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a new formulation: the theory of education is the theory of the relation of various educative interactions and institutions to one another and to the society at large. And within such a theory the Deweyan dilemma dissolves, as the interactions between education and the polity become more diverse and the opportunities for public influence thereby more numerous and accessible. 24

24 The commonsense use of the concept society as a means of referring to the broader context in which particular social activities take place is admittedly problematical but nevertheless helpful (Leon H. Mayhew discusses the issues in the article on "Society" in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, David L. Sils, ed., 17 vols. [New York: Macmillan and the Free Press, 1968], 14:578). My intention is to allude to the political, economic, and social institutions to which educative institutions inevitably relate, though I am well aware that, given my definition of education, political, economic, and social institutions are themselves in some respects educative.
I HAVE FOUND IT fruitful to define education as the deliberate, systematic, and sustained effort to transmit, evoke, or acquire knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, or sensibilities, as well as any outcomes of that effort. The definition stresses intentionality, though I am well aware that learning takes place in many situations where intentionality is not present. It makes room for study as well as instruction, thereby embracing the crucial realm of self-education. And it acknowledges that behavior, preferences, and tastes are involved, as well as knowledge and understanding. It sees education as a process more limited than what the sociologist would call socialization or the anthropologist enculturation, though obviously inclusive of many of the same phenomena. And it recognizes that there is often conflict between what educators are trying to
teach and what is learned from the ordinary business of living.¹

The definition is latitudinarian, in that it permits us several angles of vision with respect to the interplay of generations. Education may be viewed as intergenerational, with adults teaching children (the historian Bernard Bailyn once defined education as "the entire process by which culture transmits itself across the generations") or with children teaching adults (one thinks of immigrant families in which children, having learned the new culture relatively rapidly, become its interpreters to parents and grandparents); it may be viewed as intragenerational (recall Robert F. Berkhofer's account of Protestant missions to the American Indians in *Salvation and the Savage* [1965], which makes such apt use of the concept of acculturation); or it may be viewed as a self-conscious coming of age (so often the leitmotif of the reflective memoir or autobiography).²


individuals seek purposefully and planfully to bring about changes in their own or others' thinking, behavior, or sensibilities.

Every day in every part of the world people set out to teach something to others or to study something themselves (or to place others or themselves in situations from which they hope desirable changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, or appreciations will result). They deserve a theory specifically addressed to their problems and purposes, one that will assist them to act more intelligently, ever hopeful of the possibilities but fully aware of the limitations and risks that attend their efforts.

II

GIVEN an awareness of the multiplicity of institutions that educate, one soon perceives the tendency of such institutions at particular times and places to relate to one another in what might be called configurations of education. Each of the institutions within a configuration interacts with the others and with the larger society that sustains it and that is in turn affected by it. Configurations of education also interact, as configurations, with the society of which they are part.

Relationships among the institutions that constitute a configuration of education may be political, pedagogical, or personal. There may be overlapping lines of support and control—one thinks of the hold of Protestant missionary organizations on the families, churches, and schools of Ohio Valley towns during the nineteenth century, or of the interlocking influence of a gentile upper class on the museums, libraries, and scientific societies of eastern seaboard cities during the twentieth. Or there may be substantial pedagogical influence extending from one institution to another within the configuration—consider, for example, the spread of entertainment styles from cinema and television to churches, colleges, and adult education organizations during our own time. Or, indeed, there may be decisive personal influence deriving from the same people moving as teachers or students through more than one institution—such has always been the case with the configurations of education maintained by small sectarian communities like the Mennonites, the Hasidic Jews, and the Black Muslims.

The relationships among the institutions constituting a configuration of education may be complementary or contradictory, consonant or dissonant. Thus, for example, church and school may be subject to similar sources of control but may end up competing vigorously for funds and programs—one perceives the problem in the effort of present-day Roman Catholic theorists (and budgeters) to distinguish pastoral from educative functions in working out policies regarding parochial schools. Or they may operate in a near-perfect complementarity in which the church deals with values and the school deals with knowledge and each recognizes the role of the other—such was often the case with the Protestant church and the public school in the small towns of trans-Allegheny America during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (one need only compare the publications of the American Tract Society with the McGuffey readers).
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Or, to take another example, family and school may share a mutual concern for the child's intellectual development, but the teacher may be more demanding at the same time as the parent is more sustaining—the tension is at the heart of William Gibson's lovely drama The Miracle Worker (1960), about the education of Helen Keller. Or the teacher may attempt to liberate (by proffering intellectual, moral, or vocational alternatives) at the same time as the parent attempts to constrain—one thinks of countless instances in which parents prefer the immediate earnings of a dependent child to the continuance of a school career that would defer earnings but almost certainly increase them once independence was achieved. Or, bearing in mind Jerome Bruner's distinction between enactive, ikonic, and symbolic learning, the family may emphasize enactive and ikonic education (particularly as it mediates television education), while the school emphasizes symbolic education.

However these relationships develop, they must be ascertained in their particularity rather than assumed in some kind of generality. Institutions do manifest a certain stubborn persistence with respect to their roles and functions, and it is only reasonable to anticipate that families will be concerned with the values of their children, that schools will attempt to stimulate cognitive development, and that libraries will encourage the use of books. Yet there is all too frequently an unexpected gap between what ought to be, logically, and what is, actually: parents have been known to abandon their children; schools have often failed to honor intellect; and there are libraries more interested in possessing books than permitting people to read them.

There is obviously an inescapable relationship between the concept of the configuration of education and the concept of the community. Most utopian writers have recognized this, depicting their utopias as perfect configurations of education in which all the constituent agencies and institutions are consonant and complementary in their efforts and effects—a fact, incidentally, that makes Dewey's 1933 utopia all the more interesting. In real communities, however, such consonance and complementarity are usually obviated by the presence of alternative configurations of education and by the fact that individual educational institutions are often mediating external (and conflicting) influences.

The American experience is illuminating in this respect. In my own studies of the colonies, I found it fruitful to consider the multiple and changing relationships between families, churches, and schools (and, where present, colleges and printing presses) in a New England town (Dedham, Massachusetts), a southern county (Elizabeth City, Virginia), and two middle-colony market towns (Philadelphia and New York) as paradigmatic colonial configurations of education. For all the characteristic simplicity and localism of the era, and despite efforts in New England actually to construct a utopia, any congruence between configuration and community was at best partial. During the seventeenth century, all four commu-
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Communities were in continuing communication with the cultural centers of Great Britain and Continental Europe: families studied a didactic literature prepared and printed in London and Edinburgh; churches and schools employed pedagogical styles that derived variously from France, Switzerland, and the Dutch Republic; and amateur scientists exchanged data with their counterparts in a dozen European cities. The point is not to deny the significance of the local and indigenous; it is merely to argue that, even in the earliest phases of colonial development, educational institutions were already mediating diverse external influences and communities were not simply isolated geographical localities. By the eighteenth century all four communities had developed multiple configurations of education that only partially overlapped: one could live one's earliest years amid a cluster of white families in a Dedham neighborhood dominated by a New Light or Old Light pastor and only later enter into any kind of enduring association with other sorts of children and adults in a district school; one could spend one's childhood amid a cluster of black families in a New York neighborhood and only later enter into what was at best a set of sharply restricted relationships with white families of any kind.4

By the nineteenth century most local communities embraced multiple configurations of education and most configurations of education comprised institutions that were increasingly mediating nonlocal influences. Families in Indiana read books printed in New England hawked by colporteurs based in Cincinnati; churches and Sunday schools in Tennessee taught liturgies and disciplines developed in Europe and enforced by itinerant or absent diocesan authorities; quarter-communities on Virginia plantations were in touch with liberation movements in the North and in the West Indies; and newspapers in New York printed material transmitted by cable and telegraph from the far corners of the earth. In the twentieth century, the evolution of new educational institutions and the emergence of metropolitan and transnational communities (facilitated by the revolution in communications, notably network television) accelerated both developments, ultimately transforming the very nature of the local and the cosmopolitan. Today Americans are confronted with a more bewildering variety of configurations of education than ever, yet they are subject to a greater commonality of educational influences.

There is a final point to be made, about the relation of configurations of education to the phenomena of social stability and change. Inasmuch as educational institutions and configurations transmit culture to the young, they have played a time-honored role in maintaining social stability and continuity, though it is important to note that cultural conflict and confusion can be transmitted quite as effectively as cultural consonance and coherence (one need only examine the Lynds' chapter on the Middletown spirit in their classic studies of Muncie, Indiana, to be aware of the problem as it confronted Muncie's families, schools, and churches during the 1920s and 1930s). Moreover, educational institutions and configurations have also played an important role in stimulating and accelerating social change—one thinks of the impact

of radical pastors and printers during the era of the American Revolution or of the impact of television news (and commercials) on some of the leading social movements of our own time.\footnote{Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, \textit{Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts} (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937), chap. 12.}

With respect to such phenomena, an ecological approach to education, one that views educational institutions and configurations in relation to one another and to the larger society that sustains them and is in turn affected by them, can prove instructive. Thus, for example, what we have traditionally thought of as the extraordinary influence of the nineteenth-century common school (especially in small-town America west of the Alleghenies, where it reached a kind of apotheosis) derived not so much from the common school per se as from a configuration of education of which the common school was only one element. Ordinarily including the white Protestant family, the white Protestant church, and the white Protestant Sunday school along with the common school, it was a configuration in which the values and pedagogies of the several component institutions happened to be mutually supportive. Other contemporary configurations were fraught with internal conflict. Thus, if one considers the Indian reservation as a configuration of education, one is immediately impressed by the tensions between familial instruction and missionary instruction, between Indian values and white values, between the virtues of resistance and the virtues of accommodation.\footnote{The concept of ecology is useful because of its stress on relationships, though it carries with it a certain metaphysical freight from biology that is not relevant here.}

In sum, when seeking the sources of social stability and change (and especially of social reform and resistance to reform), one must consider the possible contributions of all the institutions that educate, bearing in mind that the decisive elements may still lie elsewhere. The precise balance, among educational institutions and between education and other factors, will vary from one historical circumstance to another, so that no easy generalizations—Marxian or otherwise—will suffice. At the very least, however, one will avoid claiming too much for education (even in the more comprehensive sense suggested here).

One final point is worthy of note. At any given time a society will tend to rely on one or another of the agencies of education as the critical instrument of deliberate nurture: Americans turned most often to the family and the church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and to the school in the nineteenth and twentieth. The institutions chosen may not be the most powerful or even the most effective; yet the very fact that they are chosen may enhance their influence, both within the configuration of which they are part and on the society they seek to affect.

\section*{III}

INDIVIDUALS come to educational situations with their own temperaments, histories, and purposes, and different individuals will obviously interact with a given configuration of education in different ways and with different outcomes. Hence, in considering the interactions and the outcomes, it is
as necessary to examine individual life histories as it is to examine the configurations themselves. An educational life history focuses on the experience of education from the perspective of the person having and undergoing the experience (the anthropologist would say, from the "ego perspective")—the experience resulting from the deliberate, systematic, and sustained efforts of others to transmit or evoke knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and sensibilities, as well as the experience involved in the person's own deliberate, systematic, and sustained efforts to acquire knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and sensibilities. 7

An educational life history will ordinarily begin with the efforts of others (parents, kin, peers, clergymen, schoolteachers) to nurture certain attitudes and behaviors and to teach certain knowledge and values, and with the individual's response to these efforts, which leads on the one hand to selective accommodations and patterns of believing, knowing, and doing, and on the other hand to an inevitable impact on those undertaking the nurturing and teaching. From the perspective of education, a key phenomenon in the process is the emergence of a characteristic life-style in the maturing individual, the core of which might be described using Gordon W. Allport's concept of the "proprium." One behavioral characteristic of a maturing individual is an increasing measure of properate striving, part of which clearly takes the form of intentional efforts to develop the self along particular lines, or, alternatively, efforts at self-education. In the Socratic sense, properate striving is to the individual what paideia is to the society; the former conceives of education as individual aspiration, the latter, as social aspiration. Both are products of the examined life. Granted this, one must be wary of portraying educational development as any simple, direct, or linear progression from mere responsiveness to properate striving, or of assuming that in the absence of properate striving there is no educational development, or of supposing that only intellectuals examine their lives. And one must always bear in mind that many factors other than education play a role in the making of individuality. 8

One key element in any educational life history is the emergence of what my colleague Hope Jensen Leichter has referred to as an educative style, a set of characteristic ways in which an individual engages in, moves through, and combines educational experiences over a lifetime. Presumably, she argues, these modes begin to be learned in early encounters with "educationally significant others," and are then rein-

---


8 Gordon W. Allport, Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 45-51. The term paideia as used here and elsewhere in these essays is especially valuable because of the several meanings it incorporates. The ancient Greeks used it variously and often interchangeably to mean "education," "culture," or "social, political, or ethical aspiration." I am using it in this instance primarily in the last sense. Given the social emphasis in these various meanings, there have been those who have considered the concept of paideia incompatible with individual freedom and growth; it might be well for them to recall that the same ancient Greeks employed the term politeia atlan as meaning both "to live" and "to partake in communal life." For them, as for John Dewey two thousand years later, individuality was impossible to define apart from some version of community life. See Werner Jaeger, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, trans. Gilbert Highet, 3 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930-44), i: 110 and passim.
forced or modified, confirmed or disconfirmed, in subsequent experience. They become, in their totality, the pattern according to which an individual approaches, undergoes, pursues, and organizes education. Benjamin Franklin lived his whole life as a series of educational projects whereby he constantly tried to shape and reshape his character and sensibilities—at least that is how he preferred to characterize his life in the Autobiography. Frederick Douglass reminisced about the ways in which, as a youngster, he systematically used his friendships with white age-mates as opportunities for learning to read. And Margaret Sanger appears to have imbibed a fierce and courageous independence from her father, which then marked all her subsequent approaches to education (and everything else). Educative style is itself subject to continued testing and change over a lifetime; yet it does provide an important element of continuity as an individual moves from one institution to another within a configuration and from one configuration to another. Furthermore, while educative style will generally come to include appropriate striving as an individual matures, educative style is the broader and more comprehensive phenomenon, comprising many other components.

An individual with a discernible educative style and a measure of educative autonomy will approach a particular educational institution or configuration of institutions with his own purposes, his own agenda, and his own habits of learning. The result will surely be a unique interaction, the outcome of which cannot be predicted by looking at either the institu-

---

necessarily a result of education, so education ideally contributes to development though all development is not necessarily a result of education.\textsuperscript{10}

An educational biography is an account or portrayal of an individual life, focusing on the experience of education. There is an obvious relationship between the concept of educational biography and the more general concept of biography itself. In fact, given a sufficiently broad definition of education and a subject with a sufficiently well-defined proprium, the two concepts merge. They have also merged in a number of classic autobiographies, notably Benjamin Franklin's, John Stuart Mill's, and Henry Adams's. In this respect, James Olney's notion of the "metaphors of self," put forward in his recently published theory of autobiography, is fruitful. Metaphors, Olney argues, "are something known and of our making, or at least of our choosing, that we put to stand for, and so to help us understand, something unknown and not of our making; they are that by which the lonely subjective consciousness gives order not only to itself but to as much of the objective reality as it is capable of formalizing and of controlling." It is important to recognize that such metaphors as they appear in autobiographies are ordinarily retrospective and hence far more clear, simple, and certain than what Olney refers to as the "objective reality" of the life. Moreover, everyone has some kind of metaphor of self, even in the absence of a written autobiography and even though the metaphor may be conceived and expressed in commonsense terms. Following Olney's formulation, an educational biographer might ask: What "metaphors of self" did the subject seem to choose or come to believe? How did these metaphors influence the subject's quest for education and response to it? And how in turn were the metaphors confirmed or modified by education? \textsuperscript{11}

IV

IN ITS MOST general sense, the process of education is on the one hand a series of transactions between an individual with a particular temperament and life history and one or more institutions of education that tend to relate to one another in configurations, and on the other hand a series of deliberate efforts toward self-development. It is a complex process, fraught with irony and contradiction. The teacher and the taught often differ in educational aim and outlook, as do both in many instances from the sponsor. What is taught is not always what is desired, and vice versa. What is taught is not always what is learned, and vice versa. And when what is taught is actually learned, it is frequently learned over lengthy periods of time and at the once, twice, and thrice removed, so that the intended and the incidental end up merging in such a


way as to become virtually indistinguishable. Moreover, there are almost always unintended consequences in education; indeed, they are often more significant than those that are intended.

Beyond this, there is always a great deal going on in any educational transaction, and at many levels. The late Jules Henry once referred to learning as "polyphasic," by which he meant that human beings have a strong innate tendency to learn more than one thing at a time. The term might be applied to teaching as well. Multiple intentions are almost always involved in education and multiple outcomes are almost always the result. Furthermore, both the intentions and the outcomes are as often contradictory as they are complementary. Education never liberates without at the same time limiting, and it never empowers without at the same time constraining. Hence, the problem is rarely one of total freedom versus total control but rather what the balance is, and to what end, and in light of what alternatives. Finally, it is almost a truism that the outcomes of education are seldom simultaneous and frequently delayed, and that the overall effect of any particular effort cannot be ascertained, so to speak, until all the results are in.  

There has been a marked tendency in recent years to conceive of educational transactions simplistically, using commonsense assumptions from everyday life or borrowing isolated theories from one or another of the behavioral sciences. There is a good deal of popular commentary, for example, that conceives of the school as the sole educator and the student as some kind of tabula rasa, and then goes on to imply that schoolbooks embody the essence of schooling, so that once the content of the schoolbooks has been ascertained the effects of schooling can be deduced. Assumptions such as these dominated the bitter controversies over education that rent Kanawha County, West Virginia, during 1974 and 1975.  

In quite different fashion a number of recent historians have attempted to draw upon modern behavioral science theories in developing a more sophisticated understanding of educational transactions, but the theories have too often been imperfectly applied or applied without adequate reference to data, leading to what are at best truncated versions of the educational process. Thus, for example, Stanley Elkins, in his pioneering study of Slavery (1959), applied Bruno Bettelheim's psychoan-

---


13 I am indebted for the notion of commonsense analysis to Fritz Heider, The Psychology of Interspersonal Relations (New York: John Wiley, 1946), chap. 4. The point is worth noting that commonsense analysis is not necessarily simple and often quite the opposite. Indeed, a number of scholars have taken commonsense knowledge, thinking, and decision making as topics for systematic investigation. See, for example, Harold Garfinkel, Studies in Ethnomethodology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), chaps. 2 and 3 and passim. One of the issues in the new ethnomethodology is the relation of resemblance—if any—between commonsense thinking and scientific thinking (see, for example, the several reviews of the Garfinkel volume in the American Sociological Review 33 [1968]: 128-30; Kenneth E. Boulding, The Image [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959]; and John Dewey, "Common Sense and Science: Their Respective Frames of Reference," The Journal of Philosophy 45 [1948]: 197-208). My own analysis of the controversy in Kanawha County, West Virginia, appeared in The 1975 World Book Year Book (Chicago: Field Enterprises Educational Corporation, 1975), pp. 41-45.
alytical interpretations of concentration camp life under the Nazis in an effort to understand the development of the American slave personality during the ante-bellum period, and concluded that the same psychological mechanism that led concentration camp inmates to see themselves as their captors saw them led nineteenth-century slaves to manifest the childish behavior represented by the Sambo stereotype. The difficulty with Elkins's analysis, however, is that it drew imperfectly on Bettelheim, focusing on only one of the several psychological mechanisms Bettelheim saw operative in the camps, and then went on to assert the applicability of that mechanism without reference to the evidence in the slave sources.14

Similarly, Michael Katz, in the imaginative essays he published as Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools (1971), relied heavily on the body of social theory addressed to the phenomenon of bureaucracy, a body of theory from which he inferred that the basic structure of an educational situation is a more powerful determinant of educational processes and outcomes than any curriculum the teachers themselves might choose to introduce. The theory of bureaucracy is obviously relevant to education—the structure of an institution will surely influence the ways in which it carries out its functions. But what Katz did was to trace the bureaucratization of urban schooling in the nineteenth century, assert that bureaucracy in the modern world had been a bourgeois invention representing "a crystallization of bourgeois social attitudes," and then infer that the decisive element in public school education over the past hundred years had been, pure and simple, an experience in planned social inequality whereby the bourgeoisie had exerted its control over the working class. Once again, the inference was made without reference to data concerning the educative experience itself.15

The tendency to conceive of educational transactions simplistically has also been manifest in recent discussions of educational theory (and policy) growing out of James S. Coleman's report on Equality of Educational Opportunity (1966). Coleman's data did indeed suggest that the effects of schooling were less potent and less uniform than had traditionally been assumed. His data did not indicate, however, that the school had no power, but rather that it was educating sequentially and synchronically along with other institutions and that its effect on different individuals was partly dependent on what happened to them in those other institutions. It is not that schooling lacks potency; it is rather that the potency of schooling must be seen in relation to the potency of other experience (some of which is educational in character) that has occurred earlier and is occurring elsewhere. The point has obvious bearing on assessments of the effects of schooling that ignore other educational factors, fail to hold them constant, or refuse to correct for them.

Presumably, it is theories of teaching and learning that will be at the heart of the effort to illumine the nature of educational transactions; yet it is abundantly clear that acculturation theories, role theories, and theories of human development

14 For the debate over Elkin's study, see Ann J. Lane, ed., The Debate over Slavery: Stanley Elkins and His Critics (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971).
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(head and hands of educators, and which, by entering in, render the performance of the educational function more enlightened, more humane, more truly educational than it was before. But there is no way to discover what is 'more truly educational' except by the continuation of the educational act itself. The discovery is never made; it is always making.”  

Two concluding observations are in order. First, though the thrust of the argument here is latitudinarian, nothing is meant to preclude the step-by-step systematic investigation of precisely defined problems that is the essence of scientific inquiry. The recognition that education is a complex phenomenon that goes on in many situations and institutions does not imply that every investigator must study everything all the time. What it does imply is that investigators must be alert to the complexity and range of education as they define their problems. The goal is not less definition but rather better definition in respect to the boundaries of problems and the particular phenomena deemed relevant and significant.

Finally, it is well to bear in mind that ideas, ideals, and values are always involved in education. They suggest certain images of human nature, of what is possible and desirable, and of how, when, and where to intervene (or not to intervene) to nurture what is possible and desirable. They alert both teacher and student to particular human potentialities and at the same time blind them to others. And they propel individuals to act—indeed, the most meaningful intellectual histories are

---

16 Many of the relevant methods are ably discussed in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, eds., The Handbook of Social Psychology, 2d ed., 5 vols. (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968), vol. 3.

precisely those that come to grips with the processes by which ideas become moving forces in the social world.

There is inevitably a gap between aspiration and achievement in education, and between ideal and reality. And there is frequently a gap between stated intentions and revealed preferences. Moreover, ideals are themselves commonly modified by circumstance. Nonetheless, they have a life and validity of their own and they influence education profoundly, however flawed their substance or imperfect their realization. They are well worth examining, debating, and improving, for there is much more to paideia than mere ideology.

V

THE ecological approach I have attempted to sketch here is neutral with respect to the aims of education. Family nurture is educative. Classroom instruction in mathematics is educative. Museum exhibits are educative. Factory apprenticeships are educative. The exchange of enthusiasms among adolescents is educative. Government propaganda is educative. And commercial advertising is educative. The point of the ecological model is to indicate the scope and complexity of the educational situation. Yet, there is no reason why values cannot be applied and judgments made. To what extent does an educational program or opportunity help individuals extend their horizons, heighten their sensibilities, and rationalize their actions? To what extent does it assist and encourage individuals to seek further education? Those familiar with Deweyan theory will recognize here the principle of growth: the end of education, Dewey asserted, is the growth of the individual human being, and there is nothing to which growth is relative save more growth and nothing to which education is subordinate save more education.18

The ecological approach also sheds additional light on the problems of progressive educators during the first three quarters of the present century. For, in actuality, two simultaneous developments dominated the American educational scene during that period: the first was the steady expansion and extension of schooling—in mission, scope, intensity, and clientele; the second was the revolution outside the schools—the revolution implicit in the rise of cinema, radio, and television and in the transformation of American family life to which they contributed. The two developments were in some respects contradictory. As my colleague Martin S. Dworkin has pointed out, they occasioned continuing tensions in the larger education of the public between the instruction of the media (in the form of popular entertainment) and the instruction of the schools—tensions with respect to style, substance, values, and aspirations. The progressives increasingly sensed the tensions—one need only consult the continuing debate between John Dewey and Walter Lippmann during the 1920s and 1930s over the sources and character of public opinion—but

they were unable to conceptualize them adequately, much less resolve them. In the end, the progressives settled on the school as the crucial lever of social reform and individual self-realization at precisely the time when the basic configuration of American education had begun to shift radically. And the theoretical dilemma in which they found themselves may well have reflected their own awareness of the partial character of their solution. In any case, there was no way to resolve the dilemma apart from a fundamental theoretical reformulation.

That reformulation is now underway, primarily in Europe and largely under the aegis of UNESCO. It is manifest in a host of reports that have appeared since 1968 under various rubrics such as "lifelong education" or "recurrent education" or "l'éducation permanente." The reports recognize that education proceeds in many situations and through many institutions other than the school, that individuals are involved in education throughout the entire life span, that any realistic national or international planning for education must take account of these fundamental facts, and that for free societies the goals of such planning must be, first, to establish structures and methods that will assist individuals throughout their lives in maintaining the continuity of their apprenticeship and training and, second, to equip each individual "to become in the highest and truest degree both the object and the instrument of his own development through the many forms of self-education." True, in perusing this literature, one finds author after author tending to dwell on the traditional categories of schooling and "adult education." But there can be no denying the concerted effort to break out of historic molds. In effect, a body of theory is emerging that joins the kind of humane aspirations and social awareness that marked the progressive movement to a realistic understanding of the nature and character of present-day education. It is a promising time for the intellectual reformulation that must go hand in hand with social and institutional change.19