


Mc
Graw
Hill
Education



(美) JAMES WM. NOLL 编

TAKING SIDES 立 场

辩证思维训练
第一辑

教育篇



CLASHING VIEWS ON
EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

TAKING SIDES 立场

辩证思维训练

教育篇

17TH 第17版
EDITION

CLASHING VIEWS ON
EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

(美) JAMES WM. NOLL 编

外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

京权图字：01-2014-1995

James Wm. Noll
Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Educational Issues, 17e
ISBN: 0-07-805035-9
Copyright © 2013 by McGraw-Hill Education.

All Rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including without limitation photocopying, recording, taping, or any database, information or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

This authorized English Abridgement is jointly published by McGraw-Hill Education and Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. This edition is authorized for sale in the People's Republic of China only, excluding Hong Kong SAR, Macao SAR and Taiwan.

Copyright © 2014 by McGraw-Hill Education and Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

版权所有。未经出版人事先书面许可，对本出版物的任何部分不得以任何方式或途径复制或传播，包括但不限于复印、录制、录音，或通过任何数据库、信息或可检索的系统。

本授权英文影印删减版由麦格劳-希尔（亚洲）教育出版公司和外语教学与研究出版社合作出版。此版本经授权仅限在中华人民共和国境内（不包括香港特别行政区、澳门特别行政区和台湾）销售。

版权 ©2014 由麦格劳-希尔（亚洲）教育出版公司与外语教学与研究出版社所有。

本书封面贴有 McGraw-Hill Education 公司防伪标签，无标签者不得销售。

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

立场：辩证思维训练. 第1辑. 教育篇：第17版 = Taking sides:clashing views on educational issues: seventeenth edition: 英文 / (美) 诺尔 (Noll, J. W.) 编. — 北京：外语教学与研究出版社, 2014.7 (2015.10 重印)
ISBN 978-7-5135-4933-2

I. ①立… II. ①诺… III. ①英语-语言读物 IV. ①H319.4

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2014) 第 168081 号

出版人 蔡剑峰
系列策划 吴浩
责任编辑 刘佳
封面设计 覃一彪
出版发行 外语教学与研究出版社
社址 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)
网址 <http://www.fltrp.com>
印刷 三河市北燕印装有限公司
开本 650×980 1/16
印张 114
版次 2014 年 8 月第 1 版 2015 年 10 月第 3 次印刷
书号 ISBN 978-7-5135-4933-2
定价 328.00 元 (全七册)

购书咨询：(010) 88819929 电子邮箱：club@fltrp.com
外研书店：<http://www.fltrpstore.com>
凡印刷、装订质量问题，请联系我社印制部
联系电话：(010) 61207896 电子邮箱：zhijian@fltrp.com
凡侵权、盗版书籍线索，请联系我社法律事务部
举报电话：(010) 88817519 电子邮箱：banquan@fltrp.com
法律顾问：立方律师事务所 刘旭东律师
中咨律师事务所 殷斌律师
物料号：249330001



Editors/Academic Advisory Board

Members of the Academic Advisory Board are instrumental in the final selection of articles for each edition of *TAKING SIDES*. Their review of articles for content, level, and appropriateness provides critical direction to the editors and staff. We think that you will find their careful consideration well reflected in this volume.

TAKING SIDES: Clashing Views on EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

Seventeenth Edition

EDITOR

James Wm. Noll
University of Maryland

ACADEMIC ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Joseph Akpan
*Mount Vernon Nazarene
University*

Brenda Alward
Macomb Community College

Fred Bartelheim
*University of Northern
Colorado*

Felicia Blacher-Wilson
*Southeastern Louisiana
University*

Charles Blackledge
*Bishop State Community
College*

Robert Blake
Towson University

Sally Blake
University of Memphis

Christopher Boe
Pfeiffer University

**Brenda Light
Bredemeier**
*University of Missouri,
St. Louis*

Elizabeth Y. Brinkerhoff
*University of Massachu-
setts, Amherst*

Kathleen Briseno
College of DuPage

Mary Ellen Burke
National Louis University

Darilyn Butler
*Queens University of
Charlotte*

James Calder
*Middle Tennessee State
University*

Esther Chang
Soka University of America

Darryl Cherry
*St. Louis Community
College, Forest Park*

Stephen Coffin
Montclair State University

Noble Corey
Indiana State University

Elaine Coughlin
Pacific University

David Cox
Arkansas State University

Patricia Cruzeiro
*University of Nebraska,
Kearney*

Kimberly Dadisman
*University of North
Carolina, Chapel Hill*

Robert Dahlgren
SUNY Fredonia

Ann V. Dean
SUNY New Paltz

Brian Dotts
The University of Georgia

Celina Echols
*Southeastern Louisiana
University*

Dionne H. Edison
*University of West
Alabama*

William Edwards
*Missouri Southern State
University*

Deborah Ellermeyer
*Clarion University of
Pennsylvania*

JoAnne Ellsworth
Eastern Arizona College

R. L. Erion
*South Dakota State
University*



Editors/Academic Advisory Board continued

- La Vonne Fedynich**
*Texas A&M University,
Kingsville*
- Cheryl Fields-Smith**
University of Georgia
- Kent Fisher**
Folsom Lake College
- Paul G. Fitchett**
*University of North
Carolina, Charlotte*
- Betty Jane Fratzke**
*Indiana Wesleyan
University*
- Josephine Fritts**
*Ozarks Technical Commu-
nity College*
- Shelly Furuness**
Butler University
- George Georgiou**
Towson University
- Gina Giuliano**
University at Albany, SUNY
- Francis Godwyll**
Ohio University
- Vella Goebel**
*University of Southern
Indiana*
- Denise Greene**
Roanoke College
- Charles Grindstaff**
Concord University
- Jason Helfer**
Knox College
- Michael Hohn**
*Portland Community
College*
- Jennifer Holleran**
*Community College of
Allegheny County*
- Charles Jackson**
Augusta State University
- Janna Jackson**
*University of Massachusetts
Boston*
- Mary Alice Jennings**
*Mississippi Valley State
University*
- Leslie Jones**
Nicholls State University
- Steven Kaatz**
Bethel University
- Linda Karges-Bone**
*Charleston Southern
University*
- Alan Karns**
Wilkes University
- Harvey Karron**
Stony Brook University
- Amy Kavanaugh**
Ferris State University
- Barbara Kawulich**
University of West Georgia
- Susan Kelewae**
Kent State University
- Richard Kennedy**
*North Carolina Wesleyan
College*
- Mary G. Klinger**
Empire State College, SUNY
- Glenn L. Koonce**
Regent University
- Ellie Kunkel**
Peru State College
- Sandra L. Leslie**
Shorter College
- Joslen Letscher**
University of Detroit Mercy
- Lawanna M. Lewis**
Grand Canyon University
- Ronald E. Lewis**
Grand Canyon University
- Dennis A. Lichty**
Wayne State College
- Lennie Little**
Jackson State University
- Harold London**
DePaul University
- Christopher Lucas**
University of Arkansas
- Roosevelt Martin**
Chicago State University
- Xavier McClung**
Valdosta State University
- Carmen McCrink**
Barry University
- John W. McNeeley**
Daytona State College
- Joanne Milke**
Mitchell College
- Greg Morris**
*Grand Rapids Community
College*
- Thalia Mulvihill**
Ball State University
- Paul Nelson**
Pacific Lutheran University
- Susan Nix**
West Texas A&M University
- Paul Nochelski**
Canisius College
- Myron Oglesby-Pitts**
Belmont University
- Jessie Panko**
Saint Xavier University
- Robert Parrish**
*University of North Florida,
COEHS*
- Graham Patterson**
Grambling State University
- Lynn Patterson**
Murray State University
- Roy Rosario Pellicano**
*St. Joseph's College of
New York*



Editors/Academic Advisory Board continued

- Peter Phipps**
Dutchess Community College
- Mary Pickard**
East Carolina University
- Monte Piliawsky**
Wayne State University
- Dawn Piper**
Brown Mackie College
- Ernest Pratt**
Mount Union College
- Patrice Preston-Grimes**
University of Virginia
- Tanya Judd Pucella**
Marietta College
- Anne Marie Rakip**
South Carolina State University
- Cynthia Rand-Johnson**
Albany State University
- Doug Rice**
California State University, Sacramento
- Timothy Richards**
Mckendree University
- Kathryn Righter**
Ashland University
- Terry Salem**
Lake Land College
- Terry M. Salem**
Eastern Illinois University
- Lisa Schoer**
Converse College
- Stephen T. Schroth**
Knox College
- Jill Schurr**
Austin College
- Kathleen Scott**
Ashland University, Elyria
- Melanie Shaw**
Northcentral University
- Ralph Shibley**
University of Rio Grande
- Nicholas Shudak**
Mount Marty College
- Elizabeth G. Siemanowski**
Wesley College
- Michael V. Smith**
The Catholic University of America
- Pamela Smith**
Eastern Michigan University
- Leone Snyder**
University of St. Thomas
- Harvey Solganick**
LeTourneau University
- Shirley Sommers**
Nazareth College
- Theresa Stahler**
Kutztown University
- Robert Stennett**
Gainesville State College
- Robert Stevens**
The University of Texas at Tyler
- Tricia Stewart**
University of Rochester
- Mona Thompson**
California State University, Channel Islands
- Sandra M. Todaro**
Bossier Parish Community College
- Eric Trujillo**
Colorado State University
- Madeline Turan**
SUNY at Stony Brook
- Sammy Vavroch**
Northern Illinois University
- Eduardo Vianna**
LaGuardia Community College
- Valerie Wallace**
California Lutheran University
- Thomas Walsh**
Kean University
- Patti Ward**
Johnson County Community College
- Dyan Watson**
Willamette University
- Myra Weiger**
Kean University
- David Whaley**
Iowa State University
- Herbert Whitaker**
Big Sandy Community and Technical College
- Don Woo**
Trinity Christian College
- Laura Zieglowsky**
Monmouth College
- Norma Zunker**
Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi



英语思辨，攻错他山

朱绩崧

学界奉为圭臬的《牛津英语大词典》(The Oxford English Dictionary)在side (n.)¹条目的18.a.义项里，把18.b.所收词组“to take a (or one's) side, take sides. Also to hold side (with one)”里的side解释为[t]he position or interests of one person, party, etc., in contrast to that of an opposing one，个人立场相反、党派利益对立之意，了然无疑。

惜我愚钝，近年才明白，take sides不仅仅是英语词典里的一个词组，甚至可说是英国议会制度的根本；而议会制度，实在是英国对人类文明进步最大的贡献之一：通过take sides，把思辨，而非独断专行，尊奉为国事决策那不可撼动的核心机制。我们不会忘记，电影《铁娘子》(The Iron Lady)里梅里尔·斯特里普(Meryl Streep)新学一口英国腔就来西敏宫滔滔激辩的场景，那不是骂街，虽然嘘声迭起，那是两股思想在龙争虎斗，最终推进历史。

谈到西方好争论、善思辨的传统，古希腊已臻化境，垂范千古。但这并不意味着我国真如某些评论家所言，为定于一尊的儒学所戕害，使得读书人唯服从传承是务，从不挑战权威。

《古文观止》读到最后几卷，便会看到编者吴楚材、吴调侯叔侄鼓励读者对古时定论大胆质疑的用心。如建文忠臣方孝孺的名篇《豫让论》，标新立异，一反古说，直指春秋时代为主雪仇的刺客豫让“不能扶危于未乱，而捐躯于既败者”，不配“国土”之誉。

甚至，在我们历史课本一向蔑之为“埋头故纸”、“皓首穷经”的乾嘉学派里，多数学者的考据也都具有很高的思辨性。从王念孙的《读书杂志》、刘宝楠的《论语正义》，到戴震“由字义以明经义”的治学方法和段玉裁《东原先生年谱》所载的戴氏札记——“仆生平著述最大者为《孟子字义疏证》一书，此正人心之要。今人无论正邪，尽以意见误名之曰理，而祸斯民，故《疏证》不得不作”——从文本到现实，立场鲜明，无不指向对真理的上下求索。

读书为求真。这句话，是儿时由老师灌输给我的，我不曾怀疑过。可也正是老师告诉我“乾嘉学派在历史上的作用是反动的”、“高考答题时，如遇到岳飞，不能勾选为民族英雄，他打的仗是人民内部矛盾”等等当年不容我怀疑辩驳的“事实”。

往事固不可追，令我大失所望的却是“寓教于乐”、“反对应试教育”了不知凡几年，中小学生竟在变本加厉地背记历史、语文的“标准答案”，到了易只字则为错的地步。有人甚至把中小学生语文水平的普遍降低归咎于英语课太多，视母语、外语修习为零和博弈，全然不去审视、拷问、批判当下严重阻碍思辨与创造的文科教育体制本身。试问这样的教育，又如何能培养出活泼泼的人来？如何能引导他们求真？

求真，真真何其不易也。有时，权威发声，莫敢深究。有时，缺乏条件，无从寻觅。信息爆炸、思路开阔的今天，更多情况下是众说纷纭，莫衷一是，乃至有时在“是”与“非”这两者之间，都不知何从矣。

而相对综合型、重意合（parataxis）的汉语，英语是分析型语言，重形合（hypotaxis），语法规则更明确，对指代、性数格一致等形式要求更高，且有强烈的时态观。不能不说，这在很大程度上避免了汉语常见的因文害意：把一些站不住脚的歪理，用华丽辞藻一包装，就算是“美文佳构”了。（这方面，韩愈的个别名作，如为名教张目的《原道》，可算反面教材，远逊柳宗元的《驳复仇议》。后者的论理，简朴而流畅，本质上与今天英美法院经典判词如出一辙，堪称我国古代taking sides的典范。）加之英美学者好辩的传统在当代通过课堂教育、学术论文等形式得以强化，思辨的局面委实优于我国。

我素为古罗马倾倒，曾读国人编著的几种罗马史，又看了英国剑桥大学克里斯托弗·凯利（Christopher Kelly）教授写的《罗马帝国简史》（*The Roman Empire: A Very Short Introduction*），后者末章呈现的学者思辨生动别致，过目难忘，非我国传统重介绍“史实”的史书可比：20世纪初，英国历史学家、律师、自由党政治家詹姆斯·布赖斯（James Bryce）认为罗马帝国与大英帝国非常相似，都能维持高水平的内部和平与秩序，民人深谙工程技术，勇猛活跃，不畏困苦；牛津古代史教授弗朗西斯·哈弗菲尔德（Francis Haverfield）进一步说明，罗马帝国的成功，在于把行省居民同化为一个秩序井然、富有凝聚力的文明；曾奉职印度的英国古典学会会长埃弗林·巴林（Evelyn Baring）持不同看法，在“同化”问题上，大英帝国与罗马帝国有不可弥合的区别，单论印度语言、宗教、种族的多样性，就和罗马人征服的任何地区不同；哈弗菲尔德不同意巴林，认为英国之所以有印度问题，是因为征服印度时，印度已经发展成发达社会，文明形态稳固；牛津的古代史专家、考古学家D. G. 霍加斯（D. G. Hogarth）也反对巴林，认为罗马帝国有三个阶段，即“尚未同化”、“有意同化”、“积极同化”，大英帝国对印度犹处“尚未同化”的第一阶段。

把学者taking sides过程中的各种观点陈列出来，供读者思辨，是我国各阶段教材的短板。同时，也应注意，为提高我国学生的思辨水平以及英语能力，taking sides的内容不宜学科专业化程度过高（上述关于罗马帝国与大英帝国的争辩即有此虞），还是具有一定社会影响力、为民众熟知的话题更宜为组织教材的出发点。

美国著名的*Taking Sides*丛书，其宗旨正在于满足成长中的思考者兼英语学习者的需要。这套书系，诞生于20世纪80年代，迄今出版52种专题分册，多数一版再版，其中传媒凡12版，经济、环境达15版，社会、教育更已有17版之多。畅销程度，不劳赘言。

从题材看，外研社首批择取的七册分别覆盖了社会、教育、经济、环境、科技、大众传媒与全球性问题，无一不是当下公众话题的焦点。但呈现的手法却很“单一”，即先提出问题，再摆出正反双方最典型、最具说服力的论证，最后引导读者作进一步的阅读与思考：

问：计算机对学生成长是否有副作用？

正：有。学校对电脑技术的迷信与滥用，导致学生心智发育与创造力受损。

反：无。如对电脑善加利用，能促进教学革新，从而使学生获益。

后记：“学校”或许正在由“地点”转变为“概念”，随着计算机技术的进步，许多教育手段都不必在课堂实施，但随之而来有许多新问题，需要探讨。多媒体能让学生与更多的信息产生互动，但往往也减少了学生与学生、学生与所在环境之间的互动。相关研究请见……（扩展阅读涉及三十余处学术资源）

（《教育篇》第10话题）

目录并不冗长，但当读者学完全书，必会惊喜地发现，自己在这一领域的知识结构已搭建得初具规模。摆在面前的问题往往庞大空疏，报章常见，迄无公断。从这个角度思考，有这样的道理可知；从那个方面切入，有那样的结论可得。读者的任务，就是跟着两派的思路各走一遍，最终判定哪派有理。当然，结果也可能是两派皆不尽善，或者需要修正调和之后才能获得正解。但无论如何，这一过程本身，实在是智力上的一次奥德修斯式的旅行（an intellectual odyssey）。

之所以要用荷马史诗的隐喻，是因为读*Taking Sides*与看街边吵架或中学生议论文最根本的差别，就是需要调用的思想、学术资源极多。以《社会篇》第8话题为例，菲利普·迪瓦恩（Philip E. Devine）在得出“酷刑不可保留”的结论之前，将自由主义政治学、康德学说、功利主义、自然法等一一引出，要言不烦。对迪瓦恩这位哲学学者而言，这些理论或许早已熟烂于胸。但对一般读者而言，为了确证作者没有断章取义，至少得就上述内容再读通几本导论、简介之类的书。顺便一提，酷刑当否的问题，我在近年畅销的一部法律通俗读物《法治》（*The Rule of Law*）论恐怖主义的一章中，也曾读到评论。作者、已故英国前首席大法官汤姆·宾厄姆（Tom Bingham）反对向恐怖主义犯罪嫌疑人施以酷刑的理由本质上与孔子的“己所不欲，勿施于人”无异，认为这是对法治原则的破坏。与迪瓦恩相较，其说直指人心，唯于学理微缺然。

事实上，*Taking Sides*书系所选文章，无论篇幅长短，莫不观点鲜明，针锋相对，而每一方都有强大的理据支撑，乍看难以撼动。由此，我们也不得不感叹，人类文明在今天呈现出的多样性，自有其道理，无论是同一文明内还是不同文明间发生的碰撞冲突，其背后都有复杂的理性动因，绝非皂白可以分明，需要我们全面观察，深度分析，最终选定立场。

我出身英文系，工作后常应媒体之邀，写些时事评论。落笔之前，现已养成习惯，会去新浪微博、知乎、Quora等网站，浏览各方的理性评论，在争议极大的问题上，熟悉*Taking Sides*封面上印的那两个词：Clashing Views（对立观点）。这是我在“后大学”时期补上的一堂课。

回想本科求学时，这方面所受教育几乎为零。教育的重点是背同义词、反义词

与词形变化。文章，读通便好，却读不透，因为读通之后，总觉所言有理，不会想着去倾听“不同的声音”。这个弊端，到写毕业论文时曝露无疑：说明文还凑合，议论文就写不好了。名虽论文，连核心的论点都渺不可寻。这几年，本专业内，我还常常看到号称博士论文的研究综述，或者连文献回顾都没有的论文。

为了矫正这一通病，不少学校从编教材上下功夫，课文引入争议性话题，意在以此激发学生的critical thinking——“批判性思维”遂成高校英语教师培训班极为青睐的广告亮点。可惜，在我有限的学术视野内，能一变风气的作品，尚阙如焉。我看到过浅尝辄止者，其内一篇课文，取自美国某小报，讲一对夫妻人工受孕后离婚，胚胎留在医院冰箱里，不知如何处置，遂对簿公堂。最终，作者只是提出问题，没能向学生指出解决的途径。如果有至少两种具有一定思想深度与差异性的观点呈现在教材里，附上扩展研读的书目、提要，教育的效果定会面目一新，我们也会真正地开始在语言教育中培养思想者，而不只是机械的记忆者、复制者。这一任务，如前所示，*Taking Sides*完全胜任。

我乐于推荐该书系作精读教材的另一项理由在于语言质量。就量而言，目前的精读课（Intensive Reading），阅读量普遍过低，一两千词的文章，一读就是十天半月，课程设计者不明白唯有大数量与短时间的结合，方成就intensive之效。与此相比，以本书系一卷之量，读一学期，日均1500词左右，恰到好处。以质而论，本书系符合我的外语习得理念：中高阶学生，应以非虚构作品（non-fiction）为“主食”。例如，本书系中有大量美国国会证言（congressional testimony），思维严谨，语言地道，学习西方法律、外交以及高等翻译等专业的学生如能熟读成诵，其英语学习的眼界势必更上层楼。从实用的角度看，有理、有力、有节的明快文风才是日常工作、生活所需，是语言的“常态”；文学作品中因作者意图而创造出的丰富表达，只是语言的“变态”。由常入变，初地坚固，发展空间亦大。反是，恐事倍功半。

至于“泛读”，也有一个基于*Taking Sides*的策略可行：各个话题牵涉到的著作，一学期可读上三五本。如读《环境篇》，可辅读雷切尔·卡森（Rachel Carson）的《寂静的春天》（*Silent Spring*）；读《科技与社会篇》，可辅读阿道司·赫胥黎（Aldous Huxley）的《美丽新世界》（*Brave New World*）。此时，不妨多些文学作品，加深对“精读”义理的体悟思辨，可全“文以载道”之功。

此外，*Taking Sides*对如今各高校流行的英语辩论也有直接的指导作用，无论其辩题还是论据，都可在模拟阶段直接取用。我更相信，认真研读过本书系的学生，其论文一定不会沦为简介、综述，不会抄袭维基、百度，因为他们掌握了论文写作的核心技术：如何灵巧运用事实与逻辑来作严肃的学术之论，而非执着于印象、习惯、偏见的意气之争。

总之，希望*Taking Sides*书系的引进，能综合我国英语学生的语言习得与思维训练，既提升交流的效率，更开启求真的法门，在乱云飞渡的当今时代，帮助读者迅速达成思想之质与辞藻之文的兼美共谐。



Topic Guide

This topic guide suggests how the selections in this book relate to the subjects covered in your course. You may want to use the topics listed on this page to search the Web more easily. On the following pages, a number of Web sites have been gathered specifically for this book. They are arranged to reflect the issues of this Taking Sides reader. You can link to these sites by going to <http://www.mhhe.com/cls>. All the articles that relate to each topic are listed below the bold-faced term.

Curriculum

2. Should the Curriculum Be Standardized for All?
10. Do Computers Negatively Affect Student Growth?

Democratic Classrooms

3. Are Truly Democratic Classrooms Possible?

Diversity

6. Is the Inclusive Classroom Model Workable?
8. Are Single-Sex Schools and Classes Effective?

Early Childhood Education

4. Has the Time Arrived for Universal Preschool?

Education Philosophy

1. Should Schooling Be Based on Social Experiences?

Education Policies

7. Can Merit Pay Accelerate School Improvement?

9. Can Zero Tolerance Violate Students Rights?

Engaging Students

8. Are Single-Sex Schools and Classes Effective?
10. Do Computers Negatively Affect Student Growth?

Future of Education

5. Is Privatization the Hope of the Future?

School Reform

5. Is Privatization the Hope of the Future?

Standards

2. Should the Curriculum Be Standardized for All?

Technology

10. Do Computers Negatively Affect Student Growth?



Introduction

Ways of Thinking About Educational Issues

normative

合乎规范

James Wm. Noll

Concern about the quality of education has been expressed by philosophers, politicians, and parents for centuries. There has been a perpetual and unresolved debate regarding the definition of education, the relationship between school and society, the distribution of decision-making power in educational matters, and the means for improving all aspects of the educational enterprise.

In recent decades the growing influence of thinking drawn from the humanities and the behavioral and social sciences has brought about the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives, which have sharpened the focus on educational concerns. These perspectives have allowed scholars and researchers to closely examine the contextual variables, value orientations, and philosophical and political assumptions that shape both the status quo and reform efforts.

The study of education involves the application of many perspectives to the analysis of "what is and how it got that way" and "what can be and how we can get there." Central to such study are the prevailing philosophical assumptions, theories, and visions that find their way into real-life educational situations. The application situation, with its attendant political pressures, sociocultural differences, community expectations, parental influence, and professional problems, provides a testing ground for contending theories and ideals.

This "testing ground" image applies only insofar as the status quo is malleable enough to allow the examination and trial of alternative views. Historically, institutionalized education has been characteristically rigid. As a testing ground of ideas, it has often lacked an orientation encouraging innovation and futuristic thinking. Its political grounding has usually been conservative.

As social psychologist Allen Wheelis points out in *The Quest for Identity* (1958), social institutions by definition tend toward solidification and protectionism. His depiction of the dialectical development of civilizations centers on the tension between the security and authoritarianism of "institutional

processes" and the dynamism and change-orientation of "instrumental processes."

The field of education seems to graphically illustrate this observation. Educational practices are primarily tradition bound. The twentieth-century reform movement, spurred by the ideas of John Dewey, A. S. Neill, and a host of critics who campaigned for change in the 1960s, challenged the structural rigidity of schooling. In more recent decades, reformers have either attempted to restore uniformity in the curriculum and in assessment of results or campaigned for the support of alternatives to the public school monopoly. The latter group comes from both the right and the left of the political spectrum.

We are left with the abiding questions: What is an "educated" person? What should be the primary purpose of organized education? Who should control the decisions influencing the educational process? Should the schools follow society or lead it toward change? Should schooling be compulsory?

Long-standing forces have molded a wide variety of responses to these fundamental questions. The religious impetus, nationalistic fervor, philosophical ideas, the march of science and technology, varied interpretations of "societal needs," and the desire to use the schools as a means for social reform have been historically influential. In recent times other factors have emerged to contribute to the complexity of the search for answers—social class differences, demographic shifts, increasing bureaucratization, the growth of the textbook industry, the changing financial base for schooling, teacher unionization, and strengthening of parental and community pressure groups.

The struggle to find the most appropriate answers to these questions now involves, as in the past, an interplay of societal aims, educational purposes, and individual intentions. Moral development, the quest for wisdom, citizenship training, socioeconomic improvement, mental discipline, the rational control of life, job preparation, liberation of the individual, freedom of inquiry—these and many others continue to be topics of discourse on education.

A detailed historical perspective on these questions and topics may be gained by reading the interpretations of noted scholars in the field. R. Freeman Butts has written a brief but effective summary portrayal in "Search for Freedom—The Story of American Education," *NEA Journal* (March 1960). A partial listing of other sources includes R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture*; S. E. Frost, Jr. and Kenneth P. Bailey, *Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education*; Harry Good and Edwin Teller, *A History of Education*; Adolphe Meyer, *An*

Educational History of the American People; Robert L. Church and Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*; Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators*; Henry J. Perkinson, *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865–1965*; Clarence Karier, *Man, Society, and Education*; V. T. Thayer, *Formative Ideas in American Education*; H. Warren Button and Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., *History of Education and Culture in America*; David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820–1980*; Joel Spring, *The American School, 1642–1990*; S. Alexander Rippa, *Education in a Free Society: An American History*; John D. Pulliam, *History of Education in America*; Edward Stevens and George H. Wood, *Justice, Ideology, and Education*; and Walter Feinberg and Jonas F. Soltis, *School and Society*.

These and other historical accounts of the development of schooling demonstrate the continuing need to address educational questions in terms of cultural and social dynamics. A careful analysis of contemporary education demands attention not only to the historical interpretation of developmental influences but also to the philosophical forces that define formal education and the social and cultural factors that form the basis of informal education.

Examining Viewpoints

In his book *A New Public Education* (1976), Seymour Itzkoff examines the interplay between informal and formal education, concluding that economic and technological expansion have pulled people away from the informal culture by placing a premium on success in formal education. This has brought about a reactive search for less artificial educational contexts within the informal cultural community, which recognizes the impact of individual personality in shaping educational experiences.

This search for a reconstructed philosophical base for education has produced a barrage of critical commentary. Those who seek radical change in education characterize the present schools as mindless, manipulative, factory-like, bureaucratic institutions that offer little sense of community, pay scant attention to personal meaning, fail to achieve curricular integration, and maintain a psychological atmosphere of competitiveness, tension, fear, and alienation. Others deplore the ideological movement away from the formal organization of education, fearing an abandonment of standards, a dilution of the curriculum, an erosion of intellectual and behavioral discipline, and a decline in adult and institutional authority.

Students of education (whether prospective teachers, practicing professionals, or interested laypeople) must examine closely the assumptions and values underlying alternative positions in order to clarify their own viewpoints.

This tri-level task may best be organized around the basic themes of purpose, power, and reform. These themes offer access to the theoretical grounding of actions in the field of education, to the political grounding of such actions, and to the future orientation of action decisions.

A general model for the examination of positions on educational issues includes the following dimensions: identification of the viewpoint, recognition of the stated or implied assumptions underlying the viewpoint, analysis of the validity of the supporting argument, and evaluation of the conclusions and action-suggestions of the originator of the position. The stated or implied assumptions may be derived from a philosophical or religious orientation, from scientific theory, from social or personal values, or from accumulated experience. Acceptance by the reader of an author's assumptions opens the way for a receptive attitude regarding the specific viewpoint expressed and its implications for action. The argument offered in justification of the viewpoint may be based on logic, common experience, controlled experiments, information and data, legal precedents, emotional appeals, and a host of other persuasive devices.

Holding the basic model in mind, readers of the positions presented in this volume (or anywhere else, for that matter) can examine the constituent elements of arguments—basic assumptions, viewpoint statements, supporting evidence, conclusions, and suggestions for action. The careful reader will accept or reject the individual elements of the total position. One might see reasonableness in a viewpoint and its justification but be unable to accept the assumptions on which it is based. Or one might accept the flow of argument from assumptions to viewpoint to evidence but find illogic or impracticality in the stated conclusions and suggestions for action. In any event, the reader's personal view is tested and honed through the process of analyzing the views of others.

Philosophical Considerations

Historically, organized education has been initiated and instituted to serve many purposes—spiritual salvation, political socialization, moral uplift, societal stability, social mobility, mental discipline, vocational efficiency, and social reform, among others. The various purposes have usually reflected the dominant philosophical conception of human nature and the prevailing assumptions about the relationship between the individual and society. At any given time, competing conceptions may vie for dominance—social conceptions, economic conceptions, conceptions that emphasize spirituality, or conceptions that stress the uniqueness and dignity of the individual, for example.

These considerations of human nature and individual-society relationships are grounded in philosophical assumptions, and these assumptions

find their way to such practical domains as schooling. In Western civilization there has been an identifiable (but far from consistent and clear-cut) historical trend in the basic assumptions about reality, knowledge, values, and the human condition. This trend, made manifest in the philosophical positions of idealism, realism, pragmatism, and existentialism, has involved a shift in emphasis from the spiritual world to nature to human behavior to the social individual to the free individual, and from eternal ideas to fixed natural laws to social interaction to the inner person.

The idealist tradition, which dominated much of philosophical and educational thought until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, separates the changing, imperfect, material world and the permanent, perfect, spiritual or mental world. As Plato saw it, for example, human beings and all other physical entities are particular manifestations of an ideal reality that in material existence humans can never fully know. The purpose of education is to bring us closer to the absolute ideals, pure forms, and universal standards that exist spiritually, by awakening and strengthening our rational powers. For Plato, a curriculum based on mathematics, logic, and music would serve this purpose, especially in the training of leaders whose rationality must exert control over emotionality and baser instincts.

Against this tradition, which shaped the liberal arts curriculum in schools for centuries, the realism of Aristotle, with its finding of the "forms" of things *within* the material world, brought an emphasis on scientific investigation and on environmental factors in the development of human potential. This fundamental view has influenced two philosophical movements in education: naturalism, based on following or gently assisting nature (as in the approaches of John Amos Comenius, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi), and scientific realism, based on uncovering the natural laws of human behavior and shaping the educational environment to maximize their effectiveness (as in the approaches of John Locke, Johann Friedrich Herbart, and Edward Thorndike).

In the twentieth century, two philosophical forces (pragmatism and existentialism) have challenged these traditions. Each has moved primary attention away from fixed spiritual or natural influences and toward the individual as shaper of knowledge and values. The pragmatic position, articulated in America by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, turns from metaphysical abstractions toward concrete results of action. In a world of change and relativity, human beings must forge their own truths and values as they interact with their environments and each other. The European-based philosophy of existentialism, emerging from such thinkers as Gabriel Marcel, Martin Buber, Martin Heidegger, and Jean-Paul Sartre, has more recently influenced education here. Existentialism

places the burdens of freedom, choice, and responsibility squarely on the individual, viewing the current encroachment of external forces and the tendency of people to “escape from freedom” as a serious diminishment of our human possibilities.

These many theoretical slants contend for recognition and acceptance as we continue the search for broad purposes in education and as we attempt to create curricula, methodologies, and learning environments that fulfill our stated purposes. This is carried out, of course, in the real world of the public schools in which social, political, and economic forces often predominate.

Power and Control

Plato, in the fourth century B.C., found existing education manipulative and confining and, in the *Republic*, described a meritocratic approach designed to nurture intellectual powers so as to form and sustain a rational society. Reform-oriented as Plato's suggestions were, he nevertheless insisted on certain restrictions and controls so that his particular version of the ideal could be met.

The ways and means of education have been fertile grounds for power struggles throughout history. Many educational efforts have been initiated by religious bodies, often creating a conflict situation when secular authorities have moved into the field. Schools have usually been seen as repositories of culture and social values and, as such, have been overseen by the more conservative forces in society. To others, bent on social reform, the schools have been treated as a spawning ground for change. Given these basic political forces, conflict is inevitable.

When one speaks of the control of education, the range of influence is indeed wide. Political influences, governmental actions, court decisions, professional militancy, parental power, and student assertion all contribute to the phenomenon of control. And the domain of control is equally broad—school finances, curriculum, instructional means and objectives, teacher certification, accountability, student discipline, censorship of school materials, determination of access and opportunity, and determination of inclusion and exclusion.

The general topic of power and control leads to a multitude of questions: Who should make policy decisions? Must the schools be puppets of the government? Can the schools function in the vanguard of social change? Can cultural indoctrination be avoided? Can the schools lead the way to full social integration? Can the effects of social class be eradicated? Can and should the schools teach values? Dealing with such questions is complicated by the increasing power of the federal government in educational matters. Congressional legislation has broadened substantially from the early land