort is to forward those essentials which will, in time, best aid man in coping with his existence. With the unyielding assistance of science, tests and measurements, and psychology, every attempt has been made to evaluate each bit of progress.³

In *Democracy and Education*, probably the most thorough representation of the pragmatic view, there are listed three definite goals toward which education must strive if it is to be of intrinsic value in a changing world. These educators have attempted to establish the set of aims which are the most complete embodiment of the democratic ideal, and in accordance with the revelations of psychological discovery. In order to appreciate fully the selected aims of the school, the pragmatists have established certain criteria by which to judge a worthwhile goal.

Because the pragmatist says that there is nothing to which education is to be subordinated, he asserts that the aims selected must be capable of growing out of the educative process, which is considered as continued capacity for growth. Thus through a continued reconstruction of experiences, the child is developed with the goals precisely outlined by the educator. Childs posits the view that

... if choice is inherent in all guidance, then the experimentalist as educator has his ends. Not absolute, fixed ends, to be sure, but aims which direct the process. Education, growth is its own end; but to produce a person who has the habits, dispositions, and insights which are essential if he is effectively to continue his own education through the continuous reconstruction of his experience is a fine and difficult art. To develop the type of emotional and intellectual dispositions which the experimentalist desires is surely not a hit-or-miss affair. The educator must have a definite sense of the direction in which he wants things to move. He controls and judges the educative process by constant reference to the direction in which he thinks growth lies. If this is not done consciously, critically, then it will be done unconsciously and blindly.

Because these educators consider the individual as an end in himself, their manner of viewing the individual will be in direct contrast to the earlier views held by schoolmen who conceived the individual as a means to a further end, as the church, the state, and so forth.

---


This is not the pragmatist's view. According to the outstanding authority on the modern conception of education—a view which harmonizes with that of J. L. Childs—the child is the ultimate end by which educational advancement is to proceed. This writer contributes these ideas:

Since growth is the characteristic of life, education is all one with growing; it has no end beyond itself. The criterion of the value of school education is the extent in which it creates a desire for continued growth and supplies means for making the desire effective in fact.¹

These educators have conceived the fact that in the past, the relation between the standards and ideals of our institutions has not always been to the highest interest of the individual; the institutions in the majority of cases having received the preference.²

Because of the changing attitudes towards the individual and his position under the pragmatic view, there are numerous questions which are being raised. For example, these educators wish to know whether it is to be assumed that the aims of institutions, and hence of education, are the same as the aims of the individuals who comprise them, who sponsor and maintain them.³ They question similarly, do the aims of our institutions gradually attain a kind of dignity and finality all their own? Just where, they ask, is the source of value for the individual?⁴ Does the source of value for the individual lie in conforming to a system of purposes, aims, or values that reside outside his own experience? Shall it be

¹John Dewey, op. cit., p. 61.
⁵John Dewey, op. cit., p. 117.
assumed that individuals are to be treated as means of achieving the aims of our social institutions?¹ In a statement from Childs, this same question is raised together with the reply of the experimentalist.

In spite of much criticism and serious possibility that his views might be so construed as to cause them to appear to give sanction to extreme laissez-faire and anarchistic tendencies in school procedures, the experimentalist has never been willing to sacrifice his view that education should be understood as the process by which the actual self of each child is realized. So also has he consistently opposed the view that education is the process by which the immature self of the child is supposed to grow into an ideal maturity by the passive absorption of a fixed social tradition. Growth is achieved through the interaction of the native impulses and tendencies of the child with the customs and traditions of the group. .. Customs and institutions are to be continuously evaluated in terms of their educational effect. ..²

It does not detain one long at this point to see that the modern philosopher conceives the individual as an end to which all things are subordinated.

They argue that inasmuch as we are in the midst of a period of transition, from an era of external control to one of internal control or choice, where man shall be able to derive his controlling aims and satisfactions from the perceived meanings and possibilities of his own experience, education must make a corresponding shift.³ There generally emerges the prevalent recognition of the growing significance of treating man as an end in himself.

With these criteria established, the matter of receiving the goals set forth will not be any surprise or mental strain, for certainly the product is an expected outcome of the process. Whereas in the preceding

²J. L. Childs, op. cit., p. 231.
ages, generally speaking, the aims have prepared for future living; today, the pragmatist places emphasis upon the present full living. The immediate values get the preference as contrasted with remote ones. That which best suits the needs of the student at a given time is that which is administered to him.¹

THE GOALS OF EDUCATION AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY

According to Dewey and his school, there are three general aims of education under which may be summed all the outcomes of education. These three aims which they set forth are: social efficiency, natural development, and cultural development.¹

By social efficiency is meant exactly what one usually considers of social importance. Its meaning was incorporated in the seven cardinal principles as well. By this term is meant preparing the individual for service to both himself and for others who may be directly or indirectly dependent upon his labor or service. This aim has two distinct interpretations which make it of dual importance. The first, as previously mentioned, refers more specifically to industrial competency in one line or another.² These philosophers express the view that an individual has a right to be allowed to work, and that he cannot be completely adjusted until he has a means of livelihood. Secondly, this first aim is interpreted as meaning civic efficiency. Here, the emphasis is more or less placed on the individual's ability to cooperate fully, to take an active share in civic affairs, deriving from and furnishing the best possible aid to his social group of which he is an integral component. Here one notices a shift to the importance of right social attitudes towards others. With the growing integration and interdependence of man upon man, they offer ample evidence for their view. These aspects are to be definitely striven for, and with the assistance of psychology be reached if the future citizens are to have the proper attitudes for the world in which

²Ibid.
they are living. They maintain that these attitudes must be built and constructed by the school. They regard attitudes as of extreme import, these often being the basis of one's activities and disposition towards those with whom he comes in contact.\(^1\)

Along with the deep regard for the social efficiency of the individual comes also stress upon the need of cultural development. This aim is for the purpose of enhancing one's emotional and spiritual satisfaction and enrichment. They strive to have the learner realize an inner satisfaction from any work that he does. Therefore, there is added time and emphasis placed on creativity, originality and interpretative work of all kinds. They wish the child to draw upon his experiences thereby deriving and discovering in as unique a manner as is possible just how unlimited his powers are.\(^2\) A quotation from Dewey accentuates this particular point. He asserts:

Culture means at least something cultivated, something ripened; it is opposed to the raw and crude. When the 'natural' is identified with this rawness, culture is opposed to what is called natural development. Culture is also something personal; it is cultivation with respect to appreciation of ideas and art and broad human interests.\(^3\)

The third aim, that of natural development is also regarded as a worthwhile goal towards which educators should strive.\(^4\) The significance of this aim is realized when one observes that it is replacing the

---


\(^4\) Ibid., p. 130.
scholastic methods which are known to have been artificial and conventional. This goal, natural development is reached only by freeing the human endowment of physical activities. The pragmatist sees these aims of educational value in a democratic society in which freedom and activity are given to every person,—any program which aims towards freeing the educand, assisting him to an increased reconstruction of his experiences. This aim, that of emphasis upon the natural development of an individual, is an outcome of the influence of Rousseau on philosophic and educational thought.¹ He felt that one of the chief ends of all education should be that of developing a healthy, vigorous body. It is this aim into which is translated the regard for individual differences. The fact that different native equipment varies from one person to another is evident. Thus, there is much emphasis upon one’s health. An outgrowth of this emphasis upon a healthy body also covers the matter of interests or the lack of them. In attempting to carefully observe nature means "to note the origin, the waxing, and waning of preferences and interests".²

Because of their increased emphasis upon health and the natural development of the bodily organs they have concluded that natural unfolding must go hand in hand with all other phases of development, and not be neglected and left to incidental growth. There is then, a revival of health, exercise, posture, outside activity, as an outgrowth of the attention placed upon this important phase of life.³

¹J. J. Rousseau, Émile, New York, 1911, p. viii.
The Purpose of Establishing Specific Goals for Teaching. According to modern philosophers every teacher necessarily must have definite goals established towards which he strives or else, he is liable to become haphazard in his instruction. They therefore emphatically insist that in every class, the subject matter should be thoroughly examined for its value as an aid in the attainment of either one or all of the three fundamental goals established. Not only must each subject have a definitely stated practical contribution to these goals, but each lesson must add its part to the attainment desired. Everything, each activity or practice in which a teacher finds himself engaged must be of some clearly thought-out contribution to the whole. All of the subject matter found in any daily lesson plan must have some intrinsic value as an aid to the final goal.

Because these philosophers wish to ascertain exactly where they are going, and when, definitely, they are to arrive, they have employed various means of testing. New methods of measurement have rapidly multiplied, all as a means to aid these educators in knowing when they arrive, how much daily progress is made toward their established ends in view.

There will be no teaching for its own sake. They argue that everything must have a foreseen, preconceived value before it is to merit a place in the teaching program. They believe that what is put into the

---


curriculum one time, comes out in a later period; therefore, if they are sure to put those things into the curriculum which enrich the lives of the students socially, culturally and according to health principles, their results will be seen as an outcome in a later period. Because these goals are necessary, worthwhile, and pertinent to life, they must not be left to chance. They must earnestly be striven for in each day's work.

The most dynamic thing for which these educators strive is properly developed attitudes, the emotional set of the child. They consider the emotions and feelings of children to be the guiding factors in their lives. Therefore, much attention is placed upon the development of attitudes that are as well formulated and as comprehensive in view as can be worked out by the child, all attending circumstances taken into account. This aim is one of the important aspects of the Social Development, being concerned chiefly with civic attitudes.

In summing up, the outstanding features of these goals selected by modern philosophy consist in that they are entirely utilitarian in nature. They serve as a telic, purposeful guide in all the teaching that goes on in the school. These educators say that the extreme cultural lag present in modern times does not need to exist. Because of this belief, the growing importance of science, tests, measurements, statistics, psychology, and so forth, comes into full view. The aims of today emphasize the best, most complete, and happiest life here, instead of looking to the future and ignoring the present.


2W. H. Burnham, op. cit., p. 293.
The child will assume the chief center of interest in the school, the society of the school proving itself as a point of departure and a means for developing the child who will be the end.

It will no longer be considered that institutions or that education has aims, but that individuals, teachers and students will possess aims and educational institutions will serve to carry out or materialize the aims of the individuals composing them.

In order to achieve these diversified life-like goals newly defined, there will be a continual reconstruction and addition to the present curriculum which will not at any time be stereotyped and rigidly set up. The course of study or subject matter will be selected on the basis of the need of any particular student in order to aid in reaching the desired goals.

The goals will be determined by methods established by psychological confirmation. They will vary according to the goals desired and the child considered. Flexibility, with reason, will be expected in order to make the teaching most effective. The teacher is under no obligation to methods, but is expected to employ that method at any particular time which best aids in directing the learning of the educand.¹

Finally, these educators say that if democracy is to be successful, the child must, while in school, be allowed to exercise the democratic spirit, its essential factor. Thus no goal which is not in harmony with or that does not assist in creating democratic living, deserves a place in the school. These philosophers maintain that democracy is to be

¹G. Melvin, op. cit. Chapters 19 and 20.

applied to more than principles of the democratic state, that if the student is to become acquainted with the kind of system in which he lives, he must practice its most minute aspects. They consider the freedom granted by democracy a kind of mental achievement to be gotten from successful practice and living. Thus, freedom will be noted in all work done and will characterize all thinking as well.\(^1\) According to one philosopher:

The first and probably the most fundamental problem connected with the realization of ideals is that of human freedom. Apart from any formal definition or analysis of freedom, all will agree that an act of intelligent choice may properly be called a free act. Now, without free acts in this sense, rational ideals can neither be formed nor appropriated nor realized. It is true that the ideals of primitive man are often mere group imitation of involuntary behavior or of accidental events. But depth-effects cannot be wholly involuntary, for where the will is not involved the full depth of human nature has not been stirred. The will need not be regarded as the creator of ideals; but without a free act of acknowledgment no ideal can become my ideal. Logical thought does not occur in minds which do not choose to think. Bowne has pointed out that without freedom the possibility of arriving at any distinction between truth and error is blotted out.

Freedom is thus essential to the formation of valid ideals; how much more obviously is it necessary to their realization! To carry out an ideal it is necessary to guide a long series of acts so that it will conform to the approved type. This implies a purpose freely chosen and freely sustained; the free choice of means to its attainment; and free will to criticize every stage of achievement in the light of the chosen ideal.\(^2\)

Thus, one is not surprised to observe the change in discipline and class order as formerly exercised. Activity, purposeful doing is readily seen and is overtly encouraged by these philosophers. They hope to produce the proper democratic attitudes and habits of thinking in order to give democracy a fair chance to succeed. Succinctly expressing the pragmatic


\(^2\)B. S. Brightman, *A Philosophy of Ideals*, New York, 1928, p. 84.
view in the most compendious fashion possible. I quote the four qualities of Ralph Barton Perry in his illustrious work, *Present Philosophical Tendencies*.

Pragmatism, both of the more moderate type, represented by James, and in the main by his American allies and followers, or the more radical type, represented by Bergson, Schiller, Papini, and LeRoy, is peculiarly significant of the present age. Negatively, it is significant of the reaction against absolutism, long enthroned in academic and other orthodox circles. It signifies that the spell which absolutism has long wrought upon the minds of inquiring and youthful thinkers has lost its power. More positively, pragmatism marks the maturing and the express formulation of certain ideas that have long inspired European thought.

In the first place, pragmatism employs for philosophic purposes what may be termed the "biological" imagination, as distinguished from the logical, the physical, and the introspectively psychological. Pragmatism views knowledge and religion as modes of life; and life it conceived not in any vague eulogistic sense, but in the naturalistic sense, as an affair of forced adaptation to an indifferent and at best, reluctantly plastic environment...

In the second place, pragmatism emphasizes the crucial importance of human efforts. It teaches that the spiritual life is in the making at the point of contact between man and the balance of nature—between the ideals of man, and the resistances, cruelties, and seductions with which they are forced to cope...

Thirdly, since man's efficiency lies in his collective and not in his individual action, pragmatism emphasizes society. It attaches less significance to the direct relation between man and a dynastic God, and more to that relation with his fellows which may make a man a servant of the collective life, and so lead him to a new conception of God as leader of common cause.

And finally, pragmatism is melioristic. It speaks for the spirit of making better, and denounces alike the spirit of renunciation and the spirit of despair. It is the philosophy of impetuous youth, of protestantism, of democracy, of secular progress—that blend of naivete, vigor, and adventurous courage which proposed to possess the future, despite the present and the past.¹

---

MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND THE SUBJECT MATTER IN THE
FIELD OF EDUCATION

It has been pointed out how there is now a period of transition from the era of absolutism and the period of classical idealism. The advent of the new educational outlook growing out of the new philosophies of modern conditions have significant implications for every phase of the school work. We have seen how there is a drastic renovation of the goals of education. With a transition from one philosophy to another also comes a shift in the subject matter to be found in the curriculum. Fundamentally, the question of the curriculum is one primarily of philosophy.¹

The increased importance of all the curriculum revisions programs has been significant of the underlying shift of the purpose of subject matter. The curriculums consisted largely of specific subjects logically arranged and remained so for years. No one questioned their positions in the curriculum. It was enough that these subjects disciplined the mind and supplied the necessary knowledge for the profession sought. In other words, the curriculum was much more narrowly conceived in periods past than under the modern criterion.²

In order to best describe the modifications being made in the subject matter content, the purpose and conception of subject matter, and the method by which it is determined, it will be discussed under the four main features of modern philosophy. Inasmuch as the subject matter comes as a fulfillment of the philosophy, it is of no remote theorizing that one

¹Boyd H. Bode, Modern Educational Theories, N. Y., 1927, pp. 118-120.
It was pointed out in the preceding pages how modern philosophy is accepting the biological approach in the formulation of their educational philosophy. His perspectives are many and he considers the individual from several points of view. He views man as an animal, and as a human being in continual reaction and interaction with his environment. In many instances the modern philosopher has conceived of man as being that individualized part of his environment.¹

This conception or view of man and his relation to the environment to the modern education offers many salient features for the construction of the curriculum. They conceive the most characteristic aspect of being a human, living organism is one's activities and behavior.² They believe further, that learning to do anything, swimming, breathing, thinking, singing, and so forth is as much a part of the environment as it is of the organism. Therefore, the individual is to be taught in regard to his background, his immediate and future environment.

These educators assert that all experience, then, to be beneficial must not overlook the numerous phases of worthwhile activity under which the individual goes.³ They wish to make the experiencing of the individual as purposeful and as meaningful as possible.

Moreover, they believe that the mind of the organism is built out of the activity and experience of the organism, that the long-held belief of mind-body dualism is not significant in the new psychological discoveries.⁴

¹J. L. Childs, op. cit., Chapter IV.
²Ibid., p. 70.
³Ibid., p. 73.
⁴Ibid., p. 50.
They seek to establish a closer relation between thinking and acting.

Thus they place much emphasis on purposeful activity, activity freely initiated by the learner in response to a situation which is challenging to his immediate experience. They strive to educate the "whole" individual in order to make learning more dynamic and permanent.

In attempting to introduce the principle of purposeful activity into the school, the experimentalist is not concerned merely to add one more technique by which children can be induced to learn desired subject matter. Purposeful activity as the foundation for school procedures is the natural outgrowth of his whole philosophical position. It is the educational correlative of his understanding of the world in which we live, and of the nature of the process by which experience grows intelligent. As such it is the fundamental principle in his entire program for education.

This biological approach to the learning process and to the materials to be learned will necessarily make a difference in the curriculum.

One of the tests applied to subject matter will be that of developing the whole child. It will not be something merely to be learned or quietly taught. "It involves more than the acts of learning and quiet study; it involves occupations, production, achievements, exercise, activity." The new curriculum is thus observed to be representative of sensory and motor elements found in the nervous system.

Subject matter thus becomes a means to an end in the development of the child. The material to be learned will not be of importance in itself, but in its uses and meanings that the subject matter holds for the complete development and enrichment of the child's life.

Even the curriculum shall be on a utilitarian basis. It too shall

---

1 J. L. Childs, op. cit., p. 73.
2 Ibid., p. 82.
serve as an aid in furnishing that which is of most importance to the educand.

The curriculum being a means to an end, it must necessarily vary as the end varies. Its content is determined by the life and environment for which it is to prepare. . .

The most fundamental criterion for the selection of subject matter; then, is the pertinence to present life. For a study to be admitted to the curriculum it must be clear that modern life demands it on the basis of one or more of intrinsic values, . . . and for a study to be retained it must likewise be clear that life still demands it for one or more of those values.1

It was pointed out, also in the preceding treatment of goals, that pragmatism places much importance on the value of human efforts. It values the significant fact that man is in "continuous interaction" with the forces in his plastic, radically changing environment. Because man's efforts are thus observed, these philosophers express the value of functional learning of the subject matter. They forward the belief that unless the educand can see a use for that which he learns, it is insofar useless. To be essentially beneficial, the material learned must have meaning, it must be connected with the previous experiences, interwoven with them so that it becomes part and parcel of that already possessed and not mere intellectual adornment. They therefore rather discourage the learning of high sounding vague generalities, and promote the idea that out of the experiences in the child's life can be derived most all that is necessary for him to know. That which does not affect one's experiences is not of value and therefore doesn't need to be studied. In the words of an outstanding curriculum organizer this same idea is briefly posited:

From this point of view, the curriculum has its beginning, its continuance, and its end in a forward-moving and worthwhile experience. Its content is determined by the content of experience. Its organization is determined by the way in which experience moves forward toward the

objectives of self-realizing persons. That is to say, the curriculum is experience under intelligent and purposeful control.¹

Turning to the third philosophical implication for the subject matter content of the school, one discovers a very pertinent consideration. Inasmuch as these philosophers place great stress upon the collective activity of man's life in modern days, the curriculum revisers have busily set out to discover its most fundamental implications for them. For them, this is one of the most tedious parts of the theory of education, namely, to perceive the precise character of subject matter as it operates in the matrix of social participation and molds more or less unconsciously the deeper nature of the individual who is caught up in the customs, traditions, and institutions of life. These educators assert that the child can no more escape imbibing, to some extent, these patterns of social response than he can escape certain physical qualities he possesses. Society may well be said to constitute an elaborate mechanism by which these social responses may become the content of individual minds.²

They assert further that the very tools of thought are inherently social, concluding therefore that everything one does has positive or negative social results. They state, therefore, that it is only natural for the children to share their experiences and thereby receive added stimulation for further growth, through comment, criticism, suggestions, and the like.³

²Ross L. Finney, op. cit., pp. 47-77, chapter III.
³S. Duggan, op. cit., pp. 285-306, chapter XVI.
With this view, then, comes the increased socialization of subject matter, to be more minutely discussed in a succeeding section of this study.

In addition to these things has come the grossly accentuated emphasis upon the study of those subjects more especially of a social nature, in order to develop within the maturing mind a social consciousness and a spirit of fellowship more in accord with democratic living.

In analyzing the curriculum studies completed recently, there is observed a growing position for the social studies. There is increased emphasis on all those fields which can in any way aid in bringing about proper social attitudes.

In the past, there was little more, if any time spent in the teaching of social studies than in any other course of study, such as mathematics, language, art, etc. With the advent of educational sociology and a growing criticism of modern social policies resulting in the changed mental and environmental factors, the attention of these philosophers has been focussed on the once-neglected part of the curriculum. There are many of these socially-minded educators who even go so far as to advocate social parallelism in curriculum reconstruction. An outstanding proponent of this idea forwards these ideas:

To a sociologist the principle of parallelism commends itself as meeting the requirements; and hence it would seem that that principle cannot be too insistently repeated in theory nor too rigorously applied in practice. If the school is to function vitally its program of studies must epitomize the civilization itself—omitting only such parts of it as the social process will transmit automatically through social participation—and including no extraneous material. Curriculum makers must not be satisfied with a pedantic and irrelevant lore, however fragrant with the romance of a bygone aristocracy; nor with a series of projects, however interesting, that are devoid of vital correlation with the social processes. Nothing will so quickly dispel the fog that hangs over the curricular problem as the clear light of this principle of parallelism.  

In order to teach for social utility, it is observed these thinkers would directly carry over into the schools exactly that which is found in society at present. This implies that the curriculum is no longer to be narrowly conceived and confined to four walls. It is to be as broad as life and as deep as human experience.¹

There is still another important aspect of modern times which has significant implications for the subject matter employed in these schools. The fact that modern philosophy is considered melioristic means that these educators will be possessed of a spirit conducive to democracy and progress. It proclaims the spirit of making better and eliminating the spirit of "renunciation and the spirit of despair." It is naive in its manner of seeking meanings, assuming that the meanings derived from ordinary experience are the true meanings of reality. The subject matter employed in the school will be used in a continuous search for truths. There will always result an openmindedness. Whatever hypotheses or theories work for these educators will be considered true until they cease to work. Even truth will be in a general state of change and modification. James B. Pratt in his book, What is Pragmatism? makes some dramatic statements in the following:

All realities influence our practice, and that influence is their meaning for us. I am accustomed to put questions to my classes in this way: In what respects would the world be different if this alternative or that were true? If I can find nothing that would become different, then the alternative has no sense.²

Speaking further concerning the scientist, this same writer continues:

His great question concerning any proposed generalization is: Does it work? And this for two reasons: in the first place, because its working is practically more important to him that its merely theoretical truth; and

¹Frederick G. Bonser, Elementary School Curriculum, N. Y. 1921, pp. 1-3.
secondly, because the only test he has for its truth is its successful working. Unless it works, he has no reason to believe it is true. Moreover, as truth and usefulness are both forms of value, the scientist who has no time nor fondness for what he calls "logic chopping" has a tendency to identify the two, without asking himself too curiously whether his hypothesis is true because it is useful or useful because it is true.1

In summing up the modern curriculum, laconically, one sees that it is in a continual state of reconstruction and renovation. It is employed, not as intrinsic in itself, but as a means to an end. The material constituting the curriculum will be as broad as life itself and will be employed as an aid in developing in the child the ability to act and think simultaneously. "Learning by doing" will be one of the chief principles employed by the teacher in teaching the subject matter. The materials of the curriculum will be largely determined by the needs, purposes, individual characteristics of the pupil. In attempting to achieve the goals of education, social efficiency, natural and cultural development, the educand will constitute the center of activity, concentration, the methods, etc., serving as points of departure.

In attempting to answer the question, Has modern philosophy, in this period of transition made a noticeable change in the nature and use of subject matter, the contrast between the "new school" and the "old school" as presented by all complete histories of education books, forces an emphatic answer decidedly in the affirmative.2

1James B. Pratt, on. cit., pp. 6-15.

2Stephen Duggan, on. cit., p. 306.
MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND THE METHODS OF TEACHING

It has been pointed out how the transition from scholasticism to modern philosophy has meant very specific implications for the entire educational program. It was more specifically pointed out how the goals and the subject matter have been modified, because of the definite change in the kinds of philosophy employed in the school.

It naturally follows that if the goals are to be changed, the methods of education would likewise be altered to be of the most value in attaining these goals. The nature of the subject matter taught, to a large extent, limits and establishes certain factors to be considered in the determination of the goals. These educators assert that the way a child learns a subject to a large extent determines the use to which it will then and later be put.

In the earlier discussion of pragmatism, it was pointed out how this word philologically was derived from the Greek words meaning 'practical' and 'practice'. Today, in these schools, in which the policy is pragmatically determined, there is much emphasis upon activity in learning. They consider that the most efficient method of teaching is in allowing complete freedom of activity, in order to make the education most permanently beneficial. They contend further, that "the study of a subject has not reached its end till the guiding purpose has been accomplished and the knowledge has been so assimilated that it has been used in a normal

way and has become experience, ... until precautions for the preservation of individuality have been included.1

It is of great significance to observe that there has been marked progress in America and elsewhere in the selection of effective methods. With modern philosophy and modern science cooperating, those methods which are of the most practical nature are gradually being attained, and selected in order to reach the goals now set for the schools. One writer states a happy case for the progress and advance made in the field of educational methods. In his words:

'Nowhere has modern education made more progress than in the field of method. This is true in all stages of public education and especially in elementary education. A century or more ago it was not at all uncommon for a child to spend a year or more in learning his letters and somehow learning to read by means of the methods and materials then used. Today, a skilful teacher trained in modern methods will in a year's time teach a class of normal first grade children to read not only one interesting beginner's book but a number of others besides. Most of the credit for this progress belongs to the psychologist and the experimentalist in education.2

There are certain specific characteristics of these methods which make them an embodiment and the outcome of modern philosophy.3 The methods employed generally are utilitarian in nature. It is considered as the manner or mode in which material is used to attain some end. Method, again, is nothing more than a form of procedure, the process in which the individual uses the material at his disposal to produce or attain some end. It is that critical arrangement and mode of practice whereby the educator attempts to attain the greatest results with his student. Therefore, the student, his maturity, both mental and physical, will be of utmost significance as the instructor attempts to gain his ends in view. Because

1 I. L. Kendall, Twenty Five Years of American Education, N.Y., 1924, pp.158ff.
of this serious attempt on the part of educators to realize the greatest results with the child during his school years, there has been an unyielding reliance placed upon psychology. It is to this branch of science that they have resorted more than to any other, for verification and renovation of methods, the attempt being always to get the best possible method for every phase of teaching.

The methods of education have placed great value upon socialization of learning.¹ The outcome has been that the leading method plans have made exaggerated allowance for social activity and study. The child is allowed the privilege of working and sharing with others who happen to be engaged in working upon the same work as himself. The child becomes the center about which all things move and revolve.² His needs, his interests, his activities are studied, and from these there is determined what is best for him.

Because these schools wish to make ample progress in attempting to promote the best democratic principles, there is due regard for all principles of freedom in their methods. The child is therefore treated according to his specific needs, thinking that this will best enable the individual to cope with the circumstances prevalent in a society such as this. Pupil activity, pupil initiative and thought are heartily striven for and given first-place prominence in all methods. They wish the child to grow gradually into the deeper realms of thought and truth through freedom provided in the methods employed.

---

More in accordance with the spirit of the modern philosophers also, is the practice of selecting very definite methods for specific subjects to be used. By following this practice they attempt to make all learning the most economical possible. In the words of one educator we have this idea:

"It is my judgment that in the last ten years great advance in educational method have been made along the line of developing superior techniques of learning for each of the prominent subjects. We now know how to teach spelling and writing as accurately as physicians know the diagnosis and treatment of most of their diseases. We are making great strides in the improvement of reading. There has also been some improvement in our methods of teaching other prominent elementary school subjects. Most of these improvements can be ascribed to the application of scientific method, to the making of the course of study, to the determination of economic methods, and to the discovery of the proper tests. . ."

The effect of the philosophical emphasis upon specific methods has been reflected in the college curriculums. There have come numerous courses in methods. Each subject has had established methods best for its economical learning. Methods particularly suited for one subject have not worked as efficiently as methods for other courses.

"It has been asserted that the nature of the method is largely ascertained from the nature of the subject matter. Thus, the methods for one subject will vary somewhat from those of another. In the words of John Dewey, this idea is forcefully posited:"

"Method then has for its province a consideration of the ways in which this antecedent subject matter may be best presented to and impressed upon the mind; or, a consideration of the ways in which the mind may be externally brought to bear upon the matter so as to facilitate its acquisition and possession."

---

1 R. V. Currie, op. cit., pp. 53ff.


When one thoroughly understands the nature of the pragmatic view, it is very easy to understand the attitude applied in selecting the methods to be used in developing the philosophy.

There is, first of all, observed the analysis of both the child and the subject matter in attempting to do the best teaching. The methods established will necessarily be outgrowths of these. There is a tendency toward group working as an outcome of the interest in socialization of ideas and instruction given. This social phase however does not exclude individualization to a very great extent. There is a utilitarian aspect observable in the nature of the methods employed. Only those methods are selected which are proven to be most effective in enabling the pupil to grow to his maximum capacity in the shortest time possible. Thus, methods grow out of the nature of the subject matter and are not the result of external determination.

---

CHAPTER V
GENERAL SUMMARY

At the outset, the question for the writer was, is there a growing demand for a philosophical determination of the goals, subject matter and methods in the field of education. In attempting to fully analyze the significant implications of the problem, the study fell into three related parts, the first being: Is there, as shown by recent trends in education, an increasing demand for a philosophical determination of the methods, subject matter, and the goals of education? Second, what are the basic social factors responsible for this demand, if such a demand does exist? Third, what changes may be made if philosophy is applied to the field of education?

From a survey of current literature, the writer discovered that there are numerous factors presented in the recent educational literature, books, theses, magazines, which point toward a growing insistence for a philosophical determination of the methods, subject matter and goals of education. In general, these trends are of two specific types. First, there is a growing demand for the school to broadly envisage its field, the entire society, and therefrom construct a more defensible program. That is, the school now faces the problem of working at the general upbuilding of civilization. As times change, there is an accentuated need observed by the school, in attempting to forecast and outline its future program.

Secondly, modern trends set forth a need for a more serious study of child nature, the educative process and the relation between the child and its environment. Great emphasis is being placed upon the significance of
the child as the center of the school, all things else being as points of departure for the school. In attempting to establish a more practical relationship between the child and the precarious world in which it now lives, there is a turn to the basic features of philosophy to reach the most important solution. Science, unable to solve the problems alone, unites in strong wedlock in assisting philosophy to ascertain the most defensible program for the future.

Because of the very nature of philosophy, it has been summoned with a strong assurance that it can offer much, if so formulated as to be of immediate service. Those features which make it particularly practical are thus summed in the following:

First, philosophy had its inception in educational institutions.¹ It was employed as a guide for what was the best proposed working hypotheses by the Sophists; education, the school, serving as the laboratory to test the validity of the proposed assumptions.

Further, philosophy is integrative in its manner. It attempts to get a comprehensive view before attempting to forge a proposition. It is idealistic in its approach, never completely attaining that for which it works. Its goals lie just a little ahead. Its merit is in the improved attempts as compared with earlier attempts in similar problems, and in previous centuries.

Also the genesis of philosophy is social. It strives to be of inherent service to man because it grows out of the fundamental conditions of a society. It deals with the more personal choices, situations, problems of a group striving as assiduously as possible to be the very heart of the social procedure, the school not excluded.

Inasmuch as philosophy rises from the social conditions of a given group, it was necessary to discover what social changes, environmental and mental have taken place to make a growing insistence of philosophy necessary at the present time. In a survey of present social changes it was discovered that definite factors are responsible for a philosophical determination of educational procedures. They were of two types—mental and environmental, which converging, have made for a complex civilization beyond the power of science unaided, to solve. Thus a growing insistence for philosophy has emerged.

In Chapter III, there was an attempt to ascertain what changes in modern school policies manifest a growing insistence for a philosophical determination. In a rather comprehensive survey of the modern school procedure, there was observed a marked transition from medieval scholasticism and idealism to the pragmatic determination of the goals, subject matter and methods in the modern school systems. This philosophy, with its emphasis upon immediate practicality has made noticeable modifications in the school's program. Everything is centered about the child, who has, in the modern school, become an end in himself. The goals are outgrowths of the educative process, namely, social and natural, and cultural development. The tendency in modern philosophy is to subordinate education to nothing. The traditional logical arrangement of subject matter is waning. Instead, it is determined by the capriciousness of the student's purpose, needs, etc. Method is considered to be inherent in the subject matter and flexibility rather than rigidity is desired and assiduously striven for in an attempt to make the school "life" itself. Under the regime of modern philosophy, all procedure takes on a utilitarian aspect—a means to a further end, the complete development of the tripartite nature of the child.
The writer embraces the opportunity in these closing pages to relate a few of the important books which are not in support of the generally accepted pragmatic philosophy. The study of idealism does not fall within the scope of this dissertation, but the reader may gain some information from the authors listed below. Some of these writers are extremists maintaining that pragmatism can never basically solve the educational problems permanently. Others maintain an opposite view. This is evidenced in the preceding chapters.

Michael Demiashkevich in a thorough, ambitious book, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, has set forth an unbiased criticism of the modern philosophy as a theory and as a working basis. He gives constructive and destructive criticism leaving with the reader the task of harmonising his own final impression of the practicality of the "new school." His description is complete and his arguments are fundamental. One has no difficulty in discovering, moreover, that his views do not fit concisely with those of the"new school".

Robert Maynard Hutchins, in his No Friendly Voice, expresses the desirability of a more fundamental kind of education and therefore a more fundamental philosophy of education than is afforded by the modern group. This idea is unmistakably the keynote of his concentrated work, and it has found quite a hearing among those thinkers who cannot completely march side by side with the modern philosophers.

Robert Rusk in the book, The Philosophical Bases of Education, sets forth what is to many thinkers a valid diagnosis of the "new school" and its underlying philosophy. He does not condemn outright, this philosophy. Yet one closes his book with an idea that all is not well with the modern philosophy.
Herman Harrell Horne has written the most thorough criticism of modern philosophy. His industrious book, *The Democratic Philosophy of Education* is considered the best and most complete of its kind. In this volume, Mr. Horne does not attempt to establish the fact that pragmatism has no good qualities, or that it has not been a natural outcome of the changed mental and environmental factors. He attempts to set forth its weaknesses and concurrently to show that it is not a sound educational policy. A few statements from this writer will illustrate his viewpoint.

Pragmatism is here presented as at one with the scientific method and also as democracy in epistemology. It is held to be at one with the scientific method in limiting thinking to proving hypotheses, and it is held to be democracy in epistemology in allowing earlier experiences freely to modify later ones. In view of these claims, it should be noted that pragmatism is not alone among modern philosophies in accepting the scientific method and in providing a theory of democracy. As Creighton says: "Pragmatism has no exclusive claim to be a philosophy of democracy, or a philosophy which is open-eyed to the results and methods of the sciences. I make this remark because writers of this school frequently convey the opposite assumption."

This writer continues in his same manner critically analyzing other very significant assertions of the pragmatists. He states further:

The naturalistic view of intelligence is both inadequate in itself and insufficient as a basis of school procedure. It is inadequate in itself because the course of nature is not its own object; yet it is the object of intelligence. Dr. Dewey has himself written a book about it. It is insufficient in schools because the guiding of physical activities intelligently, even in a school medium, limits the formation and free play of both intellectual and ethical ideals, without which full mental and moral development is not possible. As Creighton observes: "The description of intelligence exclusively in terms of 'planning', 'reorganizing', 'reconstituting', 'purposive activity' may be necessary to bring it under a naturalistic category, but it is surely a caricature even of the imperfect life of reason that ordinary individuals realize..."

These authors, and others not mentioned within these pages are striving for another educational outlook. They offer their views with forceful, yet practical arguments. They regard education as the most important mainstay of civilization itself.
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