

ABSTRACT

John Dewey and Mortimer Adler on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling: How Their Views Can be Incorporated Within a Christian Philosophy of Education

Claudiu Cimpan Ed.D.

Mentor: J. Wesley Null Ph.D.

In this dissertation, I explore the topics of curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling in the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler. The work evaluates the educational philosophies of these two prominent thinkers for internal consistency, and then evaluates the two philosophers from a Christian perspective. This study also seeks to incorporate their views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian educational philosophy. Finally, the project includes a practical, forward-looking aspect that connects the study to contemporary topics in curriculum, teaching, and schooling in the United States. The thesis of this dissertation is that the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling cannot be integrated fully into each other, but some of their views can be incorporated within a Christian philosophy of education. This dissertation does not attempt to synthesize the philosophies of Dewey and Adler as a whole; Dewey's pragmatism and Adler's Neo-Aristotelianism are rooted in opposing as well as

irreconcilable metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological conceptions. These differences render impossible any attempt to synthesize their views into one another. Both thinkers, however, promote specific ideas regarding curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling that can be incorporated into Christian education. Thus, this study will first evaluate these conceptions from a Christian perspective and then will include only those aspects of Dewey's and Adler's views that are compatible with Christianity.

John Dewey And Mortimer Adler On Curriculum, Teaching, And The Purpose Of
Schooling: How Their Views Can Be Incorporated Within A Christian Philosophy Of
Education

by

Claudiu Cimpean, B.A., M.S.Ed.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Larry J. Browning, Ed.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Education

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

J. Wesley Null, Ph.D., Chairperson

Michael D. Beaty, Ph.D.

Larry J. Browning, Ed.D.

Perry L. Glanzer, Ph.D.

Tony L. Talbert, Ed.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
August 2008

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2008 by Claudiu Cimpan

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
DEDICATION	viii
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Rationale, Assumptions, and Research Methodology	3
Review of Existing Research	10
A Christian Perspective: A Standard for Evaluation	15
Christian Metaphysics	19
Christian Epistemology	23
Conclusion	28
CHAPTER TWO	31
John Dewey on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling	31
John Dewey's Quest for Unity: A Journey through Idealism	31
Pragmatism: The Culmination of John Dewey's Philosophy	43
Democracy: A Pragmatic Purpose for Schooling	50
Human Occupations: A Means of Promoting Democracy	57
John Dewey on Teaching	61
John Dewey on Curriculum	70
Conclusion	76
CHAPTER THREE	78
Mortimer Adler on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling	78

Neo-Aristotelian Philosophy: Mortimer Adler's Foundation for Schooling	80
Mortimer Adler on the Myth of Perennial Progress	81
Philosophy vs. Science: Which is More Useful?	84
Democracy: Mortimer Adler's Purpose of Schooling	85
Schooling: A Means of Promoting Democracy	91
Mortimer Adler on Teaching: Seminar, Coaching, and Didactic Instruction	94
The Seminar Method of Teaching	96
The Coaching Method of Teaching	102
The Didactic Method of Teaching	108
Mortimer Adler on Curriculum	115
English Language and Literature	122
Mathematics	125
Social Studies	128
Manual Arts	134
Conclusion	136
CHAPTER FOUR	138
A Christian Evaluation of Dewey and Adler with Regard to Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling	138
A Christian Perspective on the Purpose of Schooling	139
Democracy: A Means of Serving and Loving God	149
A Christian Perspective on Curriculum	154
A Christian Perspective on Teaching	160
A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling	166
A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on the Purpose of Schooling	166

A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on Curriculum	170
A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on Teaching	174
A Christian Evaluation of Mortimer Adler's Views on the Purpose of Schooling	182
A Christian Evaluation of Mortimer Adler's Views on Curriculum	185
Conclusion	191
CHAPTER FIVE	196
Integrating and Applying the Views of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling	196
Integrating the Views of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler	197
Integrating John Dewey's Views on the Purpose of Schooling Within a Christian Perspective	197
Integrating Mortimer Adler's Views on the Purpose of Schooling Within a Christian Perspective	202
Integrating John Dewey's Views on Curriculum Within a Christian Perspective	206
Integrating Mortimer Adler's Views on Curriculum Within a Christian Perspective	210
Integrating John Dewey's Views on Teaching Within a Christian Perspective	213
Integrating Mortimer Adler's Views on Teaching Within a Christian Perspective	216
Applying the Christian Philosophy of Education Developed in this Work	222
Conclusion	228
BIBLIOGRAPHY	229

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing a dissertation is not a solitary endeavor, rather it is an activity that includes the participation of various individuals: educators, family members, friends, and colleagues. They all bring a substantial contribution alongside the author to the realization of the dissertation project, and they all deserve the author's gratitude. I am thankful not only for their contribution to the intellectual development of this work, but also for being welcomed into their lives, and for having established relationships that, I hope, will last for a life time.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. J. Wesley Null, my mentor, Dissertation Chair, and Professor. I appreciate your commitment to constantly improve yourself and your students. That sometimes requires criticism. You have been a harsh but a fair critic, and for that I am grateful. You have known how to motivate me, and how to keep me on task, to use your own words. Also, I thank you for encouraging me to find my own voice in the teaching profession, even though this has often led to us disagreeing with regard to educational matters. Finally, thank you for contaminating me with the passion for teaching.

I would like to address a special thank you to Dr. Betty Conaway, my Graduate Advisor and Professor. It was Dr. Conaway, who encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies at Baylor University. For that, I will be always grateful.

Thanks to my professors and peers for their role in shaping, challenging, and strengthening both my intellect and character.

I am also grateful to the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Michael Beaty, Dr. Larry J. Browning, Dr. Perry L. Glanzer, and Dr. Tony L. Talbert. Thank you for accepting to work with me, and for your insights and challenges that have contributed to the improvement of my dissertation.

A special thanks goes to my parents, who have always challenged me to further my education. I thank them for their prayers, and unconditional love and support. I thank them for their wisdom in raising me. They knew how to encourage my development into an individual who is intellectually independent. I also thank them for instilling in me strong moral habits. Without these traits, I would have never been able to accomplish what I have.

I would also like to thank my friends. I am especially grateful to Dr. Ioan Stir and his wife Mihaela for helping me come to Baylor, and for their support throughout my graduate studies. I would also thank John and Diana Tomoiaga, and Sergiu Tofanel, my friends from Waco. I will cherish their friendship for the rest of my life.

My graduate studies were indeed challenging, but also fulfilling. I have grown both personally and professionally. I am grateful for my experiences at Baylor, which I will treasure as long as I live.

To Ioan and Raveca, my parents

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This dissertation explores the topics of curriculum, teaching methods, and the purpose of schooling in the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler. The work evaluates the educational philosophies of these two prominent thinkers for internal consistency, and then evaluates the two philosophers from a Christian perspective. This study also seeks to include their views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian worldview. Finally, the project includes a practical, forward-looking aspect that connects the study to contemporary topics in curriculum, teaching, and schooling in the United States.

The thesis of this dissertation is that the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling cannot be integrated fully into each other, but some of their views can be incorporated within a Christian philosophy of education. This dissertation does not attempt to synthesize the philosophies of Dewey and Adler as a whole; Dewey's pragmatism and Adler's Neo-Aristotelianism are rooted in opposing as well as irreconcilable metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological conceptions. These differences render impossible any attempt to fully synthesize their views into one another. Both thinkers, however, promote specific ideas regarding curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling that can be included within a Christian educational philosophy. Indeed, not all of their educational views can be integrated within the Christian perspective.

Thus, this study will first evaluate these conceptions from a Christian perspective and then will include only those aspects of their work that are compatible with Christianity.

This dissertation provides a unique contribution to American educational scholarship in three main ways. First, it is the first dissertation to address only Dewey and Adler, by themselves, in-depth. Second, this work is unique because it evaluates the educational ideas of Dewey and Adler from a Christian perspective. Third, this dissertation is unique because it draws upon the ideas of Dewey and Adler to evaluate present educational concerns. Moreover, this study is interdisciplinary because it draws upon and contributes to the fields of philosophy of education, history of education, curriculum theory, teacher education, and educational psychology. This work will benefit university and college professors who are interested in education, curriculum, and philosophy. This study also has relevance to public school teachers, graduate and undergraduate students in education, and public school administrators. In a more general sense, this work seeks to benefit all people who are interested in school reform.

Statement of the Problem

This study attempts to integrate the educational philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler within a Christian perspective. Specifically, I will incorporate, within a Christian worldview, Dewey's and Adler's ideas with regard to curriculum, teaching methods, and the purpose of schooling. Focusing specifically on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling provides boundaries for the scope of this study, while allowing for in-depth investigation into these three crucial aspects within educational thought and practice. The work seeks to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What are the philosophies and educational theories of Dewey and Adler?

2. What are Dewey's and Adler's perspectives regarding the curriculum?
3. What are Dewey's and Adler's perspectives regarding teaching methods?
4. What are Dewey's and Adler's perspectives regarding the purpose of schooling?
5. What rationale does each thinker offer in support of his perspective?
6. Are the views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling presented by Dewey and Adler compatible, or is a synthesis of these two thinkers impossible?
7. How should Dewey's and Adler's views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling be evaluated from a Christian perspective?
8. Can Dewey's and Adler's views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling be included within a Christian perspective?
9. How can a Christian perspective that includes the ideas of Dewey and Adler be applied to K-12 schooling and the profession of teaching in the 21st century?

Rationale, Assumptions, and Research Methodology

Why write a dissertation on the educational philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer J. Adler? First, I believe that an analytical study that investigates the educational philosophies of Dewey and Adler is relevant to the 21st century because understanding the past (1) facilitates an understanding of present educational matters, and (2) allows educators to anticipate and make better decisions about future educational dilemmas and challenges. I ground the previous statements in John Pulliam's (1991) and Herbert Kliebard's (2004) argument that there is nothing new under the sun with regard to educational matters. As these authors have shown, K-12 as well as university

curriculum periodically undergoes a cyclical process of reformation. Second, Dewey's philosophy of education is so influential today in American schools that, according to historian Burton Weltman (1995), any educational reformer must consider Dewey's ideas prior to proposing his or her own. Third, Adler's educational philosophy is relevant to curriculum, teaching, and K-12 schooling today because of its emphasis on the human soul, morality, and character education. An education that emphasizes the enrichment of the soul and the strengthening of the moral fiber of human beings constitutes a precondition to a joyful human existence. Such education is needed today more than ever, which is why Adler is an appropriate person to include in this study. Fourth, I evaluate the ideas of these two thinkers from a Christian perspective. A discussion of Christianity is relevant to 21st century K-12 schooling because religion is closely related to most, if not all, of human life (Nord, 1995, p. 378). According to Warren A. Nord, religion and history are inextricably intertwined (Nord, 1995, p. 204). If religion and history are intimately connected (as Nord suggests) and curriculum and history are closely related (as Pulliam and Kliebard believe), then curriculumists are forced to take religion seriously. Therefore, religion, specifically Christianity, deserves an important, rather than a marginal, role in American public school curriculum and teaching. Fifth, this dissertation includes a practical dimension. In the final section, I will discuss how the integrationist philosophy that I attempt to develop can perhaps be implemented within an American public school context.

I would now like to expand on the rationale as well as the assumptions upon which this dissertation is written. As mentioned previously, this dissertation is a

comparative analysis, in which I draw upon the research methodologies of both history and philosophy (Rury, 1993; Neustadt, 1986).

Echoing the Biblical conception inherent in the book of Ecclesiastes that nothing is new under the sun, John Martin Rich, a former professor of educational philosophy at The University of Texas at Austin, states: “Today’s educational reform is part of a process that began many years ago. Current reform ... is indebted to a long and colorful history that can be ignored at our peril” (Sellars, 1994). Rich further states, “While today’s reformers may wear flashy shoes, they still stand on the shoulders of great thinkers of the past” (Sellars, 1994). I am conducting this study because I know that all of our decisions are influenced by prominent thinkers from the past.

John Pulliam (1991), who embraces a similar conception in his book *History of Education in America*, writes that “much of what is regarded as new or innovative in education has a long historical record ... without a knowledge of history, teachers find themselves reinventing the wheel.” Moreover, Pulliam (1991) affirms that, in the 20th century, American curriculum underwent a cyclical movement. Pulliam states,

In the 1950s, Sputnik and the NDEA produced disciplined-centered curriculum stressing science, mathematics, and foreign languages. With the civil rights movement and a demand for equal educational opportunity came a child-centered program with emphasis placed on ethical, social, and multicultural subjects. This was followed by a “back-to-basics” movement with more formalized instruction and strict accountability. Within a period of only thirty years, popularity has shifted from Dewian progressives, to strict academicians, to social reconstructionists, to conservative essentialism.

Before Pulliam, Herbert M. Kliebard (2004), in *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*, identified in the first half of the 20th century a similar cyclical evolution of curriculum reform. Kliebard mentioned four distinct interest groups with an

explicit agenda for curriculum reform. Each of these groups expressed its own conceptions regarding what should be taught, to whom, why, how, and when.

This dissertation assumes the conception expressed by Pulliam and Kliebard that the American curriculum is cyclical in nature. Therefore, by studying American educational figures from the past, present educators can better understand our current educational situation. American education in the 21st century did not develop in a vacuum. Curriculum, teaching, and schooling are inextricably linked to the work of past educational thinkers and practitioners. A better understanding of the past leads not only to a better understanding of the present, but also to a better approach to the future. Furthermore, the cyclical nature of curriculum reform allows educators to predict future educational developments, problems, and solutions. However, the cyclical nature of curriculum evolution is broad, general in nature. Specific economic, social, political, and cultural developments will nevertheless impinge upon any reformer's ability to understand, predict, and address educational problems wisely.

This work adheres to the interpretation of Dewey provided by some of his contemporaries and colleagues such as William Chandler Bagley and I. L. Kandel. J. Wesley Null (2003), in his book *A Disciplined Progressive Educator: The Life and Career of William Chandler Bagley*, argues that Bagley is a more accurate interpreter of Dewey than the progressive scholar William Heard Kilpatrick. Building on the work of Bagley and Kandel, this dissertation seeks to demonstrate that Dewey's theories with regard to the curriculum, teaching methods, and the purpose of schooling occupy the middle ground within the educational arena. In other words, Dewey is an integrationist. With regard to curriculum, I define an integrationist as someone who focuses on

developing a curriculum that integrates classical philosophical knowledge and modern scientific knowledge—to the extent that this task is possible.

This dissertation also seeks to demonstrate that Dewey provides an integrationist vision regarding teaching methods. Dewey emphasizes the processes of education and pedagogy in equal measure. Avihail S. Hadari (1983), in his dissertation *Education and Pedagogy: The Political Limitations of Educational Reform*, discusses the concepts of education and pedagogy. Hadari affirms that the process of education emphasizes the role of the student, his/her freedom, interests, desires, and instincts. He further states that, from a pedagogical perspective, the teacher is an authority regarding the transmission of culture, also referred to as the wisdom of the race.

With regard to the purpose of schooling, Dewey believes that his theory of free student inquiry should be complemented with the conception that the educational process must have an end in view, but not a final *telos* or ultimate end. I believe this is a significant point that separates Dewey from Adler. I present a lengthy discussion of this matter in Chapter II.

To interpret Dewey as an integrationist is rare. To assume the middle ground is probably the most difficult task. For this reason, integrationist scholars and interpreters of Dewey, such as Bagley and Kandel, were marginalized. During the 20th century, his most well-known interpreters preferred to take him to extremes. Among them, the most prominent is William Heard Kilpatrick (1918), the author of the well-known pragmatic article entitled “The Project Method: The Use of the Purposeful Act in the Educative Process.” According to Wesley Null (2003), in the Project Method, Kilpatrick argues that all learning should be student centered, or in other words driven by the needs and

interests of each student. Thus, the teacher assumes a marginal role in the creation and implementation of the curriculum. This interpretation of Dewey is not necessarily correct. In the second half of the 20th century, Lawrence A. Cremin (1961), in his book *The Transformation of the School*, and Alan Ryan (1995), in his book *John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism*, argue that Dewey was too narrowly interpreted by progressives such as Kilpatrick. Consequently, Cremin and Ryan also argue for an understanding of Dewey that is integrationist in nature.

The purpose of this dissertation, however, is to do more than provide an interpretation of Dewey as an integrationist. The aim, moreover, extends beyond the rehabilitation of Dewey by showing how he distanced himself from the excesses of the progressives. This dissertation seeks to assess whether Dewey's integrationist perspective with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling is a philosophically viable synthesis that has practical value for K-12 schooling today. Or, as opposed to Dewey, should the profession of teaching embrace and implement the works of Mortimer Adler, a philosopher and educational theorist who, in many ways, provides a philosophy quite different from Dewey's?

Mortimer Adler reacted passionately against the excesses of progressivism. He argued that progressivism abandoned the values inherent in the classical philosophical tradition set forth by Plato and Aristotle. Adler's alternative to progressivism is perennialist education in the liberal arts, an educational perspective promoted by the Paideia group, which was founded by Adler in the 1980s. In his dissertation entitled *Debating Dewey: The Social Ideas of American Educators since World War II, An Examination of Arthur Bestor, Jerome Brunner, Paul Goodman, John Goodlad and*

Mortimer Adler, Burton Weltman (1995) compares the “intellectual background, professional development, and social and educational ideas” of the above five thinkers against those of John Dewey. Weltman concludes that the educational ideas of these theorists, Adler included, failed to exert an enduring influence over American education due to their inability “to resolve their ongoing debates with Dewey” (1995, iii). Although an influential philosopher and educator himself, Adler was compelled to battle the ubiquitous phantasm of Dewey prior to presenting his own ideas. Besides combating Dewey’s ideas, Adler had to argue against Dewey’s influence. During Dewey’s lifetime, educators employed Dewey’s terminology even though they differed with him in substance. People who held many different views often referenced Dewey’s work to make competing arguments. In other words, Dewey’s work was used by people from many different perspectives. After Dewey’s death, Dewey’s educational philosophy has remained highly influential both in theory and practice (Zilversmit, 1993).

This dissertation assumes Weltman’s conclusion that Dewey’s educational philosophy is intellectually appealing and, as a result, has been ingrained at various levels within American curriculum, teaching, and schooling. Thus, any project meant to influence the educational status quo must wrestle with Dewey’s philosophy, its practical implications, and its influences. Put another way, to be influential in American education, any educational reformer must tackle Dewey. Therefore, this dissertation attempts to contribute to the conversation about Dewey’s and Adler’s educational philosophy regarding curriculum, teaching methods, and the purpose of schooling.

One way to view the similarities and distinctions between Dewey and Adler is to consider the different conceptions of humanism that grow out of their work. In *The*

Reach of Contemporary Humanism, Gardner H. Fair (1999) presents the conflict between two versions of humanism: classical humanism and naturalistic humanism. The former, supported by well-known moral philosopher Alasdair C. MacIntyre, assumes that the principles of science are objective and thus should rule over human existence. The latter, which is supported by Dewey, rejects any pretensions of absoluteness on the part of science. Fair sides with Dewey in his debate with classical humanists.

The antagonism between the philosophies of classical humanism and naturalistic humanism, espoused in Fair's work, seems to suggest that any educational theories derived from them would be incompatible. The incompatibility would be foundational, residing in their very core, or essence. Therefore, I will not attempt to integrate within a Christian perspective Dewey's and Adler's educational theories as a whole. Rather, I will integrate within a Christian worldview specific ideas of Dewey and Adler on curriculum, teaching methods, and the purpose of schooling.

Review of Existing Research

In this section on the review of existing research, I will discuss additional dissertations, articles, and books that address the philosophies of Dewey and Adler. In particular, I will review dissertations that have been written on these two men. I will specifically discuss dissertations that reflect the implementation of Dewey's and Adler's perspectives into the realm of K-12 schooling.

For example, in his dissertation entitled *The Humanist Enterprise from John Dewey to Carl Sagan: A Study of Science and Religion in American Culture*, Stephen P. Weldon (1997) presents the development of the humanist movement in America from its inception in the early 1910s to the mid-1980s. Weldon affirms that American humanists

attempted to create a “religion without God” around the principles of science. For these humanist thinkers, the larger, all encompassing domain of science comprises the ideals of democracy, freedom, community, honesty, and responsibility. Weldon also provides a useful introduction and an in-depth discussion of Dewey’s philosophy of naturalistic humanism.

Understanding Dewey’s philosophy of naturalistic humanism is important for this dissertation because Dewey’s theories regarding curriculum, teaching methods, and the purpose of schooling emerge from his larger body of work in philosophy. In a similar fashion, Adler’s broader philosophy serves as the foundation for his educational theories as well. As mentioned previously, the work of Gardner H. Fair (1999) entitled *The Reach of Contemporary Humanism* discusses two versions of humanism: classical humanism and naturalistic humanism. Dewey adheres to the former while Adler to the latter.

A direct confrontation between Dewey as a supporter of naturalistic humanism and Adler, an exponent of classical humanism, is presented in Fred W. Beuttler’s (1995) dissertation entitled *Organizing an American Conscience: The Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion*. Beuttler discusses the organization of a conference intended to mobilize American intellectuals for defending democracy and for fighting against Nazism. The conference had as its aim the creation of a universal system of morality upon which to justify the preference of democracy over totalitarianism. The inclusive nature of the conference gathered religious leaders, philosophers, and scientists who represented various perspectives. The conference occasioned the debate between Mortimer Adler, who supported a neo-Aristotelian foundation regarding morality and democracy, and Sidney Hook, a prominent follower of Dewey who represented scientific pragmatism.

The latter, during his doctoral studies at Columbia University, was a student of Dewey. Thus, for the period of thirty years when the Commission met, Adler's ideas clashed with those of Dewey. The Commission failed because it was unable to provide "a one world ethic," meaning an overall moral philosophy. Beuttler presents Dewey's and Adler's efforts toward reaching a unified philosophical vision. There seems to be a foundational discrepancy between Dewey's and Adler's philosophies. Beuttler's work shapes my dissertation because he shows the impossibility of synthesizing Dewey's and Adler's philosophies as a whole.

In *Holism in the Classroom: R. S. Crane and the "Chicago Method" of Teaching* (McKeon, Hutchins, Aristotelians; Illinois), Robert H. Heim (1984) discusses the influence of the Chicago School teaching philosophy. Heim focuses on the ideas developed by Crane, an American literary critic and a leading figure of the Neo-Aristotelian Chicago School. He also addresses the contribution to the field of curriculum by thinkers such as Hutchins and Adler, Crane's associates. Heim's dissertation is relevant to my study because it provides an in-depth discussion of Adler's views on curriculum. However, Heim's presentation of Adler's ideas regarding the curriculum is insufficient because he mainly focuses on the conceptions developed by Crane. Therefore, a more well-developed discussion regarding Adler's perspective on curriculum is necessary. I seek to provide this more well-developed discussion of Adler's views on curriculum in Chapter III.

In *John Dewey's Process of Inquiry as the Basis of his Educational Model*, Joseph T. Joyce (1980) provides some discussion of the difference between Dewey and Adler regarding curriculum. The main purpose of Joyce's work is to investigate the

confrontation between Dewey and Robert Maynard Hutchins, an educational philosopher and former president of the University of Chicago. The underlying difference between the two lies in their competing ideas regarding the origin and identification of traditional values. Dewey roots his philosophy regarding curriculum in his theory of inquiry. For him, values originate in experience and are constantly reconstructed by inquiry. Hutchins and Adler base their philosophy regarding curriculum and teaching on universal principles of knowledge, intrinsic values, and ultimately natural law.

In Joyce's conception, Dewey's model is deficient due to his failure to develop the notion of intrinsic value. Moreover, Joyce (1980) believes that Dewey's inquiry process and scientific method are inadequate for addressing human value problems. However, Joyce believes that Dewey's model is useful if it can be compensated with Hutchins' and Adler's view regarding common principles of knowledge and intrinsic values. Joyce's dissertation is relevant to my study because it attempts to offer a synthesis of the views of Dewey and Adler. However, Joyce's emphasis on Adler is merely secondary to his main preoccupation with Hutchins. Therefore, a more well-developed discussion regarding Adler's perspective on curriculum is necessary. Joyce's work is useful in developing this larger discussion of Adler. As stated previously, I seek to provide this more well-developed discussion of Adler's views on curriculum in Chapter III.

In *Education and Pedagogy: The Political Limitations of Educational Reform*, Avihail S. Hadari (1983) discusses the concepts of education and pedagogy. Hadari defines education as the process that emphasizes the free development of the child's abilities, interests, desires, and instincts. He presents pedagogy as the process that

emphasizes the imposition by the teacher of cultural values and the wisdom of the race. Authors from Plato to Dewey have wrestled with these two concepts in their attempt to provide an adequate philosophy of schooling. Hadari proposes his own perspective in which this dichotomy is resolved. He believes that schooling must include an initial pedagogical moment that should subsequently be transcended by the educative moment, when he says the cultural, moral, and political values are exposed as arbitrary. In this dissertation, I build upon Hadari's understanding of Dewey's views with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. Indeed, Dewey integrates education and pedagogy within his educational philosophy. In Chapter II, I assess whether his project of integrating the two is adequate.

Mortimer Adler's Views on Higher Education, a dissertation written by Scott L. Witon (1985), is an analytical study regarding the life and academic career of Mortimer Adler. The author specifies from the start that he does not intend to compare Adler's views with those of other educational philosophers. The dissertation begins by presenting a biography of Adler. Subsequently, Adler's philosophy of education, along with its implications regarding the curriculum, is discussed. The study is specifically tailored for higher education because it presents Adler's views on liberal arts colleges. Witon's study, however, is relevant to my dissertation because it presents Adler's views on the purpose of education and curriculum. My dissertation builds upon Witon's work because I am focusing specifically on K-12 schooling.

In the next section, I will present a Christian perspective, which constitutes the standard for evaluating the views of Dewey and Adler.

A Christian Perspective: A Standard for Evaluation

In order to interpret and evaluate the views of Dewey and Adler from a Christian perspective, I must address the question of what a Christian perspective entails. Several questions are significant. Why a Christian perspective on education? Should Christianity, faith, revelation have a role in the current academic debate? Is Christianity not outdated and obsolete? Steven Pinker (2006), talking about the role of religion in academia states, “For us to magnify the significance of religion as a topic equivalent in scope to all science, all of culture, or all of world history and current affairs, is to give it far too much prominence. It is an American anachronism, I think, in an era in which the rest of the West is moving beyond it” (p. 10). At the opposing end, George Marsden, in his book *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (1997) and later in an essay entitled “Beyond Progressive Scientific Humanism” (2002), militates for pluralism in the academic debate. Therefore, all worldviews, Christianity included, should participate in a fair dialogue within the academia. Going beyond Marsden’s proposal, John Sommerville (2006), in his work *The Decline of the Secular University*, affirms that religion is essential to academic discourse. According to Sommerville, religion provides an indispensable understanding regarding what it means to be human. Sommerville further states that the concept of humanity assumes “coherent meanings in a religious discourse” (p. 31). Whether one realizes it or not, scientific or naturalistic discourse is shaped, or informed, by a conception of humanity, which is not proven, or justified, by science. Scientists choose to pursue one avenue of investigation to the detriment of another based on moral and religious conceptions. Moreover, a particular scientific experiment is abandoned when moral and religious conceptions are disregarded. For

example, regardless of the scrupulous compliance of the Nazi scientists with the principles of scientific investigation, morality and religion, not science, demanded an end to their experiments. This dissertation embraces Marsden's and Sommerville's ideas regarding the need for the participation of religion, specifically Christianity, in the academic debate.

A meaningful discussion of a Christian perspective on education, the standard for evaluating the educational philosophies of Dewey and Adler, requires an understanding of philosophy in general and Christian philosophy in particular. According to Michael J. Peterson, "philosophy is both a *subject matter* and an *activity*" (2001, p. 13). As *subject matter*, philosophy engages questions pertaining to metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. A brief consideration of these three branches within philosophy helps to explain the Christian perspective that I will use to evaluate the views of Dewey and Adler.

Metaphysics examines ontological questions such as "What is the nature of reality?" and "What exists?" (Peterson, 2001, p. 14). Metaphysics inquires into spiritual matters as well as cosmological, also known as material, questions. Among its subjects of investigation are the following: the existence and nature of God, the existence of an eternal world of ideas, the nature of human beings, the existence of the soul, the nature of the time and space continuum, the existence and nature of the cosmos, and the principle of causality. The responses provided to these questions vary to a large extent within the philosophical community. The various metaphysical perspectives on the nature of reality entail divergent views on educational theory and practice. Metaphysics exerts a profound influence over the curriculum and the purpose of schooling. The metaphysical

conception of man as a spiritual being, who in order to be happy must submit to immutable moral laws, shapes a vision for the curriculum which differs significantly from a curricular vision entrenched in a naturalistic worldview. Subjects that presuppose religion, theology, and spirituality, which are absent in the latter curriculum, are essential to a curriculum that is rooted in a metaphysical worldview. When metaphysics is taken into account, the purpose of education also differs significantly. An educated person's goal becomes one of fulfilling his or her eternal destiny rather than to fight an animalistic battle for survival.

Epistemology is the branch of philosophy that examines the nature of knowledge. Epistemology examines questions such as: How do humans know?, What is the nature of knowledge?, What are the sources of knowledge?, Are there different kinds of knowledge?, How is knowledge justified?, and What is the truth? Epistemology also exerts a profound influence over curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. A theory of knowledge that considers the senses as the only legitimate means for acquiring knowledge will promote a curriculum that is only scientific and practical in nature. Theological, religious, and spiritual studies will be discarded as inadequate. Divine revelation, an inner sense of morality, and intuition are considered illegitimate sources for knowledge. Teaching will then emphasize the scientific method and the physical exploration of the environment. Pedagogy will simultaneously reject the spiritual search for identity or the exploration of the soul. Regarding the purpose of education, a materialist-naturalist conception of reality does not include among the existential aims of human beings anything pertaining to religion, spirituality, or the soul. At the opposite end, a theory of knowledge rooted in a metaphysical view of absolute morality promotes

religious, spiritual, and philosophical studies. From the perspective of a metaphysical view of curriculum, questions about intuition, insight, and divine revelation must be directed, guided, and encouraged by teachers. Spiritual goals become part of what human beings exist for, and the curriculum must take this matter into account.

Axiology is the branch of philosophy that studies the value of reality; its main question being: “What is valuable?”. Axiology encompasses the fields of Ethics and Aesthetics. As human beings, regardless of our choice to act or not to act on specific occasions, we nevertheless interact with the physical environment (both inorganic and organic) and with each other (within the social environment). Doing is part of our lot. We all experience a practical life. We have no choice but to act in the world. Ethics informs and regulates human action, activity, and behavior. Ethics is what allows us to pursue our purposes. Ethics examines what is right and good. For example, in his book *Grappling with the Good: Talking about Religion and Morality in Public Schools*, Robert Kunzman (2006) affirms that the realm of Ethics extends beyond moral obligations into investigations into questions about the good life. Therefore, according to Kunzman’s understanding of ethics, one must go beyond fulfilling one’s moral duties into examining how one should live a happy life. Ethics exerts a profound influence over curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. A curriculum that reflects an absolute ethical system is different from one that embodies the idea that all ethical systems are relative. The latter will adopt a neutral stance toward the various ethical systems, while the former will inculcate the precepts of absolute ethics. In the former, the teacher is an ethical authority, while in the latter the student is free to choose between the various ethical viewpoints presented. The purpose of education changes based on the ethical principles

adopted. For example, one's relationship with God manifested through prayer or other liturgical means constitutes an ethical obligation for a Christian, but not for a deist.

Aesthetics, another aspect of axiology, examines beauty. Among the objects of aesthetics are the creation and appreciation of beautiful objects. Aesthetics is represented in the curriculum by music and the arts. Now that the categories for assessing philosophical worldviews have been presented, I will proceed with discussing a specifically Christian perspective on metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology.

Christian Metaphysics

This study embraces Peterson's approach of entrenching the Christian perspective in the doctrine of creation. Peterson's views are largely in keeping with those of George Marsden. Marsden (1997) affirms that the doctrine of creation is at the root of Christianity. In Marsden's words:

In my view there is no Christian teaching of more consequence for scholarship than that 'God created the heavens and the earth.' It is this doctrine that sets Christian perspectives against the purely naturalistic viewpoints which dominate mainstream academia. (p. 40)

Christianity acknowledges two ontological realities: God and His creation. This metaphysical conception is presented in The Apostle's Creed: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth..." (Peterson, 2001, p. 96). God is a self-sufficient Being, perfect, and independent of His creation. In other words, God's happiness does not depend on His creation. Therefore, God was not constrained to create the reality outside Himself. God created everything: the spiritual reality—human and heavenly beings and the physical reality—and the cosmos. The Christian God is a spiritual reality who exists outside space and time. Space and time are His creation.

Therefore, unlike everything else which exists outside God, God by Himself does not have a beginning.

God's creation is neither Divine nor part of the Divine. Everything that exists outside God was created out of nothing. Christians adhere to the doctrine of *ex nihilo* creation. Christianity is different from pantheism, a worldview that affirms that God and the universe are one. Unlike Neo-Platonism, which teaches that the cosmos constitutes an emanation of God's being, Christianity preaches that God is utterly distinct from His creation. Moreover, Christianity maintains that God is omnipotent. He is sovereign over His creation. The Christian perspective rejects Cosmic Dualism, a conception teaching that the world is the battleground of the struggle between equally powerful good and evil forces. For Christians, the triumph of Good is inexorable. Christians believe in a personal God. Indeed, there is a transcendent aspect of God but also an immanent aspect: His personhood. God is not an impersonal world of ideas like the Platonic world of Forms. He has a center of consciousness. He has a will, emotions, and reason. Nevertheless, God's nature is more than personal being. His transcendent aspect is united with His immanent aspect, His personhood, into a substance that transcends human understanding. The immanent aspect of God is best reflected in Jesus Christ.

The Christian God has a triune nature. God consists of three persons: The Father, The Son (Jesus Christ), and The Holy Spirit. God is simultaneously three persons and one person. The concept of Trinity is mysterious, above human rational understanding. The Christian God also is a relational and a loving Being. He created human beings because He wanted to share His love. History is the arena in which God manifests His

love for humanity. In order to understand the relationship between God and man, one must comprehend the Christian conception of human nature.

According to a Christian worldview, human beings bear the image of God. Theologians have wrestled with the concept of *Imago Dei* and have interpreted it in various ways. Common to the plethora of interpretations, however, is the idea that humans are unique in the order of creation. The object of this study is not to discuss the rich theological understandings regarding the concept of *Imago Dei*. Therefore, I will present the more common interpretations regarding this concept. Humans, like God, are beings endowed with reason, emotions, and a will. Human beings have the ability to create. However, unlike God, whose abilities are infinite, human beings are endowed with finite capacities.

Also, like their creator, human beings have a singular center of consciousness. There is something private and unique in every human being to which nobody else can have access. The singular center of consciousness cannot be shared with anyone else but God. This interiority is the I or what Hegel (1977) calls self-consciousness. Moreover, human beings share their Creator's social nature. God is a social being, whose social nature is evident in His Triune character. Human happiness cannot be achieved in complete isolation, but rather in relationship with God and other human beings.

A central principle in Christian metaphysics is the doctrine of the fall of man. At the end of the process of creation, God declared that his creation, as a whole, was good. However, man fell when Adam and Eve chose to do evil. Consequently, human nature became corrupt, depraved, and fallen. Even worse, human beings were now unable to save themselves from their fallen state. This is the Christian doctrine of the depravation

of man. Therefore, man depended on God for his salvation. This is the doctrine of redemption.

Reinhold Niebuhr, in *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, which he presented as the Gifford Lectures between 1938 and 1940, discusses a Christian conception of human nature. According to Niebuhr, “Man is ... a created and finite existence in both spirit and body” (1941, p. 12). Human beings are completely dependent upon God’s grace for experiencing a fulfilling, meaningful existence. Humans are indeed dependent on God for their happiness, but we are also free. Augustine says that in the human soul there is an aspect of humanity that has the shape of God. Only God can fill, or fulfill, this aspect of man’s existence. Soren Kierkegaard states that God offers humans a self that they should embrace if they want to be happy. He further affirms that humans have the possibility to reject God’s offer; if we so choose, we can reject God’s salvation.

According to Niebuhr, a Christian understanding of human nature differs from the classical idea inherent in Greek tragedy. For ancient Greeks, man’s existence is engulfed by a perennial internal struggle. The human being will never find peace or meaning within his or her existence. Humans are at the mercy of competing deities as Dionysius, the representative of the vitalistic principles of life (i.e. the passions) is in constant struggle with Zeus, the god of reason. As Niebuhr put it, for human beings “There is no solution, only a tragic solution for the conflict between the vitalities of life and the principle of measure. Zeus remains God. But one is prompted to both admiration and pity to those who defy him” (1941, p. 11). Moreover, a Christian view of human nature is at odds with modern conceptions on the nature of man. According to Niebuhr, modern

man discards with the notion of sin and adheres to an optimistic, or “progressive,” perspective on humanity.

Although, as a consequence of the fall of man, the cosmos was affected by man’s sin, it still retains its basic value. The value inherent in the physical world implies that humans are responsible before God for their interaction with nature. Moreover, God explicitly mandated humans to have dominion over the world. To have dominion entails the ability to control and administer the environment. This requires an understanding of nature. Therefore, the physical world must be knowable and intelligible. The Christian ideas of a real and good physical reality are at odds with the Idealist, Gnostic, and Docetist conceptions, which view matter as evil and illusory.

Christian Epistemology

A Christian perspective on curriculum, teaching, and schooling affirms that truth is absolute. Christian metaphysical truths were presented in the previous section of this dissertation; moral truths will be discussed in the next section. Thus far, I have presented the Christian assertion that God and the cosmos are real and can be known by human beings. The nature of God can be known to a certain extent. The world is rational and intelligible. According to a Christian perspective, God is a perfect being whose knowledge is absolute, and infallible. Unlike God, man’s knowledge is fallible; he is an imperfect being susceptible to error. Moreover, man has an innate desire to search for the truth. As Pope John Paul II has stated in his encyclical letter *Fides et Ratio* (1998), “God has placed in the human heart a desire to know the truth—in a word, to know himself—so that, by knowing and loving God, men and women may also come to the fullness of truth about themselves” (p. 3).

I will now discuss the various kinds of truths embraced by a Christian perspective. The most common are scientific truths, logical and mathematical truths, and the truths of faith. Humans reach scientific truths through observation and experiment. The scientific method requires the utilization of both senses and reason; it is practical and reflective. In scientific experimentation, one's interaction with the physical environment is supplemented by thinking about this interaction. The scientist proposes a hypothesis. He then tests the hypothesis within the physical environment. The scientist then reflects upon the experiment and, if the experiment does not confirm the hypothesis, proposes a new hypothesis. This new hypothesis is then tested in the same manner as the first one. If the hypothesis is confirmed, the scientist will repeat the experiment. If the experiment yields the same results after an adequate number of repetitions, the tested theory becomes scientific truth. A Christian perspective does not reject scientific truths. These are considered useful, indeed essential, for humankind. However, according to a Christian worldview, scientific truths are not absolute truths. They are viable truths, meaning truths that can be improved.

In the second category of truths embraced by a Christian perspective are logical and mathematical truths. These truths are developed through abstract reasoning. They cannot be inferred from any source other than reason. In Plato's (1968) *Republic*, Socrates differentiates between mathematical and dialectical (or purely rational) truths. The former are valid arguments, logically deduced from axioms that were never tested by reason. The latter are sound arguments because they are grounded and tested in their entirety by reason. According to Socrates, purely rational truths are reached when one finds the first principle. The first principle is proven in itself; it does not need rational

justification. Subsequently, one can deduce the whole knowledge from the first principle. For Christians, absolute truth exists. A Christian perspective does not reject this quest for a rationally justified absolute truth. Christianity endorses the rational assertion that it would be irrational to cease the human logical quest for absolute knowledge, truth, and goodness. As long as the logical possibility of finding this rational truth exists, one can legitimately engage in the logical quest for the absolute.

A Christian perspective does not endorse the epistemological either/or between total empiricism and idealism. Philosophy and science serve different aspects of human nature. They are two parts of the same reality. The former, philosophy, satisfies the mind, while the latter, science, satisfies appetite, the senses, the will, and practical action. Humans cannot choose one over the other, but rather must live in both worlds simultaneously. God created human beings to live in both worlds from the beginning.

The truth provided by Divine revelation is central to a Christian perspective. According to Christianity, one's knowledge of God is a necessary precondition to one's happiness. Christianity affirms that the realization of human happiness requires man's relationship with God. In his work, *The Confessions*, Augustine (1960) rightly wonders whether he could love God if he does not know Him. Reason alone cannot justify the human knowledge of God. Our knowledge of God is provided to us through Divine revelation. Christianity asserts that God reveals Himself within His creation. In the Epistle to the Romans, for example, Apostle Paul discusses God's revelation in nature. Paul states,

19 that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed *it* unto them. *20* For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power

and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. (Romans 1:19-20, King James Version)

Moreover, God reveals His nature in human conscience. Apostle Paul declares,

14 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: *15* which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another; (Romans 2:14-16)

God reveals Himself in the Bible. Apostle Paul proclaims,

16 All Scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: *17* that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. (2 Timothy 3:16-17)

Finally, the apotheosis of God's revelation is in the person of Jesus Christ. The author of the Letter to the Hebrews affirms,

1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, *2* hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; *3* who being the brightness of *his* glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; (Hebrews 1:1-3)

According to a Christian perspective, God employs these means (general revelation, human conscience, nature, and special revelation: the Bible and the person of Jesus Christ) to reveal His ideas regarding the physical world, humanity, and the responsibility we have toward them. We have access to all of God's revelation only through faith. But what is faith?

According to Kierkegaard (1939), the message of faith, transmitted by God to humans through the aforementioned channels, has the weight of evidence behind it. This evidence, although not entrenched in pure reason, is sufficient in providing conviction, even certainty beyond any doubt. This is the power of faith. However, human beings are

endowed by God with the possibility to reject His message of faith. Kierkegaard, echoing the Apostle Paul, affirms that humans can further pervert, or alter, the message of God and even replace it with a lie to which they can adhere and believe.

C. S. Lewis (1984), in his work *The World's Last Night and Other Essays*, agrees with Kierkegaard that Christian faith requires evidence. According to Lewis, Christians do not consider it admirable to believe without evidence or even against opposing evidence. However, Lewis affirms that once the belief is formed, Christians believe that it is meritorious to adhere to his or her faith in spite of contrary evidence. Furthermore, Lewis addresses the following questions: *Is it reasonable to form beliefs?* and *Is it reasonable to hold on to our beliefs in spite of opposing evidence?*

In the attempt to answer the latter question, Lewis employs the analogies of a dog, whose paw is trapped, and of a boy with a thorn in his finger. To save the dog and alleviate the child's pain entails an initial increase of the level of their pain. The dog and the child consider that the actions of their benefactor go against their conceptions, supported by evidence, regarding the solution to their situation. However, the child and the dog submit themselves to the decisions of their benefactor and soon their predicament is over. Could anyone blame the victims for their decision to trust in their savior? Could anyone accuse them of lacking intelligence? Certainly not. As Lewis (1984) puts this point,

Now to accept the Christian propositions is *ipso facto* to believe that we are to God, always, as that dog or child...was to us, only very much more so. From this it is a strictly logical conclusion that the behavior which was appropriate to them will be appropriate to us, only very much more so.... If human life is in fact ordered by a beneficent being whose knowledge...infinitely exceeds our own, we must expect *a priori* that His operations will often appear to us far from beneficent and far from wise, and that it will be our highest prudence to give Him our confidence in spite of this. (p. 24)

The strength of faith required to overcome contrary evidence is smaller when the contention is between propositions of faith and scientific evidence than in the case where faith battles reason. In the former circumstance, scientific arguments are supplemented by faith because science does not have pretensions of absolute knowledge. In the latter situation, more faith is necessary to prevail over logical contradictions, which are absolute. For example, one's belief in the triune nature of God constitutes an act of faith that transcends rational understanding. Even in the latter case, it is reasonable to believe in a triune God. To dismiss such belief as unreasonable because reason refutes them is to institute reason as the ultimate authority in establishing what is true. To affirm that reason should have absolute pretensions over truth is arrogant. A Christian perspective considers arrogance less reasonable than modesty. Therefore, it embraces the mysterious and transcendent aspects of reality. According to a Christian perspective, the epistemological tools of science, reason, and faith presented above complement each other rather than being antagonistic in man's quest for the truth.

Conclusion

As mentioned previously, this study will evaluate and incorporate the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian perspective. In the section entitled "Rationale, Assumptions, and Research Methodology," I have addressed several reasons for choosing to write this dissertation. First, by drawing on the work of John Pulliam and Herbert Kliebard, I assume that the curriculum from time to time undergoes a cyclical process of reformation. Therefore, the works of past educators remain relevant to the contemporary educational setting. In this light, a study on Dewey and Adler allows

educators to reach a better understanding regarding current educational matters and, furthermore, to anticipate and make better decisions regarding future educational dilemmas. Second, I will attempt to present the integrationist interpretation of Dewey espoused by educators such as William Chandler Bagley (Null, 2003) and I. L. Kandel (Null, 2007) because I believe that 21st century K-12 schooling will benefit from the resurfacing of this forgotten understanding of Dewey. Third, I agree with Burton Weltman that any educational reformer must consider Dewey's ideas prior to proposing his or her own. Fourth, I believe that, in our contemporary society, character education is needed more than ever. Therefore, Adler's philosophy on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling is relevant to K-12 schooling due to its emphasis on morality, values, and, ultimately, the human soul. Fifth, I will use the Christian viewpoint presented in this chapter to evaluate the work of Dewey and Adler. Finally, I will look toward the future of curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling by connecting this study to contemporary challenges that face American education.

In the section entitled "A Christian Perspective: A Standard for Evaluation," I have presented a Christian perspective that I will employ as a standard for evaluating the conceptions of Dewey and Adler regarding curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. I have addressed a Christian perspective from a philosophical framework that entails metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical considerations. I have discussed Christian metaphysical conceptions regarding God, human nature, and the cosmos. According to a Christian perspective, God, human beings, and the cosmos are real. From an epistemological perspective, I have presented the Christian view that science, logic, and faith constitute adequate means for acquiring knowledge. Christianity views these as

complementary means of acquiring knowledge rather than antagonistic, or incompatible, in the search for truth. In Chapter II, I will leave this Christian standard of evaluation aside and discuss Dewey's pragmatic philosophy in general and his views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling in particular.

CHAPTER TWO

John Dewey on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling

In this chapter, I present Dewey's views with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. I argue that these educational views are founded upon two pillars inherent in Dewey's thought: pragmatism and democracy. In order to understand Dewey's ideas with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling, one is required to understand Dewey's pragmatic philosophy. An understanding of pragmatism presupposes an understanding of Dewey's philosophical journey. Therefore, I will provide a concise intellectual biography of Dewey, one that reflects the rational and emotional aspects which shaped his philosophical development. Next, I will discuss Dewey's philosophical worldview: pragmatism. Finally, I will present Dewey's understandings of curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling and show how his views derive from his pragmatic philosophy. In parallel, I will show how Dewey's political philosophy culminates in his ideal of democracy. Moreover, I will explain how Dewey's view on democracy is intrinsically connected with the evolution of his philosophy. Finally, I will show how Dewey's views with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling are rooted in his understanding of democracy.

John Dewey's Quest for Unity: A Journey through Idealism

I attempt to frame Dewey's intellectual biography by employing Robert B. Westbrook's (1991) book, *John Dewey and American Democracy*. In the preface of his book, Westbrook affirms that "Dewey has yet to receive" (p. X) a well-deserved full

intellectual biography. Westbrook further contends that he merely presents Dewey as a social theorist who mainly emphasizes the conception of “democracy as a way of life” (1991, p. x). To perceive Dewey through Westbrook’s work does not imply a narrow understanding of Dewey’s philosophy because issues pertaining to metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology are intrinsically intertwined with Dewey’s views on democracy. This dissertation adheres to Westbrook’s (1991) and Spencer J. Maxcy’s (2002) view that democracy is the corner stone of Dewey’s philosophy. In Dewey’s own words, “Democracy and the one, the ultimate ethical ideal of humanity are to my mind synonymous” (Westbrook, 1991, p. 11). Moreover, this study attempts to show that Dewey’s erotic desire for unity between pairs of opposites such as individual and society, God and man, man and the truth, science and philosophy, and the mind and the body serves as the engine of Dewey’s philosophical journey. This journey culminates in democracy. Initially, Dewey becomes aware of concrete forms of division (i.e. socio-economic, political, etc.) but, as he matures, he realizes abstract forms of separation, for example the separation between man and the truth. Finally, with a dialectical move, Dewey returns to concrete life and attempts to realize a greater synthesis, that between the concrete and the abstract, the mind and the body, and the individual and society. I will begin with a presentation of Dewey’s philosophical journey.

At the time of Dewey’s birth, American society was experiencing its darkest hour as the Civil War was looming on the horizon. A climate of division that engulfed American society was reaching its apotheosis. These divisions ran deeper than those emerging on the national stage as Dewey experienced an atmosphere of discord within his native small-town of Burlington, Vermont. In Burlington, Dewey witnessed socio-

economic, ethnic, and religious divisions, which were side effects of the processes of urbanization, industrialization, and immigration. Burlington was “a rapid growing city, the second largest lumber depot in the country and the commercial and cultural center of Vermont” (Westbrook, 1991, p. 1). During Dewey’s childhood, the town was divided between the predominantly protestant bourgeoisie and an Irish and French-Canadian working class, which comprised more than forty percent of the population. Poverty ran rampant in the city. This early encounter with poverty (not the poverty of his own family but that of others) provided the fertile soil in which Dewey’s ideas of social unity began to emerge. Moreover, Dewey found inspiration in the example provided by his parents. Dewey’s mother’s philanthropic acts, prompted by her religious zeal, exerted a formative influence upon Dewey’s social conscience. Dewey’s native town, rather than providing the type of egalitarian republicanism of a homogenous small-town society, presented him with the problems of industrial democracy. Dewey was yearning for unity across the board: social, religious, and ethnical. Since his youth, he felt an existential calling to find a resolution to these divisions.

As he matured, Dewey began to experience internal divisions inherent in “the conflict of traditional religious beliefs with opinions that [Dewey] could [himself] honestly entertain” (Dykhuizen, 1973, p. 6-7). Dewey experienced what he described as “an inward laceration” manifested through a sense of “isolation of self from the world, of soul from body, of nature from God” (Dykhuizen, 1973, pp. 6-7). In the fall of 1875, Dewey entered the University of Vermont with the ardent desire to find a solution to these divisions that pervaded society as well as his inner life. For the first two years, Dewey was an unremarkable student. However, in his junior year, Dewey began to show

interest in his studies while taking courses in geology, biology, and physiology. During his junior year, Dewey was introduced to Darwin's theory of evolution, which (according to Dewey) provided an adequate unified model for explaining the development of the material world. In his senior year at the University of Vermont, Dewey took courses in "political economy, law, history, psychology, ethics, philosophy of religion, and logic" (Westbrook, 1991, p. 5). Although fascinated with these studies, Dewey did not find in them the sense of unity inherent in the natural sciences. Therefore, his quest for unity went on.

Unlike the large majority of the departments of philosophy in the United States, which were dominated by British empiricism, the department of philosophy at the University of Vermont was influenced by professors who adhered to German idealism, specifically Kantian philosophy. Kantianism was preferred to empiricism because it could find a legitimate role for Christianity within the intellectual preoccupations of man, while simultaneously preserving and advancing the pursuits of science. Immanuel Kant (1950) attempted to reconcile science and religion by relegating them to two distinct spheres of human existence; science was given dominion over man's public life, while in the private realm, ethics and religion ruled supreme. Science employs pure theoretical reason as its method of investigation, while ethics utilizes practical reason. However, for Kant, God and immortality remain unknowable by human beings because the structure of the human mind does not allow us to conceive an object that exists outside space and time. Kant does not deny the existence of God but rather he merely affirms that reason cannot confirm it, a conception that is at odds with traditional theism. In order to harmonize Kantianism and Christian orthodoxy, Kant's philosophy was supplemented

with a form of transcendental intuitionism, which provided humans with the ability of knowing God and with a “quickenning communication with the Divine Spirit”

(Westbrook, 1991, p. 7).

H. A. P. Torrey, a Kantian philosopher and Dewey’s mentor at the University of Vermont, employed Kantian epistemology in his defense of Christianity against the threat of Darwinism. As Westbrook (1991) put it,

[Torrey] utilized Kant’s epistemology to deflect the threat of Darwinism and put science in its place as knowledge of ‘mere’ phenomena, while at the same time rejecting Kant’s conclusion that the noumena of ethics and religion were equally unknowable in favor of an intuitionism that claimed immediate access to these higher things. (p. 7)

Dewey was initially satisfied with Torrey’s solution to the conflict between science, empiricism, Darwinian naturalism, and Christian theism. He was eager to preserve and reconcile all of these aspects, which were deeply rooted in the core of his being.

After his graduation from the University of Vermont in 1879, Dewey, with the help of a cousin, found a teaching position in Oil City, Pennsylvania. He taught high school for three years, initially in Oil City and later in a small town south of Burlington. During his time in Oil City, Dewey had a mystical experience, a wonderful moment of oneness with the universe. This mystical experience regarded the issue of prayer. In Eastman’s words,

It was an answer to that question which still worried him: whether he [Dewey] really meant business when he prayed. It was not a very dramatic mystic experience. There was no vision, not even a definable emotion—just a supremely blissful feeling that his worries were over. (Eastman, 1959, pp. 256-257)

We do not have additional details about this experience, but know that it is crucial to his development as an educational philosopher.

After his experience with teaching, Dewey's quest for unity led him to Johns Hopkins University, where he pursued graduate studies in philosophy. At the time, the philosophy department was among the weakest in the university. "No full professor had been appointed in the field, and teaching duties were handled by three young lecturers: G. Stanley Hall, George Sylvester Morris, and Charles Sanders Peirce" (Westbrook, 1991, p. 13). Dewey began his graduate work under the supervision of Morris because he felt attracted to the latter's neo-Hegelianism. A discussion regarding Hegelianism is important for my study because Hegelian philosophy plays a significant role in forming Dewey's conceptions regarding democracy and pragmatism. According to Westbrook, "Dewey never completely shook Hegel out of his system" (1991, p. 14). In Dewey's own words, "I jumped through Hegel, I should say, not just out of him. I took some of the hoop ... with me, and also carried away considerable of the paper the hoop was filled with" (Ratner, Altman, & Wheeler, 1964, p. 439). Therefore, I will present, in a concise form, Hegelian conceptions regarding metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, which influenced Dewey's views on pragmatism and democracy. These conceptions are developed by Dewey in a climate dominated by his emotional quest for unity.

For Dewey, the philosophy of the German idealist Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel showed significant promise in uniting the dualisms inherent in Kantian philosophy. Moreover, Dewey considered the Hegelian understanding that humans could know God through reason significantly superior to Torrey's intuitionism, which was entrenched in faith. If for Kant, God is a logical possibility that could never be confirmed by reason, for Torrey, our knowledge of God is rooted in human intuition, for Hegel and his interpreter Morris, God is a logical necessity. Hegelian philosophy leads Dewey to a new

epistemological conclusion, one that exalts reason above faith, one in which religious faith is discarded once the individual ascends to rationality. Religious faith was useful to humanity because it provided humans with an ideal, one that, at later stages of dialectical historical development, was realized by reason. According to Hegel, faith remains useful for those who cannot acquire reason.

Furthermore, Morris' neo-Hegelianism offers a new metaphysical perspective. Hegel, unlike Kant and Torrey, adhered to the conception of the total immanence of God in the world. God can be fully known by humans. Therefore, the Christian God, at the end of Hegel's historical dialectical process, ceases to retain the attribute transcendence. It is important to note that for Hegel, the God of Genesis is inferior to the God manifested at the end of history. The latter God is inherent in the unity between absolute knowledge and society; this God is the state. For Hegel, man is a social being. He adheres to an organic conception regarding society. Moreover, this perfect state cannot be realized unless humans choose to accomplish it. Therefore, human consciousness constitutes the engine for the realization of the perfect society. Human freedom is thus posited. Man becomes an ethical being. All of these Hegelian metaphysical, epistemological and ethical conceptions allow Dewey to experience the unity between him and the truth, Christianity and reason, man and society. Moreover, the Hegelian conception of the state as the ultimate human ideal, that of man as a social being, and the idea of man as a free agent shape Dewey's understanding of democracy. A discussion regarding Dewey's conception regarding democracy will be presented later on in this chapter. Indeed, Dewey promoted a liberal (progressive) understanding of Christianity, one that is at odds with conservative Christianity.

After his graduation from Johns Hopkins and an initial period of teaching alongside Morris at the University of Michigan, Dewey decided to separate himself from the philosophical influence of his mentor. Thus, he became his own man. During this time, Dewey was eager to prove that Hegelianism provided a harmonious relationship between science and reason. According to Westbrook, Dewey “attempted to convince the new psychologists themselves that their work pointed beyond individual human minds to the ultimate reality of divine Mind” (Westbrook, 1991, p. 23). In other words, Dewey affirmed that the discoveries of science correspond to absolute ideas inherent in an immutable rational world. Dewey’s philosophy assumed a distinct trajectory from that of Morris when the former affirmed that scientific method, not reason, should be the method of philosophy. According to Dewey, scientific laboratory experimentation shows more promise in advancing human knowledge than the introspective ways of reason. Dewey thus proposes a shift in psychology: from an emphasis on introspection to a focus on experimentation. However, Dewey’s views on psychology and philosophy remain within the limits of Hegelianism. He merely states that science is more adequate than reason in finding the absolute principles of philosophy. Even so, this is nevertheless an epistemological shift in Dewey’s philosophy. Unconsciously, Dewey is moving toward pragmatism.

After Morris’ death in 1889, Dewey assumed the position of chair of the philosophy department at the University of Michigan. Dewey turned away from a speculative life regarding the ultimate reality to an action oriented existence. He allowed his assistants to teach introductory courses in psychology and philosophy, while he became interested in ethics and political philosophy. Perhaps already satisfied with his

individual unity with the truth, Dewey felt ready to advance to a greater level of Hegelian synthesis by attempting to unite society with the absolute truth. This course of action in Dewey's life was also prompted by the influence of Alice Dewey, his wife, and T. H. Green, a prominent British idealist philosopher. A strong willed, tenacious woman, Alice advocated the utilization of philosophy into vital everyday human concerns. She was unrelenting until Dewey agreed to have a practical outlet for his philosophy. Although Dewey did not personally interact with Green, the latter began to exert a profound influence on him from beyond the grave. For Green, philosophy should not be restricted to a theoretical activity, but rather should be expressed in social life. The real philosopher does not emphasize thinking to the detriment of doing; these are two sides of the same coin to Green. Therefore, philosophy, ethics, and politics are inextricably intertwined.

As a Hegelian, Dewey is a reconstructionist. Therefore, he believes that the adequate implementation of his philosophical solutions requires an evaluation of the current state of socio-political affairs. Dewey knows that Hegelian philosophy addresses concrete socio-political situations. Thus, he must tackle the issue of democracy. At the time, Sir Henry Maine, a liberal realist philosopher, viciously attacked democracy in his work *Popular Government* (1885). Maine affirmed that democracy is an unstable form of government that sooner or later will degenerate into monarchy, aristocracy, or even tyranny. Maine rooted his denigration of democracy in the idea that humans, by nature, are individualistic beings. According to Maine, society is the invention of individuals who constrain their fellow men to realize their private ambitions. Individualism engenders a higher probability for the political dissolution of a democracy than of an

aristocracy. As political power is more evenly distributed in a democratic state, the political actors driven by individualistic ambitions will eventually destroy the state. Moreover, unlike in an aristocratic state, none of the political participants in a democracy have sufficient power to impose his will and thus to prevent the dissolution of the state. Corruption and demagoguery are deeply hidden in democratic governments and this leads to their demise.

Dewey retorted in his essay “The Ethics of Democracy” (1997b). He did not deny the validity of Maine’s argument, only its soundness. Indeed, if Maine’s premise that man is an individualistic being is correct, then his conclusions regarding democracy are adequate. But Dewey disagreed with Maine’s premise. Aided by Hegelian philosophy, Dewey declared that man is a social being. Hegel proposed the conception of the social corpus as an organism. Human beings are not individualistic by nature. Society is not just the invention of individuals who constrain their fellow men to realize their personal ambitions. Human beings cannot fully realize their nature outside society. This realization, however, raises important questions. What distinguishes democracy from the other political regimes, which themselves constitute embodiments of the social nature of man? Why, according to Dewey, is democracy superior to all of these? At least at this point in his life, Dewey’s answer comes through Hegelian philosophy. Democracy is the only political system that allows for the expression of individual freedom. Dewey believes that man is by nature free. Upon his freedom rests the realization of the state, the absolute embodiment of God in Hegelian philosophy. For Hegel, the realization of the absolute state is not the product of rational necessity, but of the human will. If human

consciousness chooses to reject the guidance of reason, the absolute state cannot be realized.

At this point, Dewey unleashes his critique of Plato. The latter's political system of philosophic monarchy fails because he does not realize the human need for freedom. In a Platonic state, the non-philosopher will be dissatisfied because he cannot be free. The philosopher-king can lead him to the best possible existence but cannot do one thing: order him to be free.

Thus, unlike Hegel, who considered an authoritarian German state as the culmination of his philosophy, Dewey concludes that democracy is the ultimate political regime. According to Dewey, the unity between the individual and society, God and man, man and happiness, and philosophy and ethics can best be realized in democracy. The idea of democracy as the ultimate *telos* of man remains intact in Dewey's philosophy, even though, later on, he chooses not to explain democracy by the utilization of idealist philosophy. In theory, Dewey's conceptions regarding democracy are virile; in practice, however, they are vague (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007). Dewey failed to provide a precise answer to the following questions: Are the conditions of individual freedom present today in American society?, If not, what are the obstacles that stand in their way?, and if so, How should these obstacles be removed?. Probably the most difficult question is: What role should the state assume in the removal of the obstacles that stand against individual freedom?

Dewey identifies the class system as the main impediment in the realization of individual freedom. For individual freedom to become a reality, the social relations of production, the foundation of the capitalist class system, must be abolished. Dewey

proposes the replacement of capitalism with a new political system rooted in industrial, civic, and political democracy. However, Dewey fails to define the new political system in specific positive terms. Instead, Dewey describes it in negative terms; he mentions what industrial democracy is not rather than what it is. Dewey makes it clear that industrial democracy is not socialism. Moreover, he affirms that he is not endorsing an equal distribution of wealth.

Unable to offer a solution that allows all citizens to participate in controlling the means of production, Dewey adopts a new strategy: the socialization of intelligence. The emphasis shifts from economic power to political power. Dewey believes that the masses – by acquiring political and ethical knowledge – will be able to choose their destiny. The ideal of individual freedom will thus be realized. American democracy will finally be complete as both the social nature and the individual nature of man will be realized. For Dewey, democracy is the ultimate purpose of American society. The dissemination of knowledge to the American society, moreover, best serves this purpose. Although Dewey abandons idealism, his views on individual freedom, democracy, and the dissemination of knowledge will remain with him for the rest of his life. He will simply have to provide different philosophical grounds for justifying them.

During his last years at Michigan, there were signs for Dewey's increasing disenchantment with idealism. Deweyan scholars disagree with regard to the exact time when he abandoned idealism and began to argue for pragmatism. Perhaps the best way to describe the process is to say that Dewey slowly drifted away from idealism. Certainly, by the end of the 1890s, Dewey ceased to be a supporter of Hegel; he joined William James' pragmatic philosophy. Dewey rejected neo-Hegelianism due to its failure, at least

in his view, to address concrete human problems. To the new Dewey, Hegelianism is too remote, too detached from practical matters. Although Hegelianism, at least in theory, pretended to integrate thinking and doing, in practice it reduced human existence to a life of thought. Dewey concluded that Hegelian philosophy is insufficient because it ignores essential aspects of humanity: for example morality, emotions, and the need for physical goods. Moreover, Hegelianism failed to integrate man and society. In other words, Dewey came to believe that Hegelian philosophy fell short from fulfilling his standard of social justice. Therefore, he felt the need for a new philosophy, one that would address political, ethical, and social matters. In addition, this new philosophy should contribute to the enrichment of experience. Hegelianism was deficient on all of these counts; as a result, Dewey began to pursue another foundation upon which to base his views on politics, democracy, and education.

Pragmatism: The Culmination of John Dewey's Philosophy

In 1895, Dewey left Michigan for Chicago. He accepted a position as chairman of the department of philosophy at the newly founded University of Chicago. This position would allow Dewey to form around him a team of young philosophers who could assist him in the task of creating a new system of philosophy, a philosophy that is concrete, practical, political, social, and ethical in its emphasis. Dewey also desired an outlet for his philosophy. He wanted to apply his philosophy to the world of concrete objects: specifically, to social, political, and economic matters. Moreover, he needed to test his philosophy in human experience. Chicago met all of these demands. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Dewey had his own system of philosophy. He also had a laboratory school in which these views could be applied and tested.

Dewey's desire to create a new approach of philosophy and a laboratory school in which to apply and test this philosophy emerges from a concern for social justice. Like Aristotle, Dewey believed that politics was the supreme human endeavor, which subsumes all the other sciences and arts. In Dewey's conception, individual life is fulfilled in political life. Dewey retains his faith in democracy as the vehicle for realizing the ultimate human *telos*, political life. He attempts to promote democracy through his philosophy and his laboratory school at the University of Chicago. For Dewey, democracy is the ultimate purpose of education. In order to make this argument, I will first have to present Dewey's pragmatic philosophy. Second, I will show that pragmatism supports democracy or at least the two are compatible. Third, I will demonstrate that schooling promotes democracy. Fourth, I will use concrete examples to demonstrate that Dewey's views on the purpose of schooling presuppose democracy. Fifth, I will discuss Dewey's views with regard to teaching and show how his views on teaching promote democracy. Finally, I will present Dewey's curricular philosophy and show how it promotes Dewey's purpose of education: democracy.

I will now present the evolution of Dewey's thought from idealism to pragmatism. This philosophical transformation began during his last years at the University of Michigan. Around this time, Dewey attempted to bring Hegelian philosophy to its ultimate manifestation: the realization of the state. According to Hegel, within politics the ultimate level of unity is achieved: unity between man and the truth, man and society, and finally between man and God. All other forms of unity are comprised in the state. Hegel is thus urging Dewey to take the former's philosophy, to apply it to society, and thus to realize the absolute state. Easier said than done. As it

turned out, Dewey found that it was impossible to apply Hegelian theory to political practice. No matter how plausible Hegel's philosophy appeared, it was inapplicable in the real world. Here begins Dewey's dissatisfaction with Hegelianism.

With Hegelianism inapplicable and eventually discarded, Dewey begins to contemplate idealist philosophy in general. Idealist philosophy assumes the existence of an absolute and through the utilization of reason attempts to reach it. Philosophy is thus engaged in this quest for certainty. Socrates pretended not to have reached this absolute, to have remained until his last breath in a state of *aporia*. However, since the absolute might exist, he urged others to search for it. Hegel himself engaged in this pursuit. Although, he pretended to have found it, he might have been wrong. It might be that the inapplicability of his arguments into the concrete world is a consequence of fallacious reasoning. Is Dewey, therefore, justified to engage in his own pursuit of certainty? Before engaging in this endeavor Dewey reflects upon the legitimacy of idealism. Is the idea of an absolute adequate?

If Hegelianism, the culmination of idealist thinking, is inadequate then one must return to the drawing board. The quest for certainty must be restarted. The direct implication is that reason for over two thousand years was unable to go beyond Socrates' aporetic state. It is as if philosophy made no significant progress. Indeed, one might be justified to affirm that philosophy discovered new negative knowledge (i.e. what is not just; what one should not do), but, with the realization that Hegelianism is itself flawed, one recognizes that philosophy did not provide any positive knowledge (i.e. what one should do; what is just). Therefore, Dewey realizes that by postponing action until one acquires absolute knowledge, a process which lasted for a couple of thousand years,

philosophy in reality has been deferring action indefinitely. Thus, the idealist philosopher is destined to live a life of thought. In Dewey's conception, a life of thought is insufficient for human beings because philosophy prevents the individual from addressing the other aspects of human nature: the emotional side of man, his/her interaction with the environment, his/her will. Engaged solely in a life of thinking, the philosopher thus avoids action, interaction with nature and the world. He fails to benefit from, what Aristotle called, external goods, or physical goods. Dewey then looks at the benefits of science. Science, unlike philosophy, is not rooted in absolute reason but is able to provide humans with physical goods. As the quest for absolute knowledge deprives humans from physical goods, Dewey conclude that it is narrow, insufficient, in the end not useful. Therefore, Dewey affirms idealist philosophy prevents one from enjoying the good life. The implication is that philosophy as solely a life of thought, a pursuit of certainty prior to action is unethical. Indeed, the idealist side could also invoke ethics. For them it would be unethical not to inquire for certain knowledge prior to acting in the world. Idealists agree with Dewey idea that man is an active being. Whether humans choose or not they interact with the environment. Even a life of thought entails interaction with the environment. However, even in the absence of absolute knowledge the philosopher's interaction with the environment is more justified as the actions of non-philosophers. The philosopher's actions, unlike those of the non-philosopher, are guided by negative knowledge (i.e. knowledge of what is unjust).

At this point Dewey's philosophical endeavor has the same logical legitimacy as that of the idealists. Dewey's advantage consists in the fact that his philosophy works, it produces results, and it is beneficial for the human race. The idealists are confronted

with the following main problem: they have not produced any positive results. Other critical questions face them as well. For example, assuming that the absolute exists, who can prove that it is accessible to human beings? And if it is accessible, who can prove that it will be found? These arguments seem to incline the balance toward Dewey's camp. Dewey seems to have turned the tables on idealists. By demonstrating that science is beneficial to humankind, while philosophy has little to show, Dewey has assigned moral advantage to science over philosophy. Moreover, ethical advantage entails epistemological superiority. The methods of science are superior to those of philosophy. Therefore, if idealist philosophers pretended that morality requires absolute knowledge prior to action, Dewey argued that, from a moral perspective, the scientific method of action followed by reflection is superior.

However, one idealist philosopher seems to be able to repel Dewey's criticism. Aristotle understands this dilemma. He proposes as a solution that man must live in both worlds: the realm of thought and the realm of action, idealist philosophy and science. Dewey, although praising Aristotle for his emphasis on science, affirms that the latter did not go far enough in his critique of Platonic philosophy. In Dewey's conception, Aristotle was afraid to go all the way and reject idealism altogether. If Aristotle pleaded for a human existence divided between the realm of absolute philosophy and that of science, Dewey chose only science. To succeed at the latter, humans must abandon the pursuit of the absolute.

Dewey arrived to this understanding inspired by William James' work *Principles of Psychology* (1950). According to Westbrook (1991), James' book is controversial and even contradictory as it is torn between metaphysical dualist conceptions and anti-

dualistic radical empiricism, rooted in evolutionary biology. Dewey grappled for a considerable amount of time with these arguments before he ultimately decided that James' biological strain showed the most promise. As Morton White has observed Dewey, by the end of the 1890s, was able to "out-James James" (1943, p. 107). Dewey presented his new perspective in an article entitled "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology" (1972a). In this article he goes beyond arguing that science is morally superior to idealist philosophy and that the methods of science should be preferred to those of dualist philosophy. Dewey shows that the problem idealism attempts to solve is wrong. The very object of idealist philosophy is wrong. Its object is to unite a world which is divided into pairs of opposites such as truth and illusion; sensations and ideas; and ideas and truth. Idealism asks the wrong question: How can these disjointed parts of experience be united? According to Dewey, idealist philosophy arbitrarily chooses to interpret human experience as fragmented, disjointed, and dualistic. For Dewey, experience is a "comprehensive, organic unity" in which sensations and ideas are not "separate and complete entities in themselves, but as divisions of labor, functioning factors within the single concrete whole" (Dewey, 1972a, p. 97). This concrete whole is sensory-motor experience. Therefore, according to Dewey, what idealism considers as separate ontological entities are in essence functional, operational distinctions. The lack of any ontological distinctions within human experience implies the demise of dualism and metaphysics. Dewey's new view of philosophy occasions more than a repudiation of metaphysics, idealism, and absolute truth. Religion is also discarded. In the pragmatic unified world, the intervention of God, an Absolute Mind, or a soul is no longer needed.

For Dewey, a doctrine of God becomes irrelevant. Therefore, Dewey can easily discard these concepts.

With metaphysics discarded, how does Dewey's philosophical conception, which will later receive the title pragmatism, address the concept of truth? What is real according to this philosophy? Dewey affirms that truth must be disconnected from any form of absolute truth. Dewey's truth is viable truth, truth that cannot exist independently from experience and action. It is a truth that is being constructed, a truth that evolves. For Dewey, science is the engine that generates the constant evolution of truth. When Dewey talks about evolution and progress, he does not have in mind a person's movement toward an absolute ideal. However, he realizes that in order to measure progress, one needs a point of reference. Progress occurs on the condition that one advances toward this point of reference. According to Dewey, the process of biological evolution endowed man with the attribute of intelligence. Unlike animals, humans have the ability of utilizing their intelligence to mediate their impulses and engage in purposeful action. As Dewey put this point:

That which was instinct in the animal is conscious impulse in man. That which was "tendency to vary" in the animal is conscious foresight in man. That which was unconscious adaptation and survival in the animal, taking place by the "cut and try" method until it worked itself out, is with man conscious deliberation and experimentation. (Dewey, 1972b, p. 53)

Human purposes assume the form of ideas that are still to be realized within human experience. The most serious mistake idealists make is when they equate ideas or knowledge with reality or the truth. Ideas do not reflect the truth; they are only tools that assist us in constructing the truth or in building reality. For Dewey, reality or truth

resides in action, not in knowledge. Therefore, humans are not separated from the truth, but rather possess it within their experiences.

Dewey's only fear with regard to abandoning idealism can be found in his commitment to ethics. He faced an important question: Does the rejection of idealism entail the abandonment of ethics? Before abandoning idealism altogether, Dewey needed to find a way to connect his Darwinian naturalist philosophy to ethics. As I mentioned previously, Dewey believes that humans are purposeful creatures. Man's ability to set ideals and envision ends for actions makes him an ethical being. The fact that these ideals are not rooted in an absolute reality does not imply that man is a being who exists outside the realm of ethics.

Democracy: A Pragmatic Purpose for Schooling

During the neo-Hegelian stage of his philosophy, Dewey proclaimed that democracy constituted the highest ethical ideal for humankind. Indeed, the statement was justified on Hegelian grounds. I have shown that Dewey believed that pragmatism does not repudiate ethics. Next, I will assess the compatibility between pragmatic philosophy and democracy.

As Dewey abandoned Hegelianism, he also gave up the Hegelian justifications for democracy. He could no longer adhere to the idea that, in democracy, God and man are united. Moreover, democracy ceases to be the culmination of the process of unification between absolute reason and history. Dewey renounced the idea that there is only one way to human happiness, which will ultimately be realized in his conception of industrial democracy. However, Dewey retains within his pragmatic philosophy the Hegelian idea of human freedom. For Hegel, the absolute cannot impose itself upon history; only the

free choice of man can bring the absolute unity between truth and history to fruition. Moreover, man cannot be happy unless he is free. Even the external imposition of the good will not make man happy. In order to be truly happy, man must find truth and knowledge through the exercise of his free choices. Hegelianism provided a rational justification for these conceptions; its repudiation leaves Dewey only with the possibility to entrench them in his own life experiences. The political regime that best allows for the manifestation of human freedom is democracy. Democracy remains Dewey's ideal, the ultimate *telos* of mankind. Democracy should be realized neither through Divine intervention nor as a consequence of the human understanding of an absolute system of ideas. It should be realized rather through the free and intelligent contribution of all mankind. Dewey thus invests his highest faith and hope in humanity, not a transcendent being.

As Dewey abandons Christianity and Hegelian philosophy, he jettisons the security offered by the idea that God sustains the world by limiting man's freedom, thus restricting his powers of destruction. Dewey thus realizes that his action of removing God from the helm of history has disadvantages. He responds by affirming that whether a transcendental principle is currently at the helm of the universe or not, it makes no difference with regard to the condition of man. Disease, evil, and error are part of man's lot. Thus, according to Dewey, the transcendent is only used to assign blame and to flee from responsibility. Under these circumstances, humanity's greatest opportunity for happiness resides in man's decision to assume control of history. According to Dewey, the experience of the race has convincingly shown that when man takes control over the world through the methods of science, he has the ability to improve his existence. For

Dewey, the absence of a transcendental reality from his philosophy does not weaken his idea of a political structure rooted in pragmatism.

Dewey's faith in democracy did not blind him to the socio-political conflicts that exist in all societies. For him, these conflicts cannot be entirely negative in nature.

Darwinian naturalism shows that progress emerges from conflicting situations. However, Dewey does not endorse the laissez-faire attitude of conservative Darwinists, for example William Graham Sumner, who believed that social conflicts, driven by the irrational process of evolution, should be allowed to run their course. Dewey, rather, believed that human social intelligence should be employed in providing a solution to these conflicts. He argues that the development of social science should assume the main role in resolving these issues (Dewey, 1954).

After arguing that Dewey's democratic conceptions are compatible with his pragmatic philosophy, I will present Dewey's idea of democracy and I will derive his conception of schooling from it. In Dewey's conception, the essence of democracy is summarized in the slogan of the French Revolution: liberty, equality, and fraternity. I will now present Dewey's conception of equality. For Dewey, equality does not entail an equal distribution of resources but rather the opportunity of every individual to have access to the resources that will allow for the fulfillment of his or her existence. Dewey believes in the uniqueness of the individual. The realization of every unique human personality requires different resources. In a democratic society, individuals must be granted access to the resources needed for the fulfillment of their unique being. Therefore, an equal distribution of resources, whether material or spiritual, is not necessary in a democratic society.

The fulfillment of one's individuality is not the only goal in a democratic state. According to Dewey, the individual must employ his unique talent for the well-being of the state. The fact that the state is the final beneficiary of the activities of men shapes and restricts the development of one's unique abilities. People live in specific historical, political and cultural circumstances. Therefore, within the limits established by these circumstances, the individual is provided with resources that he can use for the realization of his self. The individual realizes his self within a framework established by the state. For example, if the country is engaged in a war, the individual must subordinate his activities to the war effort.

The concept of liberty is also known as the idea of individual freedom. Earlier in this chapter, I have presented Dewey's conception of individual freedom. Now, I would like to discuss the connection between freedom and knowledge. Dewey employs the Platonic analogy of the slave in order to emphasize the link between the two. The slave is the person who cannot put his ideas into practice. Plato's conception of the slave is relevant even today. In a democratic society individuals with no economic power and a lack of a political conscience experience the condition of the slave. Moreover, the slave is the person who, although capable of implementing his ideas in the world, does not examine his ideas in the light of reason. The latter is the slave of his or her passions. Knowledge is therefore needed by the members of all social classes whether rich or poor who want to be free. Therefore, the human ideal of freedom implies the human ideal of knowledge.

In Dewey's understanding, humans are equal and free in the ideal democratic state. As shown above, equality entails access to the resources needed for the realization

of the individuality of every one of the citizens of the state while freedom implies the need for a knowledgeable citizenry. The obvious step would be to ask whether Dewey's ideal conception of democracy is embodied in American society. If not, who is responsible for equalizing the playing field? Should the state be involved in correcting these inequities? Dewey responds by saying that sometimes the state should intervene and some other times the state should abstain from interfering. He chooses not to elaborate further. Indeed, Dewey is no longer interested in promoting social justice through socio-political methods such as a redistribution of wealth and/or providing citizens with the ability to control the means of production. Rather, Dewey chooses to build on the idea of socializing intelligence which he attempted to put into practice in Michigan shortly before his departure for Chicago.

Dewey believed that as people acquire knowledge, they will be able to withstand and eradicate the oppression of the upper classes. In Michigan, realizing the power of the press, Dewey sought to disseminate knowledge to the masses through a newspaper. The project ultimately failed (Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007). In Chicago, he adopted a different strategy: dissemination of knowledge through schooling. Dewey is simply building upon an idea that originated with Horace Mann, the conception that education is "beyond all other devices of human origin, ... the greater equalizer of the conditions of man – the balance wheel of the social machinery" (Milson, Bohan, Glanzer, & Null, 2004). Dewey makes this point when he argues:

Men will long dispute about material socialism, about socialism considered as a matter of distribution of material resources of the community; but there is a socialism which there can be no dispute—socialism of the intelligence and of the spirit. To extend the range and the fullness of sharing in the intellectual and spiritual resources of the community is the very meaning of the community. (Dewey, 1902, p. 93)

Thus, for Dewey, schooling is an imperative that derives directly from his understanding of the ethical ideals of individual freedom and democracy. Schooling is the vehicle for the dissemination of knowledge. If freedom implies knowledge and knowledge brings economic and political benefits, then Dewey has found a formula for social justice through democratic schooling. Knowledge became not only the factor that preserves a just society, but also the power which transform an unjust community into a just one.

There are two additional reasons for the urgency of schooling. First, democracy, Dewey's ultimate ideal, requires a knowledgeable citizenry more than any other political system. If schooling is the vehicle employed in the dissemination of knowledge, then democracy necessitates education more than any other form of government. In a democracy, every citizen is responsible for the state's political decisions. Thus, in order to prevent transforming democracy into a dictatorship of the mob, all the citizens of the state must be educated. The harsh lessons of recent history show that democracy contains in itself the sources of great horrors and even the seeds of its own destruction. An uninformed democratic society elected Hitler to power and thus inflicted devastating consequences upon humankind.

Second, the community requires knowledge and by implication education.

Dewey's democratic conceptions presented above do not refer solely to politics. For Dewey, democracy should be defined in broad civic, communal terms. As Maxcy put it,

Dewey was a philosopher of democracy in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson.... Dewey wished to return to rural values which had marked community cooperation during his youth. The town meeting, and other devices of small scale democratic localism dominated his values. He wished for a society that was made up of communicative, cooperative, and communal groups, touching one another, and providing the organic glue to hold together ... [the American] nation.... (Maxcy, 2002, p. ix)

In *The School and Society*, Dewey (1899/1990) provides a detailed description of the ideal local democratic community. The wide-spread development of industrialism, global commercialism, and large-scale urbanization threatened to undermine American democracy. Indeed, a return to an old household and neighborhood culture became impossible. However, Dewey urges the American society to preserve its values because they are at the core of American democracy. In community life, politics, economics, and education of small town America are inextricably intertwined. The need for education to preserve the functioning of this system and implicitly its values is unquestionable.

We have seen that Dewey's ideas of freedom, knowledge, and democracy are inextricably intertwined. Moreover, Dewey selected schooling as the vehicle for promoting these human ideals. But why did Dewey choose schooling to promote these ethical principles? What were the reasons that stood behind his decision? First, schooling provided Dewey with an environment in which he could test his ideas. Pragmatic philosophy, unlike idealist philosophy, receives its ultimate justification in action. Regardless of the rational validity of Dewey's pragmatic arguments, pragmatic theory is worthless unless it is tested in action. For Dewey, reality and truth reside in experience, not in knowledge. Even the most viable knowledge (i.e. the knowledge expressed in pragmatic theory) is only a tool, a means that provides access to reality, which is ultimately human experience.

Second, Dewey believed that schooling has a significant advantage over other human institutions that attempt to influence and eventually reform society. Unlike these other institutions, schooling assumes a preventing rather than a remedial role with regard to social injustice. Dewey's school is a miniature society in which students learn how to

coexist within a community that is guided by the principles of a civic democracy. School provides this unique opportunity for shaping the souls of immature children. If their characters are molded according to democratic standards, then the principles of democracy will prevail in their adult lives. Therefore, as they reach adulthood and assume political, social, and economic power, children will realize a just society.

Schooling thus becomes the institution best suited to promote the ideals of democracy: freedom, equality, and fraternity. Dewey now turns his attention to the internal mechanisms of schooling. Dewey, while at Chicago, became so passionate with education that he laid aside his interests in political philosophy and chose to dedicate himself to education. In a letter to his wife, he even proposes to abandon teaching philosophy directly for teaching philosophy via pedagogy (Dewey, 1894). Thus begins Dewey's affair with education. Dewey's core philosophy with regard to curriculum and teaching, which he developed at the University of Chicago, remained relatively unchanged for the rest of his life. Later on, Dewey merely refines and develops some of these principles. He also begins to engage in a battle to correct the various misinterpretation of his educational philosophy. I will now present Dewey's views with regard to two of the most essential elements of schooling: teaching and curriculum. Dewey's conceptions of curriculum and teaching are rooted in his understanding of human occupations. I will start with a discussion on Dewey's understanding of occupations.

Human Occupations: A Means of Promoting Democracy

I would now like to discuss the role that occupations play in Dewey's philosophy of education. In Dewey's understanding, occupations should occupy a central role in the

curriculum. Dewey (1990) provides his understanding of occupations in his work *The School and Society*. When Dewey talks about occupations he refers to carpentry, sawing, cooking, weaving, and all the other domestic human occupations. For Dewey, the student's schooling experience must begin with his participation in one of these occupations. Dewey is not endorsing the idea of a utilitarian curriculum devoid of academic content, but rather through these occupations the child is led by his or her teacher to academic subject matter.

Human occupations are rooted in the household or neighborhood system. In order to understand them one must first understand the household system. As a result of industrialization, urbanization, and the development of commerce, the household system ceased to exist. Dewey does not endorse a return to the pre-industrial society but rather the implementation of the household values into industrial America. The material benefits provided by industry are undeniable. Moreover, the industrial era ushered in new important values and skills such as "the increase in toleration, in breadth of social judgment, the larger acquaintance with human nature, the sharpened alertness in reading signs of character and interpreting social situations, [and] greater accuracy to adaptation to differing personalities" (Dewey, 1990, p. 12). However, Dewey argues, the disappearance of this system deprived individuals from experiencing a meaningful private and social life. In his private life, the individual lost his sense of unity with reality under its various forms. In his public life, man lost the ability to realize his social nature, the prerequisite to democratic expression. In the household system, the relation between knowledge, education, economic individual improvement, and social realization is close to being unbreakable. Knowledge is unquestionable a prerequisite for success.

The key element in this equation is education. According to Dewey, the type of education provided in this system provided man with a meaningful life. This education was provided through occupations (Dewey, 1990, p. 9-12). Historically, these occupations supported the development of science that ultimately led to human progress. Moreover, occupations provide the best educational environment in which scientific knowledge could develop. Therefore, Dewey argues that in the absence of a household system, in which occupations assumed a central role, schools should include occupations in their curriculum. Dewey further shows how in occupations most of his philosophical and existential goals are realized. In occupations, individuals learn as they are actively involved in doing things; thus, thinking and doing are integrated. Beyond intellectual progress, students acquire physical skills and moral habits. Thus, they satisfy the human need for interaction and unity with nature, the human necessity for physical development, and the human need for morality. In these occupations, individuals develop habits of industry, order, respect for authority, truthfulness, etc. that will ultimately be imprinted into their character. Also, students become aware of social goals and proceed to their realization. Children realize that work is important for the community as they see how the products they created are useful to their fellow men. The very fact that they provide a significant contribution to society brings meaning to their lives. Thus, man realizes the social aspect of his nature.

The household environment promotes democratic ideals. The child does not have an equal say with the mature individual. However, immature is given the opportunity to express his or her wishes and desires, but, nevertheless, the purposes established by the adults are primordial. The very fact that the child learns to subordinate his individual

goals to the ideals of society is among the cherished values of democracy. Moreover, the household system promotes cooperation, another democratic characteristic. Man realizes that his private interests and those of the state are better promoted in a climate of cooperation, than in isolation. Individuality flourishes in society, not in seclusion. Cooperation stimulates the development of the individual and best assists him in the realization of his goals.

Although the household system is compatible with democracy, Dewey envisions its replacement with schooling. In schooling, the positive aspects of the household system are retained and supplemented. Schooling is similar to the household system in the following aspects: (1) the child develops his moral, intellectual, emotional, and social self through occupations; (2) democratic principles such as individual freedom and social responsibility are directly taught and experienced by the child; and (3) the child is immature, thus, he does not share a position of equality with the teacher. Schooling is superior to the household system because it provides students with a richer social life and intellectual environment. Thus, a more knowledgeable and inclusive community is realized, which leads to the realization of a more mature democracy. Moreover, Dewey argues, “the occupations and relationships of the home environment are not specially selected for the growth of the child; the main object is something else, and what the child can get out of them is incidental. Hence the need of a school. In this school the life of the child becomes the all-controlling aim” (Milson et al., 2004, p. 322).

After presenting Dewey’s idea that occupations within a schooling environment promote democracy, I will discuss occupations from a teaching perspective. Thus, I

address the question: What kind of teaching emerges within a curriculum that emphasizes occupations?

John Dewey on Teaching

In this section, I will discuss Dewey's view on teaching that emerges from his understanding of human occupations. In order to understand Dewey's perspective on teaching, we must first comprehend the role of the student within Dewey's new system of education, often referred to as progressive education. Therefore, first, I will present Dewey's view on the role of the student as it emerges from his understanding of human occupations. Second, I will discuss the progressive ideas with regard to the role of the teacher.

In Dewey's understanding, learning occurs in this interaction between teachers, students, and their environment. Therefore, a successful philosophy of education must consider education from both perspectives: the child's perspective and the teacher's perspective. Dewey's understanding with regard to the role of the child and that of the teacher emerges from his evaluation and critique of traditional education. In the old traditional education, the teacher embraced a central role while the student assumed a marginal role. The teacher was the active transmitter of the wisdom of the race, while the student was the passive recipient. In Dewey's conception, traditional education failed to understand the nature of the child. This situation in traditional education is the consequence of its failure to integrate psychology and pedagogy within the curriculum. As the field of psychology evolved, new conceptions with regard to the child were proposed. Dewey sought to integrate these new conceptions within his philosophy of education. According to these developments in psychology, the child is an active being,

one that exerts his or her natural instincts, interests, and desires. This new progressive understanding with regard to the role of the child in the educational process determines a change in the relationship between teacher and student. If this relationship changes, then the whole educational endeavor will undergo a transformation. Dewey (1990) describes this new educational paradigm:

Now the change which is coming into our education is the shifting of the center of gravity. It is a change, a revolution, not unlike that introduced by Copernicus when the astronomical center shifted from the earth to the sun. In this case the child becomes the sun about which the appliances of education revolve; he is the center about which they are organized. (p. 34)

I will now elaborate on Dewey's idea that the child is an active being. This view is rooted in the theory of the natural impulses or instincts of the child. The child is an active being because at an early age he or she begins to exert the following natural human instincts: the social instinct, the constructive instinct, the investigative instinct, and the expressive instinct (Milson et al., 2004, pp. 324-325). The social instinct manifests itself in the child's desire to communicate and to converse with his or her fellow human beings. The language instinct is the most important subcategory of the social instinct. Early on in the life of the child, he or she begins to construct or create things. In their play, children manipulate the physical environment; they transform it as they produce things. The instinct of investigation is formed by the combination of the conversational instinct and the constructive instinct. The pursuit of knowledge is a natural activity of the child. The expressive or the artistic instinct also emerges from the combination of the constructive instinct and the communicating instinct. The expressive instinct is the ultimate manifestation of the two; it reflects the inner desire of the child to create an object that is useful, beautiful, and meaningful. The very manifestation of these instincts within the

life of the child constitutes evidence with regard to the fact that man is a teleological being: he or she establishes purposes and interests. These instincts become noticeable early on in the life of the child. They are present in their games. According to Dewey, anthropologists have noticed that the child attempts to relive the history of mankind. Children organized themselves in primitive societies; they construct bows, arrows, and spears; and play war or hunting games. In the process, children investigate, communicate, and cooperate with their peers.

In the face of these instincts and interests of the child, educators are confronted with the following questions: What should we do with these instincts and interests of children? Should we allow them in the educational enterprise, specifically in the process of schooling? If they are promoted in schools, will they lead to the knowledge of subject matter, ethics, and democracy? In *The Child and the Curriculum*, Dewey (1902b/1990) affirms that these questions divide the world of education into two opposing camps: the traditionalists and the romantics. Traditionalists uphold the idea of a purposeful schooling experience. Their most cherished ideals are a logically organized subject matter, morality, and ideas pertaining to democratic citizenship. Traditionalist educators refute the romantic idea that educators should indulge the child's interests and instincts. The aforementioned goals of schooling will never be realized if we allow the child to direct the educational process by the exercise of the whims of his own instincts and interests. Romantics retort by stating that traditionalists undermine the very democratic ideals, which the latter firmly proclaim that they support, of individual freedom and initiative. Traditionalists seem to emphasize knowledge to the detriment of freedom, while romantics freedom to the detriment of knowledge. The former suppress or at least

ignore the instincts and interests of the child and emphasize solely the role of the teacher, while the latter repudiate teachers' influence and give students the sole control in the educational process. None of these perspectives is to Dewey's liking. Neither one of them promotes Dewey's ideals of freedom and democracy. Traditionalists transmit the principles of democracy through none democratic means of external imposition and control. Romantics are oblivious to the fact that freedom and knowledge are inextricably intertwined; one cannot be free if one is ignorant. Thus, both groups undermine democracy. Dewey realizes that in order to promote democracy through his educational philosophy he must find a way to integrate freedom and knowledge. Therefore, he addresses the following questions: Is there a better way in which student interests and instincts can be integrated with the knowledge of the race? Is the creation of an education system in which students and teachers exercise active, not mutually exclusive roles possible? In this section, I will present Dewey's perspective on the relation between the child and the teacher. In other words, I will discuss the role of the student and the role of the teacher. In the following section entitled "John Dewey on Curriculum," I will provide Dewey's understanding on the relationship between the child and the curriculum.

In the relation between teacher and student, Dewey does not want to elevate the influence of one over the other within schooling (Dewey, 1938/1957; Dewey, 1990). According to Dewey, to solely emphasize the role of the student, in other words, to allow his or her instincts and interests to direct the educational process is unacceptable. Moreover, equally undesirable is to suppress these instincts and desires. Rather, he proposes an educational philosophy that directs the instincts and interests of the child toward the purposes established by the teacher (Dewey, 1990, p. 182). In Dewey's

educational system, both the child and the teacher assume important roles. Now, it remains to be seen whether Dewey can successfully integrate the free activity of the child with the mature knowledge of the teacher, or his educational philosophy relapses in a romantic perspective in which the immature directs the educational process.

I will provide a practical example that illustrates Dewey's conceptions with regard to the role of the student and the role of the teacher in schooling. Therefore, let us imagine an educational environment in which the child can freely manifest his or her instincts. It is an educational system that emphasizes occupations. To exemplify, I have chosen a lesson in physics, more specifically, a lesson in aeronautics. This lesson is taught in a carpentry shop. The activity is rooted in the students' interest in flying. Students express their desire to understand how flying is possible and, moreover, they want to build an airplane. They want to show their plane at an aeronautic show and win a prize for their school. Thus, students feel that their work is meaningful; it will be looked at and appreciated by many people. The expressive and social instincts are thus present in this educational endeavor. As soon as the educational goal is established, students begin to imagine the final product, the plane. They resurface their previous knowledge regarding planes and also employ the process of observation prior to deciding how their plane should look like.

With no ready-made instruction provided, students employ their investigative instinct to learn about building planes. Students organize their investigation; they assign different tasks to different persons and/or groups. Students exchange information and continue their investigation until they feel comfortable that they possess sufficient information for realizing their project. During their investigation, students learn about

physics, math, and geometry. They learn about the Bernoulli Effect: the idea that in order for flight to be possible, the upper surface of the wing must be shorter than the lower surface of the wing. Mathematical calculations are made and various geometrical principles are applied. In the process of investigating, students acquire habits of discipline. Students learn how to control their instincts and impulses; they learn how to regulate the processes of attention, observation, and reflection. Moreover, students learn to be industrious and how to persevere against opposing odds.

Once their investigation is complete, students organize the practical activity of building the plane. Tools are selected and tasks are assigned. Theory is applied into practice. The fundamentals of science: *thought action thought* are applied. As the plane is being constructed, students stand back and reflect on their work and subsequently improve it. Mathematical and geometrical skills are employed in this phase of the project. Once the building of the plane reaches its final stage, students consider painting the plane. At this point, their artistic sense is being utilized. Students are exposed to knowledge about painting, combining colors, and chemistry. The plane is now ready. The next step is to test the plane. As the plane flies, students feel a sense of joy for completing the task.

In the lesson presented above, students learn about physics, the history of aviation, reading, writing, arithmetic, geometry, math, chemistry, and art. At the end of this experience, students have acquired intellectual skills of analyzing and synthesizing information, socio-emotional skills of cooperation, and moral habits of industry, perseverance.

The role of the teacher is to guide students, to direct their educational experience rather than to indulge their instincts (Dewey, 1957, p. 75-76). The teacher leads students to predetermined goals established in the curriculum. Progressive education is not synonymous with relativistic education. Dewey's pragmatic understanding does not reject the idea of the truth. Indeed, the idea of an absolute truth is rejected but viable truths are embraced. Therefore, students are not encouraged to find their own subjective truth, but rather are led to the viable truths possessed by the teacher.

The teacher oversees the whole educational experience; he assumes the role of facilitator or guide right from the start. The goals established by students must coincide with the teacher's educational goals. For example, the teacher assesses whether building a plane is an educational goal. Moreover, he ponders whether this goal is attainable or not. When students adopt unattainable and non-educational purposes, the teacher will challenge their thinking. Dewey believes that teachers should mainly employ the Socratic method of drawing out and not the traditional method of pouring in (Dewey, 1990, p. 36). The role of the teacher is to lead students to the right answers through a process of questioning. This questioning process ends when students reach the answer sought by the teacher. The Socratic Method will be used for the entire educational experience: in investigation as well as in the practical application of the theoretical framework. Once the teacher agrees with the purpose proposed by the students, he leads them into the investigative process. Therefore, the teacher will guide them in finding the adequate information regarding building planes. When students reach an adequate level of theoretical understanding, they will begin testing their ideas in experience.

Throughout this educational experience, the teacher guides students in acquiring intellectual skills, practical skills, social skills, moral habits, and subject matter content in various fields of knowledge. Judging from the rich subject matter content acquired by the student in this progressive educational experience, Dewey concludes that the teacher must be an expert in a plethora of fields of study: both academic and practical (Dewey, 1957, p. 36). Moreover, the teacher must be initiated in a philosophical perspective that allows him or her to synthesize these apparently disparate disciplines. These various academic disciplines must be united in a greater whole and then their theoretical synthesis must be united with the practical life of man. The teacher is a unifier; he is well versed in the dialectics of pragmatism and the methods of science. Moreover, the teacher must be a model of morality; through his or her example he or she must teach the child the principles of ethics.

The teacher must be a good judge of the human condition. He or she must be capable of performing an adequate assessment of the student's "capacities, needs, and past experiences" (Dewey, 1957, p. 85). In addition, the teacher must be able to detect the uniqueness of every child and further to encourage him or her in realizing his or her individuality. Indeed, human beings must be encouraged to realize their social nature, but they will be unfulfilled if their individuality is not realized. Sometimes, the realization of their individuality contributes to the benefit of society. Other times, it only satisfies the individual. The teacher must be endowed with the ability to discern the student's individuality and subsequently encourage him or her to realize it.

Dewey's educational process allows for a large degree of spontaneity, creativity, and novelty on the part of the student. The teacher is indeed the leader of the educational

enterprise but he or she must also be open to the acquisition of knowledge. The teacher is himself or herself a learner (Dewey, 1997a, p. 304). The student could provide questions, interpretations, and suggestions that might challenge and/or improve upon the understandings of the teacher.

As in progressive education the cannon of the curriculum is never closed, the teacher must continually think of ways of improving the viable knowledge of the curriculum. The novel contribution of students must supplement the teacher's ideas with regard to curriculum improvement. Dewey believes that teachers should have an important role in designing the curriculum. Thus, teachers must assume a dual role: that of doers (educators of children) and that of thinkers (philosophers, experts in the art of education).

Dewey's conception of teaching and learning rooted in human occupations constitutes a foundation to democratic progress. Within an occupational environment, Dewey successfully integrates knowledge and individual freedom. The child is allowed to pursue his or her instincts and interests. In the process, the child acquires knowledge. In Dewey's conception, the combination between the free exercise of the child's instincts and interests and his or her acquiring of knowledge constitutes the recipe for individual freedom. In Dewey's progressive conception, the child is not being prepared for a future democratic life, but experiences democracy within the schooling environment. More than merely forming the child into a democratic citizen, Dewey assigns teachers a role that strengthens their democratic persona. The teacher has an active role in guiding the child to the wisdom of the race (Dewey, 1990, p. 182-190). Dewey's schooling system is teleological. A definite schooling purpose is established; the teacher must lead students

to it. The teacher is very knowledgeable in a plethora of disciplines whether academic or practical. Also, the teacher has a synthetic vision, one that unites these disciplines. Moreover, in Dewey's schooling system, the teacher is not merely a technician who implements blindly and mechanically within schooling the directives of educational specialists. In a progressive school, the teacher must exert his democratic persona; he is both knowledgeable and free. The occupational environment prevents the employment of the teacher as a technician. There is no readymade formula that can be implemented into the progressive schooling process. Every educational situation inherent in an occupational context is unique; every individual is unique. The teacher must be a philosopher because he or she must have the ability to adapt the universal purposes of schooling, subject matter, and the processes of teaching to particular students. Therefore, the teacher is free to perform his or her art as he or she considers. In addition, the teacher is a specialist in pedagogy; therefore, he or she should be consulted in matters pertaining to curriculum and school administration.

John Dewey on Curriculum

In this section, I will present Dewey's ideas regarding curriculum. Dewey's vision with regard to curriculum, stands upon three pillars: (1) the most adequate conception regarding the truth: the pragmatic and scientific truth; (2) an epistemological perspective regarding the truth: the scientific method and the dialectical method; and (3) the ultimate ethical ideal of mankind: democracy. In other words, Dewey's curriculum emphasizes content (scientific and pragmatic), process (the method of science and the dialectical process), and purpose (the ethical ideals of man: freedom, equality, and democracy). The content, processes, and ideals inherent in Dewey's curriculum advance

the greatest social ideal: democracy. First, I will discuss Dewey's perspective on the role of the processes of science and dialectics within curriculum. Second, I will present the factual content of Dewey's curriculum. Both the processes and the factual content of the curriculum will be presented as they connect to Dewey's ideal of democracy. Finally, I will discuss Dewey's conception with regard to the relation between the child and the curriculum.

I will now discuss the processes of science and dialectics. They are the tools that allow humans to find the content of the truth. They also assist humans in realizing the democratic ideal. In a previous section entitled "Pragmatism: The Culmination of John Dewey's Philosophy," I have presented Dewey's arguments with regard to the ethical advantages of science over idealist philosophy. According to Dewey, science, unlike philosophy, has produced results that have improved human existence. Because of this ability to improve the human condition, the method of science should replace the method of philosophy, at least how it had been previously understood. Therefore, man should embrace the scientific idea that action should precede thought and renounce the philosophical idea that thought should precede action. Dewey inflicts a final blow to the method of philosophy by affirming that at the foundation of idealist philosophy lies *a priori* decision making, not reason. Idealist philosophy made a choice to interpret the sensations and ideas as distinct ontological realities. Implicitly, it refused to interpret them as pragmatic functional elements (i.e. mere tools) in the real unity of experience. Thus, idealism becomes the product of the scientific/pragmatic method of action prior to thought. By implication, idealism undermines its core precept that thinking should always precede action. In this way, idealism is itself pragmatic. Dewey's argument is so

intricate, that he feels confident to challenge idealists to prove him wrong. The only difference between idealism and pragmatism is in the fact that unlike the latter, the former does not produce favorable results. The rational advantage of idealism over pragmatism thus disappears. Therefore, the scientific method remains the only adequate method of knowing the truth. It should be the only one emphasized in the curriculum. Needless to say, the method of idealist philosophy should not have any place in the curriculum.

I have also mentioned that Dewey finds Hegel's dialectical method as appropriate to be integrated within the curriculum. The dialectical method consists of three elements: a thesis, an antithesis, and a synthesis. The antithesis opposes the thesis; from their union a synthesis emerges. The synthesis simultaneously transcends and incorporates both the thesis and the antithesis. The synthesis then becomes a second thesis, a second antithesis emerges, and subsequently a second synthesis, and so forth. According to Hegel, the dialectical process ends in the absolute reality: the state. Dewey keeps the dialectical process but lops of its end, the absolute. Earlier I have presented Dewey's conception that the belief in idealism and its absolute reality is unwarranted. Moreover, Dewey embraces Hegel's idea that although the thesis and the antithesis are induced by reason and seem to reflect the truth, they are only tools that lead humans to the truth. The proof for this statement is provided by the fact that these are transcended by the synthesis. The later stages of the dialectical process invalidate the earlier ones. So where is the truth, what is reality? For Dewey, the truth is neither in the statements made in the name of reason, nor in a teleological reality; the truth is in the process, the dialectical process. Dewey's truth is not static, but rather is inherent in a dynamical process. If for Hegel, the

dialectical process operates in the world of thought, for Dewey it integrates thinking and doing, it unites matter and ideas. Thus, the dialectical process is embodied in the scientific method. Dewey masterfully unites in his pragmatism philosophy and science.

The scientific process and the dialectical process must be transmitted to students through the curriculum. They should be transmitted in conjunction with content. As for Hegel, the content of history plays a significant role in Dewey's curriculum. History allows students to see the dialectical process at work. It gives one the opportunity to understand how human conceptions, ideals, and activities were transformed and purified. What was beneficial for humanity was preserved and the evil discarded. Historical knowledge justifies our present conceptions and endeavors and allows us to avoid re-enacting the errors of the past. When connected to historical knowledge, the dialectical process, which will later receive the label of scientific process, allows humans to make more than a judgment of fact; it gives humans the ability to make judgments of value. Thus, historical dialectics (or science) allows one to know beyond how to do something; it has something to say about what to do. By telling us what we should do, science assumes an ethical role. At the culmination of the historical process, the curriculum must offer the most viable creations of science and ethics. Moreover, the curriculum must explicitly state that the content forged by science over time is not absolute; rather the method of science should be employed for its continual improvement. Science must always operate within the framework provided by the democratic ideals of humankind: individual freedom, equality, and fraternity.

So far, I have presented Dewey's perspective on the processes of science and dialectics. I will now discuss Dewey's perspective on the factual content of the

curriculum. I will start with discussing Dewey's conception of the place of democracy within the curriculum. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916b/1997a) affirms that schools are a means of social control in which the mature understanding of adults must be transmitted to the immature. The issue of social control raises the question of Dewey's understanding of ethics and politics. Dewey states, "the conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind" (1997a, p. 97). As mentioned previously, the society Dewey has in mind is a democratic community. Thus, Dewey dispenses the ambiguity that surrounded his idea of social progress. Dewey advocates the explicit cultivation of democratic ideas in the curriculum. Beyond the theoretical presentation of these concepts, the school must organize its students into democratic communities of inquiry. The practice of democracy is therefore essential. Dewey does not perceive democratic education as "a line of action contrary to [the child's] natural inclination" (1997a, p. 36), but rather a process in which the natural dispositions of the child are shaped by the mature teacher. As previously mentioned, for Dewey, freedom and its political outlet, democracy, are universal ideals for humankind.

Dewey's curriculum emphasizes both culture and utility. It is both academic and vocational. Many interpreters of Dewey attempted to label him as a proponent of a vocational curriculum. Moreover, Dewey is accused of promoting the interests of the upper classes by eliminating academic knowledge from the curriculum he designed for the masses. The implication is that Dewey's curriculum is undemocratic. Dewey responds by arguing that the separation between culture and utility is a consequence of idealist philosophy. If Platonic philosophy would have not separated thinking and doing,

this problem would have not emerged in the first place. The separation of these two human activities leads to a system of class divisions that will subsist as long as this separation exists. Therefore, a few humans will be the thinkers, destined to a life of contemplation and leisure, while most of humans will be the doers, members of the working class. The former have political power, while the latter realize the desires of the former. The two classes receive different kinds of education. The thinkers are initiated into the doctrines of culture; the doers receive an education that emphasizes practical labor. Thus, two curricula emerge: the first is academic in nature, the second is utilitarian and, according to Dewey, does not even deserve the name of education.

This vision of the two curricula is rooted in an inadequate conception regarding reality and is also antidemocratic. It is a vision that does not fulfill the humanity of either one of the two classes of people. Dewey attempts to show a better way that integrates the two curricula. The thinkers are instructed to pursue a life of thought. As shown above, a life of thought is insufficient for satisfying human nature. It is morally and rationally inferior to a life of action, and it is undemocratic. Therefore, the thinkers themselves should not be satisfied with only an academic curriculum. In Dewey's conception, as the vibrant methods of science replace the static idealist philosophy at the apex of curriculum, man increasingly finds more meaning within his existence. Moreover, from an ethical perspective, Dewey asserted that only in a democratic community can man be fully satisfied. Tyranny does not even satisfy the tyrant. He indeed satisfies his individuality but does not fulfill the social aspect of his nature. What he lacks is the feeling of fraternity with his fellow men.

The doers are given a curriculum that limits their access to thinking. As their access to intelligence and science is blocked, they cannot be free. They are mere tools in the hands of their employers. They are deprived of political power. Dewey states, the workers, “do what they do, not freely and intelligently, but for the sake of the wage earned” (1997a, p. 260). Therefore, he concludes, the industrial education they receive is illiberal and immoral. The vocational curriculum does not satisfy the human ideals of individual freedom, equality, fraternity, and democracy. Dewey proposes a curriculum that integrates culture and utility, a curriculum that offers the best education to all the citizens of the state, a curriculum that is built around the principles of science and democracy.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented Dewey’s views with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. I have argued that these educational views are founded upon two pillars inherent in Dewey’s thought: pragmatism and democracy. An understanding of pragmatism presupposes an understanding of Dewey’s philosophical journey. Therefore, I have provided a brief intellectual biography of Dewey, one that reflects the rational and emotional aspects which shaped his philosophical development. Next, I have discussed Dewey’s philosophical worldview: pragmatism. Finally, I have presented Dewey’s understandings of curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling and have shown how his views derive from his pragmatic philosophy. In parallel, I have shown how Dewey’s political philosophy culminates in his views on democracy. I have presented Dewey’s views with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling and have shown how they are rooted in his understanding of democracy.

I will now shift to the work of Mortimer Adler and discuss how his views are both similar and different in many respects from those of Dewey.

CHAPTER THREE

Mortimer Adler on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling

Mortimer Adler, the leader of the Paideia Group, dedicated his work, *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, to John Dewey and Robert Maynard Hutchins, a former president of the University of Chicago. Adler states that both of these men “would have been our leaders were they alive today” (Adler, 1982, p. v). Adler’s decision is motivated by Dewey’s and Hutchins’ unwavering support for democracy as well as their common conception that democracy can be promoted through curriculum, teaching, and schooling. In Adler’s conception, Dewey was the first leading American educator who employed schooling, curriculum, and teaching as a means for promoting democracy. Until Dewey’s time, schools promoted a non-democratic Jeffersonian paradigm of the curriculum. This curriculum divided students into two groups: some who were destined for leisure and learning, while others were destined for labor. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey argued that if we want to realize the ideal of democracy, we must provide students with more than the same quantity of public schooling; we must provide them with the same *quality* of education as well. According to Adler, Dewey’s ideal of democratic education is still to be realized. Hutchins, who emerged on the educational scene two decades after Dewey, dedicated his life to defending democracy against the imminent perils of Fascism and Nazism. Like Dewey, Hutchins believed that American democracy can best be protected and strengthened through curriculum, teaching, and schooling. Echoing Dewey, Hutchins stated that “The best education for the best...is the best education for all” (Adler, 1982, p. 6).

Adler embraces Dewey's and Hutchins' ideal of democracy and their conceptions that democracy can be promoted through curriculum, teaching, and schooling. Although Dewey and Hutchins agree on these general ideas, they disagree on the substance, or the meaning, of curriculum, teaching, and purpose of schooling. Although Dewey's and Adler's disagreements are not all-encompassing (because they agree on some specific educational practices), the two authors embrace opposing worldviews. In other words, they adhere to different motivations for the various educational practices that they address. Dewey's and Hutchins' disagreements are rooted in their distinct philosophical conceptions: Dewey is a pragmatic thinker, while Hutchins is a neo-Aristotelian thinker. At this point, Adler leaves Dewey and embraces Hutchins' neo-Aristotelian philosophy. Thus, the third pillar, a neo-Aristotelian philosophy, is placed at the foundation of Adler's thinking alongside his ideal of democracy and his conception that the democratic ideal can be promoted through a certain approach to curriculum, teaching, and schooling.

For Adler, neo-Aristotelian philosophy serves as the best foundation for schooling. This philosophy carries with it certain metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical assumptions that must be present in the curriculum. In Adler's view, the ideal of democracy can best be defended by a neo-Aristotelian philosophy. Therefore, I will first provide a discussion of Adler's ideas on neo-Aristotelian metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics. This philosophical discussion facilitates the evaluation of Adler's views from a Christian perspective. Second, I will discuss Adler's work with regard to democracy. Third, I will address Adler's ideas on curriculum and teaching, before showing how his views derive from his neo-Aristotelian philosophy and his acceptance, indeed advocacy, of democracy.

Neo-Aristotelian Philosophy: Mortimer Adler's Foundation for Schooling

As I mentioned previously, Adler believes that neo-Aristotelian philosophy is the foundation for democracy and implicitly schooling. For Adler, the purpose of schooling is to further the ideal of democracy. Democracy and neo-Aristotelianism coexist in a symbiotic relationship, which I will explore in detail in the section of this chapter on democracy. I will begin by addressing Adler's understanding of neo-Aristotelian philosophy as the foundation for schooling's purpose. Any serious analysis of Adler's thought must begin with addressing the following question: why philosophy?. Put another way, this question could read: what is the need for philosophy, specifically idealist Aristotelian philosophy, for humankind? Adler addresses these questions within the intellectual context of the twentieth century, one dominated by the scientific method and its philosophical counterpart: pragmatism. What is the place of traditional philosophy within the twentieth century context of change, progress, and utility? For most people in the twentieth century, all of nature evolves, even ideas. As a major and influential philosopher during the early twentieth century, Dewey extrapolated the concept of evolution inherent in the physical world into the world of ideas. Therefore, to him, truth is constructed. Thus, the need for a philosophic system entrenched in an immutable world of ideas became anachronistic. People began to believe that they lived in a progressive world in which the new positivistic and pragmatic philosophies ruled supreme, unchallenged by older idealist conceptions, which Adler thought were being discarded too quickly.

According to Adler, historically we can clearly see that scientific progress was unable to solve our existential struggle with aging and death, which remain to this day a

part of our lot. Moreover, on the political front, Hitler and Stalin are not morally superior to Caligula or Nero (Adler, 1988, p. 70). The role of science and technology in improving man's existence is undeniable. However, in Adler's conception, to assume as pragmatists and positivists do that science by itself is sufficient to provide human beings with happiness, which he views as the ultimate end of man, is inadequate. Adler is keen to point out that science does not offer solutions to moral and political problems. These problems remain unvarying throughout human history. Pragmatists admit that at the present time science does not have answers to moral and political problems. Moreover, pragmatists believe that for the time being philosophy should address these issues. However, pragmatists assert that the role of philosophy should cease once science finds an answer to social and moral problems. Adler disagrees. In his conception, philosophy is relevant not only for the present but also for the future. To Adler, philosophy has already found sufficient answers to moral and political questions (Adler, 1988, p. 40). Moreover, according to Adler, philosophy ably debunks the myth of constant change, as well as that of progress. Also, Adler shows that philosophy is superior to science with regard to utility. In other words, philosophy is more useful than science. In the following section, I will present Adler's critique of progressive philosophy. Then, I will discuss why Adler believes that philosophy is superior to science with regard to the idea of utility.

Mortimer Adler on the Myth of Perennial Progress

Progressivism, as a dominant ideology of the twentieth century, is characterized by its rejection of static (or stable) realities. Everything in nature, whether material or immaterial, is in a constant state of flux to progressivists. In addition, progressivism

entails more than the concept of constant change. The idea of improvement is also implied. The sole engine of progressivism is science; idealist philosophy is considered inadequate. A constant evolution of science entails a continuous progress of humankind. In Adler's conception, the myth of progress "*lies at the heart of progressive education*" (Adler, 1988, p. 70). Thus, the deconstruction of progressivism entails the repudiation of progressive education. Therefore, Adler's critique of the idea of progress is relevant to this dissertation that has among its goals the comparison and contrast of Dewey and Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and schooling.

Adler debunks the myth of progress by utilizing epistemological means. Thus, he provides a discussion with regard to the methods of science and philosophy. In Adler's conception, science and philosophy are adequate methods of understanding reality. Unlike the progressives, Adler believed that science and philosophy are complementary rather than antagonistic epistemological methods. According to Adler, science and philosophy share common elements. Human beings acquire knowledge through sense experience. Therefore, the knowledge of science and philosophy constitutes an interpretation of sensory data. In both cases, humans employ the processes of generalization, abstraction, reflection, analysis, and induction, which transform sensory data into ideas. Sense and reason, observation and reflection, and experience and thought are common to science as well as philosophy (Adler, 1988, p. 72).

The difference between the methods of science and philosophy resides in the quality of the sensory data analyzed. Science deals with the constantly changing world of particulars. The objects of science are in a continuous state of flux. Philosophy deals with human experiences that are always the same. Its data never changes. Therefore, if a

scientist must continuously divide his or her creative energies between the activity of collecting new sensory data and the process of reflection upon this data, a philosopher will only employ his or her intellectual abilities. The task of the philosopher is to employ reason in order to refine, or in other words to deepen, his or her understanding of unchanging sensory data. Adler, citing philosopher Alfred North Whitehead, states that the history of western philosophy “is nothing but a series of footnotes to Plato” (Adler, 1988, p. 72). Adler further adds that “Aristotle wrote most of the footnotes” (Adler, 1988, p. 72).

According to Adler, the progressive aspect of science resides in its nature. In his words, the scientific foundations of progressivism must acknowledge “the contingency of its conclusions as relative to the available data” (Adler, 1988, p. 72). In philosophy, there is no such progress because “its conclusions are not contingent, and the *relevant* experience is always the same. The historical movement of science is a straight line ever upward. The historical movement of philosophy is a deepening spiral, in every turn of which the same truths and the same errors reappear” (Adler, 1988, p. 72).

Adler does not affirm that progress is unattainable in philosophy. There are indeed areas in philosophy in which reason has not pronounced its final verdict. In these areas, human reason must be incited to produce new insights. However, Adler believes that there are domains within philosophy in which reason has uttered a final pronouncement. Over these domains, the idea of progress is powerless.

Adler’s epistemological perspective that science and philosophy occupy different spheres of human thought is at odds with the mythical idea of perennial, all

encompassing progress. Progress has a limited role, mainly in the sphere of science. I will now present Adler's evaluation of science and philosophy with regard to utility

Philosophy vs. Science: Which is More Useful?

Progressives, who are almost always pragmatists, boast with the idea that their philosophy is far more useful than idealist philosophy. Progressives depict pragmatism and science as practical arts, while philosophy is impractical. This conception is extended into the sphere of education as progressives brag about the usefulness of their paradigm, as opposed to the uselessness of a philosophically driven curriculum. Adler is eager to prove that these progressive ideas are wrong.

Indeed, science, being the primary method of progressivism, is useful. Science allows man to exert his or her influence, control, and dominion over nature. However, according to Adler, science can only provide man control over the means, meaning the operable instruments of nature. Science is incapable of giving human beings control over the ends that they are trying to pursue. Science can be used for both good and evil purposes; there is no internal mechanism of science that prevents its misuse. People can use science at the same level of efficiency in promoting Thrasymachus' moral philosophy of might makes right as well as Socrates' conception of justice. Science cannot address questions with regard to right and wrong, or good and bad. For Adler, science is insufficient to address moral and political questions.

Only philosophy adequately addresses moral and political questions. Unlike science, philosophy addresses a central ethical question: what should one do? This is indeed a practical question; it is a question that necessitates action. The question of science, how does something work?, is at least useless and at most dangerous, unless it is

subordinated to the question of philosophy. Science can only provide an increasingly more efficient way for a particular course of action. But the decision to engage in that particular course of action is moral, political, and ultimately philosophical. According to Adler, philosophy, because of its authority over the realm of human ends, is not only a practical discipline, but it is also more useful than science (Adler, 1988, p. 73).

The practical or utilitarian aspect of philosophy reveals the independence of philosophy from science not only in theoretical matters, but in practical matters as well (Adler, 1988, p. 73). Adler's thought reserves distinct spheres of activity for philosophy and science. Neither philosophy nor science can perform the work of the other. Both are necessary epistemological tools. Moreover, Adler subordinates the activity of science to the moral and political activity of philosophy. For Adler, ethics and morality direct and restrict scientific activity. Also, from Adler's perspective, neo-Aristotelian philosophy provides an adequate worldview in which philosophy and science are not only equally important, but also have the ability to coexist in harmony. For Adler, the integration of the content and methods of philosophy and science within neo-Aristotelian philosophy provides a solid foundation for democracy and schooling. I will now discuss Adler's assertion that democracy serves as an animating dimension of the purpose of schooling.

Democracy: Mortimer Adler's Purpose for Schooling

As an Aristotelian thinker, Adler believes that politics is the supreme human activity; education is one of several central dimensions within the domain of politics (Adler, 1988, p. 42). Therefore, the role of education in general and of schooling in particular is to serve the state. For Adler, the ideal political regime is democracy. Thus, the purpose of schooling is to promote the flourishing of a democratic state.

In Adler's conception, democracy is the only political regime in which the universal ideals of man are identical with those of the state. In other words, a democratic state promotes the sacred and absolute rights of man. To better understand what these universal human ideals are, Adler distinguishes them from individual human ideals. The former are common to all human beings, universal, and absolute. The latter are subjective and idiosyncratic; they refer only to specific human beings. Unlike universal ideals, individual human ideals are not promoted by the democratic state.

Adler refutes the understanding of democracy as the political regime that provides "the greatest good for the greatest number" (Adler, 1988, p. 43). In Adler's conception, if in a democratic state universal ideals are promoted, then implicitly the rights of all citizens of the state are represented. Therefore, the concepts of minority and majority become obsolete. The unity between the state and its citizens is realized.

Adler rejects Thomas Hobbes' idea that the government is a necessary evil that must be endured because it emancipates humans from their brutish nature. This evil nature of the government resides in the fact that humans must relinquish their freedom while entering a social contract with the state. For Hobbes, absolute and unrestricted freedom and human emancipation are competing ideals. As man cannot possess both, he or she is compelled to live without the possibility to satisfy his or her nature completely. In order to diminish the extent of man's dramatic existence, Hobbes adheres to the principle that the less powerful is the state, the better. Adler does not share Hobbes' view that the ideals of the state are foreign or in opposition to those of human beings. Moreover, Adler provides a different understanding of freedom that provides a resolution to Hobbes' dilemma.

Adler embraces Augustine's conception with regard to freedom (Adler, 1988, p. 50). Augustine affirmed that in itself the act of exerting one's free will is neither moral nor immoral. Freedom can be utilized for both good and evil purposes. Therefore, not all free choices are moral and lead to happiness, only those that are guided by reason and justice. While Hobbes believed that the subordination of one's will is at best a necessary evil, Adler, following Augustine, believed that man is completely happy when he or she subordinates his or her will to the authority of justice and reason. Therefore, one's submission to justice whether administered by an individual or a state is conducive to one's happiness. The idea that in the democratic state the universal rights of man are the ideals of the state consolidates Adler's conception with regard to beneficial role of the state. The government in itself is not evil. The state becomes evil when it positions itself to the extreme of Augustine's conception on freedom. As Adler put this point, "Totalitarianism, at one extreme, commits the error of defect; false liberalism, at the opposite extreme, commits the error of excess" (Adler, 1988, p. 50).

I will now address the issue of false liberalism, which, according to Adler, constitutes the most current and greatest attack against democracy. Adler believes that freedom (as described above) and democracy are absolute principles. False liberals promote the rejection of the idea of absolute principles, whether they are ethical, moral, or political. Adler identifies them as the authors of a book published by the John Dewey Society entitled *Democracy and the Curriculum* (Adler, 1988, p. 45). The false liberals' rejection of metaphysics elevates absolute freedom as the highest human ideal. Thus, for them, democracy is merely a choice, not an ideal end. In the absence of absolute political principles, democracy, communism, and fascism are rationally justified in equal measure.

From the perspective of a false liberal, if we were requested to justify our fight against communism and fascism, we could only invoke Thrasymachus' conception of justice: might makes right. Adler argues that his neo-Aristotelian conception provides a better defense for democracy, which he believes must be rooted in immutable principles. For what is better to believe: that democracy is arbitrarily chosen or that democracy is firmly rooted in unchanging ethical principles?

Moreover, Adler contends that false liberals believe that democracy should be inculcated in schooling. Indeed, if democracy cannot be deduced with the assistance of reason from absolute principles, then it must be inculcated. The very act of inculcation, however, undermines absolute freedom, which is the highest ideal of the false liberals. Thus, Adler exposes the contradiction inherent in their thinking (Adler, 1988, p. 46).

To Adler, the inculcation of democracy is not likely to produce democratic citizens. Indoctrination, in a sense, promotes democracy because it provides students with a theoretical framework of democracy. However, indoctrination undermines the formation of democratic citizens because it entails teaching democracy via non-democratic means. In other words, the process of indoctrination of democratic principles is useful in transmitting democratic theory but not in fostering democratic practice. Adler believes that the purpose of education is not to indoctrinate democratic principles, but rather to create individuals who are truly free. For Adler, freedom entails one's ability to exert his or her will while endowed with reason and possessing a conception of justice. The student is indeed introduced to democratic theory, but he or she is not required to blindly accept it. Rather, each student is requested to analyze democracy in the light of reason and self-evident universal principles. The role of the teacher is to challenge each

student's inadequate conceptions, and thereby expose the logical contradictions inherent in his or her thinking. The ultimate authority in the educational process is not external (for example the teacher), but rather internal: it is reason. Only when the individual submits to the authority of reason can he or she be truly free. In Adler's conception of democracy, when one follows reason to its ultimate implications one finds democracy. In Adler's educational process, each student learns the theory of democracy while experiencing democratic life. Thus, Adler integrates neo-Aristotelian philosophy and democracy into a unified system by showing that the latter can be deduced from the former.

Adler exposes the hypocrisy of the false liberals. These false liberals accuse educators who believe in a prescribed curriculum and in the authority of the teacher of being undemocratic. For Adler, the true liberals are those who believe in the authority of the teacher and in a pre-established curriculum. In Adler's conception, the false liberals (whom he also refers to as progressives) reject the authority of reason from which the curriculum and the authority of the teacher is derived. Indeed, in the progressive worldview, one that is deprived of a metaphysical conception of reality, developing a curriculum from universal principles is impossible. To Adler, the existence of a prescribed curriculum, one that is in harmony with universal principles, does not contravene democracy. The curriculum only anticipates the unchanging principles that the students who adequately use reason will necessarily discover. Moreover, the teacher's authority consists in his or her ability to awaken the child's reason, which is the ultimate authority. In the absence of the authority of reason and of universal principles of justice which lead students to democracy, false liberals have to resort to the

indoctrination of democracy. This undemocratic practice combined with the unjustified accusation against what Adler calls the true liberals is the ultimate hypocrisy (Adler, 1988, p. 49).

Adler asserts that the false liberals' ideology is dangerous for democracy for yet another reason. Their ideas discourage the use of reason. For relativists, the process of reasoning is indeed useless. Progressives employ reasoning only in a scientific context. As shown above, by refusing to engage in philosophical thinking, the progressive fails to think about political and ethical questions. In Adler's conception, the lack of thinking, specifically political reasoning, is the greatest danger to a democratic state. Adler, citing Hobbes, affirms that in the absence of thinking, "democracy tends to degenerate into an oligarchy of orators, and even sometimes, as we have recently seen abroad, into the tyranny of the leading orator of the land" (Adler, 1988, p. 50). In the absence of an adequate system of schooling, Adler warns, this situation might also engulf this country. The answer to this predicament is true liberal education. The solution resides in the promotion within schooling of the methods of philosophy, specifically neo-Aristotelian philosophy. He argues that neo-Aristotelian philosophy will help to spread and preserve universal principles of freedom, democracy, and justice. These are the purposes of schooling to Adler.

Thus far, I have presented Adler's view that democracy is the ultimate purpose for schooling. I have also argued that democracy can be promoted by neo-Aristotelian philosophy. In addition, I have shown that Adler believes that neo-Aristotelian philosophy is superior to relativism, positivism, progressivism, and pragmatism in promoting the ideal of democracy. Moreover, Adler not only believes that Aristotelian

philosophy can better promote democracy than all the other philosophical worldviews but he adheres to the idea that neo-Aristotelianism, by being entrenched in an immutable system of ideas, best promotes democracy. Thus, the search for a better philosophical perspective in which to entrench democracy is unwarranted; it ends in the neo-Aristotelian absolute principles of ethics and politics.

I will now discuss the third pillar of Adler's thought: the role of schooling in promoting the ideal of democracy. My attention now turns to the ways in which schooling promotes the ideal of democracy to which Adler was committed.

Schooling: A Means of Promoting Democracy

In his work *The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus*, Adler (1984) agrees with Dewey that, in order to live a fulfilling existence, human beings must pursue the following purposes: labor, citizenship, and the realization of his personal potentialities. In other words, every American must have a role in the economic realm, participate in democratic politics, and realize his or her personal aspirations. Adler, like Dewey, believes that schooling constitutes the means for the realization of these human aims (Adler, 1984, p. 3).

More than six decades later after Dewey's plea for democratic education presented in *Democracy and Education*, Adler, in *The Paideia Proposal* and *The Paideia Program*, sounds the alarm for the failure of public schools to realize the human ideals presented above. According to Adler, rather than promoting a democratic ideal, American public schools had begun to promote a caste system of education: a two-track or a multi-track system of schooling. For the privileged group of students, schooling aids them in achieving a life of leisure and learning, one in which their personal ideals are

realized and their political and economical advantages over the rest of society are assured. In the underprivileged category, on the other hand, students are destined for a life of labor, limited political influence, and personal dissatisfaction (Adler, 1984, p. 3).

The current trend, which Adler believes undermines democracy by dividing people into two distinct political and social classes, can be reversed if two principles are implemented into public schooling. First, all public schools should provide the same quality of education to all students. Second, the principle that equality of opportunity provides equality of results is flawed. Rather, for Adler, equality of educational opportunity generates inequality of results. Therefore, Adler believes that inequality of opportunity leads to equality of results and that public schools should embrace this principle. I will discuss each of these principles in detail.

Adler addresses the idea of the same quality of schooling for all students as a means of promoting democracy from three perspectives: the *why*, the *what*, and the *how* of schooling. I have already presented Adler's conception with regard to the *why* of schooling. In short, he presents it as "earning a living, being a good citizen, and living a full life" (Adler, 1984, p. 7). For Adler, the idea of the same quality of schooling implies that these purposes of schooling refer to all students, rather than only to a privileged group. Next, I will only provide a brief synopsis of Adler's understanding with regard to the *what* and the *how* of schooling.

The *what* of learning is the curriculum. For Adler, the curriculum is divided into three categories: "(1) kinds of knowledge to be acquired; (2) skills to be developed; and (3) understanding or insights to be achieved" (Adler, 1984, p. 7). Moreover, Adler's curriculum is humanistic, liberal, and general rather than vocational, specialized, and

technical. The purpose of Adler's curriculum is not to provide job training. Thus, Adler eliminates electives from the curriculum. In Adler's conception, this curricular framework applies to all students. Adler does not endorse a uniform curriculum that can or should be applied to all public schools. Rather, he proposes a universal curricular framework that, when implemented, considers the particular schools, students, and classrooms where the curriculum will be enacted. As a result, specific curricula in specific schools are different although they reflect the same universal framework presented above.

The *how* of schooling refers to teaching. It entails three different methods of instruction: "(1) didactic teaching by lectures or through textbook assignments; (2) coaching that forms the habits through which all skills are possessed; and (3) Socratic teaching by questioning and by conducting discussions of the answers elicited" (Adler, 1984, pp. 7-9). Although all students must study the same liberal curriculum and must be taught according to the principles presented above, Adler recognizes that certain students should be provided with additional education. In Adler's conception, students' difference in native endowment and environmental background requires that educators "give some children who need it pre-school preparation and, later, in the course of school years, supplementary instruction to those who need it" (Adler, 1984, pp. 6-7). As a result, Adler recognizes that teaching must take into account the individual needs of learners.

The second issue that undermines Adler's idea of providing the same quality of education within public schools is the idea that equality of opportunity generates equality of educational results (Adler, 1984, p. 3). Adler believes that the opposite is correct: equality of opportunity leads to inequality of results. To Adler, individuals are endowed

with different aptitudes and talents. Therefore, if given the same educational opportunities, the more talented students will surpass those who are less gifted. This disparity in education will subsequently lead to inequality in social status and political influence. Consequently, American democracy will suffer. Adler's resolution to this problem consists in offering increased opportunity to less gifted individuals by allocating additional resources, whether these resources are material, spiritual, or temporal. Adler acknowledges that even when all of these supplementary resources are provided, individual students may not reach the level of performance attained by his or her more gifted colleagues. However, in Adler's conception, schooling must assist every single individual in fulfilling his or her maximum potential.

Adler employs the phrase "a Paideia school" for his school. This phrase should not be used as are the phrases "a Magnet school" or "a Humanities school," which refer to a certain type of school among many others within American education. A "Paideia school," rather, is the model that should be eventually adopted by all American schools, at least according to Adler.

In this section, I have presented Adler's views with regard to the ways in which schooling promotes democracy. I will now begin a deeper exploration of schooling by discussing Adler's beliefs with regard to teaching and curriculum. I will begin with teaching.

Mortimer Adler on Teaching: Seminar, Coaching, and Didactic Instruction

Adler believes that the main responsibility for learning rests with the student. Indeed, teachers are not entirely insignificant, but they should assume a secondary role in the learning process. As Adler puts it, "Teachers are at best only a secondary cause, an

instrumental aid, assisting in the process by occasioning and guiding the mental activity of the learners in their charge” (Adler, 1984, p. 5). To Adler, Dewey was right when he affirmed that “all learning is by doing—any and every sort of doing that involves thinking” (Adler, 1984, p. 5). Adler differs from Dewey, however, with regard to the application of this principle. While Dewey restricts its application only to the realm of science, Adler extends it to the sphere of philosophy. In the realm of science, the integration between thinking and doing constitutes the essence of the scientific method. In the realm of philosophy, however, doing entails two aspects. First, Adler believes that the philosopher reflects only upon the data provided by sensory experience. Thinking prior to sense experience is inconceivable to Adler. Second, for Adler, philosophical reflection is not an end in itself, but rather a means to ethical and political decision-making.

Moreover, Adler believes that the idea that there is only one kind of learning and teaching, the traditional method, is false. Adler does not disparage the merits of traditional education, which emphasized lecturing, telling, and textbook assignments. However, Adler endorses two other teaching methods, which he refers to as coaching and discussing. He argues that both of these methods are “more important than the first kind because their results are long-lasting, as the results of the first kind are not” (Adler, 1984, p. 5). I will now present Adler’s views with regard to these three methods of teaching. I will present them in what Adler considered to be their order of importance. First, I will discuss the seminar method, then coaching, and finally the didactic method.

The Seminar Method of Teaching

Adler argues that the seminar method of teaching has its roots in Socratic teaching. Indeed, Socrates was never a seminar leader, in the sense of one who leads his students to specific knowledge, but rather merely an interlocutor. Socrates could not have been a seminar leader because he never pretended to possess positive knowledge, which refers to what one should, although he possessed negative knowledge, which refers to what one should not do. Moreover, Socrates never assigned readings, nor did he ask his interlocutors questions for clarifying what these have read. However, Adler identifies his seminar method with Socratic teaching because at the core of his method lies Socrates' passion for clarifying and understanding ideas. Socrates never employed didactic teaching nor did he directly utilize coaching. He merely taught coaching indirectly by stimulating and shaping his interlocutors' mental skills (Adler, 1984, pp. 15-16). I will employ Adler's habit of using interchangeably the phrases seminar teaching and Socratic teaching.

The main goal of seminar teaching is to promote democracy. Among the more specific goals of seminar teaching, Adler mentions stimulating students' use of the skill of reasoning. Also, the seminar method of teaching aims at clarifying ideas and issues in general and/or at elucidating the meaning of a particular book or work of art. In Adler's conception, both of the aims of seminar teaching presented above (students' increase in reasoning ability and erudition, or knowledge) are prerequisites to developing free and democratic individuals. Adler, echoing Jefferson and Dewey, admits that one cannot be ignorant and free. The idea of freedom here entails both reasoning skills and content knowledge, both of which are promoted through seminar teaching. Moreover, for Adler,

the free man is a servant only to his or her reason. Seminar teaching promotes the developing of independent minds guided only by reason. In a previous section of this chapter, I have provided a detailed discussion with regard to Adler's argument that reason and knowledge, specifically the neo-Aristotelian understanding of absolute knowledge, are inextricably intertwined with the ideas of freedom and democracy. For Adler, neo-Aristotelian philosophy provides the best defense for democracy. Since seminar teaching promotes the maturation of one's reasoning abilities and the improvement of one's knowledge (the first premise) and reasoning and knowledge promote freedom and democracy (the second premise), one can conclude that the seminar method of teaching promotes democracy.

With regard to the materials for seminar discussion, Adler states that they should be "either books or other products of human art." He goes on to say that "if books, they must be books that present ideas or broach issues, not books that are catalogues of information or direct exposition of factual knowledge" (Adler, 1984, p. 16). Therefore, textbooks, which according to Adler belong to the latter category, are not appropriate for seminar discussions. Rather, textbooks are designed as tools for didactic instruction. In Adler's conception, textbooks are "essentially undiscussable" (Adler, 1984, p. 16). Moreover, Adler affirms that seminar books should be great books, "In fact, the best books ... [which] rise the most fundamental and lively issues of all" (Adler, 1984, p. 19). The topics addressed by these books (i.e. idea of justice) are and will always remain universal, essential, and vital for all humankind.

Adler divides the teaching materials into two broad categories: imaginative literature (i.e. fiction, drama, and poetry) and expository literature (i.e. science,

philosophy, and history) (Adler, 1984, p. 19). The two kinds of seminar subject matter imply two different ways of conducting seminar discussions. However, there are activities that are common to both types of seminar teaching. The first common aspect to both types of seminar teaching is the idea that students must understand what the book says. Whether students are dealing with Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, an example of imaginative literature, or Aristotle's *Ethics*, an illustration of expository literature, they must understand the message the author is trying to convey. The second step consists of assessing the arguments made by the author. A central question in this second step would include: Is the author's line of thought valid? Third, the student is encouraged to find ways of applying the knowledge acquired to his or her life. Therefore, questions such as the following will be addressed: Can the teachings inherent in this work of art be applied to our lives? And in what way can these ideas be applied to our current circumstances?

With regard to the difference between expository seminar and imaginative seminar, Adler affirms that the former is more organized while the latter is typically more chaotic. For example, in his *Ethics*, Aristotle has a clear aim in mind. He presents a clear line of arguing for attaining his goal of cultivating happiness. In this case, the author's line of thought provides the structure for the discussion. In *Hamlet*, the lack of a linear sequence of argumentation compels "the seminar leader [to] circle round and round the play, seeking for an opening here, for an opportunity there, for a point that it would be helpful to make at this stage of the conversation" (Adler, 1984, p. 20). Although in both types of seminar teaching, the seminar leader asks questions to which there is a right or a wrong answer (i.e. factual questions and questions that refer to a specific argument), imaginative seminars provide more opportunities for asking questions to which there is

no right or wrong answer. Examples of the latter type of questions may include: Does Hamlet love Ophelia or he merely desires her? or Why does Hamlet pretend to be insane? (Adler, 1984, p. 21). Adler also suggests that imaginative seminars often assume different forms. For example, instead of discussing *Hamlet*, the seminar leader might propose that students do a production of the play on stage. Portraying a character in *Hamlet* might prove to be more fruitful than a straightforward discussion, specifically with regard to fostering students' rational skills and understanding of the play.

Adler discriminates in the application of his seminar teaching method between the lower level, or the pre-departmentalized grades, and the upper level, or the departmentalized grades, of basic schooling. In the earlier grades (i.e. from K through 2nd grade), the seminar method should be utilized every day for about a half an hour. No prior reading assignment is necessary; the teacher should merely tell a story, which should be subsequently discussed with the students. From third or fourth grade on, simple reading assignments should be required. Adler suggests that the participants in the conversation must all sit in a circle, the teacher included. The traditional positioning of students in rows behind desks, with the teacher sitting or standing in the front of the class is inappropriate for the seminar method of teaching. The teacher is the facilitator of the discussion. The discussion has an informal character as students are stimulated by the teacher to express their opinions, to provide arguments, and are even allowed to argue with each other about the topic discussed. At the upper level, students should meet for seminar discussion once or at most twice a week; seminars should last from ninety minutes to two hours. Adler suggests that students should sit around a hollow-square table on movable chairs in a room specially designed for seminar conversations.

I will now discuss Adler's viewpoint with regard to the role of the seminar leader, or the teacher. During the preparation stage, the seminar leader must select and underline key words, significant passages, main arguments, and important points to be made. Also, he or she must make notes with regard to the elements that connect one passage to another. In addition, the seminar leader will put down a series of questions, which refer to the most significant aspects of the text. Finally, the teacher will go over the questions and select between one through five questions that he or she will organize in an appropriate sequence. In Adler's conception, the seminar leader should not address more than five questions within a two hour seminar period (Adler, 1984, p. 26).

During the seminar, the leader has a threefold task: to define and give direction to the conversation through a series of questions; to examine students' answers in order to elaborate on the implications and reasoning behind them; and to facilitate a one on one discussion between students who share opposing views. The performance of these tasks is intellectually demanding; thus, Adler suggests that the teacher should conduct only one seminar per day. At the onset of the seminar, the leader must provide a clear understanding of the topic of discussion. He or she must make sure that students understand the questions asked. Moreover, at the beginning and/or during the conversation, the teacher must make sure that terms or concepts are not used loosely, but are clearly defined. The seminar leader should instruct students to ask for clarification if they do not understand the questions and the concepts discussed.

Seminar conversations are not concealed lectures in which instructors either address rhetorical questions or do not patiently wait for students to respond. Moreover, seminar discussions are not to be confused for the questioning that must accompany

didactic teaching. The method of didactic teaching will be addressed in greater detail later on in this chapter, but, for now, a useful point to acknowledge is that Adler suggests that didactic lecturing should be followed by questions about the knowledge presented (Adler, 1984, p. 18).

Students' answers must be provided in clear and complete sentences; grammatical rules must be observed. The seminar leader is not the chair of a meeting who simply invites students to voice their opinions, whatever these may be. Students cannot say whatever is on their minds, but rather must provide answers that are relevant to the questions asked. The teacher will insist through a series of questions until he or she receives the desired answer. Also, the seminar leader will draw out as many implications from the student's answers as appropriate and if necessary will reformulate his or her answers for the benefit of rest of the class.

When conflicting situations arise, the teacher must first define the terms of the conflict. Before attempting to resolve the disagreement one must have a clear understanding of the opposing views. Therefore, it is appropriate for the teacher to use blackboard for framing the opposing perspectives. Also, the seminar leader must instruct students to adopt an attitude of willingness to change their minds if reason demands it. Stubbornness, in spite of reasonable evidence, will not be encouraged (Adler, 1984, pp. 27-28).

The seminar leader must always be patient and polite. Adler suggests that seminar leaders should care for their students as hosts treat their guests for dinner. The leader should provide an example of intellectual etiquette that will inspire his or her

students. Adler also suggests the use of humor during seminar conversations. However, under no circumstances should humor be used at the expense of students.

Adler provides a series of recommendations for teachers who desire to become successful seminar leaders. First, Adler believes that beginning seminar leaders should be given the opportunity to observe competent seminar leaders at work. The act of observation by itself is not sufficient as it should be followed by a series of questions, which are addressed by the beginner to the experienced seminar leader, meant for clarifying various seminar proceedings and practices. Second, Adler suggests that every seminar leader should experience the condition of the student. The seminar leader becomes more successful when his or her performance is shaped by a thorough understanding of the student's function within the seminar experience. Finally, Adler recommends that beginning seminar leaders should teach under the supervision of experienced seminar leaders (Adler, 1984, pp. 29-30).

Next, I will discuss Adler's views with regard to coaching.

The Coaching Method of Teaching

Although Adler is a strong proponent of coaching as a method of teaching (the second in the order of importance after the seminar method of teaching), the most detailed account of coaching is written by Adler's associate, Theodore R.Sizer. Sizer was a professor of education at Brown University and a member of the Paideia Group when he wrote his essay on coaching. Sizer's article was integrated as Chapter 2 in *The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus*. In the preface of *The Paideia Program*, Adler acknowledges that although there were disagreements between the members of the Paideia Group with regard to the recommendations presented in the individual essays,

these disagreements were minor and referred solely to emphasis of some particulars to the detriment of others within the educational experience (Adler, 1984, pp. XI-XII). Adler states that *The Paideia Program* is not concerned with the particulars of the educational experience, but rather with the universal principles of education. *The Paideia Program*, a work in the field of philosophy of education, aims at presenting only universal principles of education, which will later be applied by educational practitioners to particular schooling environments. Adler affirms that with regard to the universal ideas of education, specifically ideas on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling, there is agreement between him and the other members of the Paideia Group. Therefore, we can infer that a discussion on Sizers' essay, presented in *The Paideia Program*, is appropriate in realizing the aims of this dissertation. Although, Sizers' essay will occupy a significant part of this section because it presents the most detailed account on coaching, it will not be the only account. Sizers' work will be supplemented with Adler's own remarks on this topic.

In *The Paideia Proposal*, Adler assigns an essential role to coaching within the schooling experience. As Adler puts it, "...an important end of schools is the development of intellectual skills—skills of learning by means of *reading, writing, speaking, listening, observing, measuring, estimating, and calculating*.... They are the skills that everyone needs in order to learn anything, in school or elsewhere" (Adler, 1982, p. 26). Also, Sizers quotes Adler saying that skill training is "the backbone of basing schooling" (Adler, 1984, pp. 39-40). In other words, schooling is inconceivable in the absence of coaching. In addition, Adler affirms that these skills are required whether for realizing one's individual nature, for qualifying for a new job, or for one's

participation in citizenship (Adler, 1982, p. 26). American Democracy cannot function if American citizens do not possess these basic skills.

The Paideia Program presents three practical examples of coaching and connects them to three distinct subjects: algebra, writing, and social science. I will not address each of these practical coaching situations, but rather will extract and present the general principles inherent in each and every one of them. During a coaching session in algebra, students learn how to observe, calculate, troubleshoot, and correct mathematical errors. In more general terms, coaching in algebra stimulates students' utilization of the processes of thinking: reasoning, imagining, and the efficient use of resources (Adler, 1984, p. 35). During a coaching activity in writing, students learn how to spell, apply grammatical rules, organize their ideas in an essay, and express themselves in a clear and concise manner (Adler, 1984, p. 39). In the process, students develop habits of revision and of critical appreciation of their work. In a social science coaching session, specifically history, students learn habits of evidence, sequential logic, and unambiguous use of words. In history, evidence for a particular historical event is mandatory. Moreover, a meaningful historical exposé requires a precise use of terminology and a logical presentation of the topic (Adler, 1984, p. 46).

Regardless of the subject matter, coaching entails the following general principles: telling, questioning, and drilling. The teacher (meaning the coach) is responsible for the first two, and the student is accountable for the third. Telling refers to providing direct instruction. Direct instruction can be positive in nature; for example, in a math class, the teacher will tell the student that in a specific situation he or she must always apply a particular formula. Or, the teacher can employ direct instruction for

correcting the student's errors. Questioning refers to asking the student for an explanation with regard to his or her decisions. For example, in an algebra class, the teacher will ask the student why he or she applied a formula in a specific situation. Questioning has the role of making the student a habitual questioner of all of his or her actions. Thus, questioning forms the habit of evaluating one's choices in the light of reason. Drilling entails performing and perfecting these skills in the presence of the teacher, and also spending a large amount of time in practicing these skills by the student alone. In coaching, the student is the main worker. His or her efforts must not go unnoticed but rather the teacher should resort to praise and encouragement when appropriate (Adler, 1984, p. 35).

In *The Paideia Program*, the list of the universal principles of coaching is supplemented with a series of "maxims for the guidance of coaching" (Adler, 1984, p. 39). The first refers to the requirement that the teacher must know about the student's strengths and weaknesses whether of intellectual or emotional nature. Teachers must know the level of each student's intellectual and emotional ability, his or her problem-solving skills, as well as his or her most frequent errors.

Second, the most effective form of coaching is a one-on-one affair. In other words, most effective coaching is no other than individual tutoring. Indeed, the time spent by the student and his or her coach is not sufficient for fostering the desired skills; it must be accompanied by a lengthy amount of time spent by the student, alone, practicing and wrestling with the newly acquired skills. In the real world of schooling, the overwhelming majority of teachers cannot afford the luxury to employ solely one-on-one coaching or for lengthy amounts of time. However, there are ways in this teaching

method can be utilized. For example, teachers can engage in coaching one student while the other students are busily performing individual work. Derivates of the one-on-on coaching such as one-to-two, three, or five can be employed when a group of students commit the same error in their school work. The most frequent use of the method of one-on-one coaching is occasioned by written work. Teachers will make remarks, recommendations, suggestions, and corrections that students will incorporate in their work in order to improve it (Adler, 1984, p. 40).

Each teacher can make use of other forms of coaching such as coaching himself or herself before a student audience. For example, a music teacher can present a recording of one of his or her interpretations of a specific piece of music. Subsequently, students are asked to critique the supposed expert, the teacher. Following their critique, the teacher himself or herself will emphasize the important aspects of his or her performance and will offer solutions with regard to correcting his or her mistakes. This type of coaching will expose the non-infallibility of the teacher, which will help repudiate students' fear to offer their own work to be scrutinized (Adler, 1984, p. 40).

Teachers can employ another method of coaching that of coaching the whole class at the same time. This method cannot be generalized to all coaching situations but when appropriate it could be very useful. For example, in a foreign language class, students could perform language drills. The entire class could repeat a word uttered by the teacher. Also, students who are more advanced in a particular subject matter could coach their peers. This coaching method might prove efficient because students prefer to expose their weaknesses to their peers rather than to teachers. Finally, the computer can

function as an impersonal coach. It is an interactive machine that could prove beneficial in the development of students' skills (Adler, 1984, p. 40).

The second maxim with regard to coaching presented in *The Paideia Program*, refers to students' fear to communicate with the teacher and to exhibit the skills taught as an impediment against effective coaching. Beyond courage to display his or her skills, effective coaching requires the student's willingness to be coached. The student must be willing to struggle with the newly acquired skills until he or she can adequately master them. The exhibition of the student's newly taught skills has yet another role, that of providing feedback to the teacher. In the absence of feedback, the teacher does not know whether the student has mastered the newly taught skill or not. The fact that students progress at different rates and at different times prevents teachers from knowing the ability level of a particular student based upon the performance of his or her peers. Thus, in the absence of feedback, the teacher is oblivious whether he or she must move to teaching the next skill or must still emphasize the current one (Adler, 1984, p. 41).

The third important principle of coaching is the idea of immediacy. This applies specifically to written work. Teachers must make sure that the dialogue between them and students is not interrupted. Student work must be graded thoroughly and returned promptly to the student. Fourth, errors must be exposed but also they must be explained. The student must be informed why certain aspects of his or her work are considered erroneous by the teacher. Fifth, the student must be instructed that drill is of the essence. Hard work is required both during the coaching session and also when the student is practicing alone the newly acquired skills. Finally, coaching requires time and implicitly a class of a small size. A lengthy amount of time is needed for coaching because

coaching entails that the teacher should know each and every one of his or her students. Thus, a small class size is always advantageous to coaching. Therefore, elementary schools, where teachers are usually faced with fewer students provide a better environment for coaching (Adler, 1984, p. 41-42).

I will now discuss Adler's third and final method of teaching: didactic teaching.

The Didactic Method of Teaching

From the beginnings of formal schooling and until today, didactic teaching has been and continues to be the most used method of teaching. Adler, moreover, finds that didactic instruction is more susceptible than coaching and seminar teaching to abuse and misuse. When misused, Adler believes that didactic instruction undermines democracy. However, Adler does not stop at exposing the weaknesses of didactic teaching, but also provides solutions for making didactic instruction a useful tool in promoting democracy.

In a democratic state, every individual has political power; every citizen is a leader of the state; everyone is free to express and to realize his or her intentions, desires, and purposes. But, for Adler, freedom entails more than one's ability to lead by realizing one's choices and desires. To be free entails to lead in the light of reason. The democratic person is one who integrates reasoning and political action, who is a lifelong thinker and learner, and who is a man of initiative. Adler summarizes the nature of a democratic person in his conception of an active, autonomous, and independent individual. The seminar and the coaching methods of teaching are means to realizing this purpose. Seminar teaching forms an individual who is subjected only to the authority of reason, and who is a man of initiative and action whether in ethical or political affairs. Within the context of seminar teaching, "Activity of mind is occasioned or initiated by

wonder, sustained by interest and excitement, and reinforced by the pleasure inherent in the activity itself and by delight in its success” (Adler, 1984, p. 47). Coaching constitutes the educational activity which integrates thinking and doing for both the coach and the person who is being coached. Coaching, moreover, helps to develop mental and bodily skills, which if absent will prevent people from engaging in seminars as completely as they should. In the absence of basic skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, human beings will not be able to explore the deepest aspects of human knowledge.

Didactic teaching by its nature is more susceptible than seminar teaching and coaching to be employed in undermining Adler’s schooling purpose of an active and autonomous mind. The role of didactic teaching is to transmit a large body of organized knowledge through lecturing. To Adler, didactic teaching operates in three broad subject matter areas: language, literature, and fine arts; mathematics and natural science; and history, geography, and social science (Adler, 1984, p. 8). Memory is often employed by the one who engages in this demanding task. Also, if during the activities of coaching and seminar teaching, the activity of the student’s mind is evident in his or her physical actions and interactions, during didactic teaching, the activity of the student’s mind is not being revealed via external or physical outlets. In the absence of a competent teacher who could stimulate student thinking by providing positive incentives (i.e. rational, emotional, and motivational) and negative reinforcement (i.e. testing, etc.), didactic teaching could degenerate into a schooling experience that generates passivity of mind, conformity, and boredom. Adler affirms that at the end of the twentieth century, American schools were not only emphasizing didactic teaching and eliminating coaching and seminar teaching, but were also misusing didactic teaching and thus were promoting

passivity of mind, obedience, and conformity. In other words, Adler considered American education during his time to be undemocratic. Above, I have presented Adler's proposal for introducing seminar teaching and coaching as a means of promoting democracy. Next, I will discuss Adler's proposal with regard to the adequate implementation of didactic teaching within schooling: the use of didactic teaching as a means of forming an active, autonomous, and democratic mind. Therefore, according to Adler, the main concern of educators with regard to didactic teaching is how to make didactic teaching a cause of active learning?

Adler acknowledges two kinds of didactic instruction: written and oral. The former appeals to the visual sense of while the latter appeals to the auditory sense. Before the invention of the printing press, oral instruction was more prevalent because teachers read to entire classes from books. After the invention of the printing press, however, educators employed both the oral and the written forms of instruction. Today, written instruction is occasioned by textbooks, manuals, and course materials. Oral education is typically used in the following manner: as repetition of what is covered in the reading, as commentary on what was read, and as a means of providing new information to supplement what has been read (Adler, 1984, p. 48).

Adler suggests that didactic instruction in both its forms should be utilized at what he calls the pre-departmental level, which consists of the first six through eight years of schooling, as well as at departmental level, or high school. The distinction between the two levels can be found in the fact that at the pre-departmental level, students study under the guidance of one teacher who is an expert in the basics of the various disciplines; at the departmental level, however, subject matter is divided into academic disciplines such

as math, English, and geography. At the departmental level, a teacher is an expert in a particular subject. For example, at the departmental level, we have math teachers, history teachers, and science teachers. Didactic teaching entails two aspects: one that is common to both levels and another in which different didactic approaches are promoted to the two levels (Adler, 1984, p. 49).

I will now discuss Adler's arguments with regard to the aspects that are common to both the pre-departmental level and the departmental level. I will address this issue from two perspectives: first, the perspective of the student, the reader and listener, and second, from the perspective of the teacher.

Adler urges students to read and to listen actively. Reading actively entails questioning one's understanding while reading. The student must interpret texts closely. Also, the student must explore all possible connotations inherent in the reading, in other words he or she must analyze the text. Moreover, the student must evaluate its meaning in the light of prior knowledge, thus synthetic skills are employed. Listening occasions a deeper understanding, a richer interpretation, and further clarification of the matters presented in the reading. As in the case of reading, active listening is imperiously necessary. The listener is required to constantly question his or her understanding; analytical and synthetic skills are as useful in listening as in the case of reading (Adler, 1984, p. 50).

Adler acknowledges that didactic teaching also requires practices that are less likely to stimulate and sustain interest. For example, he refers to bodies of information that must precede organized knowledge. In his words, this includes "bits of information, names and places in geography, terms and dates in history, spelling, etymology, and

meanings of words in English or some other language, rules of grammatical construction, formulas and tables in science and mathematics” (Adler, 1984, p. 50). In such cases, the teacher must make an appeal to students’ skill of memorization, an arduous and uninteresting task. Adler suggests that the teacher should motivate the students by discussing the usefulness of the information and by “predicting the interest it will lead to” prior to demanding that students should memorize it (Adler, 1984, p. 50).

To Adler, a teacher’s main attributions as a didactic instructor are to check for student retention of information read, to make sure that students understand what they have read and did not just merely learned it by rote memorization, and to supplement through oral instruction what has been read. Among all of these roles assumed by the teacher, the most important is his or her role of lecturer (Adler, 1984, p. 51).

As a lecturer, the teacher’s main concern is to stimulate the student’s engagement in the process of active listening. The teacher must attract and sustain the student’s attention during the entire lecture. According to Adler, the format of the class session which includes the lecture could induce attention and active thinking on the part of the student during the whole lecture. Adler proposes dividing the time reserved for didactic instruction: the first half will be employed for lecturing while the second half will be employed for questioning. Students will be informed about and warned to pay attention to the information provided in the lecture as a period of questioning with regard to what has been taught will follow immediately after the lecture. Moreover, teachers should inform students that they reserve the right to question them, whether orally or in written exams, with regard to the content of any lecture at any particular time. As a result, all information provided in lectures remains relevant (Adler, 1984, p. 51).

Adler recommends that teachers should embellish the logical organization of their lectures with rhetorical devices. Teachers should demonstrate enthusiasm, interest, and passion for the topic developed in the lecture. They should utilize their creative energies and powers of imagination in the presentation of subject matter. Adler warns that enthusiasm is as contagious as boredom; he urges teachers to employ the former and reject the latter (Adler, 1984, pp. 51-52).

Adler is well aware that the traits of attention, interest, and active thinking are triggered by a sense of wonder and are subsequently sustained by the joy of discovery. At the beginning of lectures, teachers should induce a sense of perplexity, amazement, and even mystery. This feeling will then be replaced progressively by a sense of discovery, which provides a resolution to the questions raised by wonder (Adler, 1984, p. 52).

Adler also recommends that teachers should neither lecture beyond the student's ability to comprehend what is being taught, nor "should they talk down and lose [students'] attention by being obvious, condescending, and dull." Rather, teachers should adopt the means between these two extremes. In Adler's words, "The middle ground consists in telling students things they can readily understand side by side with things they must make some effort to understand, that effort being re-enacted in the question period after the talk" (Adler, 1984, p. 52).

With regard to the question-and-answer period that follows the lecture, Adler suggests that it should consist of a time of bidirectional dialogue. Teachers and students should take turns in posing questions. This dialogue will allow teachers to know what has been accomplished during the class session. The teacher will employ this assessment

in guiding his or her future lectures. Students benefit from this dialogue because they are provided with an opportunity for clarification and a deeper understanding of the ideas presented in the lecture (Adler, 1984, pp. 52-53).

I will now discuss Adler's viewpoint with regard to the difference between the lower and the upper levels of schooling. At the lower level of schooling didactic instruction assumes mainly the form of oral instruction at least as long as students' reading ability is not sufficiently developed. As students' reading ability increases, written instruction will be introduced. In the beginning written instruction will be employed mainly for the purpose of transmitting facts; understanding will be fostered solely through oral instruction. Also, Adler believes that at the lower level of schooling the balance between written and oral instruction varies according to subject matter. For example, math and science require more written instruction than history, geography, and social science. Conversely, oral instruction is more emphasized in the latter category of disciplines than in the former. Adler believes that in the case of English, didactic instruction must be integrated with coaching (Adler, 1984, pp. 54-55).

At the upper level of schooling, which he calls the departmental level, the scope of written instruction should increase considerably in all subjects. Nevertheless, it should always be followed by a two-way question-and-answer session (as described above). Moreover, Adler endorses lecturing especially on topics that are not covered in the written material. Although Adler acknowledges that eloquent speakers are rare, he hopes that each school will have one or two master teachers who can deliver lectures to large audiences. Also, Adler recognizes the role that technology (for example,

videoconferencing) can play in transmitting the lectures of great speakers. (Adler, 1984, p. 55).

In this section, I have provided Adler's understanding with regard to teaching. He proposes three teaching methods: seminar teaching, coaching, and didactic instruction. Adler's teaching methods facilitate the transmission of subject matter content and intellectual, emotional, and moral skills. All three of Adler's teaching methods aim at forming a human being with a free and active mind, a man whose only master is truth and reason. Adler's teaching methods promote metaphysical truths consistent with neo-Aristotelian philosophy and with the socio-political ideal of liberal democracy.

I will now discuss Adler's views with regard to curriculum.

Mortimer Adler on Curriculum

According to Adler, the curriculum must serve the following ideals of man's existence: the socio-political ideal, the economic ideal, and the personal ideal (Adler, 1982, pp. 16-17). For Adler, in a democratic state, all of these human ideals are better fulfilled than in any other political regime. First, Adler recognizes the socio-political nature of man. Man is a social being who cannot be happy in isolation; as a result, man is compelled by his or her nature to enter into relationships with fellow human beings. Satisfying human relationships are possible only as humans reside under the auspices of reason and ethical truth. Adler includes civic and political virtue under the large domain of ethics. Adler affirms that whenever human beings choose to live outside the authority of the principles of reason and ethics, they will be unhappy. For Adler, this view of ethics is absolute. In the section pertaining to Adler's purpose of schooling, I have presented Adler's perspective on the universality of morality and ethics.

According to Adler, moral and political truth proclaims that man is a free being. Human freedom entails a private aspect and a public aspect. The private aspect of freedom refers to man's right to a private existence, in which the human being can exert his or her free choices without the interference of the state. This aspect will be discussed in greater detail later in this work when I present Adler's viewpoint on the personal ideal of man. The public aspect of freedom refers to fact that man must freely exert his or her decisions, desires, and purposes within the state. In other words, human beings have the right to political leadership. Adler declares that the political regime that best allows for the realization of man's ideals of freedom is democracy. Therefore, a fulfilling human existence entails a social being who: (1) submits to the authority of reason and ethics as he or she assumes civic responsibilities, which are deduced by reason from the immutable principles of ethics; and, (2) acts in freedom within his or her private life and assumes political leadership.

For Adler, the curriculum must serve this socio-political purpose presented above. Therefore, the curriculum must transmit to students the universal principles that govern man's socio-political existence. Moreover, the curriculum must provide students with rational skills that will assist them in analyzing and synthesizing the various socio-political principles that are found in the social world. These principles will also help them as they apply these ideals to particular situations.

Second, man's economic ideal refers to the need for the realization of his or her physical and physiological needs. In other words, man needs to have an opportunity to earn a living; every human being must work. Moreover, Adler realizes that an individual who is deprived of a minimum necessary economic or financial means will be unable to

participate in political decisions. The lack of work opportunities endangers the functioning of the democratic state. Thus, the economic ideal is more than an individual ideal; it is also a political ideal. Adler's curriculum serves the economic ideal because he believes it must prepare them for their future professions (Adler, 1982, pp. 17-18).

The third ideal, the personal ideal, refers to the development of man's nature: the mental, moral, and spiritual aspects of his or her being (Adler, 1982, p. 16). In order to possess the status of a human being, every individual must develop these fundamental aspects of human personality. In the absence of moral and rational development, humans cannot realize economic and socio-political ideals. Moreover, the personal ideal refers to man's private life. For Adler, public or social life should not completely engulf man's existence. Thus, the individual should have the right to intimacy, meaning a right to a life of his or her own. This life can entail a solitary existence and/or an existence that is not shared with other human beings other than his or her family and friends. Moreover, man must be provided the opportunity to develop a subjective existence, which means one that cannot be shared or understood by anyone else. Adler's curriculum serves this personal ideal because it promotes rational and moral skills, which he asserts are the foundation for human existence (Adler, 1982, p. 16).

Adler proposes a curriculum for K-12 schooling that is best described as liberal and general. It is also non-vocational, but it does not completely reject the economic dimension of schooling (Adler, 1982, p. 18). The term "liberal" refers to the ideals of private and public freedom presented above. Adler's curriculum is meant to foster liberty and freedom. In Adler's understanding, freedom requires knowledge. Adler adheres to the Jeffersonian understanding that man cannot be ignorant and free.

The term “general” assumes three connotations: first, it refers to universal (or absolute) principles; second, it refers to the general principles of the non-metaphysical disciplines; and third, it refers to the fact that all students should study the same curriculum (Adler, 1982, pp. 18-19). In the category of universal knowledge, Adler assigns ethical and political knowledge. To Adler, this type of knowledge is absolute, unchanging, or immutable. In other words, this knowledge is the same for all men and it remains relevant throughout the ages. Therefore, this aspect of Adler’s curriculum should remain unchanged.

In the category of general non-metaphysical knowledge, Adler includes scientific knowledge. If universal knowledge serves the socio-political ideal, non-metaphysical, or transient, knowledge mainly serves the economic ideal. Because non-metaphysical knowledge is subject to change, the curriculum that imparts it will also change. However, Adler’s curriculum does not change frequently because it mainly includes general principles of the non-metaphysical branches of knowledge; the specifics assume a marginal role. Therefore, the general principles of science, for example, which do not change very often, will be presented in Adler’s curriculum rather than the constant evolution of the specifics of science. Adler, indeed, espouses the idea that his curriculum should provide opportunities for students to apply general ideas to specific life situations. At the same time, however, he rejects the idea of learning about specific situations as an end in itself. In other words, specific knowledge should never be presented in isolation from general knowledge.

In Adler’s curriculum, the main emphasis falls on general rather than specific knowledge. He argues this point because the world of particular experiences, or

situations, is in a constant state of flux. Therefore, knowledge about specific things quickly becomes obsolete. Thus, according to Adler, knowledge about specific situations is impractical. In Adler's conception, only a curriculum, which emphasizes general principles of knowledge, is practical. Adler believes that general knowledge can be applied to every specific situation. Indeed, specific situations are constantly changing, but general principles can be adapted to each and every one of them. Adler believes that man's adaptation to specific circumstances is facilitated by man's nature. Moreover, Adler affirms that humans are "more flexible than other creatures in their ability to adjust to the widest variety of environments and to rapidly changing external circumstances. They are adjustable to every clime and condition on earth and perpetually adjustable to the shock of change" (Adler, 1982, p. 18). Thus, Adler believes that people who are endowed with a thorough understanding of universal knowledge and of the ways in which it should be applied to specific situations are more capable of dealing with practical situations than people who only possess specific knowledge (Adler, 1982, p. 19-20).

Third, for Adler the idea of a general curriculum entails that the curriculum should be the same for all students (Adler, 1982, p. 15). Adler does not separate students into those who are destined to be leaders and those destined to be followers. In other words, he rejects the separation of citizens into thinkers and doers. To Adler, a democratic state requires that all people be both thinkers and doers. Therefore, all students should study the same curriculum. Indeed, when additional instruction is needed, as in the case of students with special needs, it will be provided. Teaching, to Adler, should be differentiated, but not curriculum.

In addition to the positive description of the curriculum as liberal and general, Adler describes the curriculum, from a negative perspective, as non-vocational (Adler, 1982, p. 18). The two descriptions are equivalent. When discussed from a negative perspective—or what it is not—Adler’s curriculum does not include electives or specialized courses. As mentioned previously, all students should study the same curriculum. The only exception to this rule can be found in his views on the study of a foreign language. According to Adler, every student must study a foreign language. However, students are provided with the opportunity to choose the specific foreign language they wish to study. Moreover, for Adler, training or specialization in a profession should not be offered in K-12 schooling. Rather, it should be offered on the job, at community colleges, technical institutes, universities, or professional schools (Adler, 1982, p. 33).

Adler argues that the non-vocational aspect of curriculum appears to be in opposition with the economic aspect of curriculum. This point raises a central question: how can Adler pretend that his curriculum prepares students for a future job and simultaneously affirm that his curriculum is non-vocational? To respond to this challenge, Adler explains that the confusion arises due to the various connotations employed while using the term ‘vocational.’ First, Adler clarifies that his curriculum is “truly vocational” because it serves the three callings, or vocations, of all human beings: socio-political, economic, and personal (Adler, 1982, p. 18). In another sense, Adler affirms that his curriculum is vocational because it prepares students for “earning a living by enabling them to understand the demands and workings of a technologically advanced society, and to become acquainted with its main occupations” (Adler, 1982, p. 18).

However, Adler's curriculum is not vocational in the sense that it narrowly trains students for a specific job. His curriculum is vocational in a humanistic sense and not in a strictly economic sense.

Adler's decision to eliminate the training for a particular occupation from his curriculum is rooted in his preference for general knowledge to the detriment of knowledge with regard to specific matters. Above, I have provided Adler's justification for his decision to emphasize general knowledge and to marginalize specific knowledge in his curriculum. The same justification applies here. In Adler's conception, general knowledge that is common to all human working environments is more practical than training for a specific job. Adler is aware that in a rapidly advancing technological society, by the time students are provided with the opportunity to apply specific knowledge acquired in school in a working environment, they will be unable to do so because specific knowledge would be obsolete. The possessors of general knowledge, on the other hand, will be able to participate in the work force due to their ability to apply general knowledge to specific novel situations (Adler, 1982, p. 19).

I will now present Adler's views with regard to the fundamental branches of curriculum. Adler divides his curriculum into two major categories: basic, or indispensable, subject matter and auxiliary disciplines. He further divides basic subject matter into three categories. In the first category, Adler includes language (English and a foreign language), literature, and fine arts; in the second, mathematics and natural sciences; and in the third, history, geography, and social science (Adler, 1982, pp. 22-23). Manual arts, physical education, and a course in preparation for the world of work constitute the auxiliary studies. The basic subjects should be taught for the entire twelve

years. Physical education should also be taught for twelve years and should include instruction on matters pertaining to human health. Manual arts should be taught for less than twelve years. The course that prepares students for their future careers should be introduced in the later years (Adler, 1982, p. 33).

I will select four disciplines from each category, which I will discuss in additional detail. The four subjects I have chosen are as follows: English language, mathematics, social studies, and the manual arts. For the presentation of these subject areas, I will mainly draw from Adler's *The Paideia Program*. As I mentioned previously, when I presented Adler's conceptions on coaching, Adler was not the author but the editor of *The Paideia Program*. However, he also participated in writing some of the chapters. As in the case of the chapter on coaching, the chapters on English language, mathematics, social sciences, and manual arts were not written by Adler but by his associates. In my section on Adler's conceptions with regard to coaching, I have presented my reasons for including the works of Adler's associates from *The Paideia Program* within this dissertation. These reasons also apply to this section of this dissertation. The section on English language in *The Paideia Program* was written by Geraldine Van Doren; the section on mathematics by Charles Van Doren; the section on social sciences by Adele Simmons and Paul Gagnon; and the section on manual arts by James O'Toole. All of these authors were members of the Paideia Group.

English Language and Literature

According to Adler, English language and literature is one of the basic disciplines of schooling that should be studied for twelve years (Adler, 1982, pp. 22-23). At the beginning of the schooling experience, instruction in English will emphasize the practice

of the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These skills will continue to remain at the center of English instruction for the entire period of K-12 schooling. Indeed, these skills will reach a higher degree of refinement, which is directly proportional to students advance toward the final years of K-12 schooling (Adler, 1984, p. 60). Reading, writing, listening, and speaking are fundamental to the realization of the three main existential purposes of every human being: socio-political, economic, and personal. It is inconceivable for one to imagine that one could realize the full potential of the three main callings of man while deprived of these basic skills. Implicitly, in the absence of these skills one cannot fully participate in the democratic process. The development of these basic skills is fostered mainly through coaching. Didactic teaching and a very basic form of seminar instruction should assume a marginal role. I have presented Adler's conception with regard to seminar teaching in the lower grades in the section which deals with Adler's conceptions on seminar teaching.

After the ages of eleven or twelve, once students have mastered the basic skills of language, they should be guided toward embracing English language and literature as subjects in themselves. Thus, teachers should cultivate an interest in studying the structure of English language. A study of English as a subject in itself includes its "grammar, semantics, etymology, and history" (Adler, 1984, p. 67).

Instruction in English literature is provided for the purpose of developing students' ability to read different kinds of writings, for example "stories, poems, essays, novels, and plays" (Adler, 1984, p. 68). Beyond these works, which are usually emphasized in traditional education, Adler adds "works of history, philosophy, science, and mathematics" (Adler, 1984, p. 68). Moreover, Adler endorses the study of works

that were not originally written in English language but were subsequently translated into English. Also, in the Paideia schools' English program, students should be endowed with the ability and the habit to practice independently reading various works of human wisdom. It is a habit that should be practiced beyond their K-12 schooling experiences.

The ultimate purpose of literature is to serve in the realization of man's personal, economic, and democratic ideals. The intellectual and moral depths that are explored while engaging these works of human genius will assist in the realization of man's fullest potential with regard to these ideals. Coaching, didactic instruction, and seminar teaching should be employed in teaching English language and literature in upper levels of K-12 schooling. Didactic instruction and seminar teaching should increasingly assume a principal role as students advance to the upper grades of schooling. The role of coaching will diminish as students approach the end of K-12 schooling.

In the conclusion of the section on English language and literature from *The Paideia Program*, Geraldine Van Doren, a member of Adler's Paideia group, summarizes the objectives that should be attained by every student of the Paideia schools: “

Paideia graduates should be able to read, without help and with appropriate care and attention, almost any text in modern English. They should be able to use the English language easily in speaking or writing on most occasions. And they should be able to judge what they hear and read by reference to its purpose, its adherence to appropriate means, and even by standards of truth. (Adler, 1984, p. 70)

Students' failure to reach these objectives is not “because they have low I.Q.'s, but rather that these children have low I.Q.'s because they have not been taught to read and write well enough. Literacy, the acquisition of knowledge, and the ability to think are interdependent” (Adler, 1984, p. 70).

Mathematics

Unlike language and arts, mathematics is the most exact science. It satisfies the human need for certainty and absolute understanding. Among the effects produced by mathematics over the human mind are “order, rigor, logical development from simple to complex, exactness, universality, abstraction, economy, and elegance (symmetry, diversity, rhythm, balance)” (Adler, 1984, p. 71). To these properties, Adler adds the following operational tools: “the ideas of symbol, of function, of transformation, and the fundamental idea of proof” (Adler, 1984, p. 72). Judging from the consequences engendered by the study of mathematics, “Hardly [any other subject] could be more important for young people in the world of today, and of tomorrow” (Adler, 1984, p. 84). To Adler and his Paideia colleagues, mathematical skills are essential in an economy that is increasingly dominated by information industries. Moreover, the beauty and complexity of mathematics enrich man’s personal existence.

In the Paideia schools, mathematics is among the basic subjects; thus, it will be studied for the entire twelve years of basic schooling. Departmental study of mathematics should not be introduced before 7th, or 8th, grade. In the upper years, students should be grouped according to ability level. Also, all students should be taught the same curriculum. The broad field of mathematics is divided into various disciplines. The following disciplines should be included in the mathematics curriculum of the Paideia schools: arithmetic, algebra, geometry, differential and integral calculus, statistics, probabilistic mathematics, computers, a course on the history of mathematics, and a course on the relation of mathematics to other fields (Adler, 1984, p. 78).

I will now briefly discuss each of the disciplines that belong within Adler's mathematics curriculum. The first discipline to be introduced in the mathematics curriculum of the Paideia schools is arithmetic. The need for arithmetic is obvious. Without knowledge of basic arithmetic, citizens cannot participate in the work force or in politics. Therefore, arithmetic should be studied for the entire period of K-12 schooling. Chronologically, Algebra comes second. Algebra is the interface between basic arithmetic and the complex world of symbolic math. Learning algebra is similar to learning a new language. The symbols and abstractions inherent in the world of algebra are fundamental to thinking. As Adler's Paideia group states, "The ability to think abstractly lies at the root of the ability to think at all" (Adler, 1984, p. 79). Toward the end of the twelve years of schooling, the higher algebra of sets, groups, and rings should be introduced in the curriculum along with Boolean algebra and symbolic logic.

The third discipline is geometry. Discovered in antiquity by the Greeks, geometry combines the useful and the beautiful. Students should first be introduced to plane geometry, a discipline that is wonderfully presented in Euclid's work *Elements*. Next, students will be taught analytical geometry, which Adler's Paideia group describes in *The Paideia Proposal* as "a combination of plane geometry, elementary algebra, and arithmetic" devised by the French mathematician Rene Descartes. Following analytic geometry, students should be introduced to trigonometry. Adler's Paideia group refers to analytic geometry as "something that, in its geometric context, should be covered in no more than one or two class sessions, and thereafter made use in conjunction with a hand-held calculator" (Adler, 1984, p. 80).

Fourth, differential and integral calculus should be introduced after geometry. Invented by Newton and Leibniz, calculus is more beautiful than useful for the average man. However, for mathematicians, calculus is fundamental, especially after the discovery of the concept of *limit* in the nineteenth century. This concept helped with “removing the mystery from logarithms, trigonometric functions, and their derivatives, and so makes available to students what may be the most powerful mathematical idea ever developed” (Adler, 1984, p. 81).

Fifth, statistics and probabilistic mathematics should be introduced. The study of statistics “introduces students to a wonderful set of facts about the behavior of things in aggregates, or large groups” (Adler, 1984, p. 81). Statistics are employed, among various other situations, when taking election polls and when predicting changes in economics. Adler’s Paideia group presents statistics as a part of the larger field of probabilistic mathematics. Probabilistic mathematics does not deal with exact situations, but rather with probability situations. Probabilistic mathematics is applicable to the real world to a larger degree than exact mathematics. Simple lessons in probabilistic mathematics can be introduced early on in the curriculum of a Paideia school.

Sixth, a course on the history of mathematics is useful because it demonstrates the human dimension of mathematics. Mathematics can indeed be a tool that is employed in solving practical problems and in improving the human existence. Mathematics history is typically taught in parallel with mathematical concepts. Teaching mathematics detached from its history is unlikely. In Paideia schools, besides math teachers, history teachers should also teach a course on the history of mathematics.

Seventh, in Paideia schools, students will be taught a course on the relation of mathematics to other fields of study. In particular, Adler's Paideia group wants mathematics to be connected to exact sciences and to a lesser degree social sciences. Moreover, a complete understanding of these fields requires knowledge of mathematics principles. Indeed, different branches of mathematics are employed in different sciences. The relation between math and other disciplines extends even into the realm of art. "Music is sounding mathematics, as it was once said, and mathematics silent music" (Adler, 1984, p. 84).

Social Studies

In the Paideia curriculum, social studies belong in the category of basic schooling; as a result, they will be studied for twelve years. Social studies courses are not superficial, but rather essential components within the curriculum. They are essential because every human being must have an understanding of the society in which he or she lives. Citizens also must understand the ways in which our nation relates to other nations as well as to our physical environment. Therefore, social studies provide students with an understanding of the socio-political, economic, and cultural institutions that structure man's life. They also provide knowledge of the principles that govern the physical universe (Adler, 1984, p. 122).

The discipline of social studies integrates various branches of learning pertaining to natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. However, in a social science course, Adler's Paideia group promotes the idea that teachers should not "convey the substance of self-contained disciplines, such as anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, and sociology, which have their own conceptual frameworks" (Adler, 1984,

p. 123). These disciplines will be studied after the completion of K-12 schooling. Social studies at this level, rather, must lay the foundation that makes the study of these disciplines possible.

Social studies should be taught in the context of history and geography. Social studies courses should neither be a substitute for courses in history and geography, nor should they be taught independently from history and geography. History provides students with an understanding of the transformations that have taken place within human institutions, from their humble beginnings and until today. Wrapped in a very appealing literary form, that of narrative, history provides students with an ordered reality in which causal relations between a plethora of social, political, and economic events are emphasized. History legitimizes, or justifies, the present. Moreover, knowledge of history will prevent man from making the mistakes of his or her ancestors (Adler, 1984, p. 123).

Geography provides an understanding of the relationship between man and the environment. It addresses questions such as: How does nature affect man? and How does man influence nature? These questions are essential to humankind. They are essential because all of man's personal, economic, and political endeavors (starting with man's basic needs for food, shelter, and clothing) are shaped by his or her interaction with the physical environment. Specifically, geography deals with issues such as: weather patterns and climate changes over time; natural resources and their distribution; soils, vegetation, and crops; and the dispersion of the human population across the globe (Adler, 1984, p. 124).

Social studies courses can be taught from two different approaches. First, teachers can select a country that will be studied during the course of a semester or a whole year of schooling. Students will learn about the physical and social geography of the specific country, about its culture, about its level of economic development, and about the nature of its government. The second approach entails two aspects. At one end, students will study the relationship between man and the physical environment; at the other, students will study the nature of social institutions such as family, religious institutions, and government, whether local or national. The first approach pertains more to the lower and middle grades, while the second should be more common in the upper levels of schooling.

I will now provide a more in-depth account of the social studies curriculum of the Paideia schools. First, I will present the social studies curriculum for the lower and the middle grades. Second, I will present the social studies curriculum for the upper levels of schooling. Students' first encounter with social studies should be occasioned by a presentation of an interesting, even adventurous, social situation that is likely to capture their imagination. For example, teachers can discuss various aspects of social life during the Middle Ages, specifically what occurred during a medieval fair. Teachers will address questions such as: What is a fair?, Who were the participants?, How could one distinguish between various participants?, and Who maintained order and provided for the security of the participants?. The teaching objective is to provide students with a rudimentary but coherent understanding of social issues. Similarly, topics such as family history or the social life of the town in which students live could constitute starting points

for social issues classes. They occasion simple questions pertaining to economic and cultural issues (Adler, 1984, pp. 126-127).

In a slightly more advanced lesson in social studies, students learn about a particular country or region. Adler's Paideia group suggests that a period of six weeks should be allocated for each country that will be studied (Adler, 1984, p. 127). During this time, students will study the environmental conditions of the country as well as its cultural heritage. For example, students will learn about the location of its cities, rivers, mountings, and neighboring states; they will discover the culture of this nation through studying its cuisine, literature, and sports. They will gain knowledge of the religious, economical, and political systems of this nation.

Also in the early grades, but at a more advanced level, students will be introduced to the methods of oral history and archeology, which are employed by humans in studying about other cultures. Also, students will be provided with the tools of social scientists: "photographs, slides, films, and tapes; maps, charts, graphs; objects and documents originating in the past" (Adler, 1984, p. 128). To Adler, a third grade student should be able to identify on a map most of the nations and the major cities of the world and every state and major city in the United States. He or she should know and be able to identify all the major hydrographic systems of the world and the United States. Moreover, third graders should know about the earth's natural resources and where they occur. Finally, students should have some knowledge with regard to the natural phenomena such as "flooding, volcanoes, hurricanes, and earthquakes" and the regions that they mostly affect (Adler, 1984, p. 129).

In the upper primary grades, students should be able to “examine more systematically how economic, social, and cultural activities are carried on in other cultures and at other times. At this level, journals and notebooks can be put to good use” (Adler, 1984, p. 129). For example, students should be able to integrate history, geography, and other academic disciplines within more complex social studies projects like the way in which modes of transportation and travel change across time in a specific culture. A project such as this entails an examination of a country’s “climate, terrain, resources, and work, or a discussion of invention, technology, and production” (Adler, 1984, p. 129).

The upper primary grades provide an opportune time for learning about the United States and their relationship to other nations. Adler’s Paideia group suggests that students should learn about the population of the American nation, its “numbers, distribution, density, composition by race, language, religion, age, sex, and level of education” (Adler, 1984, p. 129). Also, students should gain some knowledge about the American economy and the social stratification in the United States. They should be able to identify the agricultural and the industrial areas of the nation; they should know about the means of transportation and communication; and they should acquire some knowledge about the American mass media (Adler, 1984, p. 129). Starting in seventh grade, students should be introduced to the principles of American government and citizenship through works such as *The Declaration of Independence*, George Washington’s *Farewell Address*, and others. The members of Adler’s Paideia group suggest that these principles should be taught through the seminar method of teaching (Adler, 1984, pp. 129-130).

Adler's Paideia group suggests that social studies courses at the high school level should occasion the study of the same subjects as in the lower grades. The difference between the two levels of basic schooling consists in the fact that at high school level, social studies issues will be explored at a deeper level than in the lower grades. In addition, the Paideia group suggests that the same teaching methods should be employed during the whole K-12 schooling experience. However, in the upper grades, the seminar method of teaching will be more prevalent than at the lower levels. Instructional tools such as maps, movies, and books will be utilized across the entire twelve years of schooling (Adler, 1984, p. 130).

At the upper levels of schooling, history and geography continue to provide the foundation for social studies courses, upon which economic, social, political, and cultural arguments will be erected. Adler's Paideia group suggests that the following themes which have a historical background should be studied in high school:

the voyages of discovery and European expansion, the evolution of agriculture and mining, banking and navigation, the application of science and invention, the Industrial Revolution, the evolution of modern class structures, the impact of war on world economics, depression and its sources, the movement of peoples, urbanization, the rise of social movements and ideologies, the 20th century technologies and the nuclear revolution in particular, the relationship between technology and culture.... (Adler, 1984, pp. 130-131)

The Paideia group also suggests the incorporation of the following topics into social studies high school curriculum:

demography, economic growth and its impact, relations between developed and underdeveloped nations, the economic systems of major states and regions of the world, the effects of technology on modern life, international trade and production, and problems of resources, energy, and ecology. These phenomena are to be found in each of the major world areas—the Americas, Europe, the Middle East, India, China and Japan, Africa, the Soviet Union, and Central Asia.... (Adler, 1984, p. 131)

Moreover, students should be provided with the opportunity to learn about at least one non-western country or region. The purpose is to familiarize students with a system of beliefs and habits that is quite different, and maybe even antagonistic to western values. Teachers should guide students into exploring the role played by various environmental factors in shaping the moral values, the economic situation, and the political regime of the non-western nation that is studied.

Finally, high school students should gain a more in depth understanding with regard to the United States. Students should learn about the demographic, economic, and socio-political features of the country, specifically

how decisions are made in Washington; the working of the constitution; the making of the laws; the administrative departments; the role of the courts. Differences among regions, the role of immigrants, income distribution, the effect of special interests... are all important subjects of the study. (Adler, 1984, p. 131)

During seminar sessions, students will discuss the concepts of justice, citizenship, democracy, liberty, equality, constitutional government, the rule of law, and freedom of speech.

Manual Arts

Manual arts are included in the curriculum of Paideia schools as an auxiliary discipline. Auxiliary disciplines, unlike basic disciplines, will not be studied for the entire twelve years of basic schooling. Importantly, to Adler's Paideia group, the study of manual arts does not constitute vocational education. Adler believes that the twelve years of basic schooling provides neither the adequate time, nor the place for vocational education. For Adler, vocational education, or training for a specific profession, should begin after the completion of K-12 schooling. The discipline of manual arts refers to

training in the general traits of various crafts, mechanical skills, and domestic arts. For Adler, every human being, regardless of his or her aptitudes and career interests, should be required to take courses in manual arts.

The main motivation for introducing manual arts into the Paideia curriculum derives from the fact that manual arts contribute to the developing of the mind. As Adler's Paideia group states, "Acquiring skill in the manual arts is as much mind-training as acquiring skill in the language arts" (Adler, 1984, p. 154). The principal role of the teacher of manual arts is to lead students to the realm of physical sciences by using the knowledge of the principles of tools, machines, and mechanisms. Also, knowledge of mathematics and art is fostered through manual arts training. As Adler's Paideia group states, "making things is a natural way to develop an understanding of proportion and other mathematical concepts, as well as of the relationship of form and function, which is a pedagogical link to fine arts" (Adler, 1984, p. 155).

A secondary motivation for including manual arts in Adler's curriculum is provided by the fact that training in manual arts fulfills a utilitarian purpose. Students will be taught how to use various tools and machines; how to "make simple, useful objects from wood and other common materials; and ...[how] to make elementary repairs on household devices" (Adler, 1984, p. 155). The utilitarian purpose of manual arts is manifested in three ways. First, manual arts serve a domestic purpose. They teach students how to cook; how to use common tools such as hammers, saws, and pliers; and how to perform minor repairs on electrical and plumbing appliances. Second, manual arts lay the foundation for student's future employment. They provide the environment in which students can get acquainted with various tools and machines. General

knowledge about the utilization of these simple mechanical devices is transferable to students' future jobs. Third, the very act of creating simple and useful objects from metal, wood, plastic, or another material provides its own satisfactions (Adler, 1984, p. 155). In addition to teaching these crafts and skills, students should be taught how to safely utilize the various tools and machines. Moreover, students should be taught how to maintain these tools.

How should manual arts be taught? Adler suggests that the teaching method of coaching should be employed in teaching manual arts. Who should teach manual arts? The teacher should not be a specialist in a specific trade or craft, but rather he or she should be a member of the academic faculty. Thus, a teacher will be able to integrate various manual arts skills with academic disciplines such as mathematics, physics, economics, and others. How much time should be devoted to manual arts training? Adler's Paideia group suggests one or two hours per week for a period of approximately three years. Adler suggests that manual arts training should be introduced at the age of twelve or thirteen (Adler, 1984, p. 156).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed Mortimer Adler's views with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. For Adler, curriculum, teaching, and schooling are rooted in neo-Aristotelian philosophy and democracy. To Adler, the purpose of schooling is to assist man in the realization of the personal, economic, and socio-political aspects of his or her nature. These ideals, which are demanded by the very nature of man, can best be realized in a democratic society.

According to Adler, the realization of the personal, economic, and democratic ideals of man is directly dependent on schooling. Adler, echoing Jefferson, Mann, and in some respects Dewey, believes that schooling is the most appropriate way to promote freedom, equality, and democracy. Teaching becomes essential if Adler's democratic ideal is to be realized. Adler proposes three teaching methods: didactic teaching, coaching instruction, and seminar teaching. In the lower grades, Adler emphasizes coaching and a basic form of seminar teaching; in the upper grades, Adler promotes an advanced form of seminar teaching and didactic instruction.

For Adler, the curriculum, when defined in positive terms, should be general and universal; or, when defined in negative terms, it should be non-vocational. Adler's curriculum emphasizes academic disciplines and rejects electives with one exception, that of the study of a foreign language. Moreover, Adler argues that his curriculum is more practical than the progressive curriculum.

In the next chapter, I will evaluate Dewey's and Adler's philosophies with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. I have presented my understanding of a Christian perspective in Chapter I. Then, I will identify those aspects of Dewey's and Adler's views that are compatible with a Christian perspective. Moreover, I will select those aspects of Dewey's and Adler's that are compatible with each other. Finally, I will seek to create a synthesis that incorporates within a Christian perspective the ideas of Dewey and Adler on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling.

CHAPTER FOUR

A Christian Evaluation of Dewey and Adler with Regard to Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling

In this chapter, I will evaluate Dewey's and Adler's views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. I have presented a Christian perspective on these subjects in Chapter I. I will use this Christian perspective from Chapter I as the standard by which to judge Dewey and Adler. In this chapter, I will revisit a Christian understanding on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. This understanding will be derived from my views on Christian metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology. Second, I will uncover the deficiencies inherent in Dewey's views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from the Christian perspective that I have developed. I will identify those aspects present in Dewey's philosophy that undermine or fail to promote Christian ideals embedded in curriculum, teaching, and schooling.

Third, I will discuss those aspects of a Christian perspective that are compatible with Dewey's philosophy. In particular, I will address the compatibility of these two perspectives within the context of the purpose of schooling. Specifically, I will discuss the place democracy should occupy within Christian philosophy. In other words, I will present a Christian justification for a democratic society and then discuss how democracy relates to the other Christian aims of schooling. Fourth, I will evaluate Dewey's views on teaching from a Christian perspective. I will assess the ways in which Dewey's teaching methods can be employed to promote Christian purposes of schooling, whether these are

democratic or of another nature. Fifth, I will evaluate Dewey's understanding of curriculum from a Christian perspective. I will discuss the ways in which Dewey's curriculum can be used to promote and/or hinder Christian aims of schooling.

Sixth, I will present various points of contention between Adler's philosophy and a Christian perspective. I will focus this chapter by discussing the ways in which these disagreements are reflected in curriculum, teaching, and schooling. Seventh, I will evaluate Adler's views on the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. Similar to Dewey, Adler believes that democracy is the ideal form of government. Consequently, Adler thinks schooling should prepare students for life in a democracy. I will assess the points of contention and agreement between Adler and the Christian understanding of democracy. Eighth, I will evaluate Adler's position on teaching from a Christian perspective. I will assess the ways in which didactic teaching, seminar teaching, and coaching can be employed within a Christian worldview. Ninth, I will examine Adler's curriculum from a Christian perspective. I will assess the ways in which Adler's views on curriculum can promote Christian ideals. Finally, I will select those aspects of Dewey's and Adler's views on curriculum, teaching, and schooling that are compatible with a Christian perspective. In doing so, I will seek to create a synthesis that incorporates the views of Dewey and Adler within a Christian perspective.

A Christian Perspective on the Purpose of Schooling

As I discussed in Chapter I, the purpose of human existence from a Christian perspective is to enter into a relationship of love with our Creator. St. Augustine argues this point numerous times in his famous autobiography, *Confessions* (Augustine, 1960). Augustine (1955) also mentions in *Confessions and Enchiridion* that serving, or

worshipping, God is the purpose of human existence. Far from being inconsistent, Augustine understands that service constitutes a way in which humans manifest their love for God. Augustine, who served as the bishop of Hippo, further rhetorically wonders whether he can enter in a relationship with God if he does not know God (Augustine, 1960, p. 43). Indeed, knowledge of God is required prior to our engagement in His service.

For Soren Kierkegaard, another famous Christian author, man's relationship with God is essential for being happy. Kierkegaard believes that by nature humans are relational beings. The human self is a complex structure. The self has the ability to relate to itself. In other words, the self is the relation of itself to itself (Evans, 1990, p. 13). As C. Stephan Evans, professor of philosophy at Baylor University, put this point "One cannot understand a spiritual being *all by itself* as a simple entity; its being is constituted by its relations" (Evans, 1990, pp. 45, 46). Of these relations, Evans believes that one's relation to God is "the most basic relationship humans have, then it seems that the God-relation cannot be a peripheral, add-on fact about human beings" (Evans, 1990, p. 46).

Kierkegaard believes that through man's relationship with God, he or she is transformed into the individual that God intended him or her to be. Man has a threefold responsibility in his or her relationship with God. First, man must accept to become what God wants him or her to be. To Kierkegaard, God cannot transform man without his or her consent. Second, man must realize that through his or her own powers he or she cannot reach the ideal set by God for his or her life. Third, man must be transparent to

God. Transparency entails knowing oneself and subsequently willfully revealing oneself entirely to God (Evans, 1990, pp. 57-59).

To Kierkegaard, knowing oneself is not an easy task. He believes that man has the ability to hide from himself or herself many aspects of his or her existence, usually those aspects that are hurtful, shameful, and sinful. Knowing oneself requires a plunge into man's unconscious, from where he or she must recover knowledge about himself or herself that was hidden by sin (Evans, 1990, p. 59).

A Christian perspective, thus, recognizes that in addition to knowledge of God, man must acquire knowledge of himself in order to be happy. Our love for God and our love for ourselves are not mutually exclusive. To the contrary, God demands that we love ourselves. As a God of supreme wisdom and as a Being whose love for human beings was ultimately manifested in the sacrifice of His only Son, Jesus Christ, the Christian God would go against the core of His nature were He to demand that we do not love ourselves.

Furthermore, according to a Christian perspective, serving God implies loving and serving one another. Jesus says that whoever loves Him will obey His commands (John 14:21). Jesus identifies the greatest commandments as the following: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38 This is the first and great commandment. 39 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Mathew 22:38-39). To summarize, serving God entails that man loves God, loves himself, and loves his fellow man as himself. This love entails knowledge of God, ourselves, and our fellow human beings.

Also, a Christian perspective acknowledges that man must acquire knowledge about the cosmos. As I mentioned in Chapter I, God gave man dominion over the Earth. Human beings were commanded to administer God's creation. In order to be a competent steward, man must possess knowledge about cosmological reality.

I presented a more in-depth discussion of the nature of God, man, and the cosmos in the section on Christian metaphysics in Chapter I. In addition, in the section on Christian epistemology in Chapter I, I presented the epistemological methodologies that are embraced by a Christian perspective. An understanding of these epistemological methodologies constitutes a prerequisite to understanding the concepts of God, man, and the cosmos. Christianity employs the methods of philosophy, science, and faith as means of acquiring knowledge. Science is employed in our investigation into things pertaining to physical reality. Faith and philosophy are employed mainly in man's dealings with God, spiritual realities, and ethics. However, on various occasions, science, philosophy, and faith, complement each other in resolving a range of issues that confront humankind. The articles of Christian faith and the self-evident truths incorporate primary concepts about God, man, and the universe. Reason is further employed to develop additional truths from self-evident principles and articles of faith. Science has a role in the realization of the ideals established by faith, reason, and self-evident principles. Moreover, science functions within the limits determined by philosophy and faith. There are, however, instances in which faith seems to be at odds with reason, such is the case of the Christian mysteries of the Trinity and the nature of Christ. In these cases, faith directs reason. Augustine argues in his *Confessions* that one should believe in order that he may

understand (*Crede, ut intelligas*) (Augustine, 1960). In other words, Augustine argues that faith must be present in order for one to know anything.

According to a Christian perspective, theoretical knowledge, regardless of its breadth and depth, is insufficient for realizing the purpose of serving God. From a Christian standpoint, knowledge for its own sake is not only useless with regard to physical and social matters, but it is also immoral. To Christians, knowledge must be accompanied by action. Serving and loving God, our fellow human beings, and the community in which we live require action. A Christian perspective recognizes that teachers must show their love for God and other human beings through action. Scientists must do the same as well. Moreover, the Apostle James, Christ's brother, affirms that a man of faith is necessarily a man of action. As James puts this point:

17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. 18 Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. 19 Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. 20 But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? (James 2:17-20)

According to a Christian perspective, even one's understanding of the most comprehensive system of theoretical knowledge will not necessarily lead one to moral action. Christianity refutes Plato's view that a man who has attained absolute knowledge will necessarily be moral. Plato believes that man's highest aspiration is the desire to be happy. No other human desire can stand against our desire to be happy. Plato believes that man will always be able to subordinate any desire to his or her yearning to be happy. In other words, for Plato, man will always choose happiness over any other competing desire. For Plato, the causes for our unhappy lives reside not in our inability to subordinate our passions, but in our lack of knowledge. Human beings always choose the

pathway that leads to happiness, but they do not reach happiness because their knowledge of happiness is defective. For Plato, therefore, a knowledgeable man is necessarily a happy man (Leaman, 1980, p. 167).

A Christian perspective adheres to the Aristotelian view that knowledge does not necessarily imply morality. Aristotle understood that although one might possess adequate knowledge, he or she still may choose to engage in an immoral act. Aristotle believed that a person's passions can be stronger than his or her desire for happiness. Aristotle's solution, provided in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (Aristotle, 1999), consists in his emphasis on the formation of habits. These habits will assist man in subordinating his or her passions to the authority of reason and happiness. Therefore, in addition to theoretical knowledge, Aristotle emphasizes moral virtue developed through action. The development of these habits is a practical endeavor. For Aristotle, one cannot become moral unless he or she frequently practices these moral habits. A Christian perspective reaffirms this Aristotelian view that in addition to theoretical knowledge, people must develop moral habits in order to be considered truly good.

In the *Confessions*, Saint Augustine provides a more comprehensive understanding of the psychology of man, one that transcends the views of Plato and Aristotle. Besides the rational aspect (which deals with knowledge) and the appetitive aspect (which deals with desire), Augustine introduces the volitional aspect within the psychological structure of man. Indeed, for Augustine, fallacious reasoning and unbridled passions will lead to unhappiness. These two problems, however, are not the sole culprits of unhappiness. The will also plays a significant role. Augustine describes in the section on the famous pear tree incident, recorded in the *Confessions*, the role

played by his will in the act of sinning (Augustine, 1960, pp. 69-75). Augustine affirms that his sin was not a consequence of his lack of adequate knowledge or of his inability to harness his passions. Rather, Augustine sinned because he chose to do evil. Augustine acknowledges that his choice was not influenced by his desire, specifically the desire to enjoy the taste of the pears from a neighbor's garden. Augustine explains that those pears were not very tasteful. Hunger was not an issue as well. Augustine even mentions that he had access to better pears. Moreover, he was fully aware of the particular situation he was confronting, specifically that stealing the property of someone else was a sin. Augustine's decision to steal was triggered by his choice to do evil for its own sake. Augustine realized that his problem resided in his will. His will was corrupt and needed to be transformed. Augustine believed that he inherited his corrupt will from his parents. This generationally transmitted sinful nature was introduced in humankind by Adam's original sin. Augustine came to the realization that the transformation of his will could be realized only by God through His Divine grace (Augustine, 1960, p. 73-74).

According to a Christian perspective, the essence of the corruption of the will resides in man's inability to choose to love God above everything else. Once God intervenes and rehabilitates man's will, however, man acquires the freedom to choose to love or reject God. For Augustine, man's love for God is more than a sentiment; it is the product of his will. Our love for God originates in our decision to love Him and subsequently evolves into a feeling of love for Him. C. S. Lewis shares this view. For example, in *Mere Christianity* (2001) and *The Four Loves* (1960), Lewis argues that man's ability to love God is essential to being a good person (Lewis, 2001, p. 132). For instance, a person might possess the highest form of knowledge. Moreover, he or she

might also exhibit the noblest of moral habits. Throughout this individual's existence, he or she could perform the greatest amount of good into the world. However, according to a Christian perspective, if this person's deeds are not motivated by his or her love for God, that person will inevitably be unhappy.

I will now discuss how Christian faith plays an essential role in fostering the ideal of serving God, improving man's condition, and assisting man as he or she contributes to the betterment of other human beings. According to a Christian perspective, only Christians can truly realize the purpose of serving and loving God. Moreover, only Christians can experience the highest state of happiness. Also, only Christians can truly love others. Christians are able to fulfill these ideals because they possess knowledge and have a regenerated will. I have already argued in this chapter that love and service entail knowledge; and knowledge requires reason and faith. Christian faith is essential because it provides knowledge with regard to God and man that is not available to man through general revelation (e.g. revelation in nature and human conscience). Moreover, Christian faith has a role in remedying the inaccuracies that we have planted in our conscience. The Apostle Paul describes in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans the process employed by humans for perverting their conscience. Paul concludes that the perversion of the human conscience was so severe that its cleansing could have only been realized through God's special revelation in Christ (Romans 2:9-28). In addition, I will affirm that Christianity is an exclusivist religion, meaning that Christianity offers the only way to God, salvation, and happiness. Therefore, among all faiths, only the content of Christian faith can assist man in achieving adequate knowledge and subsequently realizing the purpose of serving God and man.

According to a Christian perspective, a person who loves God must also obey Him. If one can express one's love for a fellow human being by refusing to satisfy the latter's desires, one cannot love God and simultaneously disobey Him. In the first case, one, as an expression of his or her love, can disregard, or even act contrary to, his or her friend's desires when these desires are unwise, meaning rationally deficient or even intentionally self-destructive. In the second case, God's desires are never unwise. God is the possessor and source of all wisdom and love. In Him, there is no hate; neither for Himself nor for another. Therefore, an all knowledgeable God will always know better than us how we should love Him. Moreover, an all loving God will never undermine Himself. Based on these arguments, man is rationally justified to express his love for God through obedience to His commands even when these commandments go against his or her understanding. Moreover, human beings should obey God even when they perceive that God's demands violate the fundamental principles of reason. According to a Christian worldview, man's obedience to God refers to respecting God's commandments presented in Scripture. Also, from a Christian perspective, man's obedience consists in abiding by the demands of his or her conscience.

All of the theological concepts presented above must be apprehended by the person who wants to follow Christ. These ideas are fostered by faith and reason. The act of conversion requires man's decision to love God above everything else and to obey Him in all aspects of his or her existence. Christian conversion requires man's free participation.

Therefore, according to a Christian perspective, knowledge regardless of its breadth and depth is necessary but not sufficient for fostering the good life. Moreover,

the formation of moral habits is also necessary but not sufficient for generating man's happiness. According to a Christian worldview, only a complete commitment to Christ can produce a good and happy human being, one that will fulfill the purpose established by God for his or her existence.

According to a Christian perspective, the purpose of schooling is to advance the Christian metaphysical ideals of God, man, and the cosmos. Christian schooling should also further the epistemological methods of science, philosophy, and faith. Moreover, schooling should seek to foster Christian moral habits. Finally, schooling should provide an environment in which human beings are provided with the opportunity to experience conversion to the Christian faith. All of these aims of schooling fulfill a greater purpose: loving and serving God.

Christian schooling also must foster excellence. Our service to God, our fellow human beings, and even ourselves must be unblemished. As I mentioned above, loving and serving God entails loving and serving ourselves and our fellow human beings. Therefore, Christian schooling must aim to develop man's capacities to their fullest potential. Michael L. Peterson (2001), in *With All Your Mind: A Christian Philosophy of Education*, identifies the following human capacities that Christian schooling must strengthen: "rational, emotional, moral, aesthetic, physical, and practical" (p. 109). All of these human capacities can reach their full potential only when developed within the Christian metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical framework presented above.

I will now discuss a Christian view on democracy. I will argue that, according to a Christian perspective, democracy can be employed as a means of promoting the ideals

of serving and loving God. A discussion of democracy is particularly appropriate due to the views of Adler and Dewey.

Democracy: A Means of Serving and Loving God

In this section I argue that democracy can be employed as a means of promoting the ideals of serving and loving God. I model my understanding of democracy on the views presented by Arthur Cushman McGiffert (1919), professor of theology and former president of Union Theological Seminary, in his article entitled “Christianity and Democracy.” McGiffert roots his conception on democracy into the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

McGiffert (1919) argues that democracy is not only a political issue, but a moral issue as well (p. 37). To McGiffert, the idea of democracy is justified by Christian ethics. In addition, McGiffert argues, non-democratic regimes, specifically autocratic governments, are immoral because they treat “men as machines instead of persons, as things to be manipulated and controlled instead of free beings gifted with the privilege of choosing for themselves even to their own hurt” (McGiffert, 1919, p. 38). According to McGiffert, the Christian God does not intend to coerce men into submission to His omnipotent will, “but to lead them into the full liberty of sons of God” (1919, p. 49). According to Christian thinking, liberty is a fundamental part of man’s nature. In other words, man must be free in order to be fully human. Also, liberty is a Christian ideal because one cannot love God unless he or she is a free being. According to a Christian perspective, love is more than a sentiment; it always entails a choice. Thus, love for God requires freedom of choice.

McGiffert warns that freedom by itself could have disastrous consequences for society; it might lead to selfishness and implicitly to anarchy. He argues that Christianity can strengthen democracy if the ideal of liberty is permeated by the ideal of service. McGiffert warns us that “Democracy may well be worse in its results than autocracy, if it meant only liberty for universal selfishness” (1919, p. 45).

Fraternity refers to man’s love for his or her fellow human beings. When Christ states this ideal in the golden rule, he clearly establishes that man must first love God and next he or she must love mankind. According to a Christian perspective, one cannot use the love for God as an excuse for not manifesting one’s love for one’s fellow man. These two kinds of love are under no circumstances mutually exclusive. To Christians, serving God in love also entails serving and loving all of society.

According to McGiffert, “an essential element in brotherhood has been commonly overlooked” (1919, p. 39). This forgotten element is the ideal of equality. The Christian idea of fraternity entails the idea of love between equals. To McGiffert, the ideal of fraternity can only be realized in a democratic state. Citizens in an autocratic society are not equal. They are the subjects of princes, kings, noblemen, tyrants, or dictators. In autocratic states, the welfare of citizens depends upon the benevolence of the rulers. In this case, the ideals of fraternity and equality are replaced (in the best case scenario) by charity. Because a Christian perspective endorses the ideal of fraternity, then it must adhere to the ideal of democracy.

McGiffert warns that the idea of equality is not synonymous to the idea of perfect identity advocated by socialism (1919, p. 46). Socialist equality attempts to create human beings who have the same political ideology, economic status, and private lives.

Socialism repudiates liberty because socialism makes no room for variety. According to McGiffert, equality must not oppose liberty, but rather they must live in harmony. The Apostle Paul endorses a harmonious coexistence of liberty and equality in I Corinthians. Paul mentions that Christians are given different gifts, some greater than others, but all alike are honorable. All of these gifts are useful for the body of Christ. They should be employed for the benefit of others rather than for selfish reasons (I Corinthians 12:4-11).

However, a Christian perspective acknowledges that absolute political equality is unattainable in a fallen world. However, democracy provides the highest form of political equality that can be achieved by human beings. Indeed, in a representative democracy, some people will have more political power than others, but in no other political system will the citizens of a state have as much political power as they do in a democracy. Also, political equality entails political freedom. In a democracy, one's political freedom is not absolute, but rather it is limited by the political freedom of the other citizens of the state. Therefore, political equality entails both rights and responsibilities. Political equality is a Christian ideal because it confers citizen freedom. Moreover, political equality restricts this freedom in such a way that it does not harm other human beings. Christianity will endorse democracy to the detriment of the other political systems because political equality is best realized in a democratic state.

Moreover, political freedom and equality inherent in a democratic state lead to the establishment of a fair economic environment. Democracy allows for the highest level of economic prosperity for the largest number of citizens. A Christian worldview acknowledges the value of political equality because it generates material prosperity. Christianity believes in material, or physical, goods. Consequently, Christians are called

to express their love for their fellow human beings by offering them these kind of goods. Charity is a Christian virtue. Moreover, if we desire that our fellow men partake of these goods, we should support the political regime that best promotes their production. Consequently, a Christian perspective should endorse democracy.

A Christian perspective supports the ideal of political equality and economic prosperity inherent in a democracy for yet another reason. Political equality and economic prosperity reinforce each other. Political equality leads to economic prosperity and vice versa. These human ideals grant political power to the individual and thus allow him or her to exercise freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. Freedom of thought allows for the developing of the human mind. How can a man expand his or her mental abilities unless he or she is free to pursue and investigate all avenues of thought? The developing of one's intellect is a Christian ideal. It is an end in itself because man's happiness depends upon the development of his or her mental capacities. Moreover, mental development is a prerequisite for serving God and one's fellow man. Economic and political power also allows one to act according to his or her conscience and religious understanding. To summarize, a Christian perspective supports democracy because democracy, more than any other political system, promotes the Christian ideals of individual freedom, political equality, economic prosperity, intellectual development, and moral and religious freedom.

As I have mentioned above, one's intellectual, spiritual, and religious manifestations are in some measure dependent upon political freedom, equality, and economic freedom. I would also like to underline the fact that the pursuit of wisdom, spirituality, science, and the activity of the mind in the life of a nation will generate

economic development and political equality. Religion also plays a significant role in society. Religion can either allow or restrict the life of the mind, economic prosperity, and political equality. Therefore, economic development, political equality, individual freedom, religion, and intellectual development are all interdependent and mutually implicit. Christianity supports democracy along with all of these aforementioned human ideals.

One might argue with some degree of historical evidence that a Christian support of democracy, political equality, economic prosperity, and intellectual freedom is a self-defeating endeavor. Coming from a former communist country, I have witnessed a spectacular expansion of the Christian church during times of restriction, oppression, and persecution. After the fall of communism, the period of economic prosperity that followed has witnessed a diminishing enthusiasm for Christianity. A similar situation occurred when Christianity became a *religia licita* (officially permitted religion) in the Roman Empire. Under these circumstances, the following question presents itself: why should a Christian perspective support democracy? My unshaken support for democracy derives from my understanding that Christianity does not adhere to the idea that the purpose justifies the means. Rather, I believe that Christianity supports the principle that just means should always be employed when promoting just purposes. Therefore, a Christian perspective will never endorse oppression, persecution, or other evils in order to promote itself. Instead, Christianity will support democratic principles such as individual freedom, political equality, and freedom of religion.

In the next section, I will move from these broader questions of Christian faith to the specific subject of curriculum.

A Christian Perspective on Curriculum

I will now move beyond a discussion of the purposes of schooling to a discussion of a Christian perspective on curriculum. The curriculum is the subject-matter and method through which schools realize the purposes of schooling that they have set out to attain. A Christian perspective employs the curriculum to realize the Christian purpose of schooling inherent in teaching young people to serve God, love others, and model themselves after the ideal of Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the Christian purposes for schooling can be organized in the following categories: religious, personal, civic, and economic (Peterson, 2001, pp. 110-111&139-142). A Christian curriculum must promote Christianity; it must allow man to develop his or her individuality, meaning the unique traits of his or her personality; it must promote man's participation in a democratic society; and it must prepare man for economic living. I have organized a curriculum that fulfills these Christian purposes of schooling in the following way: first, a Christian curriculum must transmit facts; second, a Christian curriculum must provide basic skills; third, a Christian curriculum must emphasize the development of reasoning skills; and fourth, a Christian curriculum must be practical.

First, facts refer to absolute truths as well as utilitarian truths. Absolute truths are rooted in a metaphysical conception of reality. They are truths about God, man, and the cosmos. Absolute truths are divided into three categories: self-evident truths, religious truths, and truths derived by reason from self-evident truths and religious truths. Self-evident truths are truths that proven in themselves and do not need rational justification (e.g. the ideas of liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness). Religious truths are truths that are provided through faith.

In his work, *The Problems of Philosophy*, Bertrand Russell (1912) describes the principles of reason, or, as he puts it, the laws of thought. These are (1) the law of identity: “Whatever is, is;” (2) the law of noncontradiction: “Nothing can both be and not be;” and the law of excluded middle: “Everything must either be or not be.” Russell further states that, “These three laws are samples of self-evident logical principles...” (1912, p. 72). These principles are employed to deduce from self-evident and religious truths additional truths, which are themselves absolute truths. In the category of utilitarian truths we have the truths of science. These truths are derived from the scientific method. They are useful for improving the physical, material, and economic aspects of man’s existence; they can be generalized on a large scale; but they are not absolute. According to a Christian perspective, the facts and ideas included in the curriculum must pertain to following fields of knowledge: Christian religion and other major religions, philosophy, natural science, social science (with a strong emphasis on democratic theory), natural science, mathematics, languages (English language as well as at least one foreign language), and the arts (Peterson, 2001, p. 111).

Second, basic skills are an essential part of a Christian curriculum. In their absence, the ability of students to accumulate facts and develop their reasoning skills is significantly diminished. According to a Christian perspective, these basic skills are: reading, writing, speaking, listening, observing, measuring, calculating, and estimating (Peterson, 2001, p. 118).

I will add technology and computer skills to the list of basic skills because we live in an era of great advances in the field of technology, specifically informational technology. Technology has significantly increased its influence over our lives, to the

point that many of us have become dependent upon it. Nevertheless, technology has exerted a positive role with regard to human health, standard of living, and communication. Therefore, Peterson argues that a Christian perspective should embrace technology and computers (Peterson, 2001, pp. 183-185). However, Peterson warns against the danger of considering technology, specifically computer technology, as a panacea in schooling. Peterson, moreover, reminds us that “the most vital educational experiences for our young are mediated directly through person-to-person contact with teachers and mentors” (Peterson, 2001, p. 190). He further adds,

Proper, balanced use of any of these tools is always the key. But if we glimpse the larger Christian vision of education and of what it takes to become a well-developed person, we will not allow computers or any other form of technology to usurp the important relationship between teacher and pupil. (Peterson, 2001, pp. 190-191)

Third, man’s reasoning abilities are divided into three categories: philosophical reasoning, scientific reasoning, and the method of faith. All of these reasoning methods are essential in understanding and improving upon the factual knowledge provided in the curriculum. I have argued that man cannot love and serve God unless he or she knows God. The same argument can be applied to man’s Christian duty to love himself and others. In the absence of reasoning abilities, man will neither be able to help himself or others. Reasoning abilities allow man to apply universal principles of philosophy and faith as well as general scientific principles to specific circumstances that confront man every day. According to a Christian perspective, the curriculum must emphasize the transmission of these reasoning skills to students.

Teaching for understanding (another way of putting the idea of teaching reasoning skills) is essential to Christian schooling because no curriculum can integrate all of the

factual information pertaining to God, man, and the cosmos. A Christian perspective, therefore, endorses the idea that in addition to fundamental factual information, students should be provided with the methods of faith, philosophy, and science. These skills will allow them to deduce the rest of the factual information needed for specific situations.

I have also argued that in order to be truly happy, man must realize his or her God-given potential. Therefore, man must develop his or her reasoning abilities in order to fulfill their calling from God. Moreover, I have previously stated that one's reasoning power is intrinsically intertwined with one's freedom. Finally, the development of man's reasoning abilities fulfills the purpose of serving God and man because of its role in improving the human condition through expanding the realm of knowledge. New knowledge is needed for solving the numerous moral, religious, economic, political, social, and medical problems that presently confront mankind.

Fourth, the Christian curriculum must be practical (Peterson, 2001, p. 110). A Christian curriculum emphasizes the practice of morality, democratic principles, and Christian faith. A Christian curriculum fosters the development of moral habits. These habits are deduced from Christian principles and self-evident truths. Moreover, a Christian curriculum cultivates democratic practices. As I have argued previously, McGiffert (1919) argues that democracy serves the ideals of Christian ethics. Thus, Christian schools should foster democratic ideals. Moreover, Christian schools may also provide opportunities for organizing students into miniature democratic societies. Finally, a Christian curriculum should provide students with the opportunity to convert to the Christian religion. According to Augustine, the content of a Christian curriculum

should be rooted in Scripture. As Augustine puts it, the purpose of Christian teachers should be to sway students to Christian faith (Augustine, 1996, p. 114).

A Christian perspective also organizes subject matter according to the developmental level of the student. A Christian curriculum makes room for theories of cognitive, social and moral development such as Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development, Lev Vygotsky's theory of social development, and Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development. In the earlier grades, the curriculum must provide basic skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic. The curriculum should foster an organized perspective of the world, one that will be revisited and improved upon in the later grades. A Christian perspective on curriculum shares some similarities to Jerome Bruner's psychology presented in his work *The Process of Education*. Bruner (1969) states that "a curriculum ... should revisit basic ideas repeatedly, building upon them until the student has grasped the full formal apparatus that goes with them" (p. 13). In the earlier grades, the Christian curriculum, according to Peterson, "should also include methods that provide positive emotional support, initial socialization, the beginnings of character development, and physical hygiene and coordination" (Peterson, 2001, p. 112).

A Christian curriculum also makes room for the cognitive information processing theories of D.P. Ausubel (1963, 1968, 1980) and George Miller (1956). These psychologists support their views with empirical evidence. They believe that new information will be easily lost unless students can attach it to a mental structure, which they argue was formed by previous information acquired by students. This mental structure, also known as schema in psychological terminology, is a network of interconnected concepts and ideas. Students will process new information more

successfully if it connects to their prior knowledge. Moreover, in order to prevent forgetting, information processing psychologists suggest that the new information should be attached to many elements pertaining to the schema. Put in a different way, the attachment of a new concept to the schema is synonymous to understanding that particular concept. A Christian curriculum should not ignore what these psychologists have to say. Christian teachers should organize their curriculum according to information processing principles, meaning (1) teachers should consider the prior learning of students; (2) students should be provided with various opportunities to attach new information to ideas inherent in their schemas; and (3) students should be encouraged to reevaluate their internal schemas based upon new information.

In his book, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*, E. D. Hirsch (1987) argues that general cultural literacy provides the intellectual framework that allows human beings to make sense of new information. To Hirsch, cultural literacy functions as a safety net. In its absence, Hirsch believes, large amounts of important information will be lost due to a lack of background knowledge. A Christian curriculum also can benefit from Hirsch's views. A Christian curriculum, because of its purpose to serve human beings in the best possible way, requires that students be exposed to the broad culture of the human race. Literature, art, philosophy, science, religion and other liberal arts subjects are thus fundamental subjects within a Christian curriculum.

Now that I have addressed the question of Christian curriculum, I will focus on the even more specific practice of Christian teaching.

A Christian Perspective on Teaching

My understanding of Christian teaching is similar to what Michael L. Peterson presents in *With All Your Mind: A Christian Philosophy of Education* (2001). According to Peterson (2001, pp. 117-119), a Christian perspective on teaching should emphasize three aspects: didactic teaching, seminar instruction, and coaching. In his work, Peterson has integrated these three teaching methods developed by Adler within a Christian perspective. To present a Christian view of teaching, I also use Saint Augustine's understanding of teaching presented in *Teaching Christianity* (Augustine, 1996). Augustine's views on teaching are similar to Adler's presentation of didactic teaching. Moreover, Augustine's vision on teaching offers significant improvement to those of Adler and Peterson.

Adler defines didactic teaching as the transmission of facts and organized bodies of information. Augustine (Augustine, 1996, p. 215) views teaching Christianity as a logical discourse with regard to the wisdom and truth presented in the Scriptures. Unlike Adler, Augustine believes that teaching should only emphasize the Christian doctrines presented in the Scriptures. Indeed, Augustine also allows for the teaching of subject matter that can be deduced from Scripture and that illuminates our understanding of Biblical passages. As a consequence, Augustine's teaching is not narrow but rather quite broad and encyclopedic. The fact that, for Augustine, the content of Christian teaching is rooted in Scripture implies that everything that is said by the teacher is of great importance (Augustine, 1996, p. 220). In addition, both thinkers agree with regard to the central role of the teacher in didactic teaching and, respectively, in Christian teaching as well. Moreover, Adler and Augustine agree that in addition to the logical dimension,

rhetoric should assume an important role in the practice of teaching (Adler, 1984, p. 51; Augustine, 1996, p. 201).

Augustine considers three aspects of eloquence: “to teach, to delight, and to sway” (Augustine, 1996, p. 215). First, teaching is a necessary part of eloquent speaking. Teaching refers to the logical transmission of knowledge and truth. In Augustine’s view, teachers are efficient as long as they are understood by their students. Second, delight refers to the ability of teachers to hold students’ attention, which means to keep them focused on the subject-matter that is being presented. Augustine believes that delight can be prompted by good teaching. To Augustine, people find delight in discovering the truth. Moreover, Augustine believes that teachers should employ rhetorical devices in order to make their lectures enjoyable to their students (Augustine, 1996, p. 201). He wonders rhetorically whether “the truth should stand there without any weapons in the hands of its defenders against falsehood” (Augustine, 1996, p. 201). In other words, Augustine wonders why the promoters of falsehood should employ rhetoric, while the defenders of the truth should abstain from using it. Why should the preachers of error use rhetoric to make people laugh, cry, and enthusiastic, while the defenders of the truth should deliver boring and unattractive messages? Also, Augustine believes that Christian eloquence should be grave and moderate rather than superfluous and embellished (Augustine, 1996, pp. 216-217). In Augustine’s view of teaching, concision and seriousness should characterize the rhetorical style of Christian teaching. This aspect of delight is also present in Adler’s understanding of didactic teaching (Adler, 1984, p. 51).

Third, the understanding and the enjoyment of the truth are insufficient if people are not convinced to embrace and to put this newly acquired knowledge into practice. To

Augustine, people must be swayed by the truth (Augustine, 1996, p. 215). The goal of Christian teaching is to direct student's desires toward loving and serving God. Unlike Augustine, Adler employs didactic teaching to form students' characters but not to persuade them to follow the Christian faith. Augustine and Adler have a similar understanding of didactic teaching. The difference between the two resides, however, in the purposes assigned to didactic instruction. Augustine envisages a Christian purpose, while Adler has a secular goal in mind.

Augustine also emphasizes the role of prayer in teaching. Augustine states that a teacher should "be a pray-er before being a speaker" (Augustine, 1996, p. 218). He further states that "it is more the piety of prayer than the ready facility of orators that enables" one to teach (Augustine, 1996, p. 218). Prayer is important because it allows teachers to address specific issues that confront students. According to Augustine, teachers are usually aware of broad universal issues that students face throughout their lives. However, teachers are not always aware of the specific situations that confront individual students. Under these circumstances, teachers should request the assistance of God in prayer. Augustine believes that the Holy Spirit will guide teachers with regard to how and what to teach in the very moment they are standing in front of a group of students. Augustine bases his views on a passage from Mathew 10:19-20. Unlike Augustine, Adler does not emphasize the role of prayer in fostering good teaching.

Didactic teaching is consistent with Christian schooling due to the nature of the Christian faith. Christianity is a revealed religion. The Christian doctrines of creation, fall, and redemption can neither be inferred from human experiences nor can they be deduced from self-evident moral principles. Man received Christian doctrines from God

Himself, who called man to transmit these principles to future generations. Therefore, in Christian schooling, didactic teaching is essential in transmitting these doctrines.

Coaching is also essential to Christian schooling. In Christian schooling, students are provided with a theoretical understanding of God, man, and the cosmos. Next, students are transmitted the purposes God established for man in the world. Moreover, students are provided knowledge with regard to the Christian virtues and values needed in order to achieve Christian ideals. Theoretical knowledge must be supplemented by coaching students with regard to Christian virtue. As I have already mentioned, the Apostle James, the brother of Jesus, states that faith unaccompanied by action is dead. He further urges Christians to show their faith through their actions (James 2:17-20). Coaching as a teaching practice shows students how to practice the Christian virtues of faith, hope, love, and humility. Christianity is a practical religion, meaning it requires a relationship with God and man, and an interaction with the cosmos. Christian schooling must develop this practical aspect of Christianity through coaching. Coaching entails the following dimensions: an academic dimension, a moral dimension, and a civic dimension. A strict separation of these three dimensions is impossible to achieve; they always overlap. Teaching, in the form of coaching, brings them together. This integration takes place in several ways.

First, coaching is employed in instilling Christian virtues in students (Glanzer, 2007). The Apostle Paul provides a list of Christian virtues in his letter to the Galatians. Paul enumerates the following virtues: love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance (Galatians 5:22-23). According to a Christian perspective, these are the Christian virtues that should be cultivated in schooling by

coaching. Second, Christian schooling should emphasize the teaching of academic skills through coaching. These skills include reading, writing, and arithmetic. They also include higher order skills that are of various kinds, including mathematical, logical, inductive, deductive, analytical, synthetic, reflective, and artistic. Third, Christian schooling should provide students with the opportunity to live in a miniature democratic community in which they experience democratic habits. These democratic habits include, among others: (1) interest and participation of every member of the social group in civic/political matters; (2) toleration of the rights of others to adhere to and to express views that oppose one's own; (3) predisposition for solving social issues by employing dialogue and deliberation; and (4) the individual's decision to submit to the authority of the state (Kunzman, 2006, pp. 79-102).

From a Christian perspective, seminar teaching also should be employed. Seminar teaching fosters understanding and deep engagement with ideas. I would like to clarify the distinction between academic coaching and seminar teaching. The purpose of academic coaching is to cultivate academic skills. In academic coaching, the content of the problem in which these skills are developed is as significant as the skills that are being taught. In seminar teaching, however, students utilize academic skills to connect with existential human ideals. In this case, the topic that is discussed is just as important, if not more important, than the skills being developed.

Seminar instruction is the same as Socratic teaching (Adler, 1984, pp. 15-16). Its role is to form independent human beings. Socratic teaching provides students with the experience of independent thinking. Moreover, it bestows confidence in students' thinking abilities. Students are urged to employ reason as the ultimate arbiter for

uncovering truth. They are challenged to discover truths and subsequently to make existential decisions. This type of independent thinking cannot be fostered by didactic teaching or by coaching. As I have mentioned previously, the development of thinking is essential for fulfilling the human purpose of loving and serving God. The development of thinking is an end in itself, in the sense that the activity of thinking makes us happy. Also, thinking fosters other personal human ideals, specifically the ideal of freedom. Thinking makes us independent and free.

Finally, I would like to mention guided discovery in order to complete my discussion of Christian teaching. Guided discovery is a broader teaching method that includes seminar teaching. Guided discovery also extends into the realm of science; it extrapolates Socratic teaching into the field of science. According to a Christian perspective, students should be provided with the opportunity to experiment in the fields of natural and social sciences (Augustine, 1996, pp. 159-160). These experiments should be supervised and guided according to larger theological ideals. Guided discovery in science serves the Christian purpose of loving God and indeed all of humanity. Guided discovery assists man in providing for his or her economic needs. It also contributes to the economic progress of society. Also, the idea that ethics demands the advancement of science, which I have discussed previously, implies that guided discovery is mandated by morality.

Now that I have discussed a Christian vision for curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling, I will evaluate the philosophy of John Dewey with regard to these subjects.

A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling

As I have stated previously, John Dewey's progressive philosophy and a Christian worldview are antagonistic in many respects. They stand on different metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological grounds. Because the basic principles upon which pragmatism and Christianity are erected are in opposition to one another, these worldviews cannot be synthesized without eliminating certain central aspects of one of the two perspectives. At the same time, however, I will argue that progressivism promotes specific ideas that can be integrated within a Christian perspective, which is much more comprehensive than Dewey's pragmatism. These ideas, in order to be compatible with a Christian perspective, must be stripped of their pragmatic justification. In this section, I will show how progressivism and Christianity differ with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. Next, I will integrate specific Deweyan views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian worldview. I will compare and contrast Dewey's progressivism and a Christian perspective with regard to these topics in the following order: first, I will discuss the purpose of schooling; second, I will discuss the curriculum; and third, I will address teaching.

A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on the Purpose of Schooling

The purpose of schooling is determined by metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical dimensions inherent in any particular worldview. Therefore, different metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical views lead to different purposes for schooling. As mentioned above, Dewey's progressivism and a Christian perspective differ with

regard to metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics. Consequently, they propose different purposes for schooling. A Christian purpose of schooling is rooted in a metaphysical understanding of God, man, and the cosmos. According to a Christian perspective, these metaphysical views are immutable and absolute. Moreover, God has established an absolute existential purpose for man, which is to serve and love Him. From a Christian perspective, schooling must serve this Divine purpose.

The first point of contention between Dewey's progressive philosophy and a Christian perspective can be found in the very concept of metaphysics. Dewey rejects the notion of a world that consists of absolute ideals and realities (Fair, 1999). In Chapter II, I have presented Dewey's arguments against the existence of an absolute world of ideas. If Dewey rejects the existence of absolute realities, then by logical necessity he must refute the idea of an absolute God. By rejecting the notion of an absolute God, Dewey discards the idea of a Christian God. For Dewey, the idea of serving an all-knowing God is therefore not important. Consequently, to Dewey, the idea of man created with a precise purpose established by God is also unacceptable. Therefore, Dewey rejects the Christian purpose for schooling, which is to serve and love God. When evaluated from a Christian perspective, Dewey's progressivism falls short due to its refusal to promote the Christian ideal of serving and loving God.

Dewey's purpose for schooling is to promote a democratic state. For Dewey, democracy is the ultimate ethical ideal for man. To Dewey, democracy is the political system in which man's ethical ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity can best be realized. In Dewey's view, these ideals are not entrenched in idealist metaphysics. As Westbrook (1991) puts this point,

[It] must be said in Dewey's defense that he never tried as a metaphysician to secure his most cherished values as 'fixed traits of real Being.' His attempt to establish that democracy was a reasonable regulative ideal in a hazardous world in which such ideals often came to grief was a far cry from the efforts of others to forge for their ideals a false passport to certainty. (p. 366)

A Christian perspective promotes the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Unlike Dewey, however, Christianity affirms that these principles are absolute and universal. They are offered to man through God's special revelation, which is accessible only through faith. Moreover, these principles are made available to man in God's general revelation, the revelation in nature and human conscience. Liberty, equality, and fraternity derive their content from Christian metaphysics. Unlike Dewey, a Christian perspective endorses the idea that these ideals are not ends in themselves, but rather they are means to attaining the highest ideal of serving and loving God. Therefore, a Christian perspective affirms that democracy by itself is an insufficient purpose for schooling. Democracy must be presented to students in addition to knowledge about God and the Christian purpose of serving God in love. Democracy, in other words, must be rooted in the Christian faith.

I will now compare Dewey's democratic purpose for schooling—specifically the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity—against the Christian ideal of serving and loving God (Dewey, 1976, pp. 441-444; Westbrook, 1991, p. 93). To Dewey, liberty entails two aspects: knowledge and the ability to put one's ideas into practice (Dewey, 1990, p. 23). Echoing Jefferson's view, Dewey does not believe that man can be both ignorant and free. Moreover, Dewey believes that man is a slave as long as he cannot act upon his ideas. In other words, to Dewey, a free man is the master of his private life and has a say in the affairs of the state.

A Christian perspective endorses the idea of liberty. Indeed, according to Christianity, man must be free in order to love God. Love entails liberty. Man cannot be forced to love another, whether this person is God or a fellow human being. Moreover, a Christian perspective supports the idea of political liberty. As I have shown above, McGiffert (1919, p. 38) argues that Christian ethics demands democratic freedom. McGiffert argues, similar to Dewey, that the very idea of human nature demands that man be able to put his or her ideas into practice. In other words, in order to be happy, man must have personal and political freedom. Since loving oneself is a means of loving God (Augustine, 1996, p. 114), I will conclude that democratic liberty is necessary for fostering the ideal of loving and serving God.

With regard to the ideal of equality, Dewey argues that it can be achieved by implementing the idea of socialism of intelligence (Dewey, 1976, pp. 441-444; Westbrook, 1991, p. 93-94). Socialism of intelligence refers to providing all students, regardless of their social status, with the same quality of education. Dewey, like Horace Mann, believed that education, specifically K-12 schooling, is the great equalizer of the human condition. Dewey agrees with Mann that education can assist students in accomplishing the highest potential of their natures. For Dewey, human beings are unique. Therefore, they realize their natures in different ways. Humans need different resources (both in quality and quantity) in order to fulfill their unique natures. Under these circumstances, Dewey concludes that there is no need for an equal distribution of physical, financial, and economic resources. Thus, Dewey's conception of equality is at odds with socialist ideology.

Christian morality proposes higher standards than Dewey's ethics, because Christianity demands service rather than equality. In the Gospels, Jesus affirms that the greatest in the kingdom of God is the one who serves (Luke 22:24-27). Jesus calls human beings to serve both God and one another.

Finally, for Dewey, the idea of fraternity refers to the social nature of man. Fraternity contributes to the unity of the state. To Dewey, citizens must learn to embrace the ideals of the community and ultimately the state. Dewey does not argue for either a total subordination of individuals to the state or a complete independence of men from the authority of government. Rather, Dewey promotes a balance between individual and public interests. Thus, for Dewey, liberty and fraternity must find a way to coexist in a democratic state. According to a Christian perspective, however, fraternity is formed by love and service to other humans and ultimately God, not service to the state. Fraternity is not a means in itself, but rather a means for loving and serving God (Augustine, 1996, p. 114).

In the next section, I will provide a Christian evaluation of Dewey's philosophy on curriculum.

A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on Curriculum

In this section, I will evaluate John Dewey's views on curriculum from a Christian perspective. I will offer a brief summary of a Christian perspective on the curriculum that I have presented previously. Moreover, I will discuss the ways in which Dewey does not meet the standards set by a Christian curriculum. Not all aspects of Dewey's views on curriculum, however, are antithetical to Christian faith. Therefore, I will then present the points of compatibility between Dewey and Christianity on

curriculum. Finally, I will attempt to integrate specific Deweyan ideas on curriculum from a Christian perspective.

Previously, I have stated that a Christian curriculum is employed in forming individuals who serve God, love others, and live according to the standard set by Jesus Christ. A Christian curriculum promotes these ideals in the following manner: first, a Christian curriculum must transmit facts; second, a Christian curriculum must provide basic academic skills; third, a Christian curriculum must foster the development of reasoning skills; and fourth, a Christian curriculum must be practical. With regard to facts, a Christian curriculum must transmit the following: self-evident truths, religious truths, truths derived by reason from religious truths and self-evident truths, and scientific truths. Next, a Christian curriculum must foster the following basic skills: reading, writing, speaking, listening, observing, measuring, calculating, estimating, and computer literacy (Peterson, 2001, p. 118). Also, a Christian curriculum must provide students with access to the epistemological instruments of faith, philosophy, and science. Finally, a Christian curriculum must emphasize the practice of morality, democracy, and Christian faith.

I will now evaluate Dewey's views on curriculum from a Christian perspective. First, with regard to facts and ideas, Dewey promotes a vision of the curriculum that is similar to a Christian perspective in the following ways. Dewey emphasizes the facts and principles of science; moreover, Dewey includes in his curriculum facts and ideas pertaining to the fields of philosophy, ethics, and religion. Previously, I have addressed Dewey's endorsement of the ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Needless to say,

Dewey promotes the ideals of honesty and fairness and rejects the vices of killing, stealing, and physically-harming others.

However, Dewey differs from a Christian perspective because he does not entrench these ideals in a metaphysical reality. Rather, these religious, philosophical, and ethical ideals are described as tools employed for their usefulness to humankind. Dewey refuses to believe in an immutable world of ideas, which, from a Christian perspective, remain valid regardless of historical era, culture, or political regime. Rather, Dewey believes in a constant evolution of everything, including man, cosmos, morality, ideas, and even truth. Moreover, Dewey fails to meet the standards set by a Christian perspective because he excludes knowledge within the curriculum that describes God and spiritual realities. Dewey rejects these ideals regardless of whether or not they are useful in making human beings happy or whether or not they offer peace of mind, hope, and a sense of purpose.

Second, a Christian perspective and Dewey's progressive philosophy agree with regard to the importance of including basic skills in the curriculum. These skills include reading, writing, arithmetic, and computer literacy. There is only one difference between Dewey and a Christian perspective with regard to these basic skills. Since Dewey lived before the era of the large-scale integration of computer technology into American schooling, he did not include computer literacy on the list of basic skills.

Third, according to a Christian perspective, Dewey's curriculum is incomplete because it fails to include the epistemological methods of idealist philosophy and Christian faith. Christianity agrees with Dewey with regard to the need to employ the methods of science for the benefit of humanity. However, a Christian perspective rejects

the claim of Dewey's pragmatic philosophy that the methods of science are the only legitimate methods of knowing reality.

With regard to faith—the method of Christian religion—Dewey also commits a logical error. One way to make this point is to draw upon the work of Søren Kierkegaard. In *Philosophical Fragments*, for example, Kierkegaard (1985) proposes “a psychological rather than a philosophical standard of belief” (Popkin, 1951, p. 274). In other words, Kierkegaard argues that faith is a subjective experience. Faith cannot be proven by reason. In other words, a man cannot prove to another by rational means that his or her faith is genuine. In other words, the veracity inherent in one's faith cannot be shared to our fellow men. Rather, every man must experience the Christian faith for himself. The fact that one does not have this experience of faith does not give him, or her, the right (according to the laws of reason) to affirm that Christian faith is illegitimate. As Richard Baer states, “There are no reasonable epistemological standards that allow us to judge theological thinking as inherently inferior or less reliable than secular or non-theistic thinking” (1990, p. 461). Therefore, by stating that Christian faith is an illegitimate epistemological method, Dewey commits a logical fallacy.

Fourth, Dewey's curriculum, similar to a Christian curriculum, includes a practical dimension. Similar to a Christian perspective, Dewey promotes in his curriculum habits of morality. Also, Dewey and a Christian perspective agree with regard to establishing a miniature democratic community in which students are provided with the opportunity to practice democratic principles. The idea of implementing a miniature democratic society in schooling originated with Dewey. A Christian perspective can embrace it, adapt it, and justify it according to Christian principles. This

idea constitutes one of those specific Deweyan ideas that I believe can be integrated within a Christian worldview.

The discrepancy between Dewey and a Christian perspective consists in the different justifications provided for various moral and democratic principles. In addition, according to a Christian understanding of curriculum, Dewey fails to meet Christian standards because he rejects schooling practices in which students are encouraged to relate to God and Jesus Christ, for instance students' participation in prayer. Dewey also separates the curriculum from any integration of Christian faith into subject-matter. Also, Dewey does not provide students with an opportunity to commit their lives to the Christian faith.

A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey's Views on Teaching

In this section, I will evaluate Dewey's philosophy of teaching from a Christian perspective. According to Michael Peterson, a Christian perspective on teaching emphasizes three aspects: didactic teaching, seminar instruction, and coaching (Peterson, 2001, pp. 117-119). A Christian perspective on teaching must incorporate Augustine's views on the subject (Augustine, 1996). I will evaluate Dewey's teaching philosophy in light of these three domains of Christian teaching. Next, I will integrate specific Deweyan ideas on teaching within a Christian perspective.

I will first provide a summary of my understanding of Dewey's conception on teaching, which I presented in Chapter II. Dewey rejects traditional teaching, meaning an approach to teaching that emphasizes the active role of teachers who impart knowledge to passive students. Also, Dewey rejects a romantic view of teaching, meaning teaching in which the role of teachers is reduced to indulging the interests, desires, and whims of

students. Romantic teaching puts students at the helm of the process of schooling. Dewey's view of teaching occupies the middle ground between these two extremes. Dewey recognizes, based primarily on discoveries made in the field of psychology, that the child is an active being. Early on in their lives, children manifest desires, interests, and instincts to express, construct, investigate, and socialize (Dewey, 1900, pp. 43-44). Satisfying these interests is among the fundamental purposes for schooling, at least according to Dewey. Therefore, from Dewey's perspective, educators should capitalize on students' natural instincts by allowing these instincts to guide the learning experience and, by extension, the teaching experience as well (Dewey, 1900, pp. 43-44; Dewey, 1957, pp. 87-88).

On the other hand, Dewey knows that students are unable to steer these natural human interests in the right direction by themselves. In other words, students, without guidance, are unable to develop these instincts to an appropriate level of excellence, which is essential for citizenship. For instance, an individual is unable to develop his or her constructive instinct to a high level of complexity without support from a well-prepared teacher. This individual, for example, will not be able to teach himself the art of constructing a gothic cathedral without help from teachers who know this art. This task, if it is done properly, includes knowledge of how to read, write, and calculate; it also requires an understanding of mathematics, geometry, physics, and chemistry. In order to acquire a profound understanding of all these subjects, students must be taught this knowledge. Dewey does not, however, support direct instruction in order to teach these subjects. He sees teachers as directors of students' learning experiences. Students must be confronted with various educational experiences that will allow them to develop

knowledge of these disciplines and consequently to shape their instincts. Dewey underlines the importance of subject matter, however, in *Experience and Education* (1957). He argues,

many of the newer schools tend to make little or nothing of organized subject-matter of study; to proceed as if any form of direction and guidance by adults were an invasion of individual freedom, and as if the idea of education should be concerned with the present and future meant that acquaintance with the past has little or no role to play in education. (pp. 9-10)

To Dewey, the role of teachers is that of facilitators or guides. Dewey (1990) expresses this point directly in *School and Society* when he writes:

the question of education is the question of taking hold of his [student's] activities, of giving them direction. Through direction, through organized use, they tend toward valuable results, instead of scattering or being left to merely impulsive expression. (p. 36)

Teachers should guide students to the pre-established purposes of schooling by stimulating the development of students' creative, investigative, social, and expressive instincts. Dewey emphasizes the Socratic method of drawing out rather than the traditional schooling method of pouring in (Dewey, 1990, p. 36).

A Christian perspective recognizes the importance of the psychological view that man is an active being. Indeed, student interest accelerates the learning process and increases the extent to which students retain knowledge. Therefore, a Christian perspective agrees with Dewey that teachers should pay careful attention to the needs and interests of students. Moreover, a Christian perspective welcomes the Deweyan preference for a Socratic method of teaching. Guided discovery is also a concept that corresponds with Christian teaching. Therefore, I will conclude that a Christian perspective and Dewey's progressivism agree with regard to the need to utilize Socratic teaching and guided discovery in schooling. Both of these teaching methods are rooted

in the idea that the interests and instincts of children should be considered when practicing the art of teaching.

The difference between Dewey and a Christian worldview, however, comes into play when we consider the subjects, topics, ideas, and activities addressed during seminar instruction and guided discovery. Dewey's topics and activities are limited to pragmatic philosophy and scientific experimentation. From a Christian perspective, the scope of the topics addressed is far too narrow because it excludes religion and idealist philosophy. A Christian perspective challenges the seriousness of Dewey's intention to mold students into independent thinkers. How can one become a free thinker when he or she is prevented from pursuing the truth wherever it might lead, specifically when it leads to religion and metaphysics? Dewey does not have a convincing answer to this question.

Another issue related to a Christian evaluation of Dewey's philosophy of teaching refers to didactic teaching. I am not convinced that Dewey reserves a place for didactic instruction within his philosophy of teaching. Didactic instruction entails the transmission of large bodies of information, primarily facts, to students. In the upper grades, teachers who use didactic instruction transmit to students information that is logically organized. Seminar teaching is student centered, while didactic teaching is teacher centered. In other words, teachers who use didactic teaching assume a direct position of authority. Teachers are the possessors and transmitters of knowledge. On the other hand, in seminar instruction, teachers embrace an indirect position of leadership as they guide students through the process of discovering knowledge. Moreover, didactic instruction is compatible to both deductive as well as inductive approaches, while guided discovery is an inductive method. Guided discovery, as utilized in the scientific realm, is

different from seminar teaching and the Socratic Method. Guided discovery is different because it rejects the idea that deductive thinking is a legitimate epistemological method.

Dewey is a promoter of didactic teaching if didactic teaching is defined narrowly as the transmission of information. Richard Rorty (1999) affirms in *Philosophy and Social Hope* that Dewey has never assumed that schools should stop transmitting large amounts of information to students. For instance, Rorty states that all American high-school graduates should know who lived first “Plato or Shakespeare, Napoleon or Lincoln, Frederick Douglass or Martin Luther King, Jr.” (Rorty, 1999, p. 121). Indeed, Dewey urges that these facts be transmitted within the context of experiential learning, also known as discovery learning. Also, Dewey argues that this factual information should be revealed to students as they develop an interest for it.

In the case of defining didactic instruction as the transmission of facts, Dewey’s progressivism and a Christian perspective agree with regard to the need to employ didactic instruction in schooling. However, the two perspectives disagree with regard to the content of the information conveyed to students. Dewey rejects facts that refer to metaphysics and religion, specifically Christianity.

Didactic instruction can be defined more broadly as the theoretical transmission of organized bodies of knowledge in a deductive manner. A Christian perspective makes good and appropriate use of didactic instruction defined in this manner. As I have mentioned previously, Christianity adheres to the belief in absolute principles, whether these principles are made known in man’s conscience, revealed through faith, or discovered by reason. Once man knows these absolute principles, he or she can derive from them other absolute principles with the aid of reason. Specifically, man can deduce

ideas that can be applied to particular situations. I have previously identified these ideas as pertaining to the moral, political, and religious realms. According to a Christian perspective, one's knowledge of absolute principles and one's ability to utilize reason are sufficient for discovering further knowledge with regard to the aforementioned domains (Peterson, 2001, pp. 100-101). The constant interaction with the physical environment, which ultimately culminates in the scientific method, is not necessary when dealing with these kinds of matters. Because these matters were developed solely in the mind, they can only be transmitted to other human beings through a theoretical discourse. This discourse must be logically organized in order to be meaningful to the audience.

Dewey's progressivism and a Christian perspective differ with regard to the employment of the deductive method as a means of discovering adequate knowledge. Unlike Christianity, Dewey rejects the deductive method as it is employed in idealist philosophy. Dewey does not accept ideas that are deduced with the aid of reason from absolute principles. He does not accept any knowledge unless it is based on human experience (Dewey, 1997a, pp. 339&343-345). Unlike idealism, which confers a higher value to deductive thinking and only a utilitarian role to inductive thinking, Dewey's progressivism reverses this view and elevates the role of inductive thinking over deductive thinking. For Dewey, deductive thinking becomes a maidservant, or a tool, to inductive thinking. Dewey refuses to give deductive reasoning the primordial epistemological role because he refutes *a priori* the conception of absolute ideas. If universal ideas do not exist, then deducing specific ideas from them is useless. Thus, according to Dewey, deductive thinking cannot stand on its own; it is dependent upon inductive thinking. To Dewey, inductive thinking, which he believes is inherent in the

scientific method and human experience, will provide humans with genuine knowledge. The role of deductive thinking is to derive additional knowledge with the aid of reason from the knowledge provided by science and experience. In Dewey's philosophy, the content of deductive thinking is not immutable as it is in idealist philosophy. Rather, this content changes as the premises of deduction undergo a continuous process of change.

When addressing the subject of teaching, the views of St. Augustine also should be considered. Augustine's views on teaching are compatible in some respect to Adler's conceptions on didactic teaching. Therefore, I have amended and supplemented Adler's understanding of didactic teaching with Augustine's views on Christian teaching. I will now evaluate Dewey's ideas on teaching from Augustine's perspective.

First, unlike Augustine, Dewey does not believe that the Holy Scriptures should provide the content of teaching. For Dewey, teaching should emphasize science as well as democratic knowledge and experience. Second, I believe that Dewey agrees with Augustine that didactic teaching should emphasize the logical and rhetorical dimensions of curriculum. In other words, Dewey embraces Augustine's principles of teaching and delighting students. However, Dewey restricts the utilization of didactic teaching as much as possible. For Dewey, the Socratic Method and guided discovery should be the prevalent teaching methods. To Dewey, didactic teaching is useful primarily in the upper grades of K-12 schooling. Third, like Augustine, Dewey wants teachers to sway their students. However, unlike Augustine, Dewey does not attempt to convince students to embrace Christianity. Instead, Dewey wants to transform his students into good liberal democrats who accept a neutral view of teaching. Finally, unlike Augustine, Dewey does not reserve any role for prayer within the practice of teaching.

With regard to coaching, Dewey recognizes its role in fostering students' academic skills, moral commitments, and democratic habits. Dewey and a Christian perspective agree with regard to the basic academic skills that should be cultivated through coaching. Academic skills comprise two categories: basic skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic; and higher order skills such as mathematical, logical, inductive, deductive, analytical, synthetic, reflective, and artistic skills.

Moreover, Dewey and a Christian perspective agree with regard to the use of coaching to foster democratic habits. They concur with regard to the democratic skills that should be taught in schooling. These democratic habits include participation in civic affairs, toleration of opposing views, commitment to address socio-political issues through deliberation, and a willingness to submit to the decision of the majority (Kunzman, 2006, pp. 79-102). Dewey and a Christian perspective disagree with regard to the ways in which they justify these democratic habits. A Christian perspective derives democratic habits from Christian doctrines and idealist philosophy while Dewey roots these habits in pragmatic thinking.

Finally, Dewey and a Christian perspective agree that teachers should utilize coaching in order to cultivate moral habits. They disagree, however, with regard to the nature of morality. For Christianity, morality is rooted in absolute principles. For Dewey, morality is rooted in human experience; therefore, morality is in a constant state of change. Dewey promotes the latest version of morality (meaning that which is most highly evolved), but urges students to contemplate ways of improving the morality that has been handed down to them (Dewey, 1972b, pp. 52-53). Dewey embraces only those Christian moral habits that can be separated from their Christian metaphysical

foundation. In doing so, Dewey rejects the Christian virtue of faith. Dewey asserts that the teaching of academic skills, democratic commitments, and moral habits will be realized as students follow their own interests and impulses under the guidance and direction of teachers.

Now that I have completed my evaluation of Dewey from a Christian perspective, I will employ the same Christian standards to assess the philosophy of Mortimer Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling.

A Christian Evaluation of Mortimer Adler's Views on the Purpose of Schooling

In this section, I will evaluate Mortimer Adler's views on the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. Additionally, I will compare and contrast a Christian worldview, Dewey's progressive thinking, and Adler's philosophy with regard to curriculum.

According to a Christian perspective, the broad purpose of schooling is to form individuals who serve and love God. Mortimer Adler promotes secular purposes for schooling that reflect the principles of neo-Aristotelian philosophy and liberal democracy. When discussing Adler's views on the purposes of schooling, I draw upon Adler's ideas presented in his educational manifesto, *The Paideia Program*. My discussion refers specifically to the purposes of American K-12 public schooling. Adler's commitment to advance secular purposes for schooling, rather than to explicitly support Christian ideals, does not mean that Adler's views are opposed to Christianity. We can infer that Adler most likely left the task of promoting Christianity to other institutions such as the family and the church. Adler's philosophical worldview evolved across many decades from a classical humanist position to Christianity, which he

embraced toward the end of his life. Adler converted to Christianity in 1984. He was baptized in an Episcopalian church on April 21 of that year. An account of Adler's (1992) conversion to Christianity is provided in Chapter 9 of his second autobiography entitled *A Second Look in the Rearview Mirror: Further Autobiographical Reflections of a Philosopher at Large*. In December of 1999, Adler embraced the Roman Catholic faith. Since *The Paideia Program* was published in 1984, I will assume that Adler was undergoing his religious transformation while producing this work. I am inclined to believe that Adler's secular curriculum is not antithetical to Christianity. On the other hand, Dewey's purpose of schooling stands in sharp contrast to Christian faith.

For Adler, schooling should promote individual as well as social purposes. Schooling should assist and encourage individuals to develop their unique natures. Also, economic ideals, specifically those that prepare students for earning a living, are among Adler's purposes for schooling. With regard to social ideals, Adler believes that schooling should promote democracy. To Adler, democracy is the regime in which the personal ideals of man (specifically human rights) correspond with those of society, and the state. There is consensus between a Christian perspective, Dewey, and Adler that democracy is the political regime that best promotes the individual rights of equality, liberty, and fraternity.

There is, however, a difference between these three perspectives. Christianity and Adler agree with regard to the absolute nature of these individual human rights and social ideals. Dewey, on the other hand, refuses to entrench them in a metaphysical reality (Westbrook, 1991, p. 366).

For Adler, the formation of democratic citizens depends upon the attainment of the following objectives: first, all public schools must provide the same quality of education to all students; and second, the principle that inequality of opportunity provides equality of results should replace the belief that equality of opportunity provides equality of results. Adler believes that American democracy is being undermined by a K-12 schooling system that emphasizes the promotion of the same quantity of education and not the same quality to all students. Adler asserts that the practice of providing equality of opportunity, rather than equality of results, is prevalent in American K-12 schools.

According to Adler, the failure of schools to provide the same quality of education leads to a multi-track system and ultimately to social stratification. If we do not provide the same quality of schooling to all students, society will be divided into an upper class that is destined for leisure, learning, and political leadership; and a lower class, that is destined for labor, personal dissatisfaction, and limited political influence. This climate of division and political disenfranchisement is clearly anti-democratic, at least according to Adler. A Christian perspective adheres to Adler's understanding that a democratic state requires that all its citizens should benefit from the same quality of education (Adler, 1984, pp. 2-3). Dewey will nevertheless embrace this understanding. The difference between the three perspectives resides not in the need for quality but with regard to the content of this education, meaning the substance of the curriculum and the methods of teaching. These differences will be discussed later on, when I evaluate Adler's curriculum and teaching methods from a Christian perspective.

Moreover, according to Adler, by providing the same educational resources to all students, American schooling undermines democracy. Adler argues that if given equal

access to resources, the more talented students will obtain far greater results than those who are less gifted. This will lead to inequality of results, to social stratification, and ultimately to a weakening of democratic society. For Adler, the key for realizing social equality consists in adopting the principle that inequality of opportunity provides equality of results. Therefore, less gifted students should be provided with more schooling resources, whether these are material, spiritual, or temporal (Adler, 1984, p. 3). To do so will help equalize the social field and ultimately will strengthen democracy. Also, American society will benefit because all citizens will participate to their full potential in the life of the nation. Indeed, intellectual differences cannot be eliminated entirely, but, with good teaching, they can be reduced as much as possible. A Christian perspective incorporates this view of Adler's philosophy within its broader framework (Peterson, 2001, pp. 117-119).

Now that I have assessed Adler's views on the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective, I will employ the same standard to evaluate his understanding of curriculum.

A Christian Evaluation of Mortimer Adler's Views on Curriculum

As I have stated previously, according to a Christian perspective, the purpose of schooling is to form individuals who love and serve God. This general Christian purpose for schooling entails derivative goals such as developing students into democratic citizens. In addition, a Christian perspective can incorporate Adler's means of promoting and sustaining a democratic state, which consists of (a) providing students with the same quality of education and (b) striving to achieve in schooling equality of results rather than equality of educational opportunity. I will divide these schooling purposes into two

major categories: (1) purposes of schooling which refer to God, man's relationship with Him, and man's dealings with spiritual realities; and (2) purposes that refer to man, man's relations to his or her fellow human beings, and man's interaction with physical reality and the cosmos. This categorization is helpful with regard to my evaluation of Adler's curriculum from a Christian perspective.

The purposes of schooling that deal with God and spiritual realities are promoted through a curriculum that stresses knowledge of God and spiritual existences. This curriculum also provides man with the possibility of entry into a relationship with the Divine. According to a Christian perspective, students should be provided with knowledge of God and the spiritual world (Augustine, 1996, p. 12). Knowledge of God is made available to us through special revelation (e.g. The Bible, God's revelation in Christ), general revelation (e.g. God's revelation in the physical world and human conscience), and personal revelation (God's revelation to a specific individual). Information from these sources becomes knowledge when it is legitimized by the epistemological methods of faith and reason. Faith and reason are complementary epistemological tools. The articles of Christian faith and the self-evident truths incorporate the fundamental concepts of theology. Reason is further employed in developing additional truths from the absolute self-evident principles and the articles of faith. However, on various occasions, there seems to be tension between faith and reason. I am specifically referring to the notions of Trinity and the dual nature of Christ. In these cases, faith should prevail over reason.

Moreover, according to a Christian perspective, faith is a gift from God; only God can offer it to man. Nevertheless, God does not impose His gift of faith over man.

Neither should Christians force Christianity over their fellow men through institutions or other means, including curriculum. Man can choose to reject God's gift of faith. A Christian curriculum provides students with the opportunity to assume a position with regard to this issue, whether it leads to rejection or acceptance. Acceptance leads to conversion, which in turn ushers in a life of sanctification. Sanctification entails a relationship with God through prayer, contemplation, and praise. A Christian curriculum not only offers man the opportunity for conversion, but also provides students with an opportunity to grow in the process of sanctification.

According to a Christian perspective, Adler's curriculum is deficient because it fails to include a dimension that refers to God and spiritual realities. Adler's curriculum does not include theoretical knowledge of God and the spiritual world, whether provided through special or general revelation. The metaphysics of God is absent from Adler's curriculum. Also, Adler's curriculum is deficient in a practical sense because it deprives students from experiencing the epistemological method of Christian faith. By depriving students of an occasion to experience faith, Adler denies them an even greater opportunity, that of converting to the Christian religion and subsequently experiencing a life of sanctification.

Adler, by failing to include the opportunity to convert to Christianity within his curriculum, not only deprives students of the ability to pursue a relationship with God, but also of the ability to adequately, or fully, serve and love others. Moreover, Adler, by failing to offer in his curriculum opportunities for students to grow in the Christian faith, deprives students of a deeper relationship with God. Thus, man's ability to serve others is diminished.

When we compare Dewey's and Adler's views on the question of spiritual realities, Dewey and Adler agree, although for different reasons, that the curriculum should be secular in nature. Dewey rejects Christian metaphysics as well as the Christian epistemology of faith. Adler, however, does not reject Christian metaphysics and epistemology entirely. He does not, nonetheless, reserve a place for experiencing Christian religion in American public schools. To Adler, other institutions such as the family and the church should promote the Christian faith.

So far in this section, I have presented man's relationship with God and its beneficial implications with regard to his or her relations with others. I have emphasized the epistemological tool of faith. I will now emphasize the second category that I have introduced at the beginning of this section, which deals with the purpose of serving and loving others as well as with man's proper relation to the cosmos. I will mainly focus on the epistemological tools of philosophy and science.

According to a Christian perspective, faith and philosophy are responsible for establishing the ideals of humanity, and implicitly the purposes of schooling. Adler presents a secular curriculum; therefore, his curriculum does not promote purposes of schooling established by faith. However, Adler promotes purposes of schooling that are compatible but not necessarily antagonistic to Christian faith. In other words, Adler includes in his curriculum only those ideas provided by faith that are also written in man's conscience or are considered as self-evident by man. Peterson (2001) states,

Although they do not give high priority to the religious dimension, the lay Thomists (represented by Robert Hutchins and Mortimer Adler) endorse subjects that exhibit the absolute truths of the cosmos and that treat the enduring themes of human nature. (p. 44)

Adler's philosophy and a Christian perspective are in agreement with regard to the role of philosophy in establishing ideals for human living, specifically political, civic, and ethical ideals. They also agree that the method of philosophy should be employed for deducing objectives from the main ideals presented above. Therefore, Adler and a Christian perspective agree that self-evident principles should be included in the curriculum. Dewey disagrees with Adler and a Christian perspective with regard to the role of philosophy, meaning idealist philosophy, in the curriculum. According to Dewey, idealist philosophy is not consistent with modern science (Dewey, 1960, pp. 43-44). Also, Dewey refuses to believe in the existence of self-evident principles. Dewey will indeed transmit in his curriculum the ideals of democracy, liberty, equality, and fraternity. However, these ideals are not absolute (Westbrook, 1991, p. 366).

In addition, Adler and Christianity agree that science should be employed in promoting the ideals set by philosophy. A Christian worldview and Adler's philosophy share the same views with regard to the nature of science and on the difference between science and philosophy. A Christian perspective and Adler's philosophy also agree that the curriculum should include knowledge of the methods and facts employed by science. (Peterson, 2001, p. 100). A Christian worldview, Dewey, and Adler concur with regard to the need to include scientific methods and facts within the curriculum.

I will now present the skills needed in order to foster philosophical and scientific knowledge. A Christian perspective, Adler, and Dewey are in agreement with regard to the need to include in the curriculum basic skills (i.e. reading, writing, and arithmetic) and academic skills (i.e. mathematical, logical, inductive, deductive, analytical, synthetic, reflective, and artistic, or creative). Also, the three perspectives agree on promoting

moral habits and democratic practices in the curriculum. A Christian perspective and Dewey confer a major role to the promotion of these habits and practices. Adler, on the other hand, reserves a secondary role for morality and democracy. His curriculum is primarily academic in nature. Dewey, indeed, retains Christian virtues in his curriculum, but he disconnects them from metaphysical ideals. This move radically transforms the Christian virtues. Rather, Dewey acknowledges the usefulness of these principles. He believes their value has been proven across ages, in the millennial experience of mankind.

With regard to the disciplines included in the curriculum, a Christian perspective is compatible with Adler's view on the disciplines that should be incorporated into the curriculum (Peterson, 2001, pp. 117-119). There is, however, one point of difference. A Christian worldview, unlike Adler, necessitates the inclusion of Christian religion in the curriculum. Moreover, according to a Christian perspective, Christian faith must be integrated into the other disciplines. Dewey's understanding of curriculum differs from Adler's conception. Unlike Adler, Dewey does not divide knowledge into separate disciplines. Rather, for Dewey, all subjects are integrated within an educational activity, which must be connected to the real life interests and experiences of students (Dewey, 1990, p. 35). A Christian perspective does not reject the Deweyan conception of curriculum because Christianity can be promoted through such a curriculum and a schooling environment. The difference between Dewey and a Christian perspective is a matter of curricular content rather than curricular method. The difference between the two refers to the fact that a Christian perspective promotes Christian religion and idealist

philosophy in the curriculum while Dewey rejects them both in favor of the democratic state.

Finally, I will evaluate Adler's views on teaching from a Christian perspective. I have incorporated Adler's teaching methods, meaning didactic teaching, seminar instruction, and coaching within a Christian perspective. Therefore, a Christian perspective and Adler's philosophy coincide with regard to teaching. The only difference refers to the content transmitted by the employment of these teaching methods. A Christian perspective, unlike Adler, utilizes these teaching methods to foster religious knowledge and practices. Because of the close correspondence between a Christian perspective on teaching and Adler's views on the subject, I have chosen not to include an extended section on the topic.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have evaluated the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. First, I have provided my understanding of a Christian perspective on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling as it derives from Christian metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics. I have argued that according to a Christian worldview, the purpose of schooling is to form individuals who will serve and love God and our fellow human beings. Furthermore, I have espoused the idea that democracy is the political regime that provides the best climate in which man can serve God and others. I have also argued that from a Christian perspective, the curriculum should include a mental as well as a practical dimension. A Christian curriculum will promote religion, philosophy, and science. It will give equal emphasis to the epistemological methods of faith, idealist

philosophy, and science. A Christian curriculum will include facts, basic and academic skills, moral habits, democratic activities, and Christian practices. A Christian curriculum will provide students with the opportunity to convert to Christianity and, following conversion, the chance to experience the Christian process of sanctification. With regard to teaching, I have incorporated within a Christian perspective Adler's three primary methods of teaching: didactic teaching, seminar instruction, and coaching.

Second, I have evaluated Dewey's philosophy on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. Dewey rejects the Christian purpose of schooling, specifically the idea that man should serve God and his or her fellow human beings. Rather, Dewey's purpose for schooling is to form democratic citizens. Although a Christian perspective and Dewey's progressivism adhere to the principles of liberal democracy—specifically the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity—they provide different justifications for these conceptions. Dewey's conception of democracy is rooted in pragmatic philosophy and human experience, while a Christian perspective entrenches democracy in Christian faith and idealist philosophy.

Dewey rejects any religion that promotes a form of idealism, which he views as allowing the preservation of ancient dogma. In other words, Dewey rejects any religion that is rooted in certainty or that affirms immutable truths (Dewey, 1960, p. 303). Thus, Dewey rejects Christianity. However, Dewey does not reject religion if it can be reinterpreted as the pursuit for "an idealism of action that is devoted to creation of a future" (Dewey, 1960, p. 304). This new religion does not have finality but rather is always oriented toward potentiality and the future (Dewey, 1960, pp. 304-305).

As a Christian curriculum, Dewey's curriculum includes a liberal as well as a practical dimension. Again, Dewey and a Christian perspective propose different understandings for the idea of a liberal curriculum. A Christian curriculum promotes religion, philosophy, and science, while Dewey's curriculum will emphasize science and experience. A Christian curriculum will give equal emphasis to the epistemological methods of faith, idealist philosophy, and science. Dewey, on the other hand, will accentuate the methods of science and pragmatic philosophy. A Christian perspective and Dewey agree that a curriculum should include facts, basic and academic skills, moral habits, and democratic activities. However, Dewey eliminates from his curriculum the transmission of religious facts and practices from a Christian perspective. However, Dewey will agree with a presentation of Christian religion in mythological terms within the curriculum. Dewey endorses a presentation of Christian religion as a useful institution employed by humanity in its historical evolution, but rejects the idea that Christianity is a religion rooted in the absolute truth. Thus, for Dewey, Christian dogmas and ideals pertaining to the past and the present will fail to remain relevant in the future. In his conception, unless Christianity evolves, it will lose its relevance for mankind.

A Christian perspective and Dewey concur with regard to incorporating the following teaching methods: seminar instruction (for Dewey, guided discovery), coaching, and didactic teaching. A Christian worldview and Dewey agree that teaching and learning are most efficient when they are connected to the interests and the instincts of children. However, Dewey and a Christian perspective agree that teachers should guide students' interests and impulses to the predetermined purposes of schooling. Indeed, seminar instruction and guided discovery are the teaching methods that are most

likely to satisfy the interests and instincts of students. Nevertheless, a Christian worldview and Dewey concur with the need to utilize other methods, specifically coaching and didactic teaching. These teaching methods are essential for fostering facts, skills, and habits. Dewey and a Christian perspective agree that man's ability to understand and think depends upon man's possession of facts, skills, and habits.

Third, I have evaluated Adler's philosophy on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. Adler establishes that the purpose of schooling is to fulfill man's individuality, prepare him or her for economic life, and prepare him or her for citizenship. All of these objectives are compatible with a Christian perspective. However, Adler and a Christian perspective differ because Adler does not embrace the purpose of serving and loving God. Rather, Adler believes that schooling should serve secular purposes. This does not mean that Adler rejects Christianity. Adler is a Christian, but he believes that Christianity should be promoted by other institutions such as family and church, not public schools.

Adler's curriculum includes a liberal aspect and a practical dimension. Although a Christian curriculum will promote religion, philosophy, and science, Adler's curriculum will emphasize philosophy and science. A Christian curriculum will promote the epistemological methods of faith, idealist philosophy, and science; Adler's curriculum will cultivate only the methods of idealist philosophy and science. As already mentioned, a Christian curriculum will include facts, basic and academic skills, moral habits, democratic activities, and Christian practices. Adler's curriculum will include facts, basic and academic skills, moral habits, and democratic activities. Unlike a Christian curriculum, Adler's curriculum will not provide students with the opportunity to convert

to Christianity and to experience the Christian process of sanctification. Adler and a Christian worldview are in agreement with regard to teaching. I have incorporated within a Christian perspective Adler's methods of teaching, specifically didactic teaching, seminar instruction, and coaching.

When evaluated from a Christian perspective, Dewey and Adler fail to meet the standards established by Christianity with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. While Dewey often promotes views on these subjects that are antagonistic to Christianity, Adler's views are often insufficient. However, Dewey and Adler offer specific ideas on curriculum, teaching, and schooling that are compatible with Christianity. Dewey's and Adler's ideas are valuable to Christianity because they supplement the views of Christian philosophers such as Augustine, Soren Kierkegaard, and C. S. Lewis. Therefore, an integration of Dewey's and Adler's ideas on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian perspective serves Christianity in general and Christian schooling in particular.

Now that I have evaluated Dewey and Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective, I will integrate specific ideas of Dewey and Adler within a Christian perspective. Moreover, I attempt to implement this broader Christian perspective, which results from the synthesis of Christianity and specific ideas of Dewey and Adler, within an American public school context.

CHAPTER FIVE

Integrating and Applying the Views of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler on Curriculum, Teaching, and the Purpose of Schooling

In the previous chapter, I evaluated the philosophies of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler from a Christian perspective. This chapter builds upon the previous chapter and has two purposes. First, I will integrate specific ideas of Dewey and Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling. I will integrate their views within a Christian worldview. As mentioned previously, I believe the philosophies of Dewey and Adler cannot be synthesized by themselves. They stand on opposing metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical grounds. However, specific ideas drawn from these two philosophers can be integrated within a Christian perspective. A Christian philosophy of education provides a framework within which some but not all of their views can be brought together. I will demonstrate how this is possible in the first section of this chapter.

Second, after integrating the views of Dewey and Adler within a Christian perspective, I will address the question of application. Although application is not the primary focus of this dissertation, I will discuss how the integrationist philosophy that I have developed can be implemented within an American public school context. In doing so, I will draw heavily upon the work of Warren A. Nord (1995), especially his *Religion and American Education: Rethinking a National Dilemma*.

Integrating the Views of John Dewey and Mortimer Adler

I will now discuss the integration of Dewey's and Adler's views on curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian perspective. First, I will discuss specific ideas from Dewey and Adler that I believe are compatible with a Christian perspective on the purpose of schooling. Second, I will integrate particular ideas of Dewey and Adler on the subject of curriculum. Finally, I will synthesize Dewey's and Adler's ideas on teaching within a Christian worldview.

Integrating John Dewey's Views on the Purpose of Schooling Within a Christian Perspective

As I have argued previously, a Christian perspective recognizes that loving and serving God is the ultimate purpose for schooling. Moreover, a Christian perspective views democracy as the most adequate political system in which Christianity can flourish. In other words, the Christian ideals of loving and serving God and man are better advanced in a democratic context than in any other political regime. Consequently, according to a Christian perspective, democracy becomes a means for promoting ideals that are ultimately Christian in nature.

As discussed earlier, Dewey rejects serving and loving God and man as the purpose for schooling. At the same time, Dewey raises democracy to the level of the highest ethical ideal and the ultimate purpose for schooling (Westbrook, 1991, p. x, 11). Moreover, Dewey roots democracy in the ideals of the French revolution: liberty, equality, and fraternity (Dewey, 1976, pp. 441-444; Westbrook, 1991, p. 93). A Christian perspective embraces the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity as means for promoting the goal of serving God and man in love. I have already argued for the

similarity between Christianity and Dewey in the section in which I evaluated Dewey's views on the purpose of schooling. To reiterate, I have stated that Christian love requires liberty, equality is driven by the ideal of service, and fraternity entails the building of community.

Dewey provides an important contribution to the academic discussion with regard to the purposes of schooling (i.e. democracy, liberty, equality, and fraternity) by viewing these ideals in the light of two essential principles: the uniqueness of the individual and the idea of socializing intelligence. These two Deweyan perspectives are significant additions to the Christian worldview presented in this dissertation. I will provide a discussion of the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity in the light of these two principles. A Christian philosophy of education can benefit from these two aspects of Dewey's philosophy without endangering the Christian faith.

The first in the order of discussion is the principle of the uniqueness of the individual. This idea refers to characteristics, skills, or understandings that cannot be experienced or shared by social groups (Dewey, 1997a, pp. 302-303). These experiences are meaningful only to a specific individual. The principle of the uniqueness of the individual provides a new context as well as a new justification for liberty. Individual freedom, or liberty, must be extended to situations in which an individual realizes things that are meaningful solely to himself. Because no person can understand another's uniqueness, no one can lead another in the activity of realizing his or her unique potential. The individual must direct the process of realizing his uniqueness. Thus, he must have the liberty to pursue his own interests (Dewey, 1997a, pp. 302-303).

The principle of the uniqueness of the individual sheds light upon another democratic ideal: the principle of equality. If humans are unique beings, then they require different resources (whether these are financial, material, economic, and/or spiritual) for the realization of their full potential. Therefore, for Dewey, human equality does not refer to an equal distribution of resources, but rather to providing every citizen with the resources that he or she needs in order to fulfill his or her unique nature (Westbrook, 1991, p. 94).

Finally, the principle of the uniqueness of the individual provides a new understanding for the ideal of fraternity. As mentioned above, fraternity entails building community, bestowing love, and encouraging service to mankind. In the light of the idea of the uniqueness of the individual, citizens must realize that they do not always know how best to serve other human beings. Humility on the part of the person who provides assistance to another is required. The helper must take into account the desires and the choices of other persons when building community, both in classrooms and beyond. Dialogue and communication are necessary prerequisites of service and fraternity. The benefactor should never entertain the idea that he or she can help another without the participation of the person who is being helped. Dewey stresses that teachers should always pay careful attention to the individual talents and abilities of students, which is a point that can benefit Christian teachers as they work to serve and please God (Dewey, 1899).

The second Deweyan principle that I believe can be integrated within a Christian perspective is Dewey's idea of the socialization of intelligence (Dewey, 1976, pp. 441-444; Westbrook, 1991, pp. 93-94). I have provided an expanded discussion of this

principle in Chapter II. For the purpose of this discussion, it suffices to say that Dewey was against political socialism, meaning an equal distribution of physical goods.

However, Dewey applied the principle of the socialization of intelligence to knowledge because he believed that knowledge should be imparted to all the citizens of the state.

Like Thomas Jefferson and Horace Mann, Dewey believed in the diffusion of knowledge throughout the population. For Dewey, democracy requires that all of the citizens of the state be educated. I seek to integrate the principle of the socialization of intelligence into a Christian perspective because I see its role in shaping democracy, which is the political regime that I have argued best serves the ideals of Christianity. The principle of the socialization of intelligence sheds new light on the related ideals inherent in democracy: liberty, equality, and fraternity.

With regard to liberty, Dewey argues that liberty entails two aspects: knowledge and the ability to put one's ideas into practice (Dewey, 1990, p. 23). Dewey claims in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson that one cannot be both ignorant and free. The very ideal of freedom demands that citizens pursue the ideal of becoming knowledgeable citizens, which requires education and schooling. The principle of the socialization of intelligence strives to guarantee that all citizens of the state are free and therefore should be provided with equal access to knowledge.

With regard to equality, Dewey embraces Horace Mann's conviction that education is the great equalizer of the human condition (Dewey, 1997a, p. 260). Dewey rejects the idea that a state imposed redistribution, or a more fair distribution, of physical goods is necessary for realizing the ideal of social equality. As stated above, Dewey denounces a socialist revolution. Rather, Dewey believes that political, economical, and

social equality can only be obtained when all of the citizens of the state are provided with equal access to knowledge, which only takes place through the kind of curriculum, teaching, and schooling that Dewey advances (Dewey, 1976, pp. 441-444; Westbrook, 1991, p. 93-94).

With regard to the ideal of fraternity, Dewey argues that one cannot serve and love another in an appropriate manner unless he or she has knowledge of how to do so. Augustine makes a similar argument when he wonders whether he could serve God if he does not know Him (Augustine, 1960, p. 43). The principle of socialism of intelligence facilitates the ideal of fraternity because it provides citizens with the knowledge needed for adequate service.

Moreover, the principle of the socialization of intelligence has a central role in a democratic state. The process of dissemination of knowledge to all citizens is essential in a democracy. It is essential because citizens have an important say in the way in which the state is being governed. In a democracy, citizens are more responsible than in any other political regime for the flourishing of their country. Thus, an educated electorate will always influence the political process and the affairs of the state in a positive way. In contrast, an ignorant electorate will contribute to the weakening of the state, which will ultimately result in the undermining of democracy. As history has shown many times, ignorant peoples have democratically elected demagogues and dictators. In Germany for instance, Hitler came to power as a result of a democratic process (Bullock, 1952, p. 265). Dewey's principle of the socialization of intelligence has the role of defending, strengthening, and preventing this dissolution of the democratic state due to an uneducated electorate.

Finally, Dewey believes that schooling is the most adequate vehicle for implementing his idea of socializing intelligence. He also sees it as essential for the advancement of democracy. For Dewey, schools, especially elementary schools, have a significant advantage over other institutions that attempt to reform society. Unlike other institutions, such as political parties and civic organizations, schooling assumes a preventive rather than a remedial role with regard to social injustice. We can successfully integrate, within a Christian perspective, this Deweyan idea that schooling can serve as the most adequate means for promoting democracy and preventing social injustice. Indeed, Christianity and Dewey disagree with regard to the *telos*, or purpose, of human existence as well as the purpose of schooling. However, both perspectives can embrace the idea that schooling can assume a preventive as opposed to a remedial role with regard to social injustice.

Like Dewey, there are certain aspects of Mortimer Adler's views that can successfully be incorporated in a Christian philosophy. In the next section, I will address these aspects of Adler's views on the purpose of schooling that can be incorporated within a Christian perspective.

Integrating Mortimer Adler's Views on the Purpose of Schooling Within a Christian Perspective

Mortimer Adler's ideas shed new light on the American ideals of democracy, liberty, equality, and fraternity. As I argued in Chapter IV, these ideals are among the principles upheld by Christianity. In this section, I will discuss four of Adler's views: first, Adler argues that the purpose of schooling is to foster understanding rather than indoctrination (Adler, 1976, p. 1&5); second, Adler maintains that all children are

educable and therefore should receive the same *quality* of education rather than only the same *quantity* of education (Adler, 1984, p. 3); third, Adler argues that democracy demands more than equality of educational opportunity, it also requires equality of educational results (Adler, 1984, p. 3); and fourth, Adler affirms that the primary purpose of schooling is to foster democratic liberal education rather than to prepare students for earning a living (Adler, 1984, pp. 5-6).

On the first point, Adler believes that an education that fosters understanding (rather than indoctrination) advances the interests of American democracy. I have already argued that Christianity requires individuals who possess knowledge and are endowed with the capacity to understand. Also, I have stated that democracy, liberty, equality, and fraternity demand that citizens think for themselves and seek to understand the world around them. This idea is compatible with the ideals of Christian education. Therefore, Adler's views on understanding serve the Christian purposes of schooling in two ways: (1) indirectly by promoting democracy, and (2) directly by advancing the ideals of serving and loving God. Indeed, Adler does not promote the Christian purpose of schooling that students should serve and love God. Nevertheless, Adler's views on understanding can be employed for the advancement of the Christian purpose of serving and loving God. Instead of only trying to understand nature, however, students should be taught to strive to understand both nature and God's role in it.

Adler argues for understanding and knowledge in opposition to indoctrination and memorization. He affirms that understanding constitutes an activity of the intellect, while "memory is a by-product of sense-perception" (Adler, 1976, p. 5). He argues this point further when he writes, "Statements that are verbally remembered and recalled should

never be confused with facts understood” (Adler, 1976, p. 5). Adler goes on to say, “Correlated with this distinction between mind and memory is the distinction between knowledge and opinion” (Adler, 1976, p. 5). For Adler, knowledge implies understanding in the light of adequate reasons, argumentation, and evidence. In contrast, opinion is not based on the authority of reason. Opinion is merely repeating the views of someone else. In a schooling context, a student’s opinion is based upon the authority of his or her teacher. To Adler, the schooling process too often fosters opinion rather than understanding, especially when students are encouraged to embrace information based only upon the authority of teachers. When students merely memorize information, they fail to understand it.

Adler also reveals another facet of the relationship between understanding, opinion, and memory. He states, “Opinions remembered ... are opinions for the most part forgotten” (Adler, 1976, p. 5). His point is that knowledge endures, but opinion does not. Moreover, Adler points out that understanding and memorization work hand in hand. As Adler puts this point, “The understanding of ideas once acquired, has maximum durability. What is understood cannot be forgotten because it is a habit of the intellect, not something remembered” (Adler, 1976, p. 5).

Second, Adler believes that all children are educable (Adler, 1984, pp. 3-5). He rejects the notion that only some children have the potential to be educated in all the aspects of human knowledge. Put another way, Adler argues that all children should receive the same quality of schooling. As shown above, Adler contends that, in a democratic state, all citizens should receive education in all the aspects of human knowledge. Christianity is fully compatible with this point. All young people should

have access to Christ's message. Christianity also demands that man should be given access to the highest degree of learning and schooling. Christianity is better served when all young people have access to high quality schooling.

The third principle of Adler's philosophy that I will seek to integrate within a Christian perspective is the idea that democracy requires equality of results rather than only equality of opportunity (Adler, 1984, p. 3). For Adler, equality of educational opportunity does not always lead to equality of educational results. Adler argues that students have different learning capacities, talents, and aptitudes. These differences influence the rate at which students make progress in schools. Given the same educational opportunities, some students will advance further than others on the path of learning. This reality of human nature leads to inequality of educational results. Thus, Adler argues that teachers should employ various resources (including different amounts of time) so that, over time, students will reach similar levels of learning accomplishment. Adler does not believe that all students will reach the same level of accomplishment. However, he urges that schooling in a democratic state should give every student the opportunity to reach his or her highest learning potential.

To illustrate the principle of equality of educational results, Adler employs the metaphor of a container. Adler (1984) makes this point when he writes,

If the differential capacities of the children are likened to containers of different sizes, then quality of educational treatment succeeds when two results occur. First, each container should be filled to the brim, the half-pint container as well as the gallon container. Second, each container should be filled to the brim with the same quality of substance—cream of the highest attainable quality for all, not skimmed milk for some and cream for others. (p. 3)

The principle of providing students with equality of results serves democracy as well as Christianity because it offers every citizen of the state the opportunity to realize his or her

academic potential. A student who has reached his full potential has greater opportunities with regard to freedom as well as social, political, and economical equality. Also, this person will have the ability to engage in fraternal relationship to the best of his or her abilities. Thus, he will achieve a maximum of competence in his social interactions. Moreover, the highest degree of human happiness can only be achieved when man is provided the path to fulfilling his highest academic potential.

Fourth, Adler believes that the primary purpose of schooling is to foster liberal education. For him, preparing students for their future professions should have a secondary role (Adler, 1984, pp. 5-6; 1982, p. 18). To Adler, liberal education fosters liberty and freedom. Liberal education delivers man from any form of intellectual tyranny. It also enables human beings to submit to the authority of reason. However, Adler does not reject professional preparation. He sees it as a necessary, but secondary part of schooling (Adler, 1982, pp. 17-18).

Now that I have incorporated specific ideas of Dewey and Adler within a Christian perspective, I will strive to integrate Dewey's and Adler's views on curriculum within a Christian perspective. In the next section, I will seek to integrate Dewey's views on curriculum within Christianity.

Integrating John Dewey's Views on Curriculum Within a Christian Perspective

In this section, I will discuss those aspects of Dewey's views on curriculum that can be integrated within a Christian perspective. I will draw heavily upon the curricular implications of Dewey's idea of socializing intelligence. As I have mentioned previously, Dewey believed that democracy could be promoted and strengthened by the implementation of the idea of socializing intelligence. Socializing intelligence implies

providing every citizen of the state with access to learning. Moreover, the principle of socializing intelligence implies that all the citizens of the state can and should benefit from schooling. Finally, Dewey believed that the realization of the goal of an educated American society has its origins in the education offered in American schools.

Therefore, for Dewey, all children, regardless of their social status, should be offered high-quality schooling. The idea of the same quality of schooling, however, raises questions with regard to the meaning of the term “quality.” Quality, in turn, raises the subjects of curriculum and teaching.

I will now discuss Dewey’s ideas on curriculum; teaching will be discussed in a later section of this chapter. A central theme in Dewey’s views on curriculum is the idea of unity. Dewey applies the idea of unity to different contexts: first, he wants curriculum to unite thinking and doing; second, he wants it to unite the fields of knowledge; and third, he wants curriculum to unify man and society. I will show how all of these ideas, as well as their curricular implications, can be beneficial to Christianity.

First, Dewey argues for the unity between thinking and doing (Dewey, 1960, pp. 34-38). Dewey believes that human beings must be thinkers and doers in order to satisfy their human nature. Doing is important for the human condition because man’s health is dependent upon his or her interaction with the physical environment. Moreover, doing is important because man’s material prosperity is also dependent upon his or her actions. In addition, Dewey believed that thinking requires doing. For instance, scientific knowledge is based upon this interaction between thinking and doing (Dewey, 1997a, p. 230; Dewey, 1960, p. 37). Also, morality, democracy, and fraternity demand that all people be doers. Finally, thinking is necessary for reasons that pertain to democracy,

liberty, equality, and fraternity. One who restricts the role of thinking in his or her life will not be able to fully enjoy these human ideals.

Dewey's curriculum, which attempts to unite thinking and doing, is simultaneously academic and vocational. It provides students with a solid theoretical foundation as well as an opportunity to connect theory with practice. Dewey believes that every discipline should have a practical application. As already mentioned, for Dewey, scientific disciplines are practical because they are based upon the mutual interdependence between theory and practice. Even social sciences and philosophy should have practical outlets. For instance, Dewey advances the idea that democracy should not merely be taught in schools, but it should be practiced as well (Dewey, 1957, pp. 24-26). In order for students to practice democracy, Dewey argues that American schools should be organized as miniature democratic communities (Dewey, 1990, p. 18).

A Christian perspective embraces Dewey's commitment for uniting theory and practice. Christianity recognizes the importance of a curriculum that fosters democracy using both theory and practice, or both knowledge and experience. In addition, Christianity embraces a curriculum that emphasizes the unity between various academic disciplines (whether scientific or philosophical) and practice. Finally, Christianity can apply the form of the idea of uniting theory and practice to unique Christian doctrines and practices, many of which are outside of, or even contrary to, the content of Dewey's philosophy. For example, the aim of Christian schooling goes beyond providing students with theoretical knowledge with regard to the Christian doctrines of Creation, Fall, Redemption, and Sanctification. Christian schooling also teaches students to practice

Christian living, meaning to experience salvation, to live holy lives, and to preach the Gospel of Christ to non-believers.

Second, Dewey promotes the idea of synthesizing the various academic disciplines. This synthesis occurs in experience, which is the site for the integration of theory and practice (Dewey, 1990, pp. 21-22). A Christian perspective embraces this commitment to unify the fields of knowledge. Dewey and Christianity disagree with regard to the purpose for this curricular unification, but they nonetheless agree on the idea of unification. Unification contributes to a better understanding of reality. As I have argued many times in this dissertation, a better understanding of reality is beneficial to Christians because it assists them in serving and loving God and their fellow men. In this manner, unification contributes to the advancement of the Christian purpose for schooling.

Third, Dewey argues for uniting man and society. Dewey envisions two ways in which this unity can be achieved: a socio-political one and an economic one (Dewey, 1990, pp. 61-62 & 76-78; Dewey, 1997a, p. 191). With regard to the socio-political aspect, I have already mentioned Dewey's idea of organizing schools into miniature democratic communities. Dewey also believes that the curriculum should provide opportunities for students to participate in the life of the entire community. In other words, the curriculum must provide opportunities for children to work alongside mature citizens throughout the community. This community work helps students to achieve larger social ideals. It also teaches them to connect knowledge with practice. Whenever children participate in the life of a city, they gain a sense of personal meaning and worth. This sense of meaning reinforces classroom learning because students begin to see how

learning assists them in fulfilling their socio-economic roles and achieving communal ideals.

With regard to the economic aspect, Dewey argues that schooling should prepare students for earning a living. Dewey also argues that schooling should not prepare students for a specific profession, or vocation. As Dewey (1990) puts this point,

Though there should be organic connection between the school and business life, it is not meant that the school is to prepare the child for any particular business, but that there should be a natural connection of the everyday life of the child with the business environment about him, and that it is the affair of the school to clarify and liberalize this connection, to bring it to consciousness, not by introducing special studies, like commercial geography and arithmetic, but by keeping alive the ordinary bonds of relation. (p. 76).

A Christian perspective can embrace the Deweyan idea of uniting man and society in both its socio-political and economic aspects. With regard to the socio-political aspect, the principle of unity strengthens the spirit of community, learning, and ultimately democracy; with regard to the economic aspect, it provides humans with economic and financial stability. All of these aspects foster the advancement of the Christian goals of loving and serving God, because men endowed with these characteristics (e.g. men of learning, social spirit, and economic means) are better prepared to serve God and others. Therefore, the idea of uniting man and society through curriculum can be employed for promoting Christian goals, not just the democratic state.

In the next section, I will discuss the integration of Mortimer Adler's views on curriculum within a Christian perspective.

Integrating Mortimer Adler's Views on Curriculum Within a Christian Perspective

Adler's curriculum can be described as liberal and general. Christianity also promotes liberal and general education. In this section, I will emphasize Adler's idea of a

general curriculum along with its implications for vocational preparation. I will not spend a significant amount of time on those aspects pertaining to curriculum that are common to Dewey and Adler. Instead, I will emphasize the unique dimensions of Adler's beliefs on curriculum. Certain other aspects with regard to liberal curriculum and general curriculum are shared by both Dewey and Adler.

A central aspect of Adler's curriculum is the fact that it is liberal. I do not see any major divergences between Adler's liberal curriculum and a Christian curriculum; therefore, I will not elaborate on the liberal aspect of the curriculum. Put another way, Adler agrees with Christianity that knowledge can and should liberate the souls of students. They both accept the idea that one cannot be both ignorant and free.

A second trait of Adler's curriculum is the idea that it is general and non-vocational. The two descriptions are equivalent. From a positive perspective, Adler describes curriculum as general, and from a negative perspective, as non-vocational (Adler, 1982, p. 18). To reiterate, the term "general" refers to universal or non-specific knowledge. 'General' also refers to the fact that students should study the same curriculum, not different tracks (Adler, 1982, pp. 18-19). General knowledge comprises philosophical, ethical, socio-political, and scientific knowledge. For Adler, a general curriculum is a truly vocational curriculum. This idea can serve Christianity because it assists man in fulfilling the economic, the socio-political, and the personal aspects of his or her condition. Adler's curriculum is vocational because it prepares students for the three major vocations, or callings, to which he believes that all men are destined: "to earn a living in an intelligent and responsible fashion, to function as intelligent and responsible citizens," and to enjoy fulfilling personal lives (Adler, 1982, p. 18). In addition, Adler

affirms that his curriculum is vocational because it allows students to become acquainted with “the demands and workings of a technologically advanced society, and its ... main occupations” (Adler, 1982, p. 18).

Adler argues that a general curriculum, rather than a curriculum that emphasizes specialized training in a particular profession, prepares students best for their future vocations. Adler first argues that a vocational curriculum that emphasizes training for a specific, or specialized, job is inadequate even for achieving the goal of professional training, primarily due to the fast pace of technological advancement. As Adler makes this point, “Anyone so trained will have to be retrained when he or she comes to his or her job. The techniques and technology will have moved on since the training in school took place” (Adler, 1982, pp. 18-19).

Second, Adler argues that a general (as opposed to a specialized) curriculum prepares students for their future vocations. Adler believes that humans are “more flexible than other creatures in their ability to adjust to the widest variety of environments and to rapidly changing external circumstances” (Adler, 1982, pp. 18-19). Because of their flexibility, Adler believes that if students are provided with general knowledge, they will be able to apply this knowledge to the specific life situations they encounter. In other words, shaping students’ minds in a concentrated way is the best way to prepare them to address both theoretical and practical problems.

In the next section, I will focus on integrating specific ideas pertaining to Dewey’s philosophy on teaching within a Christian perspective.

Integrating John Dewey's Views on Teaching Within a Christian Perspective

The first Deweyan idea that I think can be integrated within a Christian perspective is his argument that adequate teaching must incorporate psychology, specifically developmental psychology. For instance, Dewey asserts that good teaching cannot ignore the idea that the child is an active being. The child manifests interests, impulses, and interests to construct, investigate, express, and communicate. To Dewey, these impulses can and should be directed by the teacher toward authentic educational experiences (Dewey, 1990, pp. 36-47).

Dewey endorses the use of psychology as a tool in the teaching process, but warns against using psychology as an end in itself. He argues this point in the context provided by the debate between traditional and romantic teaching. According to Dewey, traditionalists such as William Torrey Harris emphasized knowledge and subject-matter, but rejected the ideas advanced by child psychologists. The romantics, on the other hand, embraced child psychology to the point that the child was given the right to impose his or her whims and interests as a school's ultimate goal. Dewey rejected both of these extremes. He thought they were both undemocratic. To Dewey, traditionalist teachers promoted knowledge to the expense of student freedom, while romantic teachers emphasized student freedom to the detriment of knowledge (Dewey, 1957, pp. 1-5).

In opposition to these extremes, Dewey proposed a democratic form of teaching, one that integrates traditional and romantic ideas. Dewey viewed learning as a process to which both students and teachers must contribute. For Dewey, good teaching emerges from the collaboration of both teachers and students. The role of students is to manifest their interests and instincts in an active and passionate way. Teachers, on the other hand,

should not suppress students' instincts, but rather guide them to the realization of their full potential. Thus, Dewey's teaching methods foster knowledge, freedom, and democracy. Dewey's views on teaching also can promote Christianity provided that they are put to use for Christian ends. Knowledge, freedom, and democracy are ideals embraced by a Christian perspective, so, in this respect, Dewey's views are not necessarily antithetical to the Christian faith.

Another idea from Dewey that can be integrated into a Christian perspective is the view that teachers should have the ability to synthesize the various fields of knowledge within a practical schooling experience (Dewey, 1957, p. 36). As I have shown previously, the synthesis of various academic disciplines fosters a better understanding of physical reality and human nature. Moreover, Christianity benefits from this improved understanding of reality. Thus, the process of unification of various disciplines is entirely consistent with Christianity.

The ability to synthesize knowledge from the various fields of learning is not a small matter. Dewey was aware of this issue (Dewey, 1957, p. 36). He has very high expectations for teachers. To Dewey, the complexity of teaching demands that teachers be people who are endowed with the best of human nature. Moreover, they should receive the best education available. This requires that teachers should possess deep knowledge from various academic disciplines (Dewey, 1957, p. 36). As part of their teacher education curriculum, they must complete curricula from the physical and social sciences, mathematics, philosophy, ethics, and politics. With regard to politics, to Dewey it is of utmost necessity that teachers understand and practice the ideals of democracy.

Dewey believed that teachers must take the lead in organizing American schools as miniature democratic communities (Dewey, 1990, p. 18).

Dewey believed that teachers should also be active learners themselves (Dewey, 1997a, pp. 71, 160, 304). They should learn from their students as well as from the new schooling experiences they encounter each day. To put this point differently, Dewey's teaching paradigm forces teachers to learn continuously. They are forced to be life-long learners because they must constantly interact, cooperate, and collaborate with different students in various educational contexts, or situations. They also must continue to study and learn within the subject, or subjects, they teach. This principle contributes to the fulfillment of teachers from a personal standpoint. Teachers' constant thinking, learning, and acting contribute to their personal, intellectual, and ethical improvement. Dewey's high expectation that teachers continue to grow in this way is consistent with Christian ideals. Christ expects us to continue to grow and learn more about His Kingdom every day.

Finally, Dewey argues that good teaching cannot occur when teachers fail to consider the individuality, or uniqueness, of their students (Dewey, 1997a, pp. 302-303). Dewey believes that no one else, except for the individual himself, knows how to fulfill his unique nature. Consequently, the fulfillment of man's potential requires that he be free to pursue his personal ideals. Dewey also maintains that children have the right to fulfill the unique aspects of their nature. Thus, high-quality teaching must make room for students to engage in schooling experiences that are meaningful to each individual. A Christian perspective embraces this principle of the uniqueness of the individual. God made all of us in His image, but He also made each of us unique. Moreover, a Christian

perspective integrates the principle of the uniqueness of the individual due to its close association with democracy.

In the next section, I will discuss ways in which Mortimer Adler's views on teaching can be integrated within a Christian perspective.

Integrating Mortimer Adler's Views on Teaching Within a Christian Perspective

In this section, I will seek to integrate, within a Christian perspective, three principles proposed by Adler with regard to teaching. These principles are: (1) the idea that the student, not the teacher, is ultimately responsible for whatever learning takes place; (2) the view that teaching is a cooperative, rather than a productive, art; and (3) the idea that all learning emerges from the integration of thinking and doing. Next, I will show how Adler's methods of teaching (which he labels didactic teaching, coaching, and seminar instruction) can be integrated within a Christian perspective.

Adler argues that the main responsibility for learning rests with the student (Adler, 1984, p. 5). He argued this point when he wrote "the principal cause of learning that occurs in a student is the activity of the student's own mind" (Adler, 1976, p. 3). Adler further adds, "If in genuine learning, the activity of the learner's own mind is always the principal cause of learning, then all learning is by discovery" (Adler, 1976, p. 2). Adler separates learning by discovery into two categories: unaided discovery and aided discovery. Unaided discovery occurs when the activity of the student's mind is the sole cause of learning. On the other hand, aided discovery occurs "when the activity of the learner's mind is the principal, but not the sole cause of learning" (Adler, 1976, p. 3). In this second case, teachers assist students in the process of learning, but they emphatically do not produce learning in students.

Moreover, Adler warns that “When instruction is not accompanied by discovery, when instruction makes impressions on the memory with no act of understanding by the mind, then it is not genuine teaching, but mere indoctrination” (Adler, 1976, p. 3). Adler, in this and other statements, makes us aware of the following two antagonistic visions on teaching: (1) an adequate vision, which espouses teaching that leads to discovery and understanding; and its opposite, (2) teaching that leads to indoctrination.

I believe that Adler’s vision of teaching can be integrated within a Christian perspective because of its emphasis on teachers fostering understanding. Understanding is important because it assists individuals in fulfilling the Christian ideals of serving and loving God and man. Indeed, a man of understanding is more capable to serve God and others, compared to a man who has only memorized information. A man of understanding, unlike a man who has merely memorized information, is constantly learning by applying his general knowledge to new circumstances. Unlike the latter, the former can offer solutions to novel life circumstances by applying and adapting his or her general knowledge to these circumstances. Moreover, Christianity agrees with Adler that teaching and teachers are not the principal cause of learning. Christians believe that God is the ultimate cause of learning. Teachers assist God, but God ultimately causes people to learn.

A second idea of Adler’s that I want to integrate within a Christian perspective is the view that teaching is a cooperative, as opposed to a productive, art (Adler, 1976, p. 3). This principle is closely related to the idea that I have just presented. Adler credits Socrates as the thinker who first described teaching as a cooperative art. Socrates pointed out that learning emerges from the collaboration between teachers and students. For

Socrates, teachers are similar to midwives. Just like midwives assist women in the process of giving birth, teachers assist students in the process of conceiving knowledge. Indeed, as mentioned previously, Socrates acknowledges that the mental activity of the learner is the principal cause of learning. Moreover, teachers, like midwives, are not indispensable. They are essential, but not sufficient to good education. Adler argues that students can acquire knowledge without the assistance of teachers in the same way that children can be born without midwives. However, in the same way that midwives make childbirth a bit less difficult, teachers can ease the learning process.

Adler warns that teachers should not view teaching as a productive art, meaning that they should be careful not to regard teachers as the principal, or even the sole, cause of learning. To Adler, teachers who see themselves as the principle cause of learning will foster indoctrination, not understanding. I believe that Christians can use Adler's notion that teaching is a cooperative art, because of its role in fostering understanding as opposed to mere memorization. Learning Scripture is a perfect example in this regard.

A third idea of Adler's that I want integrate within a Christian perspective is the view that learning emerges from the integration of thinking and doing. Adler gives credit to Dewey for stating this principle (Adler, 1984, p. 5). However, Adler differs from Dewey with regard to how this point should be applied. While Dewey restricts the application of this idea to the sphere of science, Adler extends it to the realm of philosophy. In the realm of philosophy, the principle of the integration of thinking and doing entails two aspects. First, Adler believes that philosophers must reflect upon data provided by sense experience. Indeed, thinking is possible only after sense experience

has taken place. Second, for Adler, philosophical reflection is not an end in itself; rather, it is a means to acting in the world by making moral and political decisions.

For Adler, teachers are moral agents. Moreover, Adler believed that adequate teaching provides students with the opportunity to integrate thinking and doing, in other words to become conscious moral agents themselves. Christianity and Adler are in agreement with regard to this moral aspect of the integration of thinking and doing. Christianity espouses the point that teaching must provide students with the opportunity to make moral decisions. Moreover, a Christian perspective affirms that teachers must and should guide their students toward making the morally justifiable decisions that are consistent with Scripture.

Next, I would like to address the relationship between the three principles on teaching presented above. Specifically, I want to point out that cooperative teaching and learning by discovery are closely related to morality. As Adler points out, learning by discovery leads to true understanding. Moreover, according to Adler, cooperative learning in the form of seminar teaching, more than any other teaching method, offers students opportunities to express themselves. In contrast to seminar teaching, Adler points out that “didactic teaching, or teaching by lecturing or telling rather than teaching by questioning and discussion, is a departure from teaching as a cooperative art” (Adler, 1976, p. 3).

I will now seek to integrate Adler’s methods of teaching within a Christian perspective. Adler proposes the following methods of teaching: didactic teaching, coaching, and seminar instruction. I will not provide an extensive presentation of these methods in this section because I have discussed them in Chapter III. Rather, in this

section, I will offer justifications for integrating Adler's teaching methods within a Christian perspective.

I have chosen to integrate Adler's ideas on didactic teaching, coaching, and seminar instruction within a Christian perspective because I am convinced by Adler's philosophical and practical justification for these teaching methods. My choice to accept philosophical and practical arguments for Christian education was influenced by Augustine, who argued that all knowledge comes from God, whether we find it in special revelation or in pagan philosophy (Augustine, 1958). Arthur F. Holmes (1977), in his work *All Truth is God's Truth*, has espoused a similar position.

I have chosen Adler's notion of didactic teaching for the following reasons. First, Adler asserts that didactic teaching is essential for transmitting factual information, which must be memorized. Factual information includes "names and places in geography, terms and dates in history, spelling, etymology, . . . , rules of grammatical construction, formulas and tables in science and mathematics" (Adler, 1984, p. 50). According to Adler, students' understanding of the various fields of knowledge must be preceded by memorization of factual information. We find this point in Christian teaching when children are expected to memorize Scripture. Memorizing Scripture is an essential means, but it is not an end in itself. Christian teachers ultimately want their students to pursue understanding Scripture as well.

Second, Christianity accepts doctrines that cannot be discovered through the ordinary mental activities of man. Among these doctrines are the concept of the Trinity and the idea that Christ shares a dual nature, being both Divine and human. These doctrines are revealed by God; they are only available in Scripture. Didactic teaching is

essential to Christianity because only through didactic teaching can man gain access to principles pertaining to special revelation. Unlike didactic teaching, other methods—for example discovery learning, Socratic teaching, and seminar teaching— can only help students to acquire knowledge that is derived from reason and human experience. For instance, only through didactic teaching are students introduced to the idea of a triune God. Human reason, intuition, and experience can never lead man to this understanding of the nature of God.

I also would like to incorporate Adler's views on coaching within a Christian perspective. For Adler, coaching is "the backbone of basic schooling" (Adler, 1984, p. 50). Schooling, to Adler, is inconceivable in the absence of coaching. To him, coaching is essential for the development of intellectual skills such as "*reading, writing, speaking, listening, observing, measuring, estimating, and calculating....*" They are the skills that everyone needs in order to learn anything, in school or elsewhere" (Adler, 1982, p. 26). These skills are required for personal growth, for qualifying for a new job, and for man's participation in civic affairs. All of these human goals are also supported by Christianity. Christian teaching can and should strengthen these intellectual skills every day. A Christian perspective integrates Adler's views on coaching because they can be used to promote Christian ideals.

Finally, I believe that Adler's views on seminar teaching can be integrated within a Christian perspective. According to Adler, seminar teaching is rooted in Socratic philosophy (Adler, 1984, pp. 15-16). Adler uses expressions such as "seminar teaching," "discovery learning," or "learning by discovery" interchangeably. Seminar teaching fosters understanding, the development of students' reasoning abilities, and the

improvement of students' knowledge. The development of rational abilities leads to independence and individual freedom, which are characteristics that are required by democratic citizenship. Thus, seminar teaching opposes indoctrination and promotes freedom and democracy. Moreover, as mentioned previously, understanding improves the abilities of individuals to serve and love God and others. Seminar teaching requires students to express themselves clearly among their peers. This ability is essential to spreading the Christian faith. A Christian perspective integrates seminar teaching for its contribution to the promotion of Christian ideals.

Now that I have sought to integrate specific views of Dewey and Adler within a Christian perspective, I will address the question of how to apply the Christian philosophy of education that I have developed. I will only begin to address the difficult question of how the integrationist philosophy that I have developed perhaps can be implemented within an American education today.

Applying the Christian Philosophy of Education Developed in this Work

This dissertation is mainly addressed to Christian educators, for example theorists, curriculumists, teachers, and school administrators. The Christian perspective presented in this work can be applied without legal complications within Christian schools. The Christian purpose of schooling, the curriculum, and the methods of teaching presented here are indeed possible to implement into a K-12 private Christian institution.

However, in this section I would like to address a more delicate question: whether the Christian perspective that I have developed can be implemented within American public schools. Although this question of application has not been the focus of this dissertation, I believe that some discussion of application is necessary. First, I will

discuss the role of a Christian perspective within American public schooling from a legal standpoint. Specifically, I will argue that the First Amendment opposes the implementation of a Christian perspective within American public schools. Second, I will show that the First Amendment reserves a role for religion within K-12 schooling. Third, I will argue for the practical importance of religion. Fourth, I will argue that the presence of religion in the public school curriculum can be informed by the Christian perspective that I have developed in this dissertation. Finally, I will present ways in which a Christian perspective can be represented in American public schools. In addressing these matters, I will draw heavily upon the work of Warren A. Nord (1995), especially his *Religion and American Education: Rethinking a National Dilemma*.

The role of a Christian perspective within American public schooling is indeed impacted by relatively recent decisions by the U. S. Supreme Court. The document that stands at the center of this issue is the First Amendment. The First Amendment comprises two clauses: the Establishment Clause (“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion”) and the Free Exercise Clause (“or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”). I will spend more time with the Establishment Clause than with the Free Exercise Clause because it has exerted a more significant influence over the relationship between religion and public education. With regard to the Free Exercise Clause, I will only reveal its meaning: the idea that Congress should not pass any laws that restrict religious liberty.

As Justice Hugo Black argued in *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947), the Establishment Clause requires that the state “*be neutral* in its relations with group of religious believers and non-believers” (Nord, 1995, p. 115). In other words, the state

cannot favor one religion over another. Moreover, the state cannot promote religion to the detriment of non-religion and vice versa. In light of this ruling, the Christian perspective that I have provided cannot be implemented as a whole within public schooling because it violates the provision of neutrality, upheld by the Establishment Clause. Implementing a Christian perspective in public schools entails favoring religion over non-religion as well as favoring Christianity over other religions.

However, Nord argues that the Establishment Clause reserves an important role to religion in public schools. Nord states that “the Establishment Clause requires that public education be neutral among religions and neutral between religion and non-religion; it cannot promote secular over religious ways of understanding reality (or vice versa)” (Nord, 1995, p. 378). For Nord, the practical implication of these views is that religion must be integrated within the public school curriculum. The exclusion of religion from the curriculum implies that the state favors secularism over religion. Moreover, Nord argues that the Establishment Clause demands that various religious voices be represented in the public school curriculum. These various religious voices are not currently represented in public school curriculum and teaching, and I agree with Nord that they should be.

The next issue I will address refers to the significance of religion in the public school curriculum. Indeed, the Establishment Clause gives religion a voice in public schooling, but this point only raises another question. How significant, or powerful, should this voice be? Nord argues that religion deserves a strong voice in American public schooling, due to its major influence in human affairs (Nord, 1995, p. 378). Nord makes this point when he points out the powerful role that religion has played in human

history. In Nord's words, "Until the last century or two, nothing was so influential for good and evil in human affairs as religion" (Nord, 1995, p. 204). Until modernity, Nord argues, religion exerted a dominant influence over "people's understanding of politics, war, economics, justice, literature and art, philosophy, science, psychology, history, and morality" (Nord, 1995, p. 204). Nord further adds, "Religion simply cannot be avoided in studying history" (Nord, 1995, p. 204). Needless to say, religion, throughout history, has exerted a strong influence over curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling.

At the beginning of this dissertation, I have argued for the importance of understanding history, specifically the history of curriculum, teaching, and schooling. I have agreed with John Pulliam and Herbert Kliebard that the curriculum undergoes a cyclical process of development (Pulliam, 1991; Kliebard, 2004). Consequently, I have concluded that it is important to know and understand the mistakes of the past if we are to address problems successfully in the future. A study of religion, following the argument I have presented, should be part of the training that curriculumists and teachers undergo.

Nord also argues that religion is still influential in human affairs. He mentions the various religious wars that have been fought and continue to be fought in the name of religion. Nord mentions India, the Middle East, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and Sudan as countries in which religious wars are being waged (Nord, 1995, p. 204). Moreover, Nord affirms that besides well-known theologians and influential writers who exhibit a fascination for religion in their writings, "a striking number of scientists (especially in physics, cosmology, and ecology) seem to be moving toward a kind of mysticism or vaguely religious view of nature" (Nord, 1995, p. 205). Nord concludes that, even today, "Religion continues to influence our contemporary world—sometimes for good and

sometimes, no doubt, for evil” (Nord, 1995, p. 205). The importance of religion in contemporary society is undeniable. Religion is closely related to most, if not all, of the issues that confront mankind today. Therefore, religion deserves an important, rather than a marginal, role in American public school curriculum and teaching.

I will now apply Nord’s views with regard to the Establishment Clause and the importance of religion to the task of how the Christian faith should be handled within American public schools. As I have already mentioned, a Christian perspective, which I have presented in this dissertation, cannot be implemented as a whole in American public schools because its implementation would violate the principle of neutrality, inherent in the Establishment Clause. However, I will argue that certain aspects of a Christian perspective can be implemented in American public schools. I will identify those aspects pertaining to Christian curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling that cannot be promoted in public schooling, while at the same time discussing those Christian features that can be employed in American K-12 public schools.

A Christian perspective establishes loving and serving God, ourselves, and our fellow human beings as the ultimate purpose for schooling. Promoting serving and loving the God of Christianity as the purpose of schooling clearly discriminates against secularism and other religions, because secularism rejects the very idea of God, and various other religions propose different understandings of the Highest Being (or beings) and of how we should serve Him (or them). Thus, this aspect of the Christian purpose for schooling is in violation of the First Amendment, and therefore cannot be embraced by American public schools.

However, certain aspects of the Christian purpose for schooling can be promoted in American public schools, for instance the ideal of loving and serving ourselves and others. Moreover, American public schooling should also consider the study of religion among its purposes for schooling. Religion, as Nord argued, deserves to be studied due to the influence it has exerted throughout human history. The investigation of questions pertaining to the existence of a Higher Being, and to our possibility to enter into a relationship with God, have been, and still are, among the fundamental preoccupations of humankind. Religion proposes solutions to these existential questions, and thus it merits inclusion within the curriculum. As Nord points out, a study of religion does not violate the First Amendment. A question still remains, however: how should we study religion in American public schools? To put this question differently, how should we integrate religion, specifically Christianity, within the curriculum?

A curriculum violates the provisions of the First Amendment if it favors Christian truths to the detriment of secular and non-Christian truths. However, a curriculum does not violate the requirements of the First Amendment as long as (1) it promotes the Christian perspective of truth alongside a variety of secular and non-Christian perspectives of truth, and (2) it does not hold one perspective in higher regard than the other (Nord, 1995, p. 377). A fair presentation of all of these perspectives requires that teachers present each one of them on their own merits, and not from the perspective of another. In this way, Christian versions of the truth as well as other faiths, can make their way into the American public school curriculum.

This curriculum, which emphasizes the discovery of the truth through the investigation of various perspectives, religious and non-religious, is in no way

detrimental to the Christian religion. Christianity is a religion that promotes freedom, knowledge, and understanding. Because it is the ultimate truth, Christianity does not fear the unrelenting pursuit of truth. Thus, Christianity welcomes the study of other perspectives, whether religious or secular. Christianity does not manipulate man into conversion. Rather, a Christian perspective wants individuals to be as knowledgeable and free as possible whenever they make fundamental existential decisions, such as embracing or rejecting religion. The ideal of finding the truth is among the ideals of Christianity. According to a Christian perspective, an honest search for the truth can only lead to knowledge of the Christian God and to a commitment to serve and love Him.

Conclusion

In this final chapter, I have sought to achieve two tasks. First, I have incorporated specific ideas of Dewey and Adler with regard to curriculum, teaching, and the purpose of schooling within a Christian perspective. Second, after integrating the views of Dewey and Adler within a Christian perspective, I have begun to address the question of application. Although I realize that the question of application is much more complex than I have presented here, I have discussed how the integrationist philosophy that I have developed can begin to be implemented within our contemporary American educational context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, M. J. (1982). *The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Adler, M. J. (Ed.). (1984). *The paideia program: An educational syllabus*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Adler, M. J. (1988). In Van Doren G. (Ed.), *Reforming education: The opening of the American mind*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Adler, M. J. (1992). *A second look in the rearview mirror: Further autobiographical reflections of a philosopher at large*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Aristotle. (1999). *Nicomachean ethics* (M. Ostwald Trans.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Augustine. (1955). *Confessions and enchiridion* (A. C. Outler Trans.). Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.
- Augustine. (1958). *On Christian doctrine* (Robertson, D. W., Jr. Trans.). New York, NY: Liberal Arts Press.
- Augustine. (1960). *The confessions of saint Augustine* (J. K. Ryan Trans.). New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Augustine. (1996). *Teaching Christianity* (E. Hill Trans.). Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1963). Cognitive structure and the facilitation of meaningful verbal learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 14, 217-221.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1980). Schemata, cognitive structure, and advanced organizers: A reply to Anderson, Spiro, and Anderson. *American Educational Research Journal*, 17, 400-404.
- Baer, Richard A. H. (1990). The Supreme Court's discriminatory use of the term 'sectarian'. *Journal of Law and Politics*, 6, 461.

- Beineke, J. A. (1999). *And there were giants in the land: The life of William Heard Kilpatrick*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform: Civic society, public schools, and democratic citizenship*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Beuttler, F. W. (1995). Organizing an American conscience: The conference on science, philosophy and religion, 1940-1968 (volumes I-III). (Ph.D., The University of Chicago).
- Bruner, J. S. (1969). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bullock, A. (1952). *Hitler: A study in tyranny*. London, U.K.: Odhams Press.
- Cremin, L. A. (1961). *The transformation of the school*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Dewey, J. (1899). *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1902a). The school as social center. *The Elementary School Teacher*, 3(2), 73-86.
- Dewey, J. (1902b). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916a). *Ethical principles underlying education*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916b). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1957). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1960). *The quest for certainty: A study of the relation of knowledge and action*. New York, NY: Capricorn Books.
- Dewey, J. (1972a). The reflex arc concept in psychology. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works of John Dewey: 1882-1898* (pp. 96-109). Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1972b). Evolution and ethics. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), (pp. 34-53). Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Dewey, J. (1976). *Lectures on psychological and political ethics: 1898*. New York, NY: Hafner Press.
- Dewey, J. (1990). *The school and society and the child and the curriculum*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997a). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997b). The ethics of democracy. In L. Menand (Ed.), *Pragmatism: A reader* (pp. 182-204). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Dewey, J. (2002). In Maxcy S. J. (Ed.), *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Bristol, U.K.: Thoemmes Press.
- Dewey, J., & Dewey, E. (1962). *Schools of tomorrow*. New York, NY: Dutton.
- Dykhuisen, G. (1973). *The life and mind of John Dewey*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Eastman, M. (1959). *Great companions: Critical memoirs of some famous friends*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy.
- Evans, C. S. (1990). *Soren Kierkegaard's Christian psychology: Insight for counseling and pastoral care*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Fair, G. H. (1999). The reach of contemporary humanism. (Ph.D, New School for Social Research).
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (seventh ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Hadari, A. S. (1983). Education and pedagogy: The political limitations of educational reform. (Ph.D., Princeton University).
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. (1977). *Phenomenology of spirit* (A. V. Miller Trans.). (Findlay, J. N. ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heim, R. H. (1984). Holism in the classroom: R. S. crane and the 'Chicago method' of teaching (McKeon, Hutchins, Aristotelians). (Ph.D., The University of Iowa).
- Hirsch, Eric Donald, Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy : What every American needs to know*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Holmes, A. F. (1977). *All truth is god's truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- James, W. (1950). *The principles of psychology*. New York, NY: Dover Publications.
- John Paul II. (1998). *Encyclical letter, fides et ratio, of the supreme pontiff John Paul II: To the bishops of the catholic church on the relationship between faith and reason*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.
- John Paul II. (1999). *Fides et ratio*. Boston, MA: Pauline Books.
- Joyce, J. T. (1980). John Dewey's process of inquiry as the basis of his educational model. (Ph.D., Georgetown University).
- Kant, I. (1950). *Immanuel Kant's critique of pure reason* (N. K. Smith Trans.). New York, NY: Humanities Press.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1918). The project method: The use of the purposeful act in the educative process. *Teachers College Record*, 19(September), 319-335.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1939). *Fear and trembling: A dialectical lyric* (R. Payne Trans.). Oxford, U. K.: Oxford University Press.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1985). In Hong H. V., Hong E. H. (Eds.), *Philosophical fragments* (H. V. Hong, E. H. Hong Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Kunzman, R. (2006). *Grappling with the good: Talking about religion and morality in public schools*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Leaman, O. (1980). Ibn Rushd on happiness and philosophy. *Studia Islamica*, 52, 167-181.
- Lewis, C. S. (1960). *The four loves*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
- Lewis, C. S. (1984). *The world's last night and other essays*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
- Lewis, C. S. (2001). *Mere Christianity*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.
- MacIntyre, A. (2006). The end of education. *Commonweal*, 133(18), 10-14.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (3rd ed.). Notre Dame, ND: University of Notre Dame Press.

- Maine, H. S. (1976). *Popular government*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics.
- Marsden, G. M. (1997). *The outrageous idea of Christian scholarship*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Marsden, G. M. (2002). Beyond progressive scientific humanism. In P. J. Dovre (Ed.), *The future of religious colleges: The proceedings of the Harvard conference on the future of religious colleges, October 6-7, 2000* (pp. 35-50). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- McGiffert, A. C. (1919). Christianity and democracy. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 12, 36-50.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-97.
- Milson, A. J., Bohan, C. H., Glanzer, P. L., & Null, J. W. (Eds.). (2004). *Readings in American educational thought: From puritanism to progressivism*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Neustadt, R. E., & May, E. R. (1986). *Thinking in time: The uses of history for decision makers*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Niebuhr, R. (1941). *The nature and destiny of man*. New York, NY: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Nord, W. A. (1995). *Religion and American education: Rethinking a national dilemma*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Null, J. W. (2003). *A disciplined progressive educator: The life and career of William Chandler Bagley*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Null, J. W. (2007). *Peerless educator: The life and work of Isaac Leon Kandel*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Null, J. W., & Ravitch, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Peterson, M. L. (2001). *With all your mind: A Christian philosophy of education*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The construction of reality in the child* (M. Cook Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Plato. (1968). *Republic* (A. Bloom Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Popkin, R. H. (1951). *The Journal of Religion*, 31(4), 274-281.

- Pulliam, J. D. (1991). *History of education in America*. New York, NY: Merrill.
- Pulliam, J. D., & Van Patten, J. J. (2003). *History of education in America*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ratner, S., Altman, J., & Wheeler, J. E. (Eds.). (1964). *John Dewey and Arthur Bentley: A philosophical correspondence, 1932-1951*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1999). *Philosophy and social hope*. London, U.K.: Penguin Books.
- Rury, J. L. (1993). Historical inquiry. In D. F. Lancy (Ed.), *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to the major traditions* (). New York, NY: Longman.
- Russell, B. (1954). *The problems of philosophy*. London, U. K.: Oxford University.
- Ryan, A. (1995). *John Dewey and the high tide of American liberalism*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Sellars, E. L. (1994). An historical comparative analysis of the ideology of selected educational reformers of the 1950s and 1980s. (Ph.D., Indiana State University).
- Sommerville, J. (2006). *The decline of the secular university*. Oxford, U. K.: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). In Rieber R. W., Carton A. S. (Eds.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky* (N. Minick Trans.). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Weldon, S. P. (1997). The humanist enterprise from John Dewey to Carl Sagan: A study of science and religion in American culture. (Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison).
- Weltman, B. D. (1995). Debating Dewey: The social ideas of American educators since World War II, an examination of Arthur Bestor, Jerome Brunner, Paul Goodman, John Goodlad and Mortimer Adler. (Ed.D., Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey).
- Westbrook, R. B. (1991). *John Dewey and American democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.
- White, M. (1943). *The origin of Dewey's instrumentalism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Witon, S. L. (1985). Mortimer Adler's views on higher education (st. John's, philosophy, liberal education, moral, perennialism). (Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh).

Zilversmit, A. (1993). *Changing schools: Progressive education theory and practice, 1930-1960*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.