

ACC

10000/144/594

10000/144/594

LECTURES  
(NO DATE)  
(1943-1947?)

Insegnamento della Matematica  
nelle Scuole Medie degli Stati Uniti

Lt.Col. C.W. Washburne

I Introduzione - Le scuole degli Stati Uniti

A - Mancanza di centralizzazione

Autonomia statale e locale

Liberta' dell'insegnante

Uniformita' base

Associazioni per il riconoscimento ed ispezione

Intercomunicazione tra gli insegnanti

Requisiti per l'universita'

Esami per l'universita'

Sperimento delle 30 scuole

Preparazione per la vita e' la migliore preparazione per  
l'universita'

B - Organizzazione delle scuole americane

Organ. tradizionale - 8-4, universita'

Organ. moderna - 6-3-3, universita'

C - Proporzione dei ragazzi che frequentano le scuole secondarie

II L'educazione tradizionale

A - Scopi tradizionali

Disciplina formale

Conoscenza enciclopedica

Preparazione per l'universita'

Preparazione per la vita pratica

B - L'insegnamento tradizionale della matematica

1. Organizzazione

Scuola elementare

Processi fondamentali

Abilita' e velocita'

Geometria pratica - come misurare

Applicazioni pratiche

Scuola media inferiore

Sviluppo e revisione dell'aritmetica e geometria

Concetti generali

Applicazioni alla vita commerciale e pratica

- 2 -

Scuola media superiore

Algebra

Geometria Euclidea - piano

Geometria solida e trigonometrica, facoltativa

Junior College

Algebra avanzata

Trigonometria

Geometria analitica

## 2. Orario

Elementare - da 20 fino a 50 minuti, 5 volte la settimana  
lavoro a casa

Medio inferiore e superiore - 50 minuti, 5 volte la sett.  
lavoro a casa

## 3. Metodo

a - sistema di istruzione

Libro di testo

Compiti a spiegazione - uso di materia concreta

Lavoro scritto ed interrogazioni

Prove scritte

Esami mensili

Esami semestrali

Voti

Numero bocciati

b - metodo di insegnamento

Logico

Astratto

Poco su esercizio e revisione

Esami esigono memoria piuttosto che ragione e  
applicazione

2341

## 4/ Critica del metodo tradizionale

Organizzato per specialisti, non per la maggioranza

Troppo dettagliato, non abbastanza inclusivo

Manca relazione ai bisogni dei ragazzi e della società

Manca coordinazione ed integrazione con altra materia

Non e' d'accordo con la psicologia dell'adolescente

Nonostante queste critiche, il sistema tradizionale

persiste, per matematica, anche nelle scuole altri-  
menti moderne

- 3 -

## III L'educazione moderna

## A - Scopi

Lo sviluppo dell'individuo  
Preparazione per la vita attuale  
Adattamento e partecipazione

## B - Analisi della materia secondo risultati desiderati

## Abitudine

Pensare criticamente e logicamente  
Onesta' intellettuale  
Precisione e prontezza

## Abilita'

Riconoscere e analizzare problemi  
Cooperare con altri  
Studiare indipendentemente secondo bisogni attuali

## Attitudini

Cooperativismo  
Mente inquisitiva  
Coscienza sociale

## Conoscenza e apprezzamento

Sistema decimale  
Valore del metodo matematico  
Relazioni fra la matematica e le scienze; e la vita  
pratica ed economica

Il programma e' mezzo ai fini, non una materia per se stessa  
L'organizzazione e prove devono essere secondo gli scopi

## C - Organizzazione moderna della matematica

## Scuola elementare

Insegnamento postposto fino all'eta' dove il ragazzo  
ha la necessaria maturita' ed esperienza  
Continua di dare peso a maestrezza ed applicazioni  
pratiche

## Media inferiore

Molto piu' peso sulla vita sociale, ed alle relazioni  
ad altre materie; Matematica generale

## Media superiore

Matematica generale, aritmetica commerciale  
Piu' peso sulla concreta ed interessante  
Meno enciclopedico

Algebra, Geometria  
Trigonometria, Logica

- 4 -

## D - Metodo moderno

## 1. Principi

Psicologico invece di logico  
Concreto invece di astratto  
Integrato invece di distaccato  
Peso ~~sulla~~ <sup>sulla</sup> interesse e ragionamento invece di memoria  
Esami ~~sulla~~ <sup>sulla</sup> applicazione e ragionamento

## 2. Applicazione dei principi

Uso di matematica per soddisfare bisogni  
Bisogno individuale - senso di normalita'  
Statistiche e misurazione  
Bisogni della comunita' della scuola  
Banca  
Assicurazioni  
Cooperativa  
Fabbriche  
"Rabbit raising" *allarme conigli*  
Bisogni intellettuali  
Geometria per analizzare natura di prova  
Valore di definizione  
Relazione ~~per~~ <sup>per</sup> assunzione e conclusione  
Applicazione del metodo di geometria a  
vari campi

## Programma nucleare

Centro di interesse  
Piani degli insegnanti di varie materie  
Piani fatti con i ragazzi stessi  
Che cosa vuole imparare  
Che cosa vuole potere fare dopo il corso  
che non era possibile prima  
La scelta della materia  
Organizzazione della materia  
Orario  
Problemi specifici  
Valorizzazione

In questi piani si deve considerare:

Scopi dello stato  
Scopi locali  
Bisogni individuali  
Bisogni sociali

2339

- 5 -

#### IV Conclusione

L'insegnamento attuale della matematica negli S.U.  
non differisce fondamentalmente dall'insegnamento  
in altri paesi

Ma c'è un movimento verso un insegnamento  
più d'accordo con i bisogni individuali e sociali  
e organizzato d'accordo con la psicologia dell'adolescente.

---

2338

## WHAT IS DEMOCRACY

What is democracy? When we try to answer this question we must be careful to distinguish between the forms of democracy and its essence.

Democracy may be implemented in a great variety of ways. Voting, for example, may be of the kind where everyone votes on everything, or it may be through representatives. Representatives may be chosen by a given number of people, or by those in a geographic area, or by people grouped according to their political beliefs or by their occupations. Every person may have a voice in selecting representatives, or the franchise may be limited by sex, by age, by property qualifications, by morals, by race, or by literacy. There may be a one-party, two-party, or many-party system. The possible forms of democracy are innumerable. Here, however, we are concerned with its spirit.

Fundamentally, democracy is a way of life that gives every individual the utmost possible opportunity for self-fulfillment as a member of an interdependent society. Therefore it involves:

1) Freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of action.

2) Social responsibility, realization of one's identification with the society of which one is a member, the subordination of temporary to permanent values and of individual and small-group action to large-group purposes; and the ability to co-operate with others in work and in thought, and to play an active part in

everything, or it may be through representatives. Representatives may be chosen by a given number of people, or by those in a geographic area, or by people grouped according to their political beliefs or by their occupations. Every person may have a voice in selecting representatives, or the franchise may be limited by sex, by age, by property qualifications, by morals, by race, or by literacy. There may be a one-party, two-party, or many-party system. The possible forms of democracy are innumerable. Here, however, we are concerned with its spirit.

Fundamentally, democracy is a way of life that gives every individual the utmost possible opportunity for self-fulfillment as a member of an interdependent society. Therefore it involves:

1) Freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of action.

2) Social responsibility, realization of one's identification with the society of which one is a member, the subordination of temporary to permanent values and of individual and small-group action to large-group purposes; and the ability to co-operate with others in work and in thought, and to play an active part in determining the social, political, and economic life of society.

3) Understanding, the ability to find facts, to think and act logically and intelligently in terms of them, and the recognition of the role of the expert.

In the practice of democracy all three of these factors must be considered, for they both limit and fulfill one another. We shall not, however, be able to draw sharp lines between them. Any consideration of one must involve simultaneous consideration of the

other two. But we can center our discussion around each in turn.

### Freedom of Thought

Jefferson said, in founding the University of Virginia :  
"Here we shall follow truth wherever it may lead; nor fear to tolerate error as long as reason is left free to combat it".  
Children, and all persons, have an inalienable right to truth. Without free access to whatever knowledge and opinions are available they cannot think wisely. To give a child half-truths, to evade honest, frank answers to his questions, to indoctrinate him in a controversial field, to mislead him in any way, is to deprive him of the chance to develop his own independence of thought, to deprive him of the elements of clear thinking.

Prejudiced parents, prejudiced teachers, prejudiced textbooks, stand in his way. Yet we cannot, however earnestly we strive to do so, wholly avoid these prejudiced influences. But we can counteract them. We can man our schools with teachers of a wide variety of viewpoints, teachers who, moreover, are intent on developing children's powers of thought rather than on imposing their own conclusions. We can use books and periodicals written from various points of view. We can help children to pierce propaganda and to allow for prejudice.

The child's maturity must, of course, be taken into account. This does not mean, however, less honesty for young children than for older, or the concealing of facts and opinions. It means rather that ideas must be personalized and facts must be simplified and

2336

Children, and all persons, have an inalienable right to truth.

Without free access to whatever knowledge and opinions are available they cannot think wisely. To give a child half-truths, to evade honesty, frank answers to his questions, to indoctrinate him in a controversial field, to mislead him in any way, is to deprive him of the chance to develop his own independence of thought, to deprive him of the elements of clear thinking.

Prejudiced parents, prejudiced teachers, prejudiced textbooks, stand in his way. Yet we cannot, however earnestly we strive to do so, wholly avoid these prejudiced influences. But we can counteract them. We can run our schools with teachers of a wide variety of viewpoints, teachers who, moreover, are intent on developing children's powers of thought rather than on imposing their own conclusions. We can use books and periodicals written from various points of view. We can help children to pierce propaganda and to allow for prejudice.

The child's maturity must, of course, be taken into account. This does not mean, however, less honesty for young children than for older, or the concealing of facts and opinions. It means rather that ideas must be personalized and facts must be simplified and related to the child's experience. But the child is entitled to truth; there must be no distortion or concealment.

In a democratic school, children do not hesitate to express their thoughts. It is through such expression that thinking is clarified. Through it children learn from one another to increase their understanding. Through it they exercise social responsibility and prepare themselves for active life as citizens.

It is in the continual formulation and expression of

./.

their thoughts, and the interaction between their own thoughts and those of their fellows, that children grow daily in the ability to exercise democratic citizenship. The school conditions that make this possible are closely tied up with freedom of action.

Two anecdotes illustrate opposite views in regard to

#### Freedom of action :

The first is well known: A mother called down stairs to her husband, "Bob, go see what Tommy is doing and tell him not to!"

The other is the little dialogue my mother used to have with me when I was a child. She would say :

"Carleton, what can you do?"

"Anything I like!" (with an air of bravado and defiance)

"Except what?"

"Other other people". (much subdued)

In the first instance there is the assumption that the child, in acting freely, is violating the family standards and must be made to conform. In the second there is the recognition that the child is free to act as he will except as that freedom violates the equal freedom of others. Social responsibility and an understanding of the desires and freedom of others are always limitations upon individual freedom in social living, but they are almost the only legitimate limitations.

Within these limitations the child, for his own development, and for the working out of his characteristic design of growth, must have the right to experience, to explore, to make mistakes, and to

The first is well known: A mother called down stairs to her husband, "Bob, go see what Tommy is doing and tell him not to!"

The other is the little dialogue my mother used to have with me when I was a child. She would say:

"Carleton, what can you do?"

"Anything I like!" (with an air of bravado and defiance)

"Except what?"

"Other other people". (much subdued)

In the first instance there is the assumption that the child, in acting freely, is violating the family standards and must be made to conform. In the second there is the recognition that the child is free to act as he will except as that freedom violates the equal freedom of others. Social responsibility and an understanding of the desires and freedom of others are always limitations upon individual freedom in social living, but they are almost the only legitimate limitations.

2335

Within these limitations the child, for his own development, and for the working out of his characteristic design of growth, must have the right to experience, to explore, to make mistakes, and to discover his own potentialities and their boundaries. There is, consequently, an atmosphere of freedom and activity in a democratic classroom. There is a minimum of compulsion and repression. There is a maximum of opportunity for children to carry out activities appropriate to their level of development, to have experience, and to make discoveries. There is much more emphasis upon initiative,

./.

originality, and self-directed work than upon set assignments, fixed routine, and strict conformity to adult standards.

This does not mean laissez faire or planlessness. The guidance and stimulation of the teacher are essential. It is through these that the children balance their freedom with social responsibility and understanding.

#### Socialization and Freedom

Social responsibility both enlarges and restricts the individual. The more inclusive the group with which he identifies himself and the larger his horizons become, the greater are his growth and satisfaction and the more complete is his self-fulfillment. Yet the more completely he is identified with more and more inclusive groups, the more his independence of action as an individual may be restricted.

Socialization, therefore, both limits and fulfills freedom. These two principles are basic in any consideration of democracy. Young children can be helped to an understanding of them in concrete situations. But a full awareness of their significance, and an ordering of life in accordance with that awareness, has not yet been achieved by adult society. The failure to recognize and apply these principles is the cause of our social, political, and economic conflicts. Let us, therefore, examine them here; for if human society is to understand them and live in the light of that understanding, we must lay the foundations in the democracy of the classroom.

### Socialization and Freedom

Social responsibility both enlarges and restricts the individual. The more inclusive the group with which he identifies himself and the larger his horizons become, the greater are his growth and satisfactions and the more complete is his self-fulfillment. Yet the more completely he is identified with more and more inclusive groups, the more his independence of action as an individual may be restricted.

Socialization, therefore, both limits and fulfills freedom. These two principles are basic in any consideration of democracy. Young children can be helped to an understanding of them in concrete situations. But a full awareness of their significance, and an ordering of life in accordance with that awareness, has not yet been achieved by adult society. The failure to recognize and apply these principles is the cause of our social, political, and economic conflicts. Let us, therefore, examine them here; for if human society is to understand them and live in the light of that understanding, we must lay the foundations in the democracy of the classroom.

2334

### Freedom of Independence

Freedom has two contradictory aspects: independence and capability. We organize into co-operative, interdependent groupings in order to increase our capability, our effective capacity, our power; and in proportion as we do so we lose our independence. What we may do is in inverse proportion to what we can do.

/.

Children can see this through such an example as the fol-

lowing:

Suppose I go off by myself into the north woods, <sup>of Canada</sup> with a canoe, a map, a compass, matches, camp outfit, gun, ammunition, and fishing tackle. Now I may do anything I please. No one can tell me what is wrong and right, what is permitted and what is forbidden. I have completely the freedom of independence. For the moment I am unconscious of any lack of freedom of capability. I travel from place to place reveling in my independence. Here in my canoe I am fully self-sufficient. But as I cross a lake, with everything neatly stowed in my canoe, a storm breaks and capsizes me. My equipment sinks beyond recovery. I barely manage to swim to an island, while my canoe and paddle blow to a distant end of the lake.

Yes, cold, exhausted, I pull myself on to land. I still have complete independence. I may do anything I please. But I cannot get to the far end of the lake to recover my canoe. I cannot make myself a good shelter without my ax. I cannot start a fire without matches, and without the knife and string with which a good scout manages to make a fire with a whirling stick. I cannot fish. I cannot hunt. I am helpless.

Am I free?

I have the freedom of independence, but not the freedom of capability. Now I realize why I did not miss the latter before. I had the canoe made by others; the gun, the ammunition, the fishing tackle, the camp outfit, all made through the co-operation of countless others.

completely the freedom of independence. For the moment I am unconscious of my lack of freedom of capability. I travel from place to place reveling in my independence. Then in my canoe I am fully self-sufficient. But as I cross a lake, with everything neatly stowed in my canoe, a storm breaks and capsizes me. My equipment sinks beyond recovery. I barely manage to swim to an island, while my canoe and paddle blow to a distant end of the lake.

Hot, cold, exhausted, I pull myself on to land. I still have complete independence. I may do anything I please. But I cannot get to the far end of the lake to recover my canoe. I cannot make myself a good shelter without my ax. I cannot start a fire without matches, and without the knife and string with which a good scout manages to make a fire with a whirling stick. I cannot fish. I cannot hunt. I am helpless.

Am I free?

I have the freedom of independence, but not the freedom of capability. Now I realize why I did not miss the latter before. I had the canoe made by others; the gun, the ammunition, the fishing tackle, the camp outfit, all made through the co-operation of countless others. I had come into the possession of these through subordinating my independence to the social organization by many, many hours of work, contributing my time, energy, and skill to the lives of my fellows, regulated by them as to how and when and where I did so. In exchange I was given the means to acquire these products of their labors. I had gained the freedom of capability through the sacrifice of the freedom of independence. And as I roan, wet, shivering, and hungry, on my island, I ardently wish to continue the exchange and I don't feel

that it will be much of a sacrifice !

Freedom of Capability

The other extreme complete freedom of capability with no freedom of independence does not and cannot exist. For the sacrifice of independence to organization reaches a point of diminishing returns. Through increasing socialization, increasing co-operative exchange of work and thought, and consequent increasing interdependence-- the capacity for effective action increases. But gradually the increasing interdependence of all results in the dependence of more and more people on the management and direction of fewer and fewer. This leads to diminishing self-determination and self-fulfillment on the part of the individuals who constitute the social organization. Consequently the organization itself begins to lose its capacity to develop.

Instead of the social organization being a living, growing, self-active organism, it tends to become machine-like, its parts well-gearred but inert.

In actuality we stop organizing ourselves before such ultimate mechanization takes place. The inherent will of living beings to live rebels against an extreme of organization that stifles life. So the extreme of over-organization, of complete subordination of all individuals to the collective, never is reached.

The answer to the paradox of the loss of the freedom of independence with increased freedom of capability through social

returns. Through increasing socialization, increasing co-operative exchange of work and thought, and consequent increasing interdependence-- the capacity for effective action increases. But gradually the increasing interdependence of all results in the dependence of more and more people on the management and direction of fewer and fewer. This leads to diminishing self-determination and self-fulfillment on the part of the individuals who constitute the social organization. Consequently the organization itself begins to lose its capacity to develop.

Instead of the social organization being a living, growing, selfactive organism, it tends to become machine-like, its parts well-gearred but inert.

In actuality we stop organizing ourselves before such ultimate mechanization takes place. The inherent will of living beings to live rebels against an extreme of organization that stifles life. So the extreme of over-organization, of complete subordination of all individuals to the collective, never is reached.

The answer to the paradox of the loss of the freedom of independence with increased freedom of capability through social organization lies in the democracy of organization, voluntary participation in an interdependent society, not dependence and subordination. Insofar as each individual is recognized as a living, contributing part of the organization, insofar as the organization exists for the well-being and the self-fulfillment of the individuals who compose it, organization increases effectiveness. The freedom of capability is attained, and a large measure of the freedom of independence is preserved. But the freedom of independence is voluntarily used for the well-being and effectiveness of the social organization of

which each feels himself to be a vital part.

It is impossible to separate that which promotes the well-being of individuals from that which promotes the well-being of society. For a society is only as wholesome and alive as are the members who compose it. Just as individuals can only achieve self-fulfillment in a democratic, developing society, so society cannot be effectively democratic and really alive and growing except as it is composed of individuals who are co-operatively approaching self-fulfillment. ~~All that we have said in the preceding chapters, there-fore, about the freedom of thought, expression, and action of individuals, bears directly upon the question of developing a wholesome, vibrant society.~~ Each individual's social responsibility can only be exercised in a free society.

The value of social organization has already been discussed-- it is our means of achieving the freedom of capability, of vastly extending our horizons of thought and our field of effective action. We achieve magnitude of spirit in proportion to our self-identification with an organic society.

The sense of responsibility for the well-being of a social group is an inevitable concomitant of a realization that one actually belongs to that group. One must feel one's membership so fully that the group's problems are one's own problems, its satisfactions one's own satisfactions.

That sense of identity with one's fellows can be achieved

by active participation of the individual in

fulfillment in a democratic, developing society, no society cannot be effectively democratic and really alive and growing except as it is composed of individuals who are co-operatively approaching self-fulfillment. ~~All that we have said in the preceding chapter, therefore, about the freedom of thought, expression, and action of individuals, bears directly upon the question of developing a democracy, or, more correctly, a society.~~ Each individual's social responsibility can only be exercised in a free society.

The value of social organization has already been discussed-- it is our means of achieving the freedom of capability, of vastly extending our horizons of thought and our field of effective action. We achieve magnitude of spirit in proportion to our self-identification with an organic society.

The sense of responsibility for the well-being of a social group is an inevitable concomitant of a realization that one actually belongs to that group. One must feel one's membership so fully that the group's problems are one's own problems, its satisfactions one's own satisfactions.

That sense of identity with one's fellows can be achieved only through the free, active participation of the individual in group undertaking. Even vicarious experiences, through movie, radio, or books, involve such participation mentally, and they are effective in proportion as the participations is real to the children. Free, active participation in group undertakings is the essence of citizenship.

Children are living a social life. They are thinking, talking, working, and playing together. Very early they begin to see the need for organization.

Once organized, their first tendency is to make rules. Then the teacher needs to guide them toward the recognition that rules should be limited to the few which are necessary to non-interference with others and co-ordination of effort. Sometimes this guidance consists in letting rules be made and suffered under or broken so that the children may become aware of the harm of too many rules or rules that are too rigid.

Some legislation, or, at least, policy forming, is, however, necessary. And in this process children get experience in group thinking, and a sense of belonging to a social group. Legislative action requires organization. The form of the organization should be indigenous to the class or school and grow up from the needs and planning of the children. But it should be based on the fundamental principles of democracy, freedom, social responsibility, and understanding.

It is essential that in any type of school democracy the children be allowed to make mistakes. Any lack of genuineness in responsibility and freedom is instantly sensed, and results in a loss of the essential values of student citizenship. The teachers say, and often do, speak and advise, but they must be extremely careful not to dominate. If a possible decision is liable to be one which will so vitally affect the well-being of the school that the teachers' custodial responsibility must be called into play, this should be explained at the outset and the children be warned that this is a matter on which they

rules that are too rigid.

Some legislation, or, at least, policy formulation, is, however, necessary. And in this process children get experience in group thinking, and a sense of belonging to a social group. Legislative action requires organization. The form of the organization should be indigenous to the class or school and grow up from the needs and planning of the children. But it should be based on the fundamental principles of democracy, freedom, social responsibility, and understanding.

It is essential that in any type of school democracy the children be allowed to make mistakes. Any lack of genuineness in responsibility and freedom is instantly sensed, and results in a loss of the essential values of student citizenship. The teachers may, and often do, speak and advise, but they must be extremely careful not to dominate. If a possible decision is liable to be one which will so vitally affect the well-being of the school that the teacher's custodial responsibility must be called into play, this should be explained at the outset and the children be warned that this is a matter on which they will not be allowed to make a decision; such an occasion is, however, so rare that I am unable to give an example.

There are, however, inherent limitations to any self-government, not imposed by the teacher or any authority, but implicit in social organization. These are: the relation of smaller groups to more inclusive larger ones; the rights of individuals and minorities; the problem of size; and the principle of understanding.

The first limitation lies in the fact any group is part of a larger, more inclusive group. Its freedom of action is limited by

its relationship to other groups and to the more inclusive society. The children in one class are part of the whole school. Their decisions, where they affect other classes, have to be made with due consideration of and in interaction with the other classes of the school. Again, the school children are a part of the community in which the school exists. Insofar as their decisions and actions influence the community or react upon it, the rights and the decisions of the community limit their freedom. The same is true, of course, for the state and the nation, and for the world as a whole.

Where a decision of the children in the classroom violates a decision by the more inclusive community, the latter must take precedence.

A second inherent limitation and strength of any democratic organization is the right of the individual or the minority to as much freedom as is attainable without harm to the majority. A majority has no right in a democracy to determine the actions of a minority except where those actions are definitely injurious to the majority's rights. For example, I would question whether a majority has a right to decide what sort of a personal life I lead or what sort of a personal life any small community leads, as long as that life does not interfere with the life of the rest of the people. It has a right to say that I shall not drive a car, if I am drunk. That obviously is seriously interfering with others.

which the school exists. Insofar as their decisions influence the community or react upon it, the rights and the decisions of the community limit their freedom. The same is true, of course, for the state and the nation, and for the world as a whole.

Here a decision of the children in the classroom violates a decision by the more inclusive community, the latter must take precedence.

A second inherent limitation and strength of any democratic organization is the right of the individual or the minority to as much freedom as is attainable without harm to the majority. A majority has no right in a democracy to determine the actions of a minority except where those actions are definitely inimical to the majority's rights. For example, I would question whether a majority has a right to decide what sort of a personal life I lead or what sort of a personal life any small community leads, as long as that life does not interfere with the life of the rest of the people. It has a right to say that I shall not drive a car if I am drunk. That obviously is seriously interfering with others. It has a right to say that I must stay inside the house if I have a contagious disease. Similarly, the majority of the population has a right to decide, not what a farmer may raise for his private consumption, but what a farmer may do in throwing an excess crop on the market and upsetting the price structure, in a way which interferes with everyone's life. It does not have a right to decide what kind of design an automobile is to have (except for safety devices), but it has a right to decide whether a single manufacturer may pay

such low wages and sweat his labor to such an extent that it forces the standard down for other manufacturers who wish to compete in the open market. And so on through the whole range of democratic legislation. A majority may only regulate the minority where the action of that minority, unregulated, would seriously and directly interfere with the rights of others.

Minority and individual rights are not merely important for the persons directly concerned. They are essential to the growth and vitality of society. Without the right of individuals and groups to exercise initiative and express themselves freely, society becomes static, inert. Variation is nature's means of effecting evolution. Different culture patterns and different political and economic theories are the life blood of social organization. They must flow unobstructed. It is only in matters of action involving the welfare of the whole social unit that a majority can, with impunity, over-rule the minority.

#### The Problem of Size

Closely related to the rights and use of individuals and minorities is the problem of size, a third inherent limitation of social organization. The larger and more inclusive a social organization becomes, the greater its potentialities for increasing the freedom of capability; yet the harder it is for all the members to preserve the feeling of vital participation. Society is blocked in the realization of its potentialities by the diminishing returns

majority. A majority may only regulate the minority where the action of that minority, unregulated, would seriously and directly interfere with the rights of others.

Minority and individual rights are not merely important for the persons directly concerned. They are essential to the growth and vitality of society. Without the rights of individuals and groups to exercise initiative and express themselves freely, society becomes static, inert. Variation is nature's means of effecting evolution. Different culture patterns and different political and economic theories are the life blood of social organization. They must flow unobstructed. It is only in matters of action involving the welfare of the whole social unit that a majority can, with impunity, over-rule the minority.

#### The Problems of Size

Closely related to the rights and use of individuals and minorities is the problem of size, a third inherent limitation of social organization. The larger and more inclusive a social organization becomes, the greater its potentialities for increasing the freedom of capability; yet the harder it is for all the members to preserve the feeling of vital participation. Society is blocked in the realization of its potentialities by the diminishing returns that result from stifling the initiative and self-expression of its members. A large school, a big city school system, a great corporation, a national government, all tend to make rules of universal application, all tend toward bureaucratic control and the loss of initiative on the part of the component groups and individuals. The solution lies in as much decentralization of control as is possible without friction and without loss of co-ordination among the parts.

The moment an organization<sup>is</sup> a school, an industry, or a government<sup>becomes</sup> so large that rules have to be substituted for judgment in terms of the well-being of individuals or groups, the organization needs to be broken into smaller parts. The larger organization must be retained to co-ordinate the groups that compose it, lest we lose the freedom of capability. But the groups must retain their initiative and the possibility of encouraging, in turn, the full development of their individual members, lest we lose the freedom of independent thought, expression, and action, and lest society stagnate.

#### Understanding

Our fourth limitation to social organization and responsibility is the degree of understanding possessed by the members of a society.

We have referred to the relationship of small groups to larger, the rights and use of individuals and minorities, the problems of size, and the amount of understanding possessed by the members of society, as limitations of social organization and responsibility. They are; but they are also its fulfillment. Just as an individual's life is fuller and more meaningful when he identifies himself with a group, so is a group fulfilled by identification with more inclusive groups. The rights of minorities limit majority action; but individuals and minorities, with their differing patterns and ideas, are essential for the life and growth of the social organism. Size

organization must be retained to co-ordinate the groups that compose it, lest we lose the freedom of capability. But the groups must retain their initiative and the possibility of encouraging, in turn, the full development of their individual members, lest we lose the freedom of independent thought, expression, and action, and lest society stagnate.

Understanding

Our fourth limitation to social organization and responsibility is the degree of understanding possessed by the members of a society.

We have referred to the relationship of small groups to larger, the rights and use of individuals and minorities, the problem of size, and the amount of understanding possessed by the members of society, as limitations of social organization and responsibility. They are; but they are also its fulfillment. Just as an individual's life is fuller and more meaningful when he identifies himself with a group, so is a group fulfilled by identification with more inclusive groups. The rights of minorities limit majority action; but individuals and minorities, with their differing patterns and ideas, are essential for the life and growth of the social organism. Size may become cumbersome; but it may also increase effectiveness. And as the lack of understanding limits social responsibility, increased understanding by the members of society is the foundation upon which democracy must be built.

"And you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free". This statement has been repeated so many times that we tend to be dull to its significance. We don't contradict it-- we accept it with a mental shrug.

But it is the key to democracy and the reason for it. Without understanding knowledge, truth, wisdom, we have neither the freedom of independence nor the freedom of capability. The seemingly independent person is constantly limited by lack of understanding. In seeking satisfaction and self-fulfillment he is continually limited by ignorance; he cannot subordinate immediate impulse to ultimate good without knowing what is his ultimate good; so that which, if he knew it, would yield him greatest richness of life is often sacrificed to momentary whims. Self-discipline is lacking or misguided when he lacks understanding. And when he lacks self-discipline, he becomes a slave to impulse, not a free man.

The freedom of capability is obviously proportionate to understanding. If we don't know how to achieve our ends, we are not free to achieve them. If we are hungry and don't know how to obtain food; if we are sick and don't know how to achieve health; if we are cold and don't know how to get clothes, shelter, and fuel; if we, to communicate and don't know the language the other person understands; if we wish to express ourselves in music or art or the dance or writing and don't have the techniques -- if we want to do anything and do not understand how to do it in a way that

neither the freedom of independence nor the freedom of capability. The seemingly independent person is constantly limited by lack of understanding. In seeking satisfaction and self-fulfillment he is continually limited by ignorance; he cannot subordinate immediate impulse to ultimate good without knowing what is his ultimate good; so that which, if he knew it, would yield him greatest richness of life is often sacrificed to momentary whims. Self-discipline is lacking or misguided when he lacks understanding. And when he lacks self-discipline, he becomes a slave to impulse, not a free man.

The freedom of capability is obviously proportionate to understanding; if we don't know how to achieve our ends, we are not free to achieve them. If we are hungry and don't know how to obtain food; if we are sick and don't know how to achieve health; if we are cold and don't know how to get clothes, shelter, and fuel; if we <sup>wish</sup> to communicate and don't know the language the other person understands; if we wish to express ourselves in music or art or the dance or writing and don't have the techniques - if we want to do anything and do not understand how to do it in a way that satisfies us, we clearly are not free.

Social responsibility and interaction, too, depend upon understanding; we must understand the thoughts and attitudes, the work and skill of our fellows if we are to co-ordinate our work and play and thought with theirs. We must know group purposes if we are to make them ours. We cannot participate in the economic, political, or social life of mankind, we cannot share in mankind's thought and feelings, except as we understand.

Understanding grows through experience. And experience is proportionate to participation. Democracy is the only way of life in which there is real participation by every individual. Therefore democracy is essential to understanding.

It is through participation in a democratic society that we know each other's capacities and limitations, each other's goals and frustrations. When we act under orders we learn little. It is as we give responsible thought to our social relations and to our conjoined purposes that we grow in understanding.

There are, <sup>however,</sup> limits to the attainable knowledge and understanding of any individual. We have to share in each other's knowledge. There must be a division of labor and specialization in the realm of understanding as there is in the realm of work. By this means the wisdom of society far exceeds that of any of its individual components. And that brings us to the role of the expert in a democratic society.

#### The Role of the Expert

In all democratic organizations there is the need for delegating authority to experts except where a situation makes the members of the society themselves experts. This point of view needs both elaboration and defense, because it is one where our own political democracy in America, like that of other countries, is running into serious obstacles, and is one which has contributed to the breakdown of democracy and the rise of dictatorship where

that we know each other's capacities and limitations, each other's goals and frustrations. When we act under orders we learn little. It is as we give responsible thought to our social relations and to our conjoined purposes that we grow in understanding.

There are, <sup>however,</sup> limits to the attainable knowledge and understanding of any individual. We have to share in each other's knowledge. There must be a division of labor and specialization in the realm of understanding as there is in the realm of work. By this means the wisdom of society far exceeds that of any of its individual components. And that brings us to the role of the expert in a democratic society.

#### The Role of the Expert

In all democratic organizations there is the need for delegating authority to experts except where a situation makes the members of the society themselves experts. This point of view meets both elaboration and defense, because it is one where our own political democracy in America, like that of other countries, is running into serious obstacles, and is one which has contributed 2325 to the breakdown of democracy and the rise of dictatorship where it has not been adequately understood.

#### The Lure of Dictatorship

Countries which did not have our long tradition of democracy, but which tried to organize themselves democratically after modern life became extremely complex, have given up in despair and let dictators appoint commissions or commissariats to work out some sort of practical scheme for running things. And as far as momentary, internal efficiency is concerned, that

./.

solution has worked reasonably well. There is no doubt but that Mussolini did much toward cleaning up Italy and making the wheels run more smoothly. Anyone living in Germany just prior to Hitler's rise to power and continuing there after his accession admits that confusion gave way to relative order, that Germany became in some ways a more efficient nation in its internal economic and political life. Anyone who saw the vast chaos of Russia in 1917 and the hopelessly bungling ineffectiveness of Kerensky's democratic government, and then watched the transformation under the cooperative dictatorship of Lenin and Stalin, has to admit that, in terms of increased industrial efficiency, military effectiveness, and the decrease of crime, there was great achievement.

Dictatorships, by doing away with the obviously unworkable notion that a group of lay representatives of the people can reach intelligent and workable decision on the vast multitude of detailed problems that affect our political life, and particularly our economic life, brought order out of chaos. But at what a price! First, all freedom of basic criticisms had to be abolished. Schools had to become propaganda machines. Newspapers had to become the exclusive mouthpieces of the governing party. All opposition parties had to be abolished. Those who opposed the will of the dictator had to be thrown into concentration camps or executed. The right of the common man to independent thought had to be ruthlessly

ways a more efficient nation in its internal economic and political life. Anyone who saw the vast chaos of Russia in 1917 and the hopelessly bungling ineffectiveness of Kerensky's democratic government, and then watched the transformation under the cooperative dictatorship of Lenin and Stalin, had to admit that, in terms of increased industrial efficiency, military effectiveness, and the decrease of crime, there was great achievement.

Dictatorships, by doing away with the obviously unworkable notion that a group of lay representatives of the people can reach intelligent and workable decisions on the vast multitude of detailed problems that affect our political life, and particularly our economic life, brought order out of chaos, but at what a price! First, all freedom of basic criticism had to be abolished. Schools had to become propaganda machines. Newspapers had to become the exclusive mouthpieces of the governing party. All opposition parties had to be abolished. Those who opposed the will of the dictator had to be thrown into concentration camps or executed. The right of the common man to independent thought had to be ruthlessly suppressed.

A momentary internal efficiency at the cost of the suppression of human thought and rights, and at the cost of a terran and militarism which destroy the basic wealth upon which all internal economy in the long run must be founded, is suicidal.

We are, therefore, trapped in the two horns of a dilemma. Democracy as heretofore known has become hopelessly clogged by the multitude of affairs calling for an expertise of decision that is utterly unattainable by a general body of representatives. The

./.

economic life of the nation is unprotected by unworkable legislation  
will implement any act for laissez-faire individualism our present,  
for governmental protection and assistance the next, with peace and  
economic breakdown just around the corner. On the other hand are  
disturbance, loss of the freedom for which the human race has been  
struggling through millennia, terror, and the holocaust of war.

#### Resolving the Dilemma

As always, between the two extremes there is an intermediary  
then pertains of the nature of both. It is not a compromise, but an  
integration. It consists of finding the elements in each extreme  
which are not mutually antagonistic and of integrating these into  
a workable whole. It consists of trying to find the good in each  
extreme and using it without its concomitant evil. When we rid our-  
selves of preconceived notions and of prejudices, when we look  
clear-eyed and open-minded at both extremes, this intermediary is  
not impossible to find.

It is obviously beyond the scope of this talk to try to  
work out in detail this integration of the round elements in the  
dictatorial and democratic schemes. But a suggestion of the nature  
of that integration has a direct bearing upon our immediate problem  
of democracy in the <sup>fields</sup> ~~classrooms~~. That suggestion is the frank recogni-  
tion of the necessity for delegating to experts in the various  
fields of human endeavor, under certain democratic limitations,  
much of the legislative, as well as the executive and judicial

### Resolving the Dilemma

As always, between the two extremes there is an intermediary that partakes of the nature of both. It is not a compromise, but an integration. It consists of finding the elements in each extreme which are not mutually antagonistic and of integrating these into a workable whole. It consists of trying to find the good in each extreme and using it without its concomitant evil. When we rid ourselves of preconceived notions and of prejudices, when we look clear-eyed and open-minded at both extremes, this intermediary is not impossible to find.

It is obviously beyond the scope of this talk to try to work out in detail this integration of the sound elements in the dictatorial and democratic schemes. But a suggestion of the nature of that integration has a direct bearing upon our immediate problem of democracy in the <sup>U.S.A.</sup> ~~elementary~~. That suggestion is the frank recognition of the necessity for delegating to experts in the various fields of human endeavor, under certain democratic limitations, much of the legislative, as well as the executive and judicial, power.

2323

These experts must ultimately derive their authority from, and be responsible to, the electorate. The outcry that this is leading toward dictatorship is natural enough, because of our failure to recognize the value of delegating authority to experts under general policies established by legislative bodies, and our failure to recognize the difference between a dictatorship which suppresses all criticism and all opposing groups and an authority which has neither the power nor the tendency toward such suppression; the

./.

difference between a dictatorship which maintains itself in power by force and terrorism, and an authority which derives its power from the untrammelled consent of the people, and which may at any moment be removed from power.

The right of initiative, referendum, and recall should always be reserved by the people. The right to freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly is a sacred right essential to democracy. While these rights remain, dictatorship need not be feared.

And let us go a step further. When the people themselves, rather than just their representatives, feel strongly in regard to a given issue that issue can be made clear enough so that there can be a reasonably universal understanding of it. Every voter can become sufficiently expert to pass intelligent judgment upon it. When the issues are few enough and universal enough in their implications, the entire electorate can legislate effectively. When the issues are more numerous and more complicated, or are confined in their effects to certain groups of the population, legislative bodies of representatives of the people may become sufficiently expert to give intelligent consideration to them. But when the issues are detailed, intricate, and multitudinous, or when they affect specialized groups (the stock exchange, for example, or railroad management), it is far better to leave legislative enactment (in the form of rulings by commissions) to carefully chosen expert commissions or executives.

always be reserved by the people. The right to freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly is a sacred right essential to democracy. While these rights mean, dictatorship need not be feared.

And let us go a step farther. When the people themselves, rather than just their representatives, feel strongly in regard to a given issue that issue can be made clear enough so that there can be a reasonably universal understanding of it. Every voter can become sufficiently expert to pass intelligent judgment upon it. When the issues are few enough and universal enough in their implications, the entire electorate can legislate effectively. When the issues are more numerous and more complicated, or are confined in their effects to certain groups of the population, legislative bodies of representatives of the people may become sufficiently expert to give intelligent consideration to them. But when the issues are detailed, intricate, and multitudinous, or when they affect specialized groups (the stock exchange, for example, or railroad management), it is far better to leave legislative enactment (in the form of rulings by commissions) to carefully chosen expert commissions or executives.

2322

Application to the Classroom

Now let us carry these principles into classroom democracy. Here the teacher is the expert in many regards. He can make the initial selection of books, plan the classroom program and the schedule, select the stimulating influences, and set the stage for learning, far better than could a group of immature children under his guidance. A recognition of this fact will prevent the extremes to which some schools, in their zeal for democracy, have occasionally gone.

In adult society we postulated that the decisions of the

./.

expert must be limited by the general conditions laid down by the electorate or their representatives; that his actions must be open to free criticism and discussion, and must not restrict freedom of expression; and that the electorate must retain the right of initiative, referendum, and recall. In the classroom society correspondingly, the teacher, as an expert, acts within the conditions set by the adult representatives of the community and state and ~~as he has discussed the~~ <sup>teacher, he</sup> ~~authority he thereby bestows the irresponsibility of his using it as~~ <sup>teacher, he</sup> ~~salute as possible.~~ Like the experts in adult democracies, encourage freedom of expression and criticism.

#### Democracy that is genuine

Whatever democracy we do have in our classrooms, it must, let me repeat, be genuine. It must allow for the making of mistakes. And it must avoid excessive direction by the teacher.

Children are intuitive. They are not easily fooled. They instantly sense a spurious democracy. If children are to gain understanding through democratic management of their own affairs, they must have a genuine feeling of responsibility. And that involves the right to make mistakes.

#### Conclusion

Children learn citizenship by practicing it. An atmosphere of democracy should pervade the classroom, all the principles of democracy should be put into practice. There should be freedom of thought, speech, and action. There should be a sense of social

representatives of the community and should  
entirely be ~~thoroughly~~ <sup>entirely</sup> ~~invested~~ <sup>be</sup> the responsibility of his ~~entirely~~ <sup>entirely</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup>  
salem-en-possible. Like the experts in adult democracies, encourage  
freedom of expression and criticism.

#### Democracy must be genuine

Whatever democracy we do have in our classrooms, it  
must, let us repeat, be genuine. It must allow for the making of  
mistakes. And it must avoid excessive direction by the teacher.

Children are intuitive. They are not easily fooled. They  
instantly sense a spurious democracy. If children are to gain under-  
standing through democratic management of their own affairs, they must  
have a genuine feeling of responsibility. And that involves the  
right to make mistakes.

#### Conclusion

Children learn citizenship by practicing it. An atmo-  
sphere of democracy should pervade the classroom, all the principles  
of democracy should be put into practice. There should be freedom  
of thought, speech, and action. There should be a sense of social  
responsibility, with the freedom of independence balanced by the  
interdependence that yields freedom of capability through cooperative  
endeavor. And there should be ever-increasing understanding. Through  
the practice of these principles, the children have a way of life  
that gives every individual the utmost possible opportunity for self-  
fulfillment as a member of an interdependent society. Such a way of  
life is democracy. It is our basic means of giving children social  
consciousness. It is education.

fr.

2321

### WHAT IS DEMOCRACY

What is democracy? When we try to answer this question we must be careful to distinguish between the forms of democracy and its essence.

Democracy may be implemented in a great variety of ways. Voting, for example, may be of the kind where everyone votes on everything, or it may be through representatives. Representatives may be chosen by a given number of people, or by those in a geographic area, or by people grouped according to their political beliefs or by their occupations. Every person may have a voice in selecting representatives, or the franchise may be limited by sex, by age, by property qualifications, by morals, by race, or by literacy. There may be a one-party, two-party, or many-party system. The possible forms of democracy are innumerable. Here, however, we are concerned with its spirit.

Fundamentally, democracy is a way of life that gives every individual the utmost possible opportunity for self-fulfillment as a member of an interdependent society. Therefore it involves:

- 1) Freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of action.
- 2) Social responsibility, realization of one's identification with the society of which one is a member, the subordination of temporary to permanent values and of individual and small-group action to large-group purposes; and the ability to co-operate with others in work and in thought, and to play an active part in

Voting, for example, may be of the kind where everyone votes on everything, or it may be through representatives. Representatives may be chosen by a given number of people, or by those in a geographic area, or by people grouped according to their political beliefs or by their occupations. Every person may have a voice in selecting representatives, or the franchise may be limited by sex, by age, by property qualifications, by morals, by race, or by literacy. There may be a one-party, two-party, or many-party system. The possible forms of democracy are innumerable. Here, however, we are concerned with its spirit.

Fundamentally, democracy is a way of life that gives every individual the utmost possible opportunity for self-fulfillment as a member of an interdependent society. Therefore it involves:

- 1) Freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of action.
- 2) Social responsibility, realization of one's identification with the society of which one is a member, the subordination of temporary to permanent values and of individual and small-group action to large-group purposes; and the ability to co-operate with others in work and in thought, and to play an active part in determining the social, political, and economic life of society.
- 3) Understanding the ability to find facts, to think and act logically and intelligently in terms of them, and the recognition of the role of the expert.

In the practice of democracy all three of these factors must be considered for they both limit and fulfill one another. We shall not, however, be able to draw sharp lines between them. Any consideration of one must involve simultaneous consideration of the

other two. But we can center our discussion around each in turn.

### Freedom of Thought

Jefferson said, in founding the University of Virginia: "Here we shall follow truth wherever it may lead; nor fear to tolerate error as long as reason is left free to combat it". Children, and all persons, have an inalienable right to truth. Without free access to whatever knowledge and opinions are available they cannot think wisely. To give a child half-truths, to evade honest, frank answers to his questions, to indoctrinate him in a controversial field, to mislead him in any way, is to deprive him of the chance to develop his own independence of thought, to deprive him of the elements of clear thinking.

Prejudiced parents, prejudiced teachers, prejudiced textbooks, stand in his way. Yet we cannot, however earnestly we strive to do so, wholly avoid these prejudiced influences. But we can counteract them. We can run our schools with teachers of a wide variety of viewpoints, teachers who, moreover, are intent on developing children's powers of thought rather than on imposing their own conclusions. We can use books and periodicals written from various points of view. We can help children to pierce propaganda and to allow for prejudice.

The child's maturity must, of course, be taken into account. This does not mean, however, less honesty for young children than for older, or the concealing of facts and opinions. It means rather that ideas must be presented in a way that is appropriate to the child's maturity. 319

without free access to whatever knowledge and opinions are available they cannot think wisely. To give a child half-truths, to evade honest, frank answers to his questions, to indoctrinate him in a controversial field, to mislead him in any way, is to deprive him of the chance to develop his own independence of thought, to deprive him of the elements of clear thinking.

Prejudiced parents, prejudiced teachers, prejudiced textbooks, stand in his way. Yet we cannot, however earnestly we strive to do so, wholly avoid these prejudiced influences. But we can counteract them. We can man our schools with teachers of a wide variety of viewpoints, teachers who, moreover, are intent on developing children's powers of thought rather than on imposing their own conclusions. We can use books and periodicals written from various points of view. We can help children to pierce propaganda and to allow for prejudice.

The child's maturity must, of course, be taken into account, <sup>2,319</sup>

This does not mean, however, less honesty for young children than for older, or the concealing of facts and opinions. It means rather that ideas must be personalized and facts must be simplified and related to the child's experience. But the child is entitled to truth; there must be no distortion or concealment.

In a democratic school, children do not hesitate to express their thoughts. It is through such expression that thinking is clarified. Through it children learn from one another to increase their understanding. Through it they exercise social responsibility and prepare themselves for active life as citizens.

It is in the continual formulation and expression of

./.

their thoughts, and the interaction between their own thoughts and those of their fellows, that children grow daily in the ability to exercise democratic citizenship. The school conditions that make this possible are closely tied up with freedom of action.

Two anecdotes illustrate opposite views in regard to

#### Freedom of action :

The first is well known: A mother called down stairs to her husband, "Bob, go see what Tommy is doing and tell him not to!"

The other is the little dialogue my mother used to have with me when I was a child. She would say :

"Carleton, what can you do ?"

"Anything I like !" (with an air of bravado and defiance)

"Except what ? "

"Neither other people". (much subdued)

In the first instance there is the assumption that the child, in acting freely, in violating the family standards and must be made to conform. In the second there is the recognition that the child is free to act as he will except as that freedom violates the equal freedom of others. Social responsibility and an understanding of the desires and freedom of others are always limitations upon individual freedom in social living, but they are almost the only legitimate limitations.

291b  
Within these limitations the child, for his own development, and for the working out of his characteristic design of growth, must have the right to experience, to explore, to make mistakes, and to

Freedom of action :

The first is well known: A mother called down stairs to her husband, "Bob, go see what Tommy is doing and tell him not to!"

The other is the little dialogue my mother used to have with me when I was a child. She would say :

"Carlston, what can you do ?"

"Anything I like !" (with an air of bravado and defiance)

"Except what ?"

"Bother other people". (much subdued)

In the first instance there is the assumption that the child, in acting freely, is violating the family standards and must be made to conform. In the second there is the recognition that the child is free to act as he will except as that freedom violates the equal freedom of others. Social responsibility and an understanding of the desires and freedom of others are always limitations upon individual freedom in social living, but they are almost the only legitimate limitations.

2318

Within these limitations the child, for his own development, and for the working out of his characteristic design of growth, must have the right to experience, to explore, to make mistakes, and to discover his own potentialities and their boundaries. There is, consequently, an atmosphere of freedom and activity in a democratic classroom. There is a minimum of compulsion and repression. There is a maximum of opportunity for children to carry out activities appropriate to their level of development, to have experience, and to make discoveries. There is much more emphasis upon initiative,

./.

originality, and self-directed work than upon set assignments, fixed routine, and strict conformity to adult standards.

This does not mean laissez faire or planlessness. The guidance and stimulation of the teacher are essential. It is through these that the children balance their freedom with social responsibility and understanding.

#### Socialization and Freedom

Social responsibility both enlarges and restricts the individual. The more inclusive the group with which he identifies himself and the larger his horizons become, the greater are his growth and satisfaction and the more complete is his self-fulfillment. Yet the more completely he is identified with more and more inclusive groups, the more his independence of action as an individual may be restricted.

Socialization, therefore, both limits and fulfills freedom. These two principles are basic in any consideration of democracy. Young children can be helped to an understanding of these in concrete situations. But a full awareness of their significance, and an ordering of life in accordance with that awareness, has not yet been achieved by adult society. The failure to recognize and apply these principles is the cause of our social, political, and economic conflicts. Let us, therefore, examine them here; for if human society is to understand them and live in the light of that understanding, we must lay the foundations in the democracy of the classroom.

Socialization and Freedom

Social responsibility both enlarges and restricts the individual. The more inclusive the group with which he identifies himself and the larger his horizons become, the greater are his growth and satisfactions and the more complete is his self-fulfillment. Yet the more completely he is identified with more and more inclusive groups, the more his independence of action as an individual may be restricted.

Socialization, therefore, both limits and fulfills freedom. These two principles are basic in any consideration of democracy. Young children can be helped to an understanding of them in concrete situations. But a full awareness of their significance, and an ordering of life in accordance with that awareness, has not yet been achieved by adult society. The failure to recognize and apply these principles is the cause of our social, political, and economic conflicts. Let us, therefore, examine them here; for if human society is to understand them and live in the light of that understanding, we must lay the foundations in the democracy of the classroom.

Freedom of Independence

Freedom has two contradictory aspects: independence and capability. We organize into co-operative, interdependent groupings in order to increase our capability, our effective capacity, our power; and in proportion as we do so we lose our independence. What we may do is in inverse proportion to what we can do.

./.

Children can see this through such an example as the fol-

lowing:

Suppose I go off by myself into the north woods <sup>of Canada</sup> with a canoe, a map, a compass, matches, camp outfit, gun, ammunition, and fishing tackle. Now I may do anything I please. No one can tell me what is wrong and right, what is permitted and what is forbidden. I have completely the freedom of independence. For the moment I am unconscious of any lack of freedom of capability. I travel from place to place reveling in my independence. Here in my canoe I am fully self-sufficient. But as I cross a lake, with everything neatly stowed in my canoe, a storm breaks and capsize me. My equipment sinks beyond recovery. I barely manage to swim to an island, while my canoe and paddle blow to a distant end of the lake.

Wet, cold, exhausted, I pull myself on to land. I still have complete independence. I may do anything I please. But I cannot get to the far end of the lake to recover my canoe. I cannot make myself a good shelter without my ax. I cannot start a fire without matches, and without the knife and string with which a good scout manages to make a fire with a whirling stick. I cannot fish. I cannot hunt. I am helpless.

Am I free?

I have the freedom of independence, but not the freedom of <sup>2316</sup>

capability. Now I realize why I did not miss the latter before. I had the canoe made by others; the gun, the ammunition, the fishing tackle,

wrong and right, what is partiality? I am unconscious completely the freedom of independence. For the moment I am unconscious of my lack of freedom of capability. I travel from place to place, revelling in my independence, here in my canoe I am fully self-sufficient. But as I cross a lake, with everything neatly stowed in my canoe, a storm breaks and captures me. My equipment sinks beyond recovery. I barely manage to swim to an island, while my canoe and paddle blow to a distant end of the lake.

Hot, cold, exhausted, I pull myself on to land. I still have complete independence, I may do anything I please. But I cannot get to the far end of the lake to recover my canoe. I cannot make myself a good shelter without my ax. I cannot start a fire without matches, and without the knife and string with which a good scout manages to make a fire with a whirling stick. I cannot fish. I cannot hunt. I am helpless.

Am I free?

2316

I have the freedom of independence, but not the freedom of capability. Now I realize why I did not miss the latter before. I had the canoe made by others; the gun, the ammunition, the fishing tackle, the camp outfit, all made through the co-operation of countless others. I had come into the possession of these through subordinating my independence to the social organization by many, many hours of work, contributing my time, energy, and skill to the lives of my fellows, regulated by them as to how and when and where I did so. In exchange I was given the means to acquire these products of their labors. I had gained the freedom of capability through the sacrifice of the freedom of independence. And as I roam, wet, shivering, and hungry, on my island, I ardently wish to continue the exchange and I don't feel

that it will be much of a sacrifice !

### Freedom of Capability

The other extreme, complete freedom of capability with no freedom of independence, does not and cannot exist. For the sacrifice of independence to organization reaches a point of diminishing returns. Through increasing socialization, increasing co-operative exchange of work and thought, and consequent increasing interdependence-- the capacity for effective action increases. But gradually the increasing interdependence of all results in the dependence of more and more people on the management and direction of fewer and fewer. This leads to diminishing self-determination and self-fulfillment on the part of the individuals who constitute the social organization. Consequently the organization itself begins to lose its capacity to develop.

Instead of the social organization being a living, growing, self-reflective organism, it tends to become machine-like, its parts well-g geared but inert.

In actuality we stop organizing ourselves before such ultimate mechanization takes place. The inherent will of living beings to live rebels against an extreme of organization that stifles life. So the extreme of over-organization, of complete subordination of all individuals to the collective, never is reached.

The answer to the paradox of the loss of the freedom of independence with increased freedom of capability through social organization lies in the democracy of organization, voluntary partici-

of independence to organization reaches a point of returns. Through increasing socialization, increasing co-operative exchange of work and thought, and consequent increasing interdependence-- the capacity for effective action increases. But gradually the increasing interdependence of all results in the dependence of more and more people on the management and direction of fewer and fewer. This leads to diminishing self-determination and self-fulfillment on the part of the individuals who constitute the social organization. Consequently the organization itself begins to lose its capacity to develop.

Instead of the social organization being a living, growing, self-active organism, it tends to become machine-like, its parts well-g geared but inert.

In actuality we stop organizing ourselves before such ultimate mechanization takes place. The inherent will of living beings to live rebels against an extreme of organization that stifles life. So the extreme of over-organization, of complete subordination of all individuals to the collective, never is reached.

The answer to the paradox of the loss of the freedom of 2113 independence with increased freedom of capability through social organization lies in the democracy of organization, voluntary participation in an interdependent society, not dependence and subordination. Insofar as each individual is recognized as a living, contributing part of the organization, insofar as the organization exists for the well-being and the self-fulfillment of the individuals who compose it, organization increases effectiveness. The freedom of capability is attained, and a large measure of the freedom of independence is preserved. But the freedom of independence is voluntarily used for the well-being and effectiveness of the social organization of

which each feels himself to be a vital part.

It is impossible to separate that which promotes the well-being of individuals from that which promotes the well-being of society. For a society is only as wholesome and alive as are the members who compose it. Just as individuals can only achieve self-fulfillment in a democratic, developing society, so society cannot be effectively democratic and really alive and growing except as it is composed of individuals who are co-operatively approaching self-fulfillment. ~~[All that we have said in the preceding chapters, therefore, about the freedom of thought, expression, and action of individuals, bears directly upon the question of developing a wholesome, organic society.]~~ Each individual's social responsibility can only be exercised in a free society.

The value of social organization has already been discussed--- it is our means of achieving the freedom of capability, of vastly extending our horizons of thought and our field of effective action. We achieve magnitude of spirit in proportion to our self-identification with an organic society.

The sense of responsibility for the well-being of a social group is an inevitable concomitant of a realization that one actually belongs to that group. One must feel one's membership so fully that the group's problems are one's own problems, its satisfactions one's own satisfactions.

That sense of identity with one's fellows can be achieved

2514

be effectively democratic and really alive and growing except as it is composed of individuals who are co-operatively approaching self-fulfillment. ~~[All that we have said in the preceding chapters, there-fore, about the freedom of thought, expression and action of individuals, bears directly upon the question of developing a wholesome, or, in other words, a healthy, society.]~~ Each individual's social responsibility can only be exercised in a free society.

The value of social organization has already been discussed--it is our means of achieving the freedom of capability, of vastly extending our horizons of thought and our field of effective action. We achieve magnitude of spirit in proportion to our self-identification with an organic society.

The sense of responsibility for the well-being of a social group is an inevitable concomitant of a realization that one actually belongs to that group. One must feel one's membership so fully that the group's problems are one's own problems, its satisfactions one's own satisfactions.

2314

That sense of identity with one's fellows can be achieved only through the free, active participation of the individual in group undertaking. Even vicarious experiences, through movie, radio, or books, involve such participation mentally, and they are effective in proportion as the participation is real to the children. Free, active participation in group undertakings is the essence of citizenship.

Children are living a social life. They are thinking, talking, working, and playing together. Very early they begin to see the need for organization.

Once organized, their first tendency is to make rules. Then the teacher needs to guide them toward the recognition that rules should be limited to the few which are necessary to noninterference with others and co-ordination of effort. Sometimes this guidance consists in letting rules be made and suffered under, or broken, so that the children may become aware of the harm of too many rules or rules that are too rigid.

Some legislation, or, at least, policy ~~far~~ <sup>is</sup>, however, necessary. And in this process children get experience in group thinking, and a sense of belonging to a social group. Legislative action requires organization. The form of the organization should be indigenous to the class or school and grow up from the needs and planning of the children. But it should be based on the fundamental principles of democracy, freedom, social responsibility, and understanding.

It is essential that in any type of school democracy the children be allowed to make mistakes. Any lack of genuineness in responsibility and freedom is instantly sensed, and results in a loss of the essential values of student citizenship. The teachers may, and often do, speak and advise, but they must be extremely careful not to dominate. If a possible decision is liable to be one which will so vitally affect the well-being of the school that the teacher's custodial responsibility must be called into play, this should be explained at the outset and the children be warned that this is a matter on which they

that the children may become aware of the harm of too many rules or rules that are too rigid.

Some legislation<sup>for</sup>, at least, policy forming<sup>is</sup>, however, necessary. And in this process children gain experience in group thinking, and a sense of belonging to a social group. Legislative action requires organization. The form of the organization should be indigenous to the class or school and grow up from the needs and planning of the children. But it should be based on the fundamental principles of democracy, freedom, social responsibility, and understanding.

It is essential that in any type of school democracy the children be allowed to make mistakes. Any lack of genuineness in responsibility and freedom is instantly sensed, and results in a loss of the essential values of student citizenship. The teachers say, and often do, speak and advise<sup>but</sup> they must be extremely careful not to dominate. If a possible decision is liable to be one which will so vitally affect the well-being of the school that the teachers' custodial responsibility must be called into play, this should be explained at the outset and the children be warned that this is a matter on which they will not be allowed to make a decision; such an occasion is, however, so rare that I am unable to give an example.

There are, however, inherent limitations to any self-government, not imposed by the teacher or any authority, but implicit in social organization. These are: the relation of smaller groups to more inclusive larger ones; the rights of individuals and minorities; the problem of size; and the principle of understanding.

The first limitation lies in the fact any group is part of a larger, more inclusive group. Its freedom of action is limited by

./.

its relationship to other groups and to the more inclusive society. The children in one class are part of the whole school. Their decisions, where they affect other classes, have to be made with due consideration of and in interaction with the other classes of the school. Again, the school children are a part of the community in which the school exists. Insofar as their decisions and actions influence the community or react upon it, the rights and the decisions of the community limit their freedom. The same is true, of course, for the state and the nation, and for the world as a whole.

Here a decision of the children in the classroom violates a decision by the more inclusive community, the latter must take precedence.

A second inherent limitation and strength of any democratic organization is the right of the individual or the minority to as much freedom as is attainable without harm to the majority. A majority has no right in a democracy to determine the actions of a minority except where those actions are definitely inimical to the majority's rights. For example, I would question whether a majority has a right to decide what sort of a personal life I lead or what sort of a personal life any small community leads, as long as that life does not interfere with the life of the rest of the people. I have a right to say that I shall not drive a car if I am drunk. That obviously is seriously interfering with others.

which the school exists. Insofar as their decisions and actions influence the community or react upon it, the rights and the decisions of the community limit their freedom. The same is true, of course, for the state and the nation, and for the world as a whole.

Where a decision of the children in the classroom violates a decision by the more inclusive community, the latter must take precedence.

A second inherent limitation and strength of any democratic organization is the right of the individual or the minority to as much freedom as is attainable without harm to the majority. A majority has no right in a democracy to determine the actions of a minority except where those actions are definitely inimical to

the majority's rights. For example, I would question whether a

majority has a right to decide what sort of a personal life I

lead or what sort of a personal life any small community leads,

as long as that life does not interfere with the life of the rest

of the people. It has a right to say that I shall not drive a car

if I am drunk. That obviously is seriously interfering with others.

It has a right to say that I must stay inside the house if I have

a contagious disease. Similarly, the majority of the population

has a right to decide, not what a farmer may raise for his private

consumption, but what a farmer may do in throwing an excess crop on

the market and upsetting the price structure, in a way which interferes

with everyone's life. It does not have a right to decide what kind

of design an automobile is to have (except for safety devices), but

it has a right to decide whether a single manufacturer may pay

such low wages and want his labor to such an extent that it forces the standard down for other manufacturers who wish to compete in the open market. And so on through the whole range of democratic legislation. A majority may only regulate the minority where the action of that minority, unregulated, would seriously and directly interfere with the rights of others.

Minority and individual rights are not merely important for the persons directly concerned. They are essential to the growth and vitality of society. Without the right of individuals and groups to exercise initiative and express themselves freely, society becomes static, inert. Variation is nature's means of effecting evolution. Different culture patterns and different political and economic theories are the life blood of social organization. They must flow unobstructed. It is only in matters of action involving the welfare of the whole social unit that a majority can, with impunity, over-rule the minority.

#### The Problem of Size

Closely related to the rights and use of individuals and minorities is the problem of size. A third inherent limitation of social organization. The larger and more inclusive a social organization becomes, the greater its potentialities for increasing the freedom of capability; yet the harder it is for all the members to preserve the feeling of vital participation. Society is blocked in

legislation, a majority may only regulate the minority  
action of that minority, unregulated, would seriously and directly  
interfere with the rights of others.

Minority ~~and~~ individual ~~rights~~ are not merely important  
for the persons directly concerned. They are essential to the  
growth and vitality of society. Without the right of individuals  
and groups to exercise initiative and express themselves freely,  
society becomes static, inert. Variation is nature's means of  
affecting evolution. Different culture patterns and different  
political and economic theories are the life blood of social  
organization. They must flow unobstructed. It is only in matters  
of action involving the welfare of the whole social unit that a  
majority can, with impunity, over-rule the minority.

#### The Problem of Size

Closely related to the rights and use of individuals and  
minorities is the problem of ~~also~~ <sup>a</sup> third inherent limitation of  
social organization. The larger and more inclusive a social organiz-  
ation becomes, the greater its potentialities for increasing the  
freedom of capability; yet the harder it is for all the members to  
preserve the feeling of vital participation. Society is blocked in  
the realization of its potentialities by the diminishing returns  
that result from stifling the initiative and self-expression of its  
members. A large school, a big city school system, a great corporation,  
a national government, all tend to make rules of universal application,  
all tend toward bureaucratic control and the loss of initiative on  
the part of the component groups and individuals. The solution lies  
in as much decentralization of control as is possible without friction  
and without loss of co-ordination among the parts.

The moment an organization<sup>a</sup> school, an industry, or a government, becomes so large that rules have to be substituted for judgment in terms of the well-being of individuals or groups, the organization needs to be broken into smaller parts. The larger organization must be retained to co-ordinate the groups that compose it, lest we lose the freedom of capability. But the groups must retain their initiative and the possibility of encouraging, in turn, the full development of their individual members, lest we lose the freedom of independent thought, expression, and action, and lest society stagnate.

#### Understanding

Our fourth limitation to social organization and responsibility is the degree of understanding possessed by the members of a society.

We have referred to the relationship of small groups to larger, the rights and use of individuals and minorities, the problem of size, and the amount of understanding possessed by the members of society, as limitations of social organization and responsibility. They are; but they are also its fulfillment. Just as an individual's life is fuller and more meaningful when he identifies himself with a group, so is a group fulfilled by identification with more inclusive groups. The rights of minorities limit majority action; but individuals and minorities, with their differing patterns and ideas, are essential for the life and growth of the social organism. Size

1 2 8 0  
poss it, lest we lose the freedom of capability. But the groups must retain their initiative and the possibility of encouraging, in turn, the full development of their individual members, lest we lose the freedom of independent thought, expression, and action, and lest society stagnate.

#### Understanding

Our fourth limitation to social organization and responsibility is the degree of understanding possessed by the members of a society.

We have referred to the relationship of small groups to larger, the rights and use of individuals and minorities, the problem of size, and the amount of understanding possessed by the members of society, as limitations of social organization and responsibility.

They are; but they are also its fulfillment. Just as an individual's life is fuller and more meaningful when he identifies himself with a group, so is a group fulfilled by identification with more inclusive groups. The rights of minorities limit majority action; but

individuals and minorities, with their differing patterns and ideas, are essential for the life and growth of the social organism. Size may become cumbersome; but it may also increase effectiveness. And as the lack of understanding limits social responsibility, increased

understanding by the members of society is the foundation upon which democracy must be built.

./.

"And you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free". This statement has been repeated so many times that we tend to be dull to its significance. We don't contradict it - we accept it with a mental shrug.

But it is the key to democracy and the reason for it.

Without understanding knowledge, truth, wisdom we have neither the freedom of independence nor the freedom of capability. The seemingly independent person is constantly limited by lack of understanding. In seeking satisfaction and self-fulfillment he is continually limited by ignorance. He cannot subordinate immediate impulse to ultimate good without knowing what is his ultimate good; so that which, if he knew it, would yield him greatest richness of life is often sacrificed to momentary whims. Self-discipline is lacking or misguided when he lacks understanding. And when he lacks self-discipline, he becomes a slave to impulse, not a free man.

The freedom of capability is obviously proportionate to understanding. If we don't know how to achieve our ends, we are not free to achieve them. If we are hungry and don't know how to obtain food; if we are sick and don't know how to achieve health; if we are cold and don't know how to get clothing, shelter, and fuel; if we <sup>want</sup> to communicate and don't know the language the other person understands; if we wish to express ourselves in music or art or the dance or writing and don't have the techniques - if we want

Without understanding knowledge, truth, wisdom we have

neither the freedom of independence nor the freedom of capability. The seemingly independent person is constantly limited by lack of understanding. In seeking satisfaction and self-fulfillment he is continually limited by ignorance. He cannot subordinate immediate impulse to ultimate good without knowing what is his ultimate good; so that which, if he knew it, would yield him greatest richness of life is often sacrificed to momentary whims. Self-discipline is lacking or misguided when he lacks understanding. And when he lacks self-discipline, he becomes a slave to impulse, not a free man.

The freedom of capability is obviously proportionate to understanding. If we don't know how to achieve our ends, we are not free to achieve them. If we are hungry and don't know how to obtain food; if we are sick and don't know how to achieve health; if we are cold and don't know how to get clothes, shelter, and fuel; if we <sup>want</sup> to communicate and don't know the language the other person understands; if we wish to express ourselves in music or art or the dance or writing and don't have the techniques - if we want to do anything and do not understand how to do it in a way that satisfies us, we clearly are not free.

Social responsibility and interaction, too, depend upon understanding. We must understand the thoughts and attitudes, the work and skill of our fellows if we are to co-ordinate our work and play and thought with theirs. We must know group purposes if we are to make them ours. We cannot participate in the economic, political, or social life of mankind, we cannot share in mankind's thought and feelings, except as we understand.

Understanding grows through experience. And experience is proportionate to participation. Democracy is the only way of life in which there is real participation by every individual. Therefore democracy is essential to understanding.

It is through participation in a democratic society that we know each other's capabilities and limitations, each other's goals and frustrations. When we act under orders we learn little. It is as we give responsible thought to our social relations and to our conjoined purposes that we grow in understanding.

There are, <sup>however,</sup> limits to the attainable knowledge and understanding of any individual. We have to share in each other's knowledge. There must be a division of labor and specialization in the realm of understanding as there is in the realm of work. By this means the wisdom of society far exceeds that of any of its individual components. And that brings us to the role of the expert in a democratic society.

#### The Role of the Expert

In all democratic organizations there is the need for delegating authority to experts except where a situation makes the members of the society themselves experts. This point of view bears both elaboration and defense, because it is one where our own political democracy in America, like that of other countries, is running into serious obstacles, and is one which has contributed to the breakdown of democracy and the rise of dictatorship where

that we know each other's capacities and limitations, each other's goals and frustrations. When we act under orders we learn little. It is as we give responsible thought to our social relations and to our combined purposes that we grow in understanding.

There are, <sup>however,</sup> limits to the attainable knowledge and understanding of any individual. No one can share in each other's knowledge. There must be a division of labor and specialization in the realm of understanding as there is in the realm of work. By this means the wisdom of society far exceeds that of any of its individual components. And that brings us to the role of the expert in a democratic society.

#### The Role of the Expert

In all democratic organizations there is the need for delegating authority to experts except where a situation makes the members of the society themselves experts. This point of view needs both elaboration and defense, because it is one where our own political democracy in America, like that of other countries, is running into serious obstacles, and is one which has contributed to the breakdown of democracy and the rise of dictatorship where it has not been adequately understood.

#### The Lure of Dictatorship

Countries which did not have our long tradition of democracy, but which tried to organize themselves democratically after modern life became extremely complex, have given up in despair and let dictators appoint commissions or committees to work out some sort of practical scheme for running things. And as far as momentary, internal efficiency is concerned, that

./.

revolution has worked reasonably well. There is no doubt but that Mussolini did much toward cleaning up Italy and making the wheels run more smoothly. Anyone living in Germany just prior to Hitler's rise to power and continuing there after his accession admits that confusion gave way to relative order, that Germany became in some ways a more efficient nation in its internal economic and political life. Anyone who saw the vast chaos of Russia in 1917 and the hopelessly bungling ineffectiveness of Kerensky's democratic government, and then watched the transformation under the comparative dictatorship of Lenin and Stalin, has to admit that, in terms of increased industrial efficiency, military effectiveness, and the decrease of crime, there was great achievement.

Dictatorships, by doing away with the obviously unworkable notion that a group of lay representatives of the people can reach intelligent and workable decisions on the vast multitude of detailed problems that affect our political life, and particularly our economic life, brought order out of chaos. But at what a price! First, all freedom of basic criticism had to be abolished. Schools had to become propaganda machines. Newspapers had to become the exclusive mouthpieces of the governing party. All opposition parties had to be abolished. Those who opposed the will of the dictator had to be thrown into concentration camps or executed. The right of the common man to independent thought had to be ruthlessly suppressed.

ways a more efficient nation in its internal economic and political life. Anyone who saw the vast chaos of Russia in 1917 and the hopelessly bungling ineffectiveness of Kerensky's democratic government, and then watched the transformation under the cooperative dictatorship of Lenin and Stalin, has to admit, that, in terms of increased industrial efficiency, military effectiveness, and the decrease of crime, there was great achievement.

Dictatorship, by doing away with the obviously unworkable notion that a group of lay representatives of the people can reach intelligent and workable decisions on the vast multitude of detailed problems that affect our political life, and particularly our economic life, brought order out of chaos. But at what a price! First, all freedom of basic criticism had to be abolished. Schools had to become propaganda machines. Newspapers had to become the exclusive mouthpieces of the governing party. All opposition parties had to be abolished. Those who opposed the will of the dictator had to be thrown into concentration camps or executed. The right of the common man to independent thought had to be ruthlessly suppressed.

A supplementary internal efficiency at the cost of the suppression of human thought and rights, and at the cost of a terrorism and militarism which destroy the basic wealth upon which all internal economy in the long run must be founded, is suicidal.

We are, therefore, impaled on the two horns of a dilemma. Democracy as heretofore known has become hopelessly clogged by the multitude of affairs calling for an expertness of decision that is utterly unattainable by a general body of representatives. The

./.

economic life of the nation is suffocated by unworkable legislation until businessmen cry out for laissez-faire individualism one moment, for governmental protection and assistance the next, with panic and economic breakdown just around the corner. On the other horn are dictatorship, loss of the freedom for which the human race has been struggling through millennia, terror, and the holocaust of war.

#### Resolving the Dilemma

As always, between the two extremes there is an intermediary that partakes of the nature of both. It is not a compromise, but an integration. It consists of finding the elements in each extreme which are not mutually antagonistic and of integrating these into a variable whole. It consists of trying to find the good in each extreme and using it without its concomitant evil. When we rid ourselves of preconceived notions and of prejudices, when we look clear-eyed and open-minded at both extremes, this intermediary is not impossible to find.

It is obviously beyond the scope of this talk to try to work out in detail this integration of the sound elements in the dictatorial and democratic schemes. But a suggestion of the nature of that integration has a direct bearing upon our immediate problem of democracy in the <sup>schools</sup> ~~classroom~~. That suggestion is the firm recognition of the necessity for delegating to experts in the various fields of human endeavor, under certain democratic limitations,

## Resolving the Dilemma

As always, between the two extremes there is an intermediary that partakes of the nature of both. It is not a compromise, just an integration. It consists of finding the elements in each extreme which are not mutually antagonistic and of integrating these into a workable whole. It consists of trying to find the good in each extreme and using it without its concomitant evil. When we rid ourselves of preconceived notions and of prejudices, when we look clear-eyed and open-minded at both extremes, this intermediary is not impossible to find.

It is obviously beyond the scope of this talk to try to work out in detail this integration of the sound elements in the dictatorial and democratic schemes. But a suggestion of the nature of that integration has a direct bearing upon our immediate problem of democracy in the <sup>future</sup> ~~classroom~~. That suggestion is the first recognition of the necessity for delegating to experts in the various fields of human endeavor, under certain democratic limitations, much of the legislative, as well as the executive and judicial, power.

These experts must ultimately derive their authority from, and be responsible to, the electorate. The outcry that this is leading toward dictatorship is natural enough, because of our failure to recognize the values of delegating authority to experts under general policies established by legislative bodies, and our failure to recognize the difference between a dictatorship which suppresses all criticism and all opposing groups and an authority which has neither the power nor the tendency toward such suppression; the

./.

- 16 -

difference between a dictatorship which maintains itself in power by force and terrorism, and an authority which derives its power from the untrembled consent of the people, and which may at any moment be removed from power.

The right of initiative, referendum, and recall should always be reserved by the people. The right to freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly is a sacred right essential to democracy. While these rights remain, dictatorship need not be feared.

And let us go a step farther. When the people themselves, rather than just their representatives, feel strongly in regard to a given issue that issue can be made clear enough so that there can be a reasonably universal understanding of it. Every voter can become sufficiently expert to pass intelligent judgment upon it. When the issues are few enough and universal enough in their implications, the entire electorate can legislate effectively. When the issues are more numerous and more complicated, or are confined in their effects to certain groups of the population, legislative bodies of representatives of the people may become sufficiently expert to give intelligent consideration to them. But when the issues are detailed, intricate, and multitudinous, or when they affect specialized groups (the stock exchange, for example, or railroad management), it is far better to leave legislative enactment (in the form of rulings by commissions)

always be reserved by the people. The right to freedom of speech, of press, and of assembly is a sacred right essential to democracy. While these rights remain, dictatorship need not be feared.

And let us go a step farther. When the people themselves, rather than just their representatives, feel strongly in regard to a given issue that issue can be made clear enough so that there can be a reasonably universal understanding of it. Every voter can become sufficiently expert to pass intelligent judgment upon it. When the issues are few enough and universal enough in their implications, the entire electorate can legislate effectively. When the issues are more numerous and more complicated, or are confined in their effects to certain groups of the population, legislative bodies of representatives of the people may become sufficiently expert to give intelligent consideration to them. But when the issues are detailed, intricate, and multitudinous, or when they affect specialized groups (the stock exchange, for example, or railroad management), it is far better to leave legislative enactment (in the form of rulings by commissions) to carefully chosen expert commissions or executives.

#### Applications to the Classroom

Now let us carry these principles into classroom democracy. Here the teacher is the expert in many regards. She can make the initial selection of books, plan the classroom program and time schedule, select the stimulating influences, and set the stage for learning, far better than could a group of immature children under her guidance. A recognition of this fact will prevent the extremes to which some schools, in their zeal for democracy, have occasionally gone.

In adult society we postulated that the decisions of the

expert, must be limited by the general conditions laid down by the electorate or their representatives; that his actions must be open to free criticism and discussion, and must not restrict freedom of expression; and that the electorate must retain the right of initiative, referendum, and recall. In the classroom society correspondingly, the teacher, as an expert, acts within the conditions set by the adult representatives of the community and state and we have discussed the ~~authority he thereby imposed the despotism of his unassailable~~ <sup>knowledge, he</sup> ~~cannot~~ <sup>encourage</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>children</sup> ~~as~~ <sup>as possible</sup>. Like the experts in adult democracy, encourage freedom of expression and criticism.

#### Democracy Must Be Genuine

Whatever democracy we do have in our classrooms, it must, let us repeat, be genuine. It must allow for the making of mistakes. And it must avoid excessive direction by the teacher.

Children are intuitive. They are not easily fooled. They instantly sense a specious democracy. If children are to gain understanding through democratic management of their own affairs, they must have a genuine feeling of responsibility. And that involves the right to make mistakes.

#### Conclusion

Children learn citizenship by practicing it. In atmosphere of democracy should pervade the classroom, all the principles of democracy should be put into practice. There should be freedom

representatives of the community and state and to have discussed the  
~~subject by the teacher~~ <sup>freedom, to</sup> ~~the responsibility of his students~~  
 as far as possible. Like the experts in adult democracies, encourages  
 freedom of expression and criticism.

#### Democracy Must Be Genuine

Whatever democracy we do have in our classrooms, it  
 must, let me repeat, be genuine. It must allow for the making of  
 mistakes. And it must avoid excessive direction by the teacher.

Children are intuitive. They are not easily fooled. They  
 instantly sense a specious democracy. If children are to gain under-  
 standing through democratic management of their own affairs, they must  
 have a genuine feeling of responsibility. And that involves the  
 right to make mistakes.

#### Conclusion

Children learn citizenship by practicing it. An atmos-

phere of democracy should pervade the classroom, all the principles

of democracy should be put into practice. There should be freedom  
 of thought, speech, and action. There should be a sense of social  
 responsibility, with the freedom of independence balanced by the  
 interdependence that yields freedom of responsibility through cooperative  
 action. And there should be ever-increasing understanding. Through  
 the practice of these principles, the children have a way of life  
 that gives every individual the utmost possible opportunity for self-  
 fulfillment as a member of an interdependent society. Such a way of  
 life is democracy. It is our basic means of giving children social  
 consciousness. It is education.

fr.

96.60

# Lecture notes

Che cos'è la democrazia ?

Significato originale, adesso molto allargato:

Vuol dire il pieno sviluppo dell'individuo, anche come persona, anche come membro cooperante di una società organica.

Dal punto di vista personale, vuol dire:

libertà e opportunità di seguire il proprio modo di vivere, limitato dall'eguale diritto di tutti gli altri;  
libertà e opportunità di scegliere la professione e di prepararsi ad esercitarla;  
libertà di esprimersi, e voce, con la stampa, in assemblee pubbliche.

Queste libertà appartengono non solo agli individui, ma anche alle minorità.

Sono essenziali per lo sviluppo degli individui, ma anche per lo sviluppo della società di cui ognuno fa parte, e, perciò, per tutti gli altri individui della stessa società. Perciò, lo sviluppo di un individuo dipende dalla società. L'uomo non è un essere che può vivere pienamente solo. È un essere gregario, e le sue potenzialità essenzialmente umane non possono realizzarsi senza la cooperazione di altri, senza un ambiente sociale.

Due tipi di libertà:

Libertà d'indipendenza  
Libertà di potenza.

Posso illustrare:

Ero in Canada e facevo campeggio solo. Nel canotto avevo tutto ciò di cui avevo bisogno, tenda, coperte, cibi, fiammiferi, pentole, articoli da pesca, libri. Non c'era nessun altro sul lago, né vicino. Potevo fare tutto quello che volevo; avevo libertà di indipendenza assoluta.

Venne una tempesta, il canotto si capovolse. Fui obbligato a raggiungere a nuoto un'isola vicina. Tutta la mia roba andò perduta. Arrivato all'isola, bagnato, freddo, volli accendere un fuoco, ma i fiammiferi erano bagnati, ecc. Avevo tanta libertà d'indipendenza, quanto ne avevo prima. Ma mancava la libertà di potenza. Avrei con piacere cambiato un po' della libertà d'indipendenza

- 2 -

pendenza per maggiore libert  di potenza.  
Cos  nello sviluppo della societ .  
Per avere maggiore libert  di potenza, l'uomo ha sacri-  
ficato una parte della libert  d'indipendenza. Ha im-  
parato ad organizzarsi in societ  interdipendenti, coope-  
ranti, con divisione del lavoro. Per cio  ha dovuto sot-  
tomettersi alla volont  collettiva.

L'estremo di questa evoluzione era il totalitarismo, dove la  
societ  era suprema, l'individuo soppresso. La socie-  
t  ~~era~~ <sup>era</sup> ~~alzata~~ <sup>alzata</sup> a divinit .

Per il momento una societ  totalitaria ha una potenza ener-  
gica. Ma in se  ha il seme della sua distruzione. Perche   
impedisce lo sviluppo degli individui che la compongono.  
Senza la libert  di sviluppare le loro potenzialita ,  
di sperimentare, di esprimersi, gli individui non possono  
contribuire alla evoluzione della societ . <sup>Variazione</sup>  
e  il fine qua non dell'evoluzione. E quando un essere  
vivente cessa di crescere, muore.

Per di pi  la societ  organizzata da individui per il bene  
degli individui diventa un mostro Franken-Stein che fa  
schiavi i suoi creatori.

Vogliamo libert  di indipendenza.

Vogliamo libert  di potenza.

L'estremo dell'una distrugge l'altra.

E' solo per mezzo della democrazia che si puo  avere entrambe,  
ognuna limitata dall'altra, e' vero, ma anche ognuna com-  
pletata dall'altra.

La libert  d'indipendenza limitata da:  
Leggi necessarie per la protezione della propriet , del-  
la salute, dei diritti altrui.  
La coordinazione delle attivita .

Ma completata dalle opportunit :  
Dell'educazione, scambio di idee, invenzioni e comodita   
che lasciano tempo libero, che permettono di viaggiare,  
comunicare per posta, per telefono, ecc.

Libert  di potenza limitata da:

i diritti degli individui  
le critiche liberamente espresse  
il potere del popolo di far cambiare leggi e governi

4302

- 3 -

Completata dallo:

sviluppo degli individui che compongono la società,  
l'evoluzione e vitalità che risulta dalla variazione.

Lo sforzo di dare troppo peso alla libertà dell'indipendenza risulta in individualismo, anarchismo e la perdita di potenza.

Lo sforzo di dare troppo peso alla libertà di potenza risulta nella perdita dei diritti degli individui, nella soppressione dello sviluppo della potenzialità degli individui, nella stagnazione della società.

Ma la democrazia costituisce cooperazione volontaria agli ordini autocratici, la massima autonomia, sia per gli individui, sia per le minoranze, sia per i comuni o le regioni. Evita leggi generali, sempre che è possibile, limitandosi a leggi necessarie per la protezione dei diritti, della sicurezza, della salute, a leggi essenziali per la coordinazione delle attività sociali, come l'organizzazione della posta, le ferrovie, ecc., e alle leggi per provvedere opportunità per lo sviluppo degli individui, tasse e regolamenti per stabilire scuole, biblioteche, ospedali, per esempio.

Lo Stato ha funzioni importantissime nella vita complessa ed interdependente di oggi. E' perciò che abbiamo visto l'esagerazione dello stato fino ai totalitarismi. Il solo mezzo per evitare questo pericolo è la democrazia, la piena libertà di espressione e il popolo sempre supremo.

Ma perché un popolo ignorante non sa utilizzare bene il suo potere e perché una persona ignorante non può sviluppare le sue potenzialità, l'educazione universale è il sine qua non della democrazia.

Quella Educazione, però, deve essere molto più larga, molto meglio adattata alla diversità di capacità, interessi e bisogni degli individui ed ai bisogni della società, che è il caso nella educazione attuale.

Questa Università che ha oggi l'inaugurazione del nuovo anno accademico può, e deve, avere la sua parte in questo processo. Qui gli studenti possono sviluppare la loro potenzialità; qui essi possono imparare a lavorare insieme, cooperativamente, verso scopi comuni.

- 4 -

qui essi possono imparare tolleranza e apprezzamento di diversita' di opinioni; qui possono proteggere i diritti di individui e minorita' e il diritto di piena espressione; qui possono imparare responsabilita' sociali - in una parola, possono imparare che cosa e' la democrazia - il pieno sviluppo dell'individuo anche personalmente, anche come membro cooperante ed integrativo di una societa' organica.

Qui possono imparare che:

il benessere d'ognuno dipende dal benessere di tutti e che

il benessere di tutti dipende dal benessere d'ognuno.

## Definizione della Democrazia

Due tipi di libertà

La libertà dello stato

L'estremo di totalitarismo

L'estremo di individualismo

Combinazione per mezzo di democrazia

Libertà individuale e libertà di esprimere l'autorità e completata

Lo stato limitato e completato degli diritti del popolo

Leggi per protezione e coordinazione

Diritti degli individui, della minoranza.

Autonomia locale

Importanza dell'educazione

Come deve essere insegnata l'educazione

Lo sviluppo delle potenzialità dei ragazzi

Pratica nella democrazia

Primi ed ottimi cooperativi

Autogoverno

I ragazzi imparano la democrazia per mezzo di vivere

Trovano che la democrazia è veramente molto più

insieme che lo sviluppo di individui come persone

e come membri cooperanti della società organizzata

# WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

Address by Lt. Col. Carleton W. Washburne

Director of Education

Allied Commission

## Introduction.

Colleagues: Today I want to talk with you as a fellow-teacher, not as an Allied Officer. I began my career as a teacher in a rural elementary school; then I taught in the elementary school of a small city; after that I taught in a Teachers' College - something like an Istituto Magistrale. Since that time I have been a superintendent of schools and a professor in universities. So, like you, I am primarily a teacher, and it is as a teacher that I want to discuss with my colleagues the vital question of "What is Democracy?"

## Basic meaning.

As we all know, the original meaning of the word "democracy" was a form of government in which the people ruled through direct votes or through elected representatives. But the term has come to have a much broader meaning. Today democracy may be considered not merely as a form of government, but as a way of life in which each individual has the utmost possible opportunity to develop his own potentialities, not only as a single human being but as a participating member of an organic society. Such development is possible only in an atmosphere of freedom. There must be freedom to choose one's way of living, limited only by the equal freedom of others; there must be freedom to think and to express one's thoughts and free access to the thought and expression of all others; and there must be freedom to select one's profession, to train oneself for it and to exercise it for one's own satisfaction and for the common good.

Two types of freedom.

There are two kinds of freedom: the freedom of independence and the freedom of power (potence). Each in its extreme form blocks the other but both are essential for the democratic way of life. I can illustrate both by recounting a personal experience:

A few years ago I went camping alone in the lakes and forests of Canada. In my canoe I had everything I needed for living - tent, blankets, food, matches, fishing equipment, books. I rarely saw another person - there was no one to tell me what I should or should not do. I was completely free to go where I wanted to go, to do what I wanted to do. I had practically absolute freedom of independence.

Then there came a storm. My canoe capsized. Everything I had went to the bottom of the lake. I swam to an island near by. Wet and cold and soon hungry I wanted a tent, dry clothes, a fire, food. But I could get none of these. I still had complete freedom of independence - there were no laws or persons to tell me what I might or might not do. But I ~~lacked~~ the freedom of power. I could not do any of the things I so desperately wanted to do. I would gladly have sacrificed some of my freedom of independence for the power to satisfy my needs.

It was just such necessity which drove primitive man into societies where ~~they~~ <sup>men</sup> could interchange work and help one another. And as these societies became more and more efficient the individuals who composed them ~~lost~~ <sup>lost</sup> more and more of the freedom of independence - they depended on ~~the~~ <sup>each other</sup> work of others and they had to conform to the laws of ~~others~~ <sup>their fellows</sup>.

The extreme of organization for power was approached in the recent ~~organization~~ <sup>development</sup> of totalitarian states. The power of ~~these~~ <sup>these</sup> states became vast and the individuals lost a large part of their independence. Just as primitive man found the extreme of independence



safe from robbery, safe from fire, safe from disease, one must obey laws for the protection of property, life and health; to obtain the fruits of co-ordinated work one must co-ordinate one's life with those of others and must contribute his work, as represented by money, to the common good. But the freedom of independence in such a society is also completed by the freedom of power: through the organization of society one obtains the interchange of thought, ideas, invention and discovery; through it one obtains education for oneself and one's children; through it one has more leisure for the amenities of life - one's time is not all consumed in getting food, clothing and shelter; one can travel, communicate by mail or telephone, and partake of the innumerable conveniences of an industrial civilization where man's co-ordinated activities make nature serve man's needs and desires, physical, intellectual, esthetic, and even spiritual.

The freedom of power - man's organized state - is limited, in a democracy, by the freedom of independence: the rights of individuals and minorities must be respected; the freedom of criticism must be preserved; laws must be limited to those essential for the protection of the life, liberty and property of the individuals who compose the state, and for the co-ordination of their activities for the common good - the regulation of traffic, the establishment of schools and libraries, the provision of public utilities such as water, electricity, and transportation; and at all times the people themselves are free to change their government and laws.

But the freedom of power is also completed by the freedom of independence: it is the independence of the individuals which allows each to develop his own potentialities and therefore to contribute his share to social growth. The health and evolution of the state consist of the health and evolution of its component parts. So the only state - the only society organized for the development of the freedom of power - which can be healthy and evolving is the state that

state that completes itself by recognizing as its primary function the fullest possible development of the potentialities of the individuals who compose it.

### Democracy and education.

In a democracy the main reliance is on voluntary cooperation, with as little regulation by law as possible. But both for the passing and obeying of a minimum of laws and for a maximum of ~~extra~~ voluntary cooperation the people must be educated. And since the development of the potentialities of the individual members of society is the primary purpose of an organized ~~society~~ <sup>state</sup> and since, ideally, education consists of just such development of individuals, education becomes the most important single function of the state.

But education is more than intellectual and verbal culture. To serve its major purpose for both the state and the individual it must embrace all aspects of the development of the individual. Today organized education in the schools tends to be narrow, limited, confined to memory, words, <sup>and</sup> the manipulation of symbols, ~~and~~ For a truly democratic society we must, instead, study the nature of the child. We must provide for his physical development and healthy living; for his emotional wholeness and satisfaction; for his aesthetic appreciation and expression; for his capacity to think clearly on the basis of his own experience and the accumulated experience of the human race. We must help him to find his own aptitudes and interests and to prepare himself for a trade or profession which will use these for his own good and for the common good. And we must help him to develop a social conscience so that he sees his own well being bound up in the well being of all, and learns how to coordinate his life with the life of society to the advantage of both.

There is no age at which such education should stop; there is no individual who will not profit by such education. During

childhood and adolescence every individual has the right to give a large part of his time to this kind of education; and adults have a right to a continuance of it during the hours when they are free from providing for their economic needs.

I say everyone has a right to such an education. But if we are to have a truly healthy democratic society, this becomes not merely a right but a necessity. For education, rightly conceived, is the very development of the potentialities of each individual both as a single human being and as a participating member of an organic society, that constitutes democracy. Through such development and through such a society, and only so, can human beings combine the freedom of independence and the freedom of power, each limited and completed by the other. It is with this broad concept of democracy and of education that we teachers should undertake our work, both as citizens and as those charged with the responsibility of helping the oncoming generation to become citizens of a democratic state.

## WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

Address by Lt. Col. Carleton W. Washburne  
Director of Education  
Allied Commission

Introduction.

Colleagues: Today I want to talk with you as a fellow-teacher, not as an Allied Officer. I began my career as a teacher in a rural elementary school; then I taught in the elementary school of a small city; after that I taught in a Teachers' College - something like an Istituto Magistrale. Since that time I have been a superintendent of schools and a professor in universities. So, like you, I am primarily a teacher, and it is as a teacher that I want to discuss with my colleagues the vital question of "What is Democracy?"

Basic meaning.

As we all know, the original meaning of the word "democracy" was a form of government in which the people ruled through direct votes or through elected representatives. But the term has come to have a much broader meaning. Today democracy may be considered not merely as a form of government, but as a way of life in which each individual has the utmost possible opportunity to develop his own potentialities, not only as a single human being but as a participating member of an organic society. Such development is possible only in an atmosphere of freedom. There must be freedom to choose one's way of living, limited only by the equal freedom of others; there must be freedom to think and to express one's thoughts and free access to the thought and expression of all others; and there must be freedom to select one's profession, to train oneself for it and to exercise it for one's own satisfaction and for the common good. 2293

### Two types of freedom.

There are two kinds of freedom: the freedom of independence and the freedom of power ((potenza)). Each in its extreme form blocks the other but both are essential for the democratic way of life. I can illustrate both by recounting a personal experience:

A few years ago I went camping alone in the lakes and forests of Canada. In my canoe I had everything I needed for living - tent, blankets, food, matches, fishing equipment, books. I rarely saw another person - there was no one to tell me what I should or should not do. I was completely free to go where I wanted to go, to do what I wanted to do. I had practically absolute freedom of independence.

Then there came a storm. My canoe capsized. Everything I had went to the bottom of the lake. I swam to an island near by. Wet and cold and soon hungry I wanted a tent, dry clothes, a fire, food. But I could get none of these. I still had complete freedom of independence - there were no laws or persons to tell me what I might or might not do. But I ~~lacked~~ <sup>lacked</sup> the freedom of power. I could not do any of the things I so desperately wanted to do. I would gladly have sacrificed some of my freedom of independence for the power to satisfy my needs.

It was just such necessity which drove primitive men into societies where they could interchange work and help one another. And as these societies became more and more efficient the individuals who composed them lost more and more of the freedom of independence - they depended on the work of others and they had to conform to the laws of others.

The extreme of organization for power was approached in the recent <sup>development</sup> ~~organization~~ of totalitarian states. The power of such <sup>2002</sup> states became vast and the individuals lost a large part of their independence. Just as primitive man found the extreme of inde<sup>and</sup>pendence

ance incompatible with his desire for the power to do what he wanted to do, modern man has found that the extreme of organization for power stifles his individual liberty.

And in stifling the liberty of individuals the all-powerful state has within itself the seed of its own destruction. The individuals are the cells that make the organism of the state. If those cells are not living fully the organism dies. Growth and development are essentials of all living things - when growth stops atrophy begins. Growth in a totalitarian state is made almost impossible because independent thought and variation are inhibited. There is no evolution in the biological world without variation; likewise in the social world the variation of thought, the freedom to express new ideas, to oppose and to experiment, are the signa non of the evolution and growth of society. In inhibiting this evolution the totalitarian state brings about its own destruction.

#### Both freedoms in a democracy.

The extreme of the freedom of independence is anarchy, and results in the lack of power to <sup>do</sup> what one desires and needs to do. The extreme of the freedom of power is totalitarianism and results in the suppression of the ~~many~~ individuals for whose well-being ~~the state is organized~~ the state is organized, and in the atrophy of the state itself. In a democracy alone is it possible to have both the freedom of independence and the freedom of power, each limited by the other but at the same time each fulfilled by the other.

In a democratic society - a society organized to give each individual the utmost possible opportunity to develop his own potentialities both as a person and as a cooperating member of an organized society - the freedom of independence is limited by the freedom of power: to obtain the results of the work of others one must produce socially useful and socially desired work; to live

4

safe from robbery, safe from fire, safe from disease, one must obey laws for the protection of property, life and health; to obtain the fruits of co-ordinated work one must co-ordinate one's life with those of others and must contribute his work, as represented by money, to the common good. But the freedom of independence in such a society is also completed by the freedom of power: through the organization of society one obtains the interchange of thought, ideas, invention and discovery; through it one obtains education for oneself and one's children; through it one has more leisure for the amenities of life - one's time is not all consumed in getting food, clothing and shelter; one can travel, communicate by mail or telephone, and partake of the innumerable conveniences of an industrial civilization where man's co-ordinated activities make nature serve man's needs and desires, physical, intellectual, aesthetic, and even spiritual.

The freedom of power - man's organized state - is limited, in a democracy, by the freedom of independence: the rights of individuals and minorities must be respected; the freedom of criticism must be preserved; laws must be limited to those essential for the protection of the life, liberty and property of the individuals who compose the state, and for the co-ordination of their activities for the common good - the regulation of traffic, the establishment of schools and libraries, the provision of public utilities such as water, electricity, and transportation; and at all times the people themselves are free to change their government and laws.

But the freedom of power is also completed by the freedom of independence: it is the independence of the individuals which allows each to develop his own potentialities and therefore to contribute his share to social growth. The health and evolution of the state consist of the health and evolution of its component parts. So the only state - the only society organized for the development of the freedom of power - which can be healthy and evolving is the state that

state that completes itself by recognizing as its primary function the fullest possible development of the potentialities of the individuals who compose it.

#### Democracy and education.

In a democracy the main reliance is on voluntary cooperation, with as little regulation by law as possible. But both for the passing and obeying of a minimum of laws and for a maximum of ~~voluntary~~ voluntary cooperation the people must be educated. And since the development of the potentialities of the individual members of society is the primary purpose of an organized <sup>state</sup> society and since, ideally, education consists of ~~the~~ just such development of individuals, education becomes the most important single function of the state.

But education is more than intellectual and verbal culture. To serve its major purpose for both the state and the individual it must embrace all aspects of the development of the individual. Today organized education in the schools tends to be narrow, limited, confined to memory, words, <sup>and</sup> the manipulation of symbols, ~~and~~ For a truly democratic society we must, instead, study the nature of the child. We must provide for his physical development and healthy living; for his emotional wholesomeness and satisfaction; for his esthetic appreciation and expression; for his capacity to think clearly on the basis of his own experience and the accumulated experience of the human race. We must help him to find his own aptitudes and interests and to prepare himself for a trade or profession which will use these for his own good and for the common good. And we must help him to develop a social conscience so that he sees his own well being bound up in the well being of all, and learns how to coordinate his life with the life of society to ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> advantage of both.

There is no age at which such education should stop; there is no individual who will not profit by such education. During

childhood and adolescence every individual has the right to give a large part of his time to this kind of education; and adults have a right to a continuance of it during the hours when they are free from providing for their economic needs.

I say everyone has a right to such an education. But if we are to have a truly healthy democratic society, this becomes not merely a right but a necessity. For education, rightly conceived, is the very development of the potentialities of each individual both as a single human being and as a participating member of an organic society, that constitutes democracy. Through such development and through such a society, and only so, can human beings combine the freedom of independence and the freedom of power, each limited and completed by the other. It is with this broad concept of democracy and of education that we teachers should undertake our work, both as citizens and as those charged with the responsibility of helping the oncoming generation to become citizens of a democratic state.

1310