

ROBERT McCLINTOCK  
Committee on College Relations

Thanks very much. I hope I will be able to suitably demonstrate.

I find it very difficult to live on the New York to Washington shuttle and always remember exactly where I am and what I'm supposed to be doing at any particular time. The object as I see it is to start putting out in partially developed form at any rate some sense of what we might speak to in trying to deal with the questions that the Committee on College Relations put to the CPC last year. At this stage I'd like to stick primarily with the first question that we put forward: what is the process of education and how in the present world can it be made to work well for the person and the public. And to speak to that as I see it. And then to indicate very briefly some of the implications that it might have for trying to answer the second and third questions in the near future: what significant roles can and should a formal graduate school of education play in making the process of education have optimum results for the person and the public. And the third being: what changes might that vision of a foremost graduate school of education entail for Teachers College over the foreseeable future. To me the process of education is best understood as an interpersonal process by which people acquire their knowledge, values, ideas, skills, aspirations, emotional character - in a word, their culture. In essence, I've stolen this definition from Wilson Follett's Modern American Usage. I think it's a significant one because it puts a stress on acquisition rather than transmission. And there are three words in this definition that I'd like to dwell on briefly. First, I think it's an interpersonal process. And I think that this is important because looking at education as an acquisition, one has to see that it's located in exchanges ultimately understandable as exchanges between persons. This interpersonal relationship need not be face to face. But it is nevertheless personal. I think there is a difference between a

---

personal reading of Plato and an impersonal reading of Plato. The personal reading, accepting that there is something of oneself at stake and there is a role for oneself to play. And that there was, no matter how filtered through various mechanical means, a person or persons at the other end of the communication process who also believe that something was at stake, for others, and for themselves. And putting the stress on the interpersonal, I think, properly makes us take into account phenomena such as empathy, projection, internalization - which I think are all necessary attributes of the educative process. That in the act of acquisition one needs to empathize, one needs to project, to try and construct what it was like for that other person who is saying this or that. And one in the end needs to internalize. One needs to say what this means for me, where I stand with respect to it. I think it is also important in this conception of education to put due stress on the conception of acquisition. Much, almost all or most, of what we acquire in the course of education, of what one acquires in the course of education, comes to one. But it is uttered by others. It is summarized in textbooks; it is symbolized in images, verbal or pictorial, auditory. And there is a strong tendency to assume that it is enough that that material comes to one. And that somehow in the process of its *being* brought to someone, it can be adequately, there is an adequate assurance that it has actually been transmitted. I think that the range of material brought to people far exceeds their capacity to acquire; that the significant limit is - in the process of education - is the capacity to acquire that people bring to the process. That everything to some degree has to be made one's own for education to have taken place. And in that making it one's own there is a very powerful selective mechanism rooted in the student, the learner, the acquirer of culture. There is an important range of rejections, of mere tolerances in which much that is brought to people is edited out. There are

powerful selective processes going on, I'm convinced, from the very earliest stage in the newborn infant. They have powers of attention; they have powers of selection. And I think if we are going to understand education as a process of acquisition, we need to take those into account. Then, lastly, I'd like to stress the word culture. To me, it's important to distinguish culture from civilization; and I think that we can start with civilization, understanding it as the sum total of human creation taken in the aggregate and viewed externally. We talk of the civilization of the West or the civilization of this group or that group. I think that culture is, to a large extent, the same sum of human creations but rather than viewed externally, is viewed internally. For there to be culture, one has to conceive of their being persons who live by that culture, who have internalized it, who possess it as their own. That the, once again, I think in keeping with the stress on interpersonal and acquisition, we can understand culture as things that we ourselves make and other people have made that have become part of our lives. And it exists as our culture or a particular group's culture in the sense that they live by it. That they make their daily judgments by reference to it. <sup>It is</sup> something that they possess as tools, as means for living. And the implication of this definition of, or conception of education for understanding the process of education in our time and place and asking how it can be made well, to work well for persons and the public, seems to me to be that we need all these to take into account a moral and intellectual autonomy possessed by the persons acquiring their culture in analyzing the educative process. External causes of incredibly diverse nature impinge on each person. And external results of incredibly diverse nature, some of which of life and death significance flow from the quality of the educative experience that person has undergone. But I think if we define education as an interpersonal process in which the

acquisition of culture is essential, and understand culture as something by which persons live in their real experience, then it is a fundamental mistake to ignore the moral autonomy and the intellectual autonomy of the person acquiring culture, in analyzing the educative process, no matter how sophisticated our analysis of external causes and external results may become. This could be schematized as in the educative process. Everything impinges on student understood as an individual or category, class of individuals. But those individuals carry within them significant feedback mechanisms of their own that allow always for selective attention, for choices to be made by them for rejections, acceptances, a channelling of attention; and I think a sound analysis of education needs to take that autonomy into account. This is not to say that it is all that there is. But it needs to be taken into account. And by taking it into account I would be inclined to take it into account as the premise of the educative process - which to me shifts slightly the latter part of the question: how can the educative process be made to work well for the person and the public? If the educative process is interpersonal acquisition of culture, I think the educator, meaning people who are particularly concerned with bringing good education about, can assume that education is going to take place. That is another way of speaking of the intellectual and moral autonomy of the educatee, the student, the learner. Everyone, all of the time, is acquiring culture. That process is not something that needs to be made to happen. The question seems to me to come back, to come down to, not how can we make the acquisition of culture happen, but how can we provide the best possible conditions for that acquisition of culture to have the best results, or the most humane results, the most significant results, for the person and the public. By taking into account the intellectual and moral autonomy of the learner, I think we are

forced to look at the conditions that we try to provide, rather than the mechanisms that, putatively, in our heart of hearts or our dreams of glory, we might devise that would make the acquisition of culture take place according to our particular whims, desires, priorities, rationale.

If, then, it's a matter of looking at the conditions under which people are continually acquiring their culture, making it their own, living by it, I think we ask essentially something <sup>to</sup> the effect of, we have to look at what conditions are most conducive to sound personal habits and social forms. Ones that respect the intellectual autonomy of the learner. And how can those be cultivated, furthered, developed in our world and what personal habits and social forms impinge, or impede, discourage the sound acquisition of culture. And how can those habits and social arrangements be discouraged? I think that this in a sense is a very formal answer to the question of what can be done to make the process of education worthwhile for the person and the public for it suggests really that we have to look at all things, all conditions, and analyze as best we can what sort of a situation may provide people for their acquisition of ideas, values, knowledge, skills, emotional character. And in some ways that is too all encompassing for establishing a set of priorities for schools of education or Teachers College in and of itself. I don't think we should turn it ~~around~~ on, however, from that all encompassingness. We should recognize that at the same time that it says all things need to be taken into account, it suggests that all things need to be taken into account from a particular point of view, namely, the pedagogical. What are the effects of our social conditions? Our interpersonal conditions? Our human conditions? On the process of acquiring culture that each of us goes about day in and day out? It suggests that the entire range of human experience is pertinent; but that we need to take into account only certain aspects, that we need to take that entire range of human experience into account from a particular pedagogical point of view. And it is here in the implication of this simultaneous

stress, I think, on the universal and particular, that all things are pertinent from a particular point of view that we get to what seems to me to be the really productive question for the kind of discussions that I would hope a group such as ours could get going internally within Teachers College and eventually externally within the public. Mainly what is it that is particularly strategic that we clarify about the conditions under which people are acquiring their culture? Day in and day out be it in schools or in the general course of their lives? But particularly, strategic, I do not mean what is now most fashionable. Nor from a narrowly institutional point of view what is perhaps presently most expedient; but what points in the total set of conditions under which people are acquiring their culture might we suggest that there are transformation possible that would lead to a significant improvement in those conditions. And this seems to me to be a problem of judgment, a problem to be answered through common discussion; so an examination of the world around us, the way people react to that world, and it would seem to me that a, the first and foremost role of a graduate school of education should be to provoke and inform profound public discussion about what it is that is most strategic in reforming the pedagogical conditions under which we live. And shaping the situation or making the situations under which people acquire their culture. Situations that better respect their intellectual autonomy and moral autonomy. Ones that allow them to do more with themselves. Intellectually, emotionally, culturally. And that the problem, perhaps, with the schools of education now is that they have been tied to established clienteles that make it difficult for them to take such a provocative role in the public. That make it difficult for them to draw back from somewhat reified functions and say, work out first internally and in the public, and say, "Here we stand. We think it is important that something be done about this aspect of life and that aspect of life. Because these aspects of life either provide very great resources to

persons as they seek to acquire their culture. Or they create very great problems for persons in general or this or that class of persons as they seek to acquire their culture." And it seems to me, to my mind, our discussion should revolve around what it is that is strategic here and now. Given the realities of the latter third of the twentieth century American culture, American conditions, what do we think would be really important to suggest as truly pedagogic resources? That people have available to them? In the conditions that they find themselves under? What would we suggest are pedagogical conditions that really merit serious effort at transformation by the society at large? It seems to me that is the question before us and I would without any intention I think it's a question that I would like to participate in some very serious and probing discussion. I'd like to indicate a few areas where I think it would be worthwhile to probe further as I see it looking at the world I find myself and others in, the conditions that I see at work and trying to ask how they are conducive or destructive to efforts to acquire culture. To point to four areas that seem to me to be highly worth further examination without any sense that these are exclusive or inclusive or necessarily when the discussion is done the ones that I would come out as saying are the most important ones; but they are ones in light of my recent experience in Washington and previous experiences and reflections, seem to me to be very important. The first of these would be to look at the status, or conditions, or health of bonding institutions in present <sup>day</sup> American civilization. By bonding institutions I mean family, community, association - institutions that one enters into with a high degree of interpersonal involvement, that one enters into more usually by an act of will or with a strong emotional engagement. These are the institutions that exist in between the level of the individual taken in isolation and the society taken on its macro level. I think if we look at the conditions under real people acquire their real culture in an interpersonal process of exchange, it generally takes place under the conditions

that exist within bonding institutions. That process of acquisition does not take place on the macrosocial level in real human experience. It is something affected by the family, the community, the association in which I would understand as well the formal school. And I think that a lot of the pressures of twentieth century social developments have been to weaken the bonding institutions relative to the macrosocial level and the micro individual level. This has been a steady theme of a great deal of major sociological-anthropological-historical analysis: that the studies going back to Durkheim and Weber, Ferdinand Toennies, earlier, the effect of contract and its spread as a major social bonding form that is impersonal in its basic form rather than interpersonal. The way the federal government has come to operate in many of its programs, working on the macro level, channelling its resources to the individual as ultimate recipient, the nutrients in our culture, I'm not sure are that good for our bonding institutions. And I think that we need as educators concerned with the conditions under which people acquire their culture to look profoundly at the importance of bonding institutions for the acquisition of culture as a site, a set of conditions in which people acquire their culture. And the status of those bonding institutions, given the major social trends of today, and what can be done to counter, if necessary, the dissolving influences on those bonding institutions.

A second area that I personally think is important to look at, perhaps closely related to that area of bonding institutions, although somewhat more intellectualized, is the question of how we understand the public, particularly the concept of the public interest and how we conceptualize that standard by which we judge what the society or what we collectively, better put, should or should not do. And I'd like to see developed a more educative conception of the public interest which I personally at this point would like to call the civic interest. One that, and I think it's important to, perhaps, disengage ourselves



from the concept of the public in education and a great deal else. Because it is so abstract. It is so impersonal it gets either reified or meaningless. It is very hard to say what the public is and what its interest is. I think it is important to have some concept of collective interest in order to make collective decisions but I am not sure that the public is the best standard vis a vis which to make it. And I'd like to see investigated and discussed the effects of the abstractness of our conception of the public on the conditions under which people work in the providing of educational resources—among other things; and I am curious about the possibility of developing a concept that I would call the civic interest which starts out with the proposition, or stress, on the importance of self governance. And argues that the civic interest is that which leads to the increase of the capacity for partaking in self governance on personal, interpersonal, and collective levels. Or is that which diminishes the degradation of that capacity. And I think, along those lines, we might develop a somewhat educational standard usable and applicable in making collective decisions that <sup>I</sup> can see perhaps leading to somewhat different kinds of discourse... (end of side 1) strategic as the conditions of work and of leisure become conditions less and less shaped on an interpersonal level. Where the individual has less and less to say, perhaps, about what the conditions of his or her work and his and her leisure may in fact be. And the fourth area that I think, in looking at conditions and their effects on the process of the acquisition of culture, we need to pay more attention to and point to a number of concepts such as reciprocity limits and affect which perhaps are inadequately taken into account in many pedagogical analyses. Reciprocity, all of them, I think, have to do with people coming to terms with their own conditions, and what they seek to acquire or to do or how they seek to shape those. Reciprocity that seems to me perhaps to be a fundamental characteristic of life; there is a balance between all things. Somehow it seems to me to be tied to the intellectual and moral autonomy that I spoke of

as something essential to take, to respect, to take into account. And I think that one quality that many of our provisions for things, be it in the form of social policy aiding particular groups who are seen as disadvantaged, being in our educational methodologies, being in the way we treat people day in and day out; so that the dimension of reciprocity in those relationships may not be developed as highly as it might be. Our sense that the student gives as well as receives, our sense that the indigent have a contribution to make as well as something to be given to them by society in our altruism, - these are the kinds of things that I think we need to attend to in analyzing the conditions under which we acquire our culture. I am not sure that they have sufficient reciprocity in them. And perhaps we need to try and build up that reciprocity. I am not sure that they have sufficient attention to ever present limits. A realistic contention of what cannot be done as well as an enthusiastic vision of what can be done. And things such as affect. How much affect do we have to build into the system or how much room for affect do we have to allow for in the system to provide place for people to become engaged, to try and structure conditions so that they encourage and cultivate that? In the critique of the conditions under which people acquire culture, I think it is things of this nature that to me are strategic. And I think that if a school of education can come out with a compelling vision of what it is that is strategic in this day and age, to pay attention to and providing the best possible conditions for people to acquire their culture, a lot of the more particular questions of clientele, who we are serving, where resources come from and so forth, may tend to take care of themselves. I think that unless we can get a good clear sense of what it is that is really strategic for people living under the full range of conditions, I think that we can only base our priorities and policies on an ever changing sense of the expedient and will not really shape the environment that we are working in, but will be continually responding to it. I think, however,

that to follow this search for the strategic is a far more risky and difficult course because there is little conventional wisdom in it to draw sustenance from. Well, I'd like to end there. Those in essence are the kind of considerations, the kind of questions that I would like to talk to and I as I say, the particulars that I alluded to towards the end, I think, are really merely allusions, illustrations, the sort of questions that I think might be looked at in attempting to define what it is that is strategic in trying to speak to the public about what should be done through shared common public effort to improve the conditions under which all of us are acquiring our culture day in and day out. Thank you.

We felt we would go until five and use the time now for a session with Robbie and discussion among ourselves. So, dig in.

Q Robbie, how deliberately have you been using the word acquire, acquisition, as opposed to specially construct? A person's constructing culture versus a person's acquired culture?

A To me, acquisition is more inclusive than construction in that one way of acquiring something is to construct it. Other ways are to appropriate it and things more highly given. I was very, there is something in acquisition and such synonyms or partial synonyms as construction that I do want to stress, and I may have done so just before you came in. That there is an act of participation in the person who ends up with the culture, the ideas, the skills, the emotions, and so forth. That I think if not taken into account, skews all discussions of education. And I, it's that participating in taking, making one's own which of course has a varying range of degrees of intensity. But I think is always there in any true acquisition of culture. One that makes it possible for the person to live by that culture, to use it in their lives, in the concrete realities of their lives, and simply not merely to perhaps be acquainted with it. Although there are forms of acquaintance that we do use which are also, I think, very valuable, valid forms of acquisition of culture.

ISSPK-R

Q I'm not clear of the terms by which you define the intellectual and moral autonomy of the individual if, seeing the individual is interacting with the conditions that you allude to, without postulating, say, one's choices or selectivity in the first instance; maybe conditioned and he went out postulating unconscious. There are forces which shape the nature. Is this a biological given, the moral and intellectual autonomy upon which, which is an agent in its own creation and creating conditions as well as being impacted in by them but....I am not clear of the terms which you define intellectual and moral autonomy of the learner. (Well, I think it... ) How that interacts with what you specified as conditions.

A I think that's a...it's that act of acquiring or selecting and rejecting, that dimension of judgment in terminology that I would like personally in my own work to do about this as central. I think that perhaps is a biological basis. I haven't studied it far enough. But the, which gets one into a long standing debate between vitalism and mechanism in biology, which I have paid some attention to over a number of years. But the, a number of, I think, reputable, say, cell analysis analysts, in some ways, the decipherment of the genetic code has gone both ways. It has provided a mechanism explaining the choices made by cells but it has also stressed the fact that choices are made and that the... that how far back in projecting into inert matter we can go, seeing something that can understood as choice. I think it's still a very open question. I think though, granted, I've chosen, I build in this moral autonomy, I think, by definition, by start with a definition of education that asserts that it's, is an act of acquisition. To me, that is where the moral and ~~middle~~ intellectual autonomy is located. If you ...it's a certain grasping, a taking to one's own, internalizing, and I think where, if I were a...had to argue this on a, within the domain of behavioristic Pavlovian psychology, what, say the . experiments show us the process of conditioning, they do not explain the process of memory by which that conditioning is internalized

and brought to bear on later situations. And it is really there that I think the acquiring goes on. ~~Where/what~~ Or one has to understand the nature of memory to fully explicate what we mean by acquisition. Acquisition, to me, means that it becomes an enduring aspect of one's character and I think that it is in that, I would say there is a choice to make it enduring.

Q I was only reacting to your stating it as a prior condition. I am willing for you to say you can take them both as given if the conditions are not prior to, if the autonomy is not prior to the conditions and...

Yeah. What I'm saying is if, and I think there are other potential, I am sure there are other potential definitions of education, but looking at it as a process of <sup>acquiring</sup> culture, then these other things seem to me to follow and I am perfectly willing to enter into a lively discussion of, with those - acquisition isn't important and something else is central. But if you take acquisition as central, then it seems to me to follow that it is going to happen or that we do not have control over its happening but that we as educators may be able to influence the conditions under which it happens. And that those can be diagnosed and we can search for strategic conditions that either need to be held onto as very important as good conditions or need to be a profound and compelling critique of contemporary social educational trends might need to be mounted because we would have come to the conclusion that those are very dangerous conditions from the pedagogical point of view. John?

*Not in* Q I'd like to follow this up a little bit. But I'll stipulate ahead of time that I personally don't think this is the forum for discussion regarding <sup>a</sup> determinism and I'm not moving in that direction with the remarks that I'm going to make ...that would fall under this thing. I find this term acquisition that you're using a very compelling one and also a very seductive one. Since it fits in so nicely with my own conclusions. But you, in talking about an intellectual autonomy, let me leave moral aside just for a moment because I think the two

---

are closely intertwined. I think one has to be careful. Autonomy seems to say an almost complete if not a complete freedom to select those aspects of the culture which one wishes to select and to dismiss those aspects of the culture which one wishes to dismiss. That, I guess that would be fine if we could redefine the organism that is doing the acquiring; but from what we know about the organism that we are dealing with - in this case, human beings - we have a pretty substantial body of knowledge now which says that whatever, that, <sup>what,</sup> number one, that ~~one~~ does select definitely from what is presented or what is available to select from; but that the selection depends on great measure on what has already been acquired. So that two people with a different background of prior information presented with the same new bit of information, perforce, select different aspects. In that one can only select and thus incorporate into one's type of a structure, if you will, that which is possible for the structure to acquire. I would like to put even more emphasis on this, as we're reaching out to acquire but emphasize that what I reach out to acquire depends very much on what I already have. This, I don't think is to negate autonomy. If one wants to put autonomy into the picture, then I think that it has to be the next step. That only <sup>I'm</sup> autonomous in making my choice regarding those things which I am capable of selecting. Now the reason I'm bringing this up is that as one goes on to the further points that you were making, I think it's critical to keep in mind that not every individual is going to be capable of making what one might call an informed choice, to use language HEW is throwing around these days. If I am not in a position to select those things that I might like to select where I am in a position to select it, perhaps I am not as autonomous as I should be and perhaps then that says something about the way we arrange the conditions under which education takes place so that we can optimize the probability that the individual can be brought to the place where he can be autonomous.

A        Yeah. I don't want to get into sort of being into a discussion of

determinism. I, in some ways, I ~~hope~~ regret having introduced the term autonomy which happens to be part of the cultural baggage that goes around in my head; and I don't really want to argue too many of the difficulties. So what I would be perfectly happy to pick up on in what you were describing as the importance that people do select. And grant that the, what they select is very highly conditioned, having been around HEW for awhile where we are beginning to recognize what we call "forced choices" where all the things impinging upon you, cuts down the range of options so that it is absolutely minimal. Still, still in order to carry out a course of action from that forced choice, you have to bring yourself to the point of, in a certain sense, making up your own, saying "Yeah, these are the limits; this is the way the law is structured and so on and so forth. Under the conditions, even though I would like to act that way, I have to act this way and I am going to act along that course because that particular choice....Preserving the dimension of choice is what I'm....it has been made by taking as much as I can consider into consideration.

Q I am trying to comment in even a more fundamental way. In that what I am capable of learning is very much conditioned by what I already know. I think what you're referring to is what is operating externally to limit my choices. I'm addressing myself to what's going on internally as being a very limiting factor on what I am actually able to acquire.

A Which I would fully grant and agree with. I think that...yeah, as a cultural, I define much of my work as cultural criticism and I mean I think that the whole central character of that endeavor is built in precisely that proposition, that we need to evaluate what we know in order to understand its effects on our further acquisition of culture. The...I think the question that I'd like to put, shifting the discussion a little bit from the definition of education to the set of emphases that might follow from it - is it running down a dead end? To try and analyze the role of the graduate school of education and Teachers College's policies

and priorities by asking what, by critically evaluating the conditions under which people are acquiring their culture. And trying to not arrive at a single answer to that but suggesting that a lot of what we do of a more specific nature should follow from commitments about where we stand individually and collectively in response to an effort to diagnose the pedagogical value of the conditions that we find.

Hubacek Q Robbie, I don't have any trouble with that; but I would have trouble with your analysis at the present time in order to get there. As you read off or developed your first three conditions, I tried to predict your fourth condition and then your fourth concern. And I thought: ah, hah, he's going to deal with the way in which culture is in a sense stored, the way it is not necessarily lived out, but the way it's presented out, so to speak. Or he's going to deal with the problem of individual emancipation. And you totally floored me by your reciprocity limits and affect; and I think I was floored because of your focus on acquisition. And in a sense the hiding of the dialectic between self and other or between self and culture in others and you dealt with acquisition but you didn't deal with domination; and therefore there is a power ingredient that's lost. And you get at that then indirectly through your moral-intellectual autonomy and through your reciprocity. And it seems to me that if you had dealt more directly with the phenomena of others, not simply making possible acquisition but in a sense putting on, then the moral-intellectual autonomy doesn't become a statement about the individual, it becomes a demand upon the other to treat the one with that kind, as if he had that kind of autonomy which would in a sense solve all those problems; and you wouldn't have the problem of reciprocity as your fourth thing. But you'd have to look at the power relationships and the dialectic between the individual and the other, which it seems to me is lost in your detailing it at the present time.

A I think that, I thought that the kind of critique that I think you're calling for is a part of the examination of (you feel is) the bonding institutions which entails, I think, simultaneously a critique of what to me is



a growing predominance of institutions that presuppose no bonds but simply make legal compliance or minimal contract relationships. As, that present things on a more or less take it or leave it basis. But if you leave it, you're out; you're in an anomic condition, an isolated individual. But what I would stress in reaction to that, to the general thrust, I think, of your question that it seems to me that the only way to get somewheres in educational reform is getting at...the positive. I just cannot get myself into a Manichaeian view of the world in which one has to come to terms with the devil. That what is wrong is our failure to take sufficient care for what is right. And that my inclination is to search for ways of nurturing the positive conditions and to premise a critique of other tendencies, not so much that they are positive evils but they fail to do the kinds of things that the bonding institutions do. They do not take as much, they do not lead to as productive a public discourse about collective action as would a concept such as the civic interest. That I think that it's there that reform which likes very much to get up on a "this is wrong" or "that is wrong" - I think its ultimate sterility is frequently the fact that it has not come to terms with really what needs to be nurtured as that which is right.

(John has... to that) (the former speaker agrees with M.)

(M. is interrupted) It's I think there that I have not stressed domination in opposition to autonomy because I think (again M. is interrupted)

I wouldn't have any difficulty with the positive thrust.

But then I would want acquisition to be talked about in, although you entail it in your own definition of the mean, I think I would want to deal, at least deal with an acquisition and transformation as a single thrust. You bring transformation in later and it seems to me the acquisition transforming aspect gives that the concern for perhaps the misuses of that. And to bring those two together; whereas acquisition could easily be one person putting that on another from whom he must acquire, even though you're not intending that in your own language. But if it were acquisition-transformation together...(end of side two)

M That many forms of liberation are truly acquiring a constraint...  
 I sort of found that out in using any language, particularly a written language.  
 That your power to express comes by having acquired the constraints, knowing  
 what to do with them, knowing how they work, having made them your own. It is  
 then that you can work within those limits, sometimes to break out of the system  
 beyond them. But I don't think that by not having acquired the limits, you can  
 break them. And there is a great deal of mechanical acquisition that I think  
 needs to be also taken into account or a place for it needs to be harbored in  
 our perception of education. And that the eventual transformation of culture  
 comes by knowing and recognizing and then breaking through <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ limits.

*Isaiah*  
 Q

All right. I appreciate your emphasis on the positive; but it  
 seems to me you put the macro level in the negative. You think that you say life  
 is at a micro level - not the devil but the culprit in the case - (Barabbas ...

... yet your appeal is to an institution or the thrust ~~would~~  
 ought to be to analyze those macro level conditions which inhibit micro living,  
 if that's what my English says. That is, as the level of persons and primary  
 institutions, the focuser of the larger culture, you're saying that if you would  
 read late developments is inhibiting or breaking down the micro living and you're  
 changing <sup>changeable</sup> whole columns...and the <sup>big</sup> great achiever state; and you're part of - now -  
 HEW; but yet the appeal is to create the micro, macro conditions given inter-  
 dependence <sup>and</sup> complexity which will ~~result~~ <sup>know</sup> facilitate - I don't which comes first. But  
 are you saying now, if you ~~ideal~~ create these ideal micro conditions, the other<sup>s</sup>  
 will take care of <sup>themselves</sup> ~~itself~~? That's not the way it seems to work.

M Yeah. What seems to me to be....I think every affirmation carries  
 with it a <sup>host</sup> ~~hope~~ of negation. I stylistically and I think strategically would say  
 one's ~~one~~ substantive would get much further by making one's negation<sup>s</sup> as <sup>efficacious/as</sup> implications ~~for~~ of  
 one's affirmation<sup>s</sup> rather than ~~totte~~ <sup>correctly</sup> ~~altteflly~~ making one's negation<sup>s</sup> by being ~~itde~~  
<sup>for it</sup> ~~of/it~~, one is in effect against a lot of other things. And the problem with, until

we find a way of doing things that is a real substantial alternative which can be positively cultivated, one can decry the bureaucracy of HEW until one is blue in the face. Or any other such thing. Nothing will happen. And that's - that's what seems to me to be the reason why it's important to, from the policy point of view... take a stand for certain things. That as their logical implications carry with them stands against a lot of things. Than to at the outset say this is bad. Is the devil - we must fight against him.

Q There is a fair amount of that - poverty and racism inhibits or prevents the development of the kinds of autonomy you look for. Are you suggesting that a more penetrating empirical analysis and demonstration of this? And a promulgation of the publish those things? That there is an anti-educator that is doing this job instead of what we think should be going on. And that the school ought to be taking more stands on that if it has solid ground to stand on. Would that be an illustration of... (Well, I...) ...can we expect the school to make it possible or certainly the diminish the possibilities for the development of the educated person? ....

A Yeah. I think that for instance if we set this as...busing has in part been dealt with primarily as a legal-political issue on the national level and on the local level. Because educated types have not yet very fully developed a means of saying to themselves and to the interested parties and to the public at large what it, what this is doing to the conditions under which people - both the school children involved and the persons in the communities participated and the public at large - but what that's doing to our conditions in acquiring our culture; and that this is, to my mind, I don't know where it would lead. It might recast a number of issues in a quite different way.

Q But there is a simpler illustration. Malnutrition. That is based on and related to early childhood. You don't have to get involved in political controversy there. You demonstrate how this affects human development in such a way. Is there

a simple answer?

A Yeah. And it's an example of whether I think there might be significant effects if the issue was articulated well publicly as an ultimate pedagogical issue <sup>of</sup> ~~with~~ interest to the society. But, but a society that tolerates malnutrition is prejudicing the educative development of those children amongst it and that is rather than mere, I shouldn't say mere, but simple altruism. A damn good reason why the society as a whole should try and do something about those conditions of malnutrition - because that diminished educability or that diminished capacity for self development which I would closely relate to self government is going to be a detriment to everyone in this society. And I think we need to, that might be a case of a highly particular nature where there is something strategic that might be <sup>said</sup> set in the public by way of critique of social conditions and their effects on the efforts by the individuals and groups involved to acquire their culture. And to live by their culture. What I am suggesting is that it seems to me that the graduate school of education articulates its role in the public by working through as many possible issues as I've mentioned and finding out which ones ...based on common judgment are the ones that something should be done about by ourselves and by the public. And as we do that, I think that we take positions of real value in the public and have an effect on the public that is not one where we're only being responsive to the causes of the moment but have an educational reason for the stands that we are taking. Rather than adopting our educational policies to non-pedagogical rationales that are being presented at the time to the public.

Robert,

Q I feel that you have concepts that might be scratched because they... problems by nutrition; but they lend themselves to certain kinds of problems. One thing that I have been thinking about as you were talking, monitoring it, in respect the the relationship between education narrowly construed as schooling and education in your terms as taking place in the work place. There are claims that

GRAND'S

the demands for more autonomy, in the many kinds of workers, are influenced by the amount of education. We allow that education contributes to schooling, contributes to alienation at work at some point. I think to investigate those things to find out what is it that is going on in the schooling process that creates certain expectations for control in one's work. And then to ask the kind of question that you're asking: what culture would one <sup>construct</sup> ~~instill~~, or acquire or develop and the working place is the consequence of sharing more than controls which Don actually asked. But I see similar questions vis a vis the family. Despite what you said about the lunge in the family, some people say it's stronger than ever. And that's got some linkage to an education. I think that barking up the wrong tree is barking up to what extent school is linked to achievement scores. That's really pretty much now the reverse of a telescope in terms of some processes that are going on.

A I think that once we start looking at the effects of various conditions - in school, out of school, on the way people, the relationship of various conditions with the way people acquire culture or what culture they acquire, the study of a vast number of interrelationships becomes possible and that's where perhaps there is potentially a great multiplier effect to be developed by whatever society can muster the intelligence and will to correlate it - some of the conditions of school, workplace, entertainment, leisure, so that they have, their, what they conduce to reinforces each other. I think this is what Professor Cremin and his idea ~~about/his~~ of configurations of educative influences is looking at. And I think we need to understand a great deal more about such configurations and what we can, what sort of stands that understanding relates to, or gives rise to in, vis a vis public questions.

CREMIN

Q Could I raise a question, Robbie, about the role of definitions? It's no secret. I have had a great deal of hassling with my own definition. I like yours. And I (resurrect) to it. I am sympathetic. You wrote an article five years ago called "Toward A Place To Study in a World of Instruction," in which you pleaded

for a place to study in a world of instruction. Here your definition almost reads instruction out unless your self instruction. This leads to a question of the role of definition. John Dewey called his 1919 book How We Think and it is clearly said it should have been entitled How One Educated Person Thinks We Ought To Think. Now, I'm perfectly ready to have you say educational best as truism. It is most valid particularly in our kind of society with its complex of values, I think we could all agree here is ~~that/position/~~ acquisition. There's a difference between a definition that casts a wide net so you work a wide range of versions of a phenomenon and then make a judgment as to which is better and which is worse. And the definition that is in Raymond ( Aron's ) word, tries to transform the world; and I think you have to level with your listener or your audience as to which you are trying to do. I think if you're telling us what is the best kind of education, I get into this trouble all the time because my definition which is broader than his, is far too narrow for lots of people. So I am talking about an argument I have that when... just mention one other thing. When Dick Hofstadter got through defining ~~Descartes said/about/proofs/of/finding~~ intellect book in his Anti-Intellectualism in American Life, he said "intellect is not intelligence." He kind of set it up so that America would lose. And you couldn't have the kind of intellect he wants in our kind of society and for the future you would want because the very, to me, the essence of the American tradition, like it or not, is the transformation of intellect into intelligence. Now, let's get on. Coming back to the role of definitions....Because I think it's crucial in where we are running. And I say this simple thing that Hofstadter just said. If education is acquisition, then you got to name a lot of other things that you called instruction and others would call socialization and what have you. And say OK; well, that's a first cousin to education. But it's not. Am I at least being clear? I am not quarreling with your definition at all. I am asking you for how you see the role of definition. Is it to give us a broad terrain that we study and then act upon or is it a very function of your definition

to transform the role?

A I think...quickly say to begin with, it has to be both. And then to pick up on a couple of things that ...I neither meant a study to exclude instruction nor do I mean acquisition to be something other than socialization or construction. What I am trying to say is that, what I was trying to say was that to study is to make sense ... instruction cannot work unless it presumes that the student is studying. That when you get, and you get this phenomena on many educational levels now. The student who comes through certain experiences and sits back and says "Well, teach,"; in that frame of mind, the best instruction I don't think will lead to much of anything. I'd also say <sup>of</sup> ~~that~~ socialization, although ~~with~~ <sup>lots</sup> of it is unconscious, it nevertheless is an acquisition. And that there is, to understand socialization, I think, you have to take into account the mode of attachments that go into giving valence to certain things in the vast range of stimuli that one finds around one and some of those in the course of socialization are taken to one, perhaps for very different reasons than one learns the Pythagorean Theorem. But no child in the course of socialization takes in anything approaching the full range of cultural stimuli, the mode of stimuli, linguistic stimuli that he has been subjected to as potential socializers.

Q What I hear your definition giving us then is a perspective because as I read David Ausulin and Bert Braham who write on socialization and I am much less disturbed with the concept of transmission than you; they would make all the qualifiers that you make, that you looking at it from the point of view of acquisition make - which allows a great deal of transmission in, though you say I reject transmission, they would talk about transmissions and, ah, yes, but ideally, you see the person's participation in it so it is not a kind of Clockwork Orange.

A Yeah. But I think that our definitions, what I'd like to pick up is the

general thrust of the question. I think that our definitions are constructive - sometimes destructive - that they are not purely matters of definition. And that there are different worlds that follow from different constellations of definition. And that if we are going to have a, if we are going to make the effort to shape the world in which we live in, we need to recognize that aspect along with others in the matter of definition and that I think, to my mind, the ultimate, <sup>where</sup> ~~what~~ I would have to take my stand for this definition would be that the, that it gives rise to a world that I think I would find preferable to live in; that ones that might with equal adequacy deal with the phenomena, but the implications for action that they may carry with them, seem to me to be less desirable. And I think that that is a very important aspect of the discussion that we should have and that it is the responsibility of intellectual institutions to make clear to the public *before/you/at*.

FINAL REMARK Before you acquire Robbie's definition of education, I invite you to acquire <sup>Dale's</sup> (Edel's) definition of education Monday morning at 9:30. Thank you very much, Robbie.

CREMIN <sup>since</sup> May I say in advance that some of us are on different schedules the failure to appear Monday should be not be taken for value judgment but an acceptance, Robert...

FURTHER COMMENT Maybe we should also make available the days when you can visit, so as I contact other people they will know that.

CREMIN Well I am well aware of machines and I assumed it's unimportant whether I'm here; it's only important for me whether I can learn.

FURTHER COMMENT You can also teach.

Thank you very much, Robert.