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CHAPTER I

A BIOGRAPHICAL PORTRAIT OF I.L. KANDEL AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

The central focus of chapter I is on Dr. Isaac L. Kandel's long and fruitful career as a professional educator. Kandel's career as a professional educator spanned more than five decades, from his appointment at Columbia in 1913 to his death in 1965. During this time period he made significant contributions to education in the United States and worldwide. His great breadth and depth of knowledge had their underpinnings in his respect for truth, in his ideas on the advancement of civilization through schooling, and in his ideas on international cooperation gained through the contributions of each nation to the rest of the world.

William Brickman, the well known historian of education and a noted comparative educator, published a brief but detailed Festschrift in honor of Kandel's seventieth birthday. Much of Brickman's information came from personal correspondence.

1 Not much information on his early life is available from published sources. from the UNESCO archives in Paris, France, the Hoover Institution archives at Stanford University, or the personal papers of William Russell, former Dean and President of Teachers College, Columbia University.

This writer visited the archives at Unesco in Paris, France in 1987 and again in 1988, examined the personal papers of I.L. Kandel at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, and obtained all relevant papers on Kandel from the William Russell papers at Columbia University. After examining all three archival sources and scrutinizing published materials, relatively little biographical material could be found.
Interviews and his close association with Kandel. Depicting Kandel's early life Brickman said. "Isaac Leon Kandel was born January 22, 1881, in Botosani, Roumania, to Abraham and Fanny Manales Kandel of Manchester, England, during the course of a business trip." Isaac's father was a Manchester merchant. Isaac Kandel died on 14 June 1965 in Geneva, Switzerland at the age of 84. In examining the huge number of works by Kandel, this writer found that he most often used the initials I.L. for his first and middle names. The New York Times obituary said that, "Kandel never used his given names, Isaac Leon." While that may have been true of his published works, he did use his first name, usually spelling it "Izak." in his personal and professional correspondence.

Isaac Kandel attended the Manchester, England primary school from 1887 to 1892 and then continued at the well known Manchester Public Grammar School. It was there that he received his solid background in the classics as a foundation scholar. He received a B.A. (First class, Honors, School of Classics) from Victoria University in Manchester, where he studied from 1899, until his graduation in 1902. He received the award of University Scholarship in 1902. Brickman noted that Kandel won additional honors as a


4 No evidence could be found to determine why Kandel chose not to use his given names in the great number of publications he produced.
student: the Oliver Heywood and Victoria scholarships in classics: Latin and Greek Prose Prize; and the Dauntsey Law Exhibitioner. 5

Two years after receiving his B.A., Kandel wrote for the Indian Civil Service Examination, scoring in the 27th place. He began his graduate studies in 1905 at the University of Manchester in the Department of Education. He received an M.A. degree from the University in 1906, along with a teacher's diploma. While he was still pursuing his M.A. degree, he taught German at the Fielden Demonstration School.

I.L. Kandel took his first major position in 1906 as assistant classical master at the Royal Academic Institute in Belfast, Ireland, where he stayed until 1908. Even in his first job Kandel was busily engaged in doing extra work related to educational matters and his future career. Brickman said:

In his spare time he was secretary of the Ulster Branch, Association of Intermediate and University Teachers and contributed to the Journal of Education, School Universities Review and Irish School Monthly. The desire for advanced study led him to spend the summer of 1907 under Wilhelm Rein at the University of Jena. Here Kandel met several Americans, notably William Chandler Bagley, David Snedden and George Drayton Strayer, all future leaders in American education. From his revered teacher at the University of Manchester, the distinguished educator Michael Sadler, he heard about John Dewey, and it was evidently at his suggestion that he decided to study at Teachers College, Columbia University, rather than Germany. Sadler convinced him that education should be approached from the socio-political standpoint. 6

Kandel arrived by boat to the United States in 1908 and became

5 Brickman, 390.

6 Ibid.
a graduate student at Teachers College, Columbia University. He came to the United States with Peter Sandiford. Both he and Sandiford received their doctorates in 1910 in the field of comparative education after only two years of study. Paul Monroe, the noted educator, was a great influence on Kandel while Kandel was a student at Columbia University. Along with Strayer and Snedden.

7 The names Sandiford, Monroe and others, mentioned above were all prominent educators either in the United States or abroad. A brief statement about each of them will be given:

Peter Sandiford was a personal friend of Kandel who became a prominent Canadian comparative educator. He also did important work in educational psychology and educational measurements. Sandiford was the editor of an important work entitled, Comparative Education, published in 1918. Kandel contributed a chapter on Germany to the book.

Professor Wilhelm Rein was a leading Herbartian and director of the Pedagogical Seminary at the University of Jena in Germany. It appears that Rein influenced Kandel in Herbartian principles, especially as they impacted on Kandel's lifelong concerns with the role of the teacher in the learning of the child. Rein was born in 1847 and he died in 1929. He taught at Jena from 1886-1923.

William Chandler Bagley 1874-1946 was a leading spokesman for the Essentialist movement in education. He was a well known professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, from 1917-1940. Kandel embraced many of Bagley's ideas, especially his criticisms of what he saw as the extremist tendencies in progressive education. Kandel wrote a biography of Bagley in 1961, entitled, William Chandler Bagley: Stalwart Educator.

David Snedden 1869-1951 was an adjunct professor of education at Columbia University from 1905-1909. He was a member of Kandel's doctoral committee. He then became the first commissioner of education for the State of Massachusetts from 1909-1916. He did pioneering work in educational sociology and he was also a leader in vocational education. He returned to Columbia in 1916 as a professor of education until his retirement in 1935.

George Drayton Strayer, 1876-1962 was a prominent professor of education and educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University, from 1907-1943. He was also a member of Kandel's doctoral committee. Strayer was the sponsor of Kandel's dissertation. He was an expert on the financing of public school systems and he did eighty important surveys of American school systems. Strayer was a national leader in school administration.

Sir Michael Sadler, 1861-1943 was a world famous authority on secondary education and a supporter of the English public school system. He was an expert on comparative education and he was
the third member of Kandel's doctoral committee at Teachers College was Professor Julius Sachs. While pursuing his Ph.D at Columbia, Kandel also took on additional loads: teaching, as well as extracurricular duties.8

According to the National Cyclopedia for American Biography, published from 1911-1913, during 1908-1910 he was a teaching fellow at Columbia University. Remarkably, then Kandel not only finished his doctoral work in less than the usual time frame, but he was also a teaching fellow and he prepared articles. Also one year before his graduation he undertook a very responsible job as assistant

8 Julius Sachs, 1849-1934, was a prominent American secondary school educator. He received his Ph.D degree at Rostock University in Germany in 1871. He operated his own secondary school in New York from 1872-1907. He was a professor of secondary education at Teachers College, Columbia University from 1902-1917.

editor of *A Cyclopedia of Education* with the well known educator Paul Monroe with whom he primarily studied at Teachers College. This job lasted from 1909 to 1913. It appears that the undertaking of more than one job at a time was a lifelong work pattern that one could easily discern in the habits of this leading scholar and educator.⁹

The courses Kandel taught as a teaching fellow were on the history of education. He also wrote on administrative and historical topics. Among the best known of these writings was his work on Comenius and on Jewish Education (with Louis Grossman). All of the articles Kandel wrote, either alone or with others, for Monroe's Cyclopedia are named in Chapter II of this dissertation. A few of the articles, including the one on Comenius and the one on Jewish Education, are discussed at length.¹⁰

Kandel's Ph.D dissertation was entitled, *The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany*. This was published in book form by Teachers College, Columbia University in 1910. The dissertation was an expansion of two papers presented by Kandel at Teachers College to the departments of Educational Administration and Elementary Education in 1908-1909. He supplemented these papers


¹⁰ Louis Grossman, 1863-1926 was a rabbi and he served as professor of ethics and Jewish pedagogy at the Hebrew Union College, 1898-1922. He contributed to the development of modern Jewish religious education and he was an innovator in applying modern scientific methods to Jewish religious training. Source - *Biographical Dictionary of American Educators*, Vol. 1.
by a trip to Germany in the summer of 1909. There he visited and studied the German normal schools. Kandel's doctoral dissertation was limited exclusively to the training of elementary teachers in Germany because, from his point of view, the training of secondary school teachers was an entirely different situation. At the time he wrote his dissertation it had already been the custom in the United States to look for guidance from other countries on educational matters. Germany, in particular, was one of the countries looked at for new educational ideas and practices.

Kandel became an instructor at Teachers College in 1913. and he was appointed associate professor there in 1915. He was an associate professor for eight years. Lawrence Cremin, in his memoir of Kandel, has written that "beginning in 1914 he undertook a number of assignments as research specialist for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, acquainting himself with such diverse matters as vocational education, teachers' pensions and examination systems."11

In 1923, ten years after his first appointment at Teachers College, Kandel was appointed to a full professorship. He terminated his service to the Carnegie Foundation in the same year. Also in 1923 Teachers College established its International Institute with a large grant from the International Education Board.

Kandel was appointed an associate with the Institute.\textsuperscript{12}

Brickman, discussing 1923, the year Kandel received a dual appointment as both full professor and an associate at the newly created institute headed by Paul Monroe, said, "That year marked the turning point in his academic career. Now he had an opportunity of concentrating his attention on comparative education and making the subject an integral part of the foundational studies at his college."\textsuperscript{13} Cremin, also saw 1923 as the turning point in Kandel's career. About this specific period Cremin writes, "Now he could devote full time to teaching and research in the fields of his choice, offering such courses as 'Comparative Education,' 'Problems of Secondary Education,' and 'European Education: Problems and

\textsuperscript{12} A basic function of the institute was to provide the visiting foreign student with the opportunity to visit real American schools and attend lectures on education, especially in New England, the Middle States and the adjacent South.

Other functions of the institute were instructing the American student about education abroad, and investigating the conditions of foreign educational systems.

In addition, each year, from 1924-1944, the institute issued an educational year book encompassing studies in education in many countries. Each of the various dozen or so articles was written by prominent educators representing their particular country. Dr. Kandel was the editor of all twenty-one volumes of the yearbook.

The support for the Institute came from the International Education Board and its founder John D. Rockefeller Jr. Also Macy grants were the gifts of Mr. V.E. Macy.

The original staff of the institute consisted of the following members: Paul Monroe, director, William F. Russell, associate director, I.L. Kandel, Thomas Alexander, and Lester M. Wilson, associates. By 1928 the structure changed so that there was an administrative board headed by Dean William F. Russell. Paul Monroe was still the director and George S. Counts became the associate director. To the list of associates was added the name of Milton C. Del Manzo.

\textsuperscript{13} Brickman, 391.
Tendencies'; supervising doctoral students; and editing the Educational Yearbook of the International Institute. 14 Kandel earned an enviable reputation as the editor of the yearbook which was internationally acclaimed.

While not much of Kandel's private life is known either through published or unpublished sources, some information is available. He married Jessie Sara Davis in Manchester, England, on 27 July 1915. She was the daughter of a Manchester merchant named David Davis. The Kandels had two children named Alan Davis and Helen Raphael. The family lived in Westport, Connecticut. Kandel became an American citizen in 1920. Helen married an American sociology professor from Columbia University, named Herbert H. Hyman. At the time of his death in 1965, Kandel was staying with his son-in-law in Geneva, Switzerland. The latter was conducting a United Nations mission on teaching programs in developing countries.

As a scholar and prolific writer, Kandel was extremely serious. Privately, however, he did express a fine sense of humor. He occasionally penned a humorous or satirical piece of writing. The following excerpts are taken from the private collection of William F. Russell. 15 Undated, they are entitled, "Vacation Echoes," and signed Izak. "Teachers College Faces the New Year with

14 Cremin, 3.

15 The William Fletcher Russell papers, Special Collections, Milbank Memorial Library, Teachers College, Columbia University. William Russell was Dean of Teachers College, Columbia University from 1927 to 1949. He served as the president from 1949 to 1954. Kandel served under Russell and his father, James Earl Russell, who was Dean of Teachers College from 1898 to 1927.
The New York Times [italics mine] discovered recently that a member of the Teachers College faculty had "nothing to say;" some of his colleagues have known that for some time.

We come from Teachers College.
The home of Kilpatrick and Dewey.
We try to disseminate knowledge.
But the reaction of many is "Phooey!"16

Kandel, it seems, also appreciated listening to the humor of the times even if the humor was contrived. In a private handwritten memo to Dean William Russell of Teachers College, dated November 22, 1933, he passed on some radio humor that he had heard from the famous Burns and Allen program. The memo read,

"Dear Will,

Although I write this immediately after the staff meeting it has nothing to do with that or anything else, but you may be interested in it: The dumbest crack of the week belongs to George Burns who told Gracie Allen: "You are learning more and more about less and less plus some day you'll know practically everything about nothing."

Sincerely Yours,
Izak17

George Z.F. Bereday was another comparative educator who wrote

16 Appendix I—"Vacation Echoes." Russell Papers. All appendices referred to in these chapters will be at the back of the dissertation.

17 Russell Papers, 2.
about Kandel. Bereday portrays Kandel thusly, "He was trying to be nice to me to make good the rough treatment he gave me on the publication of my book. ... I was fortunate to enjoy his respect and to those he respected he was blistering in his criticism." On the occasion of another article he wrote, "Dear George, The last paper you sent me is the best you have ever written and as usual is utter nonsense." 

In a deeper contextual vein, Bereday, in spite of Kandel's biting sarcasm, continues, "Isaac Kandel was a man cast in the old mould, a stature that now seems indestructable. To me, he was first and foremost a professor, a scholar of the old type, a person of meticulous habit and purpose."

Cremin described Kandel's wit and directness:

And his wit was both ready and delightful: no one could be more scathing about the shibboleths and tomfooleries of the pedagogical world. When I told him I had embarked on a history of the progressive education movement, he insisted I

18 George Z.F. Bereday was born in Warsaw, Poland on July 15, 1920. He died in 1983. He became a U.S. citizen in 1954. Bereday received his Ph.D. degree from Harvard in 1953 in comparative education and sociology. He joined the faculty at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1955 and became a professor of comparative education in 1959. He had traveled extensively to many countries and he had written a great deal on comparative education. He is considered a world figure in the field of comparative and international education.


20 Ibid.
would need at least a chapter to cover G. Stanley Hall's inferences from his studies of the knee jerk. When I called on him for help with a lecture I was preparing, he quickly obliged but took occasion to warn me about my "undemocratic" propensities for "knowledge-prepared-in-advance." And when I reported that the Department has stiffened both its entrance and its exit requirements, he applauded, but quipped that was certainly no way to take account of the "felt needs" of students.21

As Bereday showed the serious demeanor of Kandel as well as his "humorous" side, so does Cremin, who adds to his passage above, this eloquent tribute to I.L. Kandel: "Today's educational leaders probably have not read Kandel: indeed some of them pride themselves on not having read the educational literature at all. But if they did read him—and they could doubtless do so with profit—they would find in his work both sustenance and inspiration for their own. And beyond that, if they paused to reflect, I think they would recognize how much he had paved the way for them with his scholarship, his wisdom, and his personal courage."22

Regarding the years he spent at Teachers College it may be likely that Kandel harbored negative feelings, at least at certain periods of his long stay there. The evidence for this comes from Kandel's friend and colleague, the late great comparative educator, George Z.F. Bereday who became a faculty member at Teachers College after Kandel retired. According to Bereday, writing about Kandel's initial years at Teachers College, "He was the first Jew to be appointed to the professorate at Teachers

---

21 Cremin, 2.

22 Cremin, 9.
College and it was not easy. Though he completed the doctorate in 1910, two years after his arrival, he had to wait thirteen more years before being allowed to join the faculty as a professor. "23

Commenting on the latter part of Kandel's illustrious career at Teachers College, Bereday said, "Kandel was profoundly alienated from Teachers College and his last years after the retirement of his friend Bagley were sad, lonely years."24

It may well be that Kandel was unhappy with Teachers College for more years than Bereday seems to convey. The distinguished educator Robert Ulich wrote of his firsthand acquaintanceship with Kandel. Ulich made this point about Kandel, "He was then at the height of his international influence and productivity. Yet, in spite of his enormous correspondence as the editor of the Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, and his friendship with his colleague William Chandler Bagley, the 'essentialist,' he was not really at home at Teachers College, Columbia University."25

Some years after his retirement from Teachers College Kandel returned there in a blaze of glory. George Bereday was responsible for Kandel's return as an honored professor emeritus. Bereday, quoting from a eulogy given about Kandel's life by Cremin who

23 Bereday, "Memorial to Kandel," 148.

24 Ibid., 149.

it was not until George Bereday came to Teachers College in 1955 and actively sought Kandel's counsel on the programmes in comparative education that Kandel's professorship emeritus became anything more than pro forma...when he did come back into the limelight it was with the great excitement and wonderment of a gardner who sees forgotten seeds sprout. Kandel was a devoted teacher and nothing delighted him as much as the recognition and reverence with which he was at last received.26

When Kandel was a regular faculty member at Teachers College he was excluded from teaching on the panel of Education and Society, the famed 200 FA course taught by the great progressives Kilpatrick, Counts, and Childs.27 It is not clear whether this exclusion was self imposed or enforced by the college. Kandel had a vast understanding of the progressive movement in education. He was in agreement with many progressive ideas, but he could not tolerate either the missionary zeal nor the lack of tolerance of many of the great educational progressives of his day.

In discussing how Kandel felt in not being on the panel of Education and Society, Bereday said, "He secretly suffered very greatly from exclusion."28 However poorly Kandel fared with his progressive colleagues at Teachers College, it appears that he had good administrative support after he began his career there. James

26 Bereday, "Memorial to Kandel," 149.

27 The 200 FA course at Teachers College was taught by prominent progressive educators who lectured on politics and education.

28 Bereday, "Memorial to Kandel," 149.
Russell, who was Dean of Teachers College in 1919, wrote a general letter of recommendation for Kandel on 30 April 1919. This complimentary letter of Dean Russell's reads, in part,

As a student, he was easily outstanding in his scholarship, and he ranks among the leaders who have attended this institution at any time. As a teacher since 1914 in this institution, he has enjoyed the confidence of our most advanced graduate students and has served them with satisfaction. In point of personality he is tactful, pleasing, and helpful to those with whom he is associated. I feel confident, therefore, that as a productive scholar and teacher, he has a splendid career before him, and that wherever he may be located, he will give an excellent account of himself. He has my hearty endorsement. 29

Kandel taught at Teachers College from 1913 to 1947 when he became professor emeritus. Early in his career Kandel attracted the attention of the then United States Commissioner of the Bureau of Education, P.P. Claxton. Kandel's dissertation on teacher training in Germany, published in 1910, was followed by a continuous series of studies on the conditions of education in different parts of the world.

Commissioner Claxton, impressed with Kandel's competence invited him to do a survey of elementary education in London, Liverpool, and Manchester. This was published as a bulletin issued by the Bureau of Education in 1913 and disseminated nationwide by 1914. In this study Kandel found that the English school had become more of a public concern than it was in previous years. In his survey he found also that instruction was not the only concern of the schools. The physical and moral development of the children were seen as important curricular goals.

29 Russell Papers, 30 April 1919.
Kandel's 1913 study of the schools in London, Liverpool, and Manchester showed clearly that the English system placed ultimate responsibility for the operation of the schools with the local authorities. This principle of freedom was typical of each branch of English education, down to the local school. The national authority had a financial role to play, giving financial help if certain standards were maintained. Other than that, local schools were autonomous. This, Kandel pointed out, was quite a contrast from the bureaucratic and centralized systems of France or Germany.

In 1915, again under U.S. Government auspices, he published a monograph on the training of elementary mathematics teachers in ten European countries and the United States. Kandel used available sources in German, French, Italian, and English for these publications. The complete title of this work is: The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Mathematics in the Countries Represented in the International Commission on the Teaching of Mathematics.

In 1917, Kandel did his survey of Commercial Education in England published by the United States Printing Office for the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress. Kandel reported in this work that while progress had been made with this type of education in England, it was not equal to commercial education in many European countries or in the United States. At that time in England commercial education took three directions: training boys and girls who stayed in school until the age of 15 or 16, coursework in evening schools for young men and women who were commercial workers,
and special university courses leading to diplomas and degrees. Kandel predicted in this report a bright future for commercial education in England.

In 1918 Kandel assisted Professor Paul Monroe for a study commissioned by President Wilson. These were translations to be used by the United States Government of foreign school laws and administrative regulations that promoted nationalism in these foreign governments. The titles of the study were "Prussian School Laws and Administrative Regulations concerning Private Schools, Teaching Orders, Teaching of Foreign Languages, Educational Privileges and Subject Peoples and in General the Use of Schools for Nationalistic Ends;" "Austrian School Laws...for Nationalistic Ends;" and "Japan, France, Belgium, Holland: School Laws...for Nationalistic Ends."

Brickman discussed this study:

Carbons of three typescripts are deposited in the library of Teachers College, Columbia University. Each contains on the title page the following notation: "Submitted by Paul Monroe, Ph.D./Assisted by Isaac L. Kandel, Ph.D." No dates were given, but these documents were evidently prepared in 1918. The respective catalogue cards carry the note: "Part of a study conducted by Professor Monroe for President Wilson." 30

In 1919, the Bureau of Education released three more of Kandel's books in monograph form, all referred to as bulletins. In these three monographs Kandel described the development of education in Great Britain and Ireland, Germany, and wartime France. All three very detailed works are not well known, even among many

30 Brickman, 397.
scholars in the fields of comparative and international education.

In the book on Great Britain and Ireland, Kandel dealt with medical inspection in the schools of England, the reform of secondary education there, government reports, and the passage in England of the Education Act of 1918. Ireland was included in the monograph even though its educational system was different from England's because Kandel thought it was influenced by England's reforms. The Education Act in Great Britain, passed in 1918, included: extension of the age of compulsory education, provision for medical inspection in the schools, establishment of nursery schools, inspection and supervision of private schools and equal distribution for education between local and national taxes.

In his monograph on Germany, Kandel discussed the situation of education in general, along with secondary education, the training of secondary schoolteachers, and the separation of church and state. In his monograph on France, Kandel looked at the administration of the schools, physical welfare of the students, elementary education—and the secondary education of both boys and girls.

As a visiting professor Kandel taught at universities throughout the United States and in Mexico. He taught at the University of California in 1919 and again in 1929; the University of Mexico in 1927; the University of Pennsylvania in 1929 and 1930; the Johns Hopkins University in 1931, 1933 and 1935; College of the City of New York from 1935 to 1936, and 1936 to 1937; and Yale University in 1940. He also taught for a period of time at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City.
Kandel was the Joseph Payne lecturer at the University of London in 1933. The lectures were entitled, "The Outlook in Education." and they were subsequently published under the same title by Oxford University Press in 1933. Kandel was also the Inglis lecturer at Harvard University. The name of these lectures was "The Dilemma of Democracy," thereafter published by Harvard University Press in 1934.

In 1933, Kandel had his monumental book entitled, Comparative Education published. (For an analysis of this landmark book see chapter VI of this dissertation). Among the last works written by Kandel were the following books: The New Era in Education, 1955, American Education in the Twentieth Century, 1957, and William Chandler Bagley: Stalwart Educator, 1961. In the opinion of the writer of this dissertation these later writings of Kandel's were an improvement, in terms of clarity, over his earlier works.

Kandel traveled throughout the world, studied school systems in many countries, and lectured extensively. All of the places he visited and the groups he spoke to are too numerous to mention in detail. From his beginnings as a student of comparative education, Kandel studied intensively in England, Germany, and the United States.

Archival research at UNESCO and the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, along with documents received from the archives at Teachers College, Columbia University, depicted Kandel as being at home almost everywhere in the world at a time when intercontinental and international travel were not often done
frequently, easily, or inexpensively. He traveled and lectured in Europe, the United States, Mexico and Latin America, the Caribbean, Japan, the Middle East, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. He apparently did not have any firsthand experience in visiting the Soviet Union, for he used secondary sources when writing about the U.S.S.R.

In 1948, one year before the Communists came to power in the 1949 revolution in China, Kandel was invited there to lecture at Peiping National Teachers College. The invitation was from a Professor Chin who said in his letter, "I believe that a series of lectures on comparative education by an authority like you will do us much good." No evidence could be found to show that Kandel accepted the invitation and went to China.31

To show the spirit of Kandel's extensive visits to other countries in his work as a comparative educator, two copies of correspondence are included as Appendices III and IV. This correspondence shows Kandel to be a comparativist who not only theorized but who traveled far and wide to gain firsthand experience in meeting with education experts, teachers, and officials of other nations.

Letter II shows Kandel off to Java, the Fiji Islands, New

31 Isaac Leon Kandel, personal and unpublished papers. Archives - Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California. Letter to Professor Kandel from Professor Shuyung Chi, 9 March 1948. See Appendix II, for a copy of the letter.
Zealand, and Australia in 1937. Letter III, dated 1938, shows that Kandel lectured in Cairo, Egypt. This laudatory letter from an Egyptian educator mentions that Kandel's talk which he gave there was published in the Egyptian education journal in English, even though Arabic is the language of the magazine. It appears that the journal's decision-makers in Egypt wanted a wider dissemination of Kandel's paper than Arabic alone would have afforded.

Kandel was an inveterate letter writer and note taker whose handwriting is almost always undecipherable. Fortunately he typed, or he had typed for him, some of his correspondence. The typing at least makes it possible for a researcher to figure out where he went and what he did in his mission to bring a higher quality of education to the peoples of the world. Kandel's work has been translated into many languages. These include Spanish, French.

32 Russell Papers. Letter from Izak (Kandel) to Will (William Russell, 1 July 1937). See Appendix III for a copy of the letter.

33 Kandel papers, Letter to Dr. Kandel from Amir Boktor. See Appendix IV for a copy of the letter.

34 Research indicated that Kandel's work had been translated into Hebrew in several important articles on comparative and higher education. In my research in Israel I obtained most of these Hebrew languages articles. I then gave the articles to a Hebrew-English translator with the intention of having the articles translated into English. The translator carefully read them and then informed me that, surprisingly, they were not articles written by Kandel and translated into Hebrew. They were, instead, educational articles written by others. Kandel's name was found only in ONE paragraph of one of the articles. Thus it cannot be proven on the basis of this that his writings were in fact translated into Hebrew. From Cremin, Isaac Leon Kandel Bibliography. Cremin lists in his bibliographic memoir of Kandel that the above mentioned articles were written by Kandel in Hebrew. The complete citation and names of the articles are:
German, Italian, Portuguese, Chinese, Arabic, and Japanese. Kandel had a Japanese colleague who admired his work, translated it, and wrote to him asking his permission to translate more of it. He, himself, also translated educational articles into English from German, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, and Norwegian, and, according to Brickman who knew Kandel well, he had the linguistic capacity to translate at least four more foreign languages into English.

Brickman thought of Kandel as being a unique member of a rapidly disappearing group of scholars and educators. Brickman eloquently summed up Kandel's vast and comprehensive accomplishments:

One would have to roam far and wide in educational literature in many languages to escape the name of Kandel. Where many a pedagogue has been overtaxed by one branch of his subject or has dissipated his energies by dabbling in several, he has established and maintained a position of authority in an impressive number of areas—educational history, comparative education, educational philosophy,
international education and testing. Prolific author of monographic studies, textbooks, articles, editorials and reviews: editor of yearbooks, encyclopedias and journals; teacher and research mentor to students in many universities; active consultant to governments, school boards and educational bodies of five continents - this is a bare outline of his achievements.

Even with his deep involvement with teaching and writing, Kandel found time to give to many, many educational projects and organizations. Incredibly, he found the time to do so many things and do them superbly. In the following section there is a rather complete if not exhaustive list of the organizations he belonged to, the honors awarded him, and the journals he contributed to, all on an international basis.

He was secretary of the American Field Service Fellowship for French Universities from 1919-1924; trustee of Finch Junior College in New York City; member of the council, American Association of University Professors; member of the advisory boards of the American Council of Learned Societies and the American Friends of Hebrew University; member of the Institute Fellowship Committee, Institute for Religious and Social Studies, Jewish Theological Seminary; and laureate member, Kappa Delta Pi. His memberships in educational organizations include the National Educational Association and the National Society of College Teachers of Education, Kappa Delta Pi and Phi Delta Kappa.

He was also a member of the Modern Language Association, a member of the Columbia University Faculty Club, a consultant to the

36 In the matter of authority, Bereday sheds some interesting light on Kandel's very high opinion of himself: "In many arguments with him about standards, I would ask him," Professor Kandel; why are these standards? Who says so?" He would answer, "I say so! I am the standard." and he meant it in all seriousness." Bereday, Memorial to Isaac Kandel, 148.

37 Brickman, 384.

38 Brickman, 392.
Educational Policies Commission, and active in the Conference on Science Philosophy and Religion. In 1930 Columbia University conferred the Butler Gold Medal upon him. In addition he was a member of the advisory board of the Council of Basic Education. Kandel's great honor in being unanimously elected to the National Academy in Education is recalled with fond memory by Cremin, who says, "And how well I remember his cabled reply to the letter informing him of his unanimous election to the National Academy of Education; it read: Honored, accept, Kandel." Cremin's admiration of Kandel is shown by his comment on Kandel's unusual and pithy reply: "Not even the lifelong economizing of an academic could explain that away." In 1937, the University of Melbourne awarded him a Doctor of Letters degree, and in that same year he was greatly honored by the French government as Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. In 1946 the University of North Carolina awarded Kandel an honorary L.L.D. degree.

Bereday explained how Kandel received all of these honors:

He was not as ardently given over to the all-consuming yearning for knowledge as some of us are in this age of material pleasures for which we try to atone by a fierce commitment of spirit. He took his life as an academic in stride. It was what came naturally, what he liked to do and knew how to do... He took honours that were showered upon him, two honorary doctorates, a Legion of Honour and election to the National Academy of Education as ordinary things. He was pleased... But he never sought honours, nor was

39 Cremin, 2.

40 Ibid.
conscious of the need to seek them. After his mandatory retirement in 1946 from Teachers College, Kandel remained as active as ever. In 1946 he became the editor of the journal, School and Society, a post which he held until 1953. In 1947 he became emeritus professor at Teachers College. From 1947 to 1948 he was to become the first Simon Research Fellow at the University of Manchester, his original alma mater. At the University of Manchester, he edited the British journal, Universities Quarterly, from 1947-1949. In 1948 the University of Manchester appointed Kandel to its first professorship of American Studies. He served as chairman of this new department with distinction for two years. During this period he lectured, guided students, organized a degree program, and was involved in the selection of teaching staff.

For personal reasons, Kandel gave up teaching in the spring of 1950 after setting up the new department in American Studies with all of its ramifications. Writing in 1951, Brickman, praising Kandel's achievements at Manchester, commented, "In recognition of his signal services, the University of Manchester conferred emeritus rank upon him. Without doubt, there have been very few, if any, professors who have held emeritus status simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic. This is but another indication of the international esteem by which I.L. Kandel is regarded." After his


42 Brickman, 393.
retirement from teaching at Manchester in 1950, Kandel prepared monographs under the auspices of UNESCO. continued to lecture at universities worldwide, and wrote articles for educational journals.

Cremin, writing in 1966 after Kandel's death, estimated that, "In all, Kandel authored or co-authored some forty books, monographs and reports, edited another forty, and wrote over three hundred articles and reviews." Cremin, expressing amazement at Kandel's productivity, continues, "Even granting the inevitable measure of repetition and overlap in any such corpus of scholarly work, his accomplishment is nothing short of astonishing."

In a bibliographical note, Templeton, who wrote an Ed.D. (Harvard University unpublished) dissertation on Kandel's contribution to American education, interviewed Kandel and wrote, "Dr. Kandel himself does not have a bibliography of his extensive writings. According to him, certain articles were published at too early a date to be listed in standard reference sources; other material, in mimeographed form or appearing as portions in joint studies and in anthologies, has been lost or is no longer available."

The names of some of the journals that Kandel contributed to (some on a regular basis) are: School and Society, Educational

43 Cremin, 4.

44 Ibid.

These journal articles dealt primarily with the history of education, educational philosophy, and comparative and international education. The two journals that Kandel contributed the most to are School and Society and Educational Forum. Even before becoming editor of the former he contributed a sizable number of articles, short pieces, and book reviews. When he became editor of School and Society he developed a policy to limit his writings in the journal to the weekly editorial. This may explain why during his tenure as editor he chose to use the Educational Forum as his major vehicle for his longer theoretical and research articles.

Kandel also served in some editorial capacity as editor, revising editor, assistant editor, consultant, or member of the editorial board for the following works: Encyclopedia Britannica, Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, National Encyclopedia, Educational Forum, American Scholar, Comparative Education Review, Jewish Social Studies, New International Encyclopedia, Lord Percy's Year Book of Education, World Education, Collier's Encyclopedia, Nelson's Loose Leaf Encyclopedia, Chambers Encyclopedia, and, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, Monroe's, A Cyclopedia of
Education.

He wrote voluminously in other authors' books about nations including Great Britain (and Northern Ireland), Germany, France, and the United States. He did a brief analysis on the problems of literacy for UNESCO. He wrote on the great Moravian educator, Comenius, and he contributed several articles in the annuals of the Conference on Science, Religion, and Philosophy.

In 1924 he was the editor of a book entitled, Twenty-Five Years of American Education. The book was in honor of his distinguished teacher, Paul Monroe. Contributors to this volume included such prominent educators as Kilpatrick, Cubberley, Inglis, Woody, and Knight.

In the early 1930s Kandel edited seven important pamphlets entitled Education in the United States. These were disseminated in Latin America. Bagley, Snavely, and Norton were some of the writers for these specially illustrated monographs.

Brickman was of the opinion that, "The editorial feat for which Kandel will, in all probability, be remembered most by hosts of students of education is the 'Educational Yearbook' of Teachers College's International Institute." These yearbooks are discussed in detail in chapter VIII of this dissertation. The production of these yearbooks could alone have been a fulltime job for Kandel, but it was just one of the many jobs he undertook.

The Institute began in 1923 and it served several purposes, one of which was to publish studies about worldwide educational

46 Brickman, 394.
conditions. The Institute initiated the *Educational Yearbook* in 1924 and it published twenty-one volumes under Kandel's editorship, the last one in 1944. For twenty-one years educational surveys from many countries were published and analyzed by experts including Kandel himself. Most of the volumes examined special educational problems while some depicted overviews of educational problems in many countries. Paul Monroe, the Institute's director acclaimed Kandel for his work with the Institute in this manner: "Whenever the International Institute is called upon for a particularly scholarly job, we usually assign it to Kandel." 47

Monroe, writing in 1928 about the Institute's *Educational Yearbook*, described it this way: "the Institute has issued each year an Educational Yearbook consisting of studies on the contemporary educational tendencies in various countries. Each volume consists of approximately a dozen articles, so that every third or fourth year the most important countries find consideration." 48 The Institute found outstanding foreign educational experts to contribute to the yearbooks.

Kandel had a lifelong interest in German education. He wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on the training of elementary school teachers in Germany when he was twenty-nine years old, in 1910. After World War I, Kandel wrote optimistically but cautiously about the greater

---


48 Paul Monroe, "The International Institute of Teachers College Columbia University," *Teachers College Bulletin Nineteenth Series*, No. 3 (May 1928): 8
freedom of choice and of the reforms in German schools. When Hitler rose to power, Kandel cautioned people everywhere against the totalitarian menace to civilized society from Hitler and his henchmen. Kandel also had his own specific ideas as to the reform of education in Germany during the transition period following World War II.

In a lengthy newspaper article written in 1918, Kandel gave his views on the German schoolboy and sport. In the article, Kandel concluded that the absence of sports or games in the German schools, and the excessive promotion of physical training from the primary grades to the university had a damaging effect. He reached this conclusion on the basis that the main objective of physical training in the German schools was to prepare boys for military service.

Kandel was quoted in the article as saying:

Even in the primary schools the German child is part of a militaristic machine, and in that inexorable mechanism, sport as the Anglo-Saxons know it, athletics which inculcate the sense of "playing the game," have no part, just as in the German language the words "sport" and "athletics" have no equivalent. During the last two decades the German primary and secondary schools have adopted more and more the tone of the barracks.......[sic] most physical training is devoted to work in mass, under orders, supervised by specially trained experts. Every elementary school teacher must have a course in gymnastic training, and each secondary school has specialists for that subject.49

In the year 1935 with the publication of one of his landmark books, The Making of Nazis, Kandel emphasized the great challenge to democracy by Hitler's Nazi totalitarianism. Kandel spent much of his adult life as a citizen and a professional educator warning

democratic societies against totalitarianism of the right or the left, particularly Nazi totalitarianism, Italian fascism, and Soviet Communism.

Speaking from an unpublished paper to students and faculty at St. Paul's Chapel, Columbia University on July 30, 1940, Kandel gave his views of the Nazi hatred of Jews, Judaism, and Judeo-Christian tradition. He said:

The Germans deride the Jews for the claim to be the Chosen People; they would lay claim to the title themselves. And yet what a difference between the idea of a people which chooses as its mission the enslavement of the world and a people chosen to reveal God to the world of man. There is another cause of Nazi hatred of the Judeo-Christian tradition because this revelation of the divine in man, this recognition of the dignity of the individual as a responsible human being is the basis on which democracy rests. Intolerance and hatred are the foundations of the new ideologies: "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is the injunction of the Hebrew prophets and of the Golden Rule. 50

In another part of the same talk, Kandel clearly exhibited his desire for pluralism and true internationalism at a time when Nazism and fascism were attempting to eliminate such ideas. He said the following, apparently with the students in mind:

Here is the real challenge to those who enjoy the opportunities that you have. The least of these opportunities is the acquisition of knowledge. The greatest is the opportunity of living for a short time with others of different creeds and different sects, of different races and of different color, in an atmosphere where your task should not be to look for differences which divide but for those common elements of humanity which make for brotherhood. 51

50 Isaac Leon Kandel. From an unpublished paper of a speech prepared for delivery at St. Paul's Chapel, Columbia University, 30 July 1940. From his personal papers at the archives - Hoover Institution.

51 St. Paul's page 4.
One can easily determine from the above remarks that Kandel, a man of unquestioned and even remarkable knowledge, who advised students to put brotherhood ahead of learning, was, and is still, a model for comparative educators everywhere. Kandel, in addition to writing an important book on Nazis and Nazism, published numerous articles attacking totalitarianism before, during, and after World War II. In 1935 he blasted German teachers calling them "supine." Kandel castigated German teachers for, "deserting the cause of academic freedom and liberalism without putting up a strenuous fight for these principles."

Kandel, whose professional life was so inextricably tied to German education for many decades, followed the Nazi educational system from afar but with regularity. He learned, for example, from the Times Educational Supplement in May of 1942 that Germany was no longer producing students specializing in academic areas of the curriculum. Quoting from the newspaper he said: "It may be noted that nobody appeared anxious to study law or theology, professions for which there is no demand or need in Nazi Germany."

As World War II came to a close and the Germans were defeated, the American military under the leadership of General Dwight D.


53 Ibid.

54 From the newspaper article, "Crisis in Nazi Education," from the Times Educational Supplement 30 May 1942, p. 256. The Hoover Institution Archives, See Appendix VI.
Eisenhower announced that it would control teaching in the defeated nation. The New York Times reported:

General Dwight D. Eisenhower told the German people yesterday in the thirteenth and last of a series of proclamations that "all educational institutions except boarding schools and orphanages will be closed" in conquered Germany "until Nazism has been eliminated". It declared that "elementary schools will be the first to be reopened" under the direction of "the existing German educational system subject to Military Government control" and "after the purging of Nazi and militaristic elements." "Steps to reopen secondary schools and higher German educational institutions will be taken as soon as practicable," the proclamation said.55

Kandel thought that he had some significant input into this American plan for controlling teaching in Germany when the war ended. He said in a short letter to Dean Russell that he had sent his suggestions to an American military officer dealing with this issue earlier in the year. Kandel implied that there were similarities between his suggestions for closing and reopening German schools and the steps outlined by General Eisenhower in the aforementioned The New York Times article. (Appendix VII shows the letter to Dean Russell, dated December 18, 1944. Appendix VIII is a copy of the suggestions Kandel was referring to in his letter.)56

Kandel's strong statements recommended the extrication of all vestiges of totalitarianism from post World War II German schools.57


56 Russell Papers. Letter from Kandel to William Russell 18 December 1944. See Appendices VII and VIII.

57 Ibid.
This plus his well known position on German government and education under Hitler, led at least one noted comparative educator to state:

His political analyses are marred by an absolute emotional condemnation of totalitarianism. He often cautioned against attempting to say in comparative education which systems are best. But he could not live up to his own prescriptions. The martyrdom of the Jews under Hitler put academic blinders on him. Though he neither knew Russia at first hand nor spoke Russian, he fiercely denounced Russian and German versions of totalitarianism in one breath, as blasphemous anathema.58

Kandel was coeditor and contributor to the prestigious volume entitled International Understanding through the Public School Curriculum. It was Part II of the Thirty-Sixth Yearbook published in 1937 by the National Society for the Study of Education. The other coeditor was Guy Whipple. Kandel's chapter in the volume is entitled "International Understanding through the Public School Curriculum."59

During the Second World War, the government of Jamaica invited Kandel to chair a committee which was to survey secondary education in the island country. Kandel was the only citizen of the United States to serve on the committee. The name of the document that Kandel and his committee wrote was entitled, Report of the Committee


59 Guy Montrose Whipple, 1876-1941.

Whipple was a noted educator who taught both psychology and education at Cornell, the University of Illinois, the University of Michigan and the Carnegie Institute of Technology. He authored many books and he founded the Journal of Educational Psychology. He served on the board of directors of the American Psychological Association 1914-1916. Source - Biographical Dictionary of American Educators, Vol. 3.
Appointed to Enquire into the System of Secondary Education in Jamaica. The report soon thereafter came to be known as The "Kandel Report on Education."

Kandel served as a member to the United States Mission to Japan. The Mission concerned itself with the postwar reorganization of the Japanese education system, and a report was issued to the Supreme Commander, General Douglas MacArthur. While the chairman of the Mission, George D. Stoddard and the Assistant Secretary of state, William Benton, both applauded Kandel's contributions to the Mission, it is a little known fact that Kandel himself was none too pleased with some aspects of the work of the Mission. Kandel contributed to the writing of the report as a member of a particular committee, the Committee on Curriculum and Textbooks.

That Kandel saw weaknesses in the work of the Mission is evidenced by his correspondence to a certain Mr. Edwards, apparently a publisher. Kandel's letter is dated 1 May 1950. Kandel's criticisms relate to the small number of members who were experienced with foreign educational systems. "Hence the imposition on Japan of the American system of education."

While Kandel disagreed with other points in the Mission's report, he said he regretted that he did not submit and sign a minority report as part of the entire report. He even requested

60 Kandel to Edwards, 1 May 1950. See a copy of the letter - Appendix IX - from Kandel's personal papers- The Hoover Institution Archives.

61 See the first paragraph of the letter - Appendix IX.
that this person--Edwards, not use his (Kandel's) name in anything that Edwards published on the Mission's report.

Kandel's key point that "Hence the imposition on Japan of the American system of education." is worth repeating here. Four years earlier in an article in School and Society entitled, "The Revision of Japanese Education." Kandel strongly rebutted a certain writer named Carroll Atkinson who had earlier questioned the Mission and its report. Atkinson thought that the United State through its Mission would impose upon the Japanese an American type of system of education. Kandel then went on to say in his rebuttal, "The Mission was not invited by General MacArthur to impose American or any other educational theories on the Japanese, but to help the Japanese to reconstruct their own educational system." 62 Why Kandel decided to admit his true feeling in writing four years later in his correspondence to Mr. Edwards remains unclear.

Kandel was a consultant to the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations. He was also active in working as a writer for UNESCO. Aside from the work on literacy for UNESCO mentioned earlier, he made additional contributions to this worldwide organization. In 1947 Kandel was hired to prepare the final seven parts of UNESCO's Study of Education for International Understanding In the Schools of Member States. This was presented in late 1947 at

In 1949 Kandel contributed a chapter entitled, "Education and Human Rights," in a book edited by UNESCO with an introduction by Jacques Maritian. The book was entitled Human Rights. Among the luminaries who also contributed to this work were: Gandhi, De Chardin, Northrup, Harold Laski, E.H. Carr, Benedetto Croce and Aldous Huxley. In 1951 Kandel contributed a volume to UNESCO. It was part of a series published by UNESCO on compulsory education. It was entitled Raising the School-Leaving Age. In 1962 the regional center of UNESCO in Havana, Cuba published a monograph in Spanish by Kandel. The name of the book is Hacia una profesion docente or in English: The Making of the Teaching Profession.

In an unpublished and undated work on UNESCO, while the organization was being formed, Kandel said:

The organization can make an important contribution by means of conferences, by collecting and disseminating accurate information on the developments in education, science and culture, and by directing attention to new areas that need to be explored. It can encourage cooperation between nations in all branches of intellectual activity through the exchange of persons, objects of artistic and scientific interest and other materials of information. It

---

63 See the copies of two letters in Appendices X and XI. The first is a letter from a representative of UNESCO offering Kandel an assignment with UNESCO. Letter to Dr. Kandel from Professor R. Ballou. The second letter is from another representative of UNESCO giving some details of the project to Kandel. Letter to Dr. Kandel from Leonard Kenworthy. The letters were obtained at UNESCO - Paris, France - Division of the UNESCO Library, Archives and Documentation Services. Most of the information on Kandel's work for UNESCO was obtained at the UNESCO archives.
can serve in general as a clearinghouse of information.\(^{64}\)


Bereday said this about Kandel and his contribution to comparative education. "Kandel felt exceedingly proprietary about comparative education. He pushed it to exceedingly high standards in terms of the requirements of the thirties and he was recognized for it in academic and professional circles alike. He did not popularize or spread the field. He feared dilution in spreading and he abhorred popularity."\(^{65}\)

In a startling piece of information, Ulich informs us that invariably Kandel's works did not continue beyond the first edition.\(^{66}\) In a generally complimentary article in memory of

\(^{64}\) I.L. Kandel, UNESCO - Unpublished personal paper from the archives of The Hoover Institution, Palo Alto, California.

\(^{65}\) Bereday, "Memorial to Isaac Kandel," 149.

\(^{66}\) While this may be true, several of Kandel's works were republished at later dates by other publishers.
Kandel. Ulich said:

> with his emphasis on details Kandel himself sometimes caused his readers to lose sight of the whole. Consequently inexperienced instructors who followed his *Comparative Education* page for page, lost themselves in the minutiae until they lost the interest of their class and gave up in disappointment. With one exception, his main works did not go through a second edition. Nevertheless Kandel's writings will remain an invaluable source for the scholar of educational policies in their larger historical context. 67

Robert Templeton interviewed Kandel when he wrote his dissertation on Kandel's contributions to American education. They met in New York in December, 1955. Templeton was impressed with Kandel's sense of humor, his geniality, vitality, and awareness. During the meeting, which lasted for two hours, Kandel displayed a considerable breadth of interests and he was profoundly concerned with the problems and issues of contemporary life.

Templeton discussed their meeting in these terms: "During this time he touched on a wide variety of subjects, ranging from comparative and international education to the meaning of democracy. His approach to major issues was incisive and sharply critical but always tempered by a deep sympathy for the human situation and by a profound spirit of liberalism." 68

Isaac Leon Kandel's biography has appeared in many different works which list famous people, including *Who's Who in America*, *Who Was Who in America*, *Who's Who in Literature*, *International Who's Who*, *Presidents and Professors in American Colleges* and

---

67 Ulich. "In Memory of I.L. Kandel." 256.

68 Templeton. 332.

This biographical portrait of I.L. Kandel has attempted to present a look at a great comparative educator whose profound thinking in comparative and international education impressed scholars and influenced the field for many years. Kandel, however, also was a noted historian and a philosopher of education. The next chapter covers his historical work and outlook, while chapter III focuses on his work in the field of educational philosophy.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL WORK AND OUTLOOK OF ISAAC LEON KANDEL

Chapter I examined the major events of Isaac L. Kandel's early life and education. It provided a biographical summary of his accomplishments as a teacher, published scholar, editor, and educational consultant. The biographical chapter was designed to give the reader an overview of Kandel's multifaceted contributions during his long and productive career. Chapter VIII of this dissertation gives additional information on Kandel's specific contributions to comparative and international education.

Chapter II focuses on Kandel's historical work and his historical outlook. In this dissertation it will be shown how his historical outlook was related to his ideas in comparative and international education. While known best for his major contributions to comparative and international education, he was also an important educational philosopher as well as a noted historian of education.

Chapter II also includes some of his works that cannot be strictly categorized as a part of history, philosophy or comparative education. For example, he wrote a report for the Carnegie Foundation For the Advancement of Teaching in 1917, entitled, Federal Aid For Vocational Education. Kandel gave a thorough account of the passage of both Morrill Acts in 1862 and in 1890. He
also examined in this work the constitutional and educational precedents for federal aid to education in the United States. The purpose of this work was to set forth in a clear manner the beginnings of the federal policy toward education and to depict the legislative procedure by which the policy of federal aid to state education was begun. So, while the account set forth in the bulletin was historical in its presentation, it could also be considered an important document in educational policy studies.

Henry S. Pritchett in the introduction to Kandel's work for the Carnegie Foundation said:

The attitude of the federal government toward education is to-day, and will become increasingly, a matter of concern to every state and every citizen. The Morrill Act of 1862 was the first step in a governmental policy which carries with it results of great financial magnitude and of far reaching importance politically and educationally... As to the development of this policy in the future and its importance, the American people will themselves decide.1

In the following year, 1918, Kandel with Clyde Furst also published a work for The Carnegie Foundation entitled, Pensions for Public School Teachers. The bulletin covered the social philosophy of pensions, the fundamental principles of pensions, the status as of 1918 of teachers' pensions in Europe and the United States, an example of retiring allowances for public school teachers in Vermont, a tabular statement of teacher pension systems, and a summary and map of teachers' pension systems.

Kandel's varied writings continued. In 1920, along with authors William S. Learned, William C. Bagley, Charles A. McMurray.

1 I.L. Kandel, Federal Aid For Vocational Education (New York: The Carnegie Foundation For the Advancement of Teaching, 1917), VI.
George D. Strayer, Walter F. Dearborn and Homer W. Josselyn, he published, *The Professional Preparation of Teachers For American Public Schools*. Again, this was published under the auspices of The Carnegie Foundation For the Advancement of Teaching. While an important part of this bulletin focused on the state of Missouri, Kandel's purpose in this publication was to give an account of the rise of normal schools outside the state of Missouri.

In 1924, Kandel edited and contributed to a book in honor of his former teacher Dr. Paul Monroe. The book, *Twenty-Five Years of American Education*, was comprised of collected essays from former students of Paul Monroe. In addition to editing this volume, Kandel contributed an essay entitled "University Study of Education." The dual jobs of editing and writing originally were roles Kandel assumed regularly in his long career.

In 1934 Kandel published a book, *Introduction to the Study of American Education*, with Lester M. Wilson, professor of education, at Teachers College, Columbia University. Kandel and Wilson noted in the preface to the book that they intended to present a simplified account of American education to the American student of Education. Among the topics covered in the book were: the characteristics and magnitude of the American educational system, control and administration, finance, articulation, elementary and secondary education, higher education, the curriculum, vocational and adult education and private and religious education.

In 1936 Kandel wrote another bulletin for The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, entitled: *Examinations*
According to H.G. Good:

it... was a history of the examination problem in European and American social conditions with an account of the rise of the International Examinations Inquiry... Dr. Kandel believed that the examination problem is not mainly a technical one. It is, instead, the problem of providing several forms of liberal education to meet the different capacities and interests of youth and needs of society. The Great Tradition, the humanistic type will remain, he believes, as one among several paths to growth and maturity. Education must provide the best opportunity for all.2

In the bulletin, Kandel traced the entire history of college entrance examinations in the United States. He discussed how they have been used and how they developed. He firmly believed that examinations were merely a means to a better education for individual students, and not ends in themselves.

Kandel perceived a pattern in which United States' institutions of higher learning had initial reservations in using examinations for guiding, advising, and placing students. But he nevertheless described the great public interest in aptitude tests, intelligence tests, and vocational tests. He also discussed the potential that these tests had in minimizing individual failures. This would assure society that each citizen was performing to the best of his or her ability.


---

chapter to this volume: "Intelligent Nationalism in the Curriculum." While this can be categorized as a study in curriculum, it was really one of Kandel's major works in international education and is treated as such in Chapter VI.

Kandel's continued output of scholarly work outside of the fields for which he was best known would no doubt have established him as an important educator had he not written anything in the history of education per se, or philosophy, or even comparative and international education. His depth, scope, and wisdom shine through even in his lesser known or "minor" works that do not fall in these areas of study.

In 1940 Kandel wrote a book entitled: Professional Aptitude Tests in Medicine, Law, and Engineering. He said, "The present study is a continuation of the author's investigation of objective measures, published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as Bulletin Number Twenty-eight, Examinations and Their Substitutes in the United States."3 This book, however, was not published by the Carnegie Foundation. Rather, it was published by Teachers College, Columbia University. In this study, Kandel presented a balanced view of aptitude testing for professional schools. In discussing the use of these tests for admission purposes, he said, "All that can be claimed is that here are measures which have proved their value for purposes of diagnosis and prognosis and which may be used as one criterion for purposes of

3 I.L. Kandel, Professional Aptitude Tests in Medicine, Law and Engineering (Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940), X.
One more example of this tangential work presented here is a monograph published in Spanish by UNESCO. Published in Havana, Cuba in 1962, its English title is *Towards a Teaching Profession*. Kandel dealt with what he saw as new responsibilities of teaching personnel, trends in educational reform movements, the work of the teacher, the development of the teaching profession, and the challenge to it. Discussing the new responsibilities of the North American teacher, Kandel thought that the teacher was expected to be, "a combination of psychiatrist, specialist in social studies, scientist, and an individual of considerable culture." This is a statement that he repeated and elaborated upon in some of his other work. (See footnote 54 of this chapter for a further elaboration of this theme).

Kandel's historical outlook shaped his theories of comparative education, and this chapter examines his ideas on the history of education. An examination of Kandel's historical interpretation is useful in illuminating his approach to comparative education. Thus, Kandel's historical outlook should help us to better understand his perspectives in studying the educational systems of other countries, including the United States. His historical writings also included many specific aspects of educational history. His books and

---

4 Ibid., IX.

5 A translation from the book (page 10) in Spanish which is entitled, *Hacia Una Profesión Docente*. Translated for the author of this dissertation by Ms. Dionioes M. Sampson, a Spanish\English expert from the Chicago Public Schools.
articles reflected a topical approach to the study of certain phases of educational history instead of the more usual comprehensive general works found on the history of education.

All four of the authorities cited in chapter I, Brickman, Cremin, Bereday, and Ulich, who did biographical work on Kandel, showed that he made important contributions to the history of education. Among these contributions were his earliest published writings on the history of education which were included in Monroe's *A Cyclopaedia of Education*. The encyclopedia was published in five volumes.  

All of the articles in Monroe's *A Cyclopaedia* were unindexed. They were arranged alphabetically and initialed at the end of each article by the author or authors. Kandel wrote nine of the eighteen articles himself and nine with either one or more collaborators. Among these collaborators were J.E.G. De Montmorency, Foster Watson and Arthur F. Leach. Kandel's articles appeared in each of the volumes except volume four. and they were all signed I.L.K. Some articles were brief and some were lengthy. Paul Monroe was the editor, and he had the assistance of department editors and more than 1,000 individual contributors. Kandel worked on the *Cyclopaedia* from 1909 -1913.

Volumes I and 2 were published in 1911, Volume 3 in 1912, and Volume 5 in 1913.


In Volume 3, he contributed to two articles: "Jewish Education" and "Harrow School."

Finally, in Volume 5, Kandel contributed to three articles: "Corporal Punishment" (History), "Scientific Societies" (written alone) and "Teachers' Voluntary Associations" (written alone).

The lengthy articles are: "Apprenticeship and Education," "Bible in the Schools," "Comenius," "Examinations," "Jewish Education," "Harrow School," "Teachers' Voluntary Associations," and
volumes from 1911 to 1913. Kandel was an assistant editor of this work. He contributed eighteen articles in all: articles that are not well known but which are certainly very scholarly, even if somewhat esoteric. The following four articles will be discussed briefly: "Academy," "Apprenticeship and Education," "Comenius," and "Jewish Education."

Kandel traced the academy to ancient Greece and treated its historical development to modern times. He showed how, in the United States, the academy evolved into the public high school with its emphasis on college preparation. He said:

To speak generally, the academy was the product of the frontier period of national development and the laissez faire theory of government. When these conditions departed, the academy gave place to the high school as the predominant secondary school of the American people. 7

Kandel explored the latest trends up to 1910 in his historical article on apprenticeship and education. Interpreting an American Federation of Labor report published in 1910 which emphasized the revival of apprenticeship, he wrote:

This revival of apprenticeship is proceeding, roughly speaking, along four main lines. The first is where the industrial establishment and the school system cooperate in the education of the apprentice, practice in the shop being supplemented and illuminated by cognate school study of mathematics, drawing, physics, chemistry, etc. The second is

"Scientific Societies."

It appears that, without exception, all of the eighteen articles contributed by Kandel to Monroe’s A Cyclopedia, are rarely, if ever, discussed in other works by Kandel or by other authors writing about him. Two examples of those who do mention the Cyclopedia are: Brickman who discusses Kandel’s work on the Cyclopedia in his Festschrift on Kandel; Good mentions it too in his work.

7 Ibid., Volume I, 23.
where the employer provides such school exercises within his own establishment. The third is where the industrial establishment recommends or requires school study without making any provision, direct or through affiliation, for such supplemental training. The fourth is where apprenticeship training is practically concentrated upon a single process or range of processes for the purpose of securing specialized skill.  

In the article on John Amos Comenius, Kandel wrote about the greatness of this pioneer of modern educational thought. He reviewed Comenius' most important works and he mentioned the Orbis Pictus or The World in Pictures, which was more popular than any other of Comenius' writings and began a new departure in school textbooks. The World in Pictures was perhaps the first successful application of illustrations in books to successful school purposes.

In discussing both Comenius' twenty-nine principles of method which helped children learn rapidly, enjoyably, and thoroughly, and the importance of the work of this seventeenth century scholar, Kandel said:

The greatness of Comenius consists more in his early formulation of those principles in concrete terms, than in his direct influence in the introduction of such principles into subsequent educational practice. After his own generation, it was not until near the middle of the nineteenth century that these remarkable educational writings of Comenius were again called to public attention by the early German historians of education, and consequently that due recognition be given to the place of Comenius in educational reform.  

Clearly, Kandel recognized Comenius' genius, his great accomplishments, and his influence on generations of future teachers.

---

8 Ibid., Volume I. 158.
9 Ibid., Volume 2. 141.
and students. Kandel credited Comenius with conceiving of compulsory education, a school curriculum which would appeal to all aspects of human interest, organized schools and classes, an educational ladder with higher steps or grades within an educational system, and giving students less severe discipline, more physical exercise, moral training, and greater intellectual activities.

Kandel was also somewhat critical of Comenius. He said that he had no knowledge of even the basic principles of research. In addition, even though he was a reformer, he did not revolutionize the curriculum. The student then had to deal with the burden of the old juxtaposed with the new. This, according to Kandel, placed the student in a very onerous position of dealing with both.

In the article on Jewish Education, one of his lengthiest in The Cyclopedia, along with the article on apprenticeship and education, Kandel divided the time frames into three different eras: the ancient period, the middle ages and the modern period. In this article, Kandel gave a historical accounting of educational practices and theories that were thousands of years old. He depicted the Jewish ideal as having formulated the goal of education as having been based on character formation. The result of a wise education was to be a God-fearing man.

The Jewish mother had an important educational function. The well being of the state also depended on the welfare of the family. The father had the duty to explain the national traditions to the children. The curriculum presented to the child by the parents consisted of: reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and singing.
Arithmetic was used to determine festival dates and everyday needs. Thus, parents preceded schools in very early Jewish history.

According to Kandel:

Schools as such were unknown in Biblical times, because it was felt that the education of children was the business of the family. It was the duty of the parents to act as interpreters to their children of the annual festivals and the religious rites and ceremonies, all of which served as object lessons in the history of their ancestors and as practical religious and moral training.10

After the Old Testament period, talmudic or religious education followed for nine hundred years. The school was just as important to every Jewish community as was the synagogue. The school was necessary, and to live where there was no school was prohibited. According to Jewish law and custom, the existence of the world depended on the lives of children who attended school. Teachers thus were considered to be the protectors of the towns.

Kandel portrayed a modern decline in Jewish education. He said:

On the side of the Jewish schools for the purely sectarian and religious education, little has been done to keep pace with the advance in educational thought and practice. The methods are still in the majority of instances the methods of the medieval period. Cramming and memory work without appeal to the understanding too often tend to arouse a rebellious spirit.11

In spite of the decline Kandel saw trends, however, in a reformed curriculum which would stimulate an appreciation for the best that has been in Jewish education.

Kandel's eighteen well written articles in Monroe's A

---

10 Ibid., Volume 3, 542.

11 Ibid., Volume 3, 552.
Cyclopedia set the stage for his later thorough research and scholarship. It may be likely that the deference Kandel showed in much of his later work to what was important in time honored traditions, and beneficial to society at large, was related to his penchant for showing, in the history of different topics, how certain things of educational value developed over a period of hundreds or even thousands of years. Kandel did not, however, laud tradition for tradition's sake. As will be shown in this and the following chapter, he was ready to denounce the type of teaching which grew out of formalism with its undue emphasis on memorization and repetition and its total rejection of the learner as a person in his own right, who was treated as a vessel to be filled with subject matter.

In a 40 page unpublished monograph, obtained and photocopied from his private papers which were donated to The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace and entitled, History of the Curriculum (which Kandel had copyrighted in 1935), he offered a remarkable example of the type of teaching based on the doctrine of formal discipline.\textsuperscript{12} The example is one of a dialogue between a Prussian teacher and his fifth grade geography class for boys in Prussia.\textsuperscript{13}


\textsuperscript{13} It is not completely clear in exactly what year the dialogue took place. Kandel mentioned in the History of Curriculum that there was little change in the Prussian curriculum between the years 1872 and 1923. Nor is it clear as to whether Dr. Kandel observed the lesson first hand during a visit to Prussia, translated it from
Kandel depicted the geography example in order to show the nationalistic-political emphasis in education at the time, as well as to show the emphasis on how knowledge is acquired through repetition and memorization.

In this monograph, Kandel traced curricular events back to more primitive times and then to the eras of the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and early Christians. He said:

The curriculum as a body of facts, information and experiences to be transmitted as an essential part of the social heritage is both the oldest and most enduring conception in the history of education.14

Continuing to trace developments in the curriculum in the United States and Western Europe, Kandel emphasized the period from the late 1700s to the early 1900s. He discussed faculty psychology and the doctrine of formal discipline. Under this type of system of learning there was an agglomeration of facts and information which were not considered as important a learning outcome as the discipline obtained from studying subjects. This discipline purportedly increased the students' general ability to

a Prussian textbook, or read an English version of it somewhere.

Kandel gathered some of his data for his Ph.D dissertation in Germany in the summer of 1909. The dissertation was published in 1910. The title of it was The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany. While doing first hand observation in the Prussian normal schools it is possible that he also observed this dialogue taking place in a Prussian elementary school.

The dialogue itself seems to point to Kandel's first hand observation. On the original page 17 of appendix twelve, he said in a parenthetical statement, "The song 'Deutschland, Deutschland, uber alles' was then sung, presumably because the boys were getting a little sleepy." This makes it appear that he actually witnessed the dialogue.

14 Kandel. History Of The Curriculum, 1.
handle any other type of material.

He also discussed John Dewey's influence in the United States and abroad during the first quarter of the twentieth century. He said, "There is no doubt that Dewey has exercised a more powerful influence on the reconstruction of educational thought than any other educator in the preceding century and a half." Expounding on Dewey's ideas, Kandel continued:

The life of the school was to be active, not passive: the children were to work not merely to listen. The curriculum was to be organized around four chief impulses: "the social instinct", "the instinct of making - the constructive impulse", "the expressive instinct - the art instinct", and in the "impulse toward inquiry, or finding out things".

Writing in 1956, Professor of Education, H.G. Good of Ohio State University, said that, "The Dean of American specialists in comparative education, Dr. Isaac Leon Kandel, is well known also for his work in the history of education." Good corroborated the point made earlier in this chapter that Kandel was not a general or comprehensive historian of education. Therefore, Good noted, Kandel was not as popular as other contemporary educational historians who did use the general approach. Continuing his discussion of Kandel as a historian of education, Good said:

Using his historical knowledge and insights he has worked toward a solution of educational problems. He is an exponent of what may be called an applied history of education. He has been an educational critic in the same sense in which one speaks of literary or social critics. The history of education is..., a major gateway to an

15 Ibid., 11.
16 Ibid.
17 Good, 30.
understanding of civilization and the progress of society....in Dr. Kandel's hands it has been, an excellent means of educational criticism.  

Kandel's historical outlook viewed education as something which each present generation inherited from the previous one. He believed in the continuity of one generation to another based also on the transmission of the accumulated experience of the human race. Good supported this opinion. He said that, "Dr. Kandel proposes self-realization, not self-expression, as the end of education, a clear definition of values, and reliance not upon the narrow experience of the individual but upon the experience of all the people in all recorded times."  

Kandel wrote historical articles which were published in many periodicals and encyclopedias. He wrote textbooks on particular topics along with monographs, bulletins and reports. Some of his work went unpublished. In 1951, Brickman, writing about Kandel's plans to write a history of education with him said: "His interest in the history of education continues and he still has intentions to undertake in collaboration with the present writer a history of education in the United States since 1890."  

In a footnote, Brickman added, "Around 1940, Kandel and Bagley began to write a textbook in the history of education. After several chapters were completed the work came to a stop."  

---

18 Ibid.  
19 Ibid., 32.  
20 Brickman, 407.  
21 Ibid.
From 1934 to 1943, Kandel published three important works which were based upon his interpretation of educational and social history. These three documents, The Dilemma of Democracy. 1934, Conflicting Theories of Education. 1938, and The Cult of Uncertainty. 1943, spiraled a rejection of certain aspects of the progressive education movement. He criticized the child-centered school which frowned upon subject matter, and everything fixed in advance, and which recognized knowledge only when it was needed. In the following chapter, Kandel's antipathy to the Progressive Education movement in the United States will be discussed at length.

In addition, Kandel pointed out in these works that the problem for democracy was how to prevent liberty from becoming license and of equality to turn into uniformity. In secondary education the dilemma consisted of curricular uncertainty leading to anarchy and the resultant uniformity of pupil achievement that was a dull average. Kandel saw a weakness in democracy whereby the emphasis on individual liberty too often overlooked the importance of individual responsibility to others and to society. This he felt weakened democracy by making it difficult to have group cohesion and societal progress. The emphasis on equality without taking individual differences into consideration led to an unacceptable framework of uniformity, for Kandel.

The secondary school had a negative force of treating any subject as being as good as any other subject without regard for the subject's contribution to the promotion of thought and the advancement of civilization. Thus a watered-down curriculum with
its low level offering dulled the students and their achievement. Blaming the educators in the United States for this sad state of affairs in 1943, Kandel said, "Educators...have concentrated their attention on the immediately present and contemporary; they have refused to recognize any value, except incidentally as the need might arise, in the experience of the race." 22

Kandel thought that students in elementary school and even secondary school would benefit far more from studying mathematics, history, literature, and languages, than from the study of controversial issues. He resented the "learning" that took place which centered upon techniques of controversy instead of emphasizing the development of judgement and values. He blamed those progressive educators who would encourage the study of complicated controversial issues whose solutions were not even apparent to the world's experts. Studying such issues instead of important traditional subjects left students cynical and skeptical, he believed.

Kandel minced no words in blaming educators for having little or no respect for history and for those traditions, hammered out on the anvil of hard experience, which have helped societies progress throughout the ages. Kandel respected those eternal truths that have endured but which educators neglected in the twenty-five year period prior to the publication of this book, The Cult of Uncertainty in 1943. His beliefs in absolute values and eternal

---

truths came into conflict with the pragmatist-progressive educator who stressed relativity and tentative truths.

Kandel felt that it took the human race thousands of years of struggle to realize the very basic value of human life. He wrote about the role of the school in the transmission of values:

the school as a social institution has the obligation of selecting such experiences as will develop the individual into a socially responsible and intelligent member of the community. The school, in other words, is an institution, established and maintained by society to achieve certain ends, to transmit certain values, and to give each individual his rightful share in the heritage of human experiences.23

For Kandel and his historical outlook towards education and schooling, "The essence of education, however, was not self-expression but self-realization as the individual entered into his heritage of human culture."24 Self-realization was a much more comprehensive idea which among other things encompassed self-expression.

Kandel believed that the teachers who were well prepared would be best able to begin a process of seeing that this concept of self-realization took hold. These well prepared teachers would be society's best chance for a better life for people. The teachers would need firm support and intelligent administrators to help them provide better educational conditions. Kandel's emphasis on the importance of having well prepared teachers was a recurring theme. But he thought that there were no royal roads to education. In examining the historical process by which education worked best, he

23 Ibid., 108.

24 Ibid., 99.
said.

there are...no methods of instruction of universal validity which can replace the teacher who has a full mastery of what he undertakes to teach and no teacher so equipped will employ one method, one theory, one principle to the exclusion of all others.25

Cremin was of the opinion that Kandel, like most of his Western contemporaries, saw the world as the Western World. Cremin said that. "Kandel's historical interests were essentially extensions of his political concerns. Much in the fashion of his contemporaries, he wrote instrumentalist history, interpreting the past principally in terms of its bearing on the present."26

Continuing to point out Kandel's subsuming of both history and education as branches of political science, Cremin wrote, "At bottom he viewed education as a branch of politics using the term as Plato and Aristotle used it; and hence, he dealt with education not as a series of pedagogical techniques and procedures, but rather as the foremost activity of humanity, organized into nations, for its own preservation and progress."27 Since Cremin thought Kandel saw education as a branch of politics, it meant that he considered education to be more than a congerie of pedagogical techniques and procedures. For Kandel, education was the most important activity of humanity. This political dimension of education for Kandel was vital in understanding the whole history of Western education from the city-states of the Greeks, to the Church's control of education

26 Cremin. 6.
27 Cremin. 4.
during the middle ages, and to modern education controlled by the various nation-states.

Finally, Cremin found some of Kandel's writing on the history of education to be derivative rather than original, especially his writings from the ancient Greek period to the Enlightenment. Cremin found that Kandel's historical strengths were in writing about the modern era, particularly since they included important discussions of the contributions of education in shaping national character.

It is conceivable that education for Kandel meant formal schooling, but he took a broad approach to the study of schooling. He dealt with such problems as the meaning of culture, the politics of curriculum making, how national character is formed, the training of elites, the training and status of teachers and the problems of freedom and servitude. He wrote, "It is an axiom that the character of an educational system is determined by the politics of the group or nation that it serves; every nation has the educational system that it desires."28

Ulich saw Kandel as a careful historian and an observer of human attitudes. On the way Kandel wrote history, Ulich said,

by establishing the proper historical and social sequence for the events he described, he avoided what I may call "accidentalism," a peril that threatens especially the field of education. I mean by that term the mere explanation of events without an explanation why they occurred the way they did and not otherwise.29


Bereday thought of Kandel as having his own personal style as a historian. Bereday said:

He studied to teach. He believed comparative education to be a contemporary extension of history and hence primarily a conveyor of lessons. He yielded to temptation over and over again to switch roles from observer to ardent advocate of the conclusion of his observations. He even disliked the more meticulous, more mechanistic, more dispassionate approach to society characteristic of the social scientist. On one occasion he called it "mental diarrhoea." 30

Bereday thought that Kandel was misjudged by later generations of academicians who thought that he was in favor of comparative education being the work of a philosopher or a historian. He believed that the social science approach was in fact advocated by Kandel even to the degree that things outside the school are more important than what happens in school, for correct understanding. However, evidence presented later in this dissertation shows Kandel as having problems with social science as it related to comparative education. Brickman cited Kandel as having said that "comparative education... is merely the prolongation of the history of education into the present." 31 Brickman felt that Kandel tried, on the one hand, to present comparative education as an independent area of study, but, on the other hand, showed that it was really a component of the history of education. Apparently Kandel never really resolved this long term conflict.

Brickman said that for many historians of education, the history of education was primarily the development of the curriculum

30 Bereday, "Memorial to Kandel." 149.
31 Brickman, 400.
and of methodology. But he said, according to Kandel, it was concerned, "with the study of the relation between education and cultural backgrounds, in the fullest sense of the term, and is as much concerned with the history of education as with political history."\(^{32}\) In analyzing this statement Brickman, himself, said:

This is about as broad and liberal a definition of the nature and function of educational history as one would find among the self-styled progressive thinkers on the subject. And yet, one cannot fail to get the impression that Kandel is...interested in the solid substratum of tested processes and logical analysis upon which any accurate historical writing must rest.\(^{33}\)

According to Templeton, Kandel's idea of human history may be seen in the context of a continuing struggle. It was a struggle to obtain freedom from any type of tyranny in order to realize his best self and to some degree control his own destiny. Templeton pointed out that these ideas underlie much of Kandel's writings and colored his historical outlook.\(^{34}\) Indeed, this writer clearly agrees with this assessment of Kandel's historical outlook.

Kandel said, "The history of education is, indeed, a history of the conflict between the ideal of freedom and the ideal of authority and control."\(^{35}\) By this he meant that man's quest for freedom or individual liberty was challenged throughout history by the ideal of authority and control or the power of society to reign over the

\(^{32}\) Brickman, 407-408.

\(^{33}\) Ibid., 408.

\(^{34}\) Templeton, 34.

affairs of the individual. Buttressing this, Kandel wrote, "freedom is a right which like all other rights must be won, and that all rights, imply a corresponding responsibility in their use, no matter what the field of activity may be." Kandel's idea dealt also with the roles, both positive and negative, that institutions have played in making man's struggle possible. This is the case because man as an individual is a product of his own culture and is shaped through his participation in it. It follows then that his social and political institutions have helped to structure, keep alive, and even conserve that culture.

Focusing on the school as a particular institution, Kandel was of the opinion that society defined its functions and had done so throughout its long history. The school was there to gain ends that were considered to be very important to society. Historically, schools reflected the character of the society they have served. The school was affected by all of society's forces from which the social order obtained its substance and direction. This included its ideals, values, hopes, tensions, and problems. In order to understand education and deal directly with its problems and therefore indirectly with the problems of the social order, it was necessary for education to deal with: "the relation between education and cultural backgrounds...with the history of culture and politics and their impact on education. Nothing is more needed in the study of education than a realization that it is a social

36 Ibid., 120.
Kandel supported the analysis of William E. Hocking regarding the main function of education, and society's fundamental responsibilities to its youth. As defined by Hocking, education was, "to provide for the reproduction of the type, or in other words, to promote and ensure the solidarity, preservation and survival of the group....[and] the conservation or transmission of the cultural or social heritage". 38

Kandel was highly critical of those educators who denied that anything could be learned from the past and discounted all educational practices up to the present as contributing to a static society or aiming for the transmission of mere knowledge. While admitting educational inadequacies in the past, Kandel nevertheless discussed the positives he saw in previous generations of educational experiences. The goals of education were aimed at benefitting society. The schools, he admitted, had their shortcomings but the critics were too harsh. The schools had as their objective the training of the mind to cope with changing times even though later studies showed them to be inadequate in the attainment of results. "That the world did progress, that it did produce intellectual giants, are facts which cannot be ignored and


for which some credit must be given to centuries of forgotten teachers." This was a tribute to generations of teachers that is not often seen in the literature of education.


Kandel shed insight into his own outlook as to the role of history in understanding education in the History of Secondary Education. He believed that success in education could happen only if two things occurred: if there were a clear understanding of the elements that were responsible for the present situation, and if there were an appreciation of the factors which must be analyzed in


order to build a new philosophy. Kandel realized that, in one form
or another, secondary education for all was a movement whose time
had come. One of the major problems that education for all would
bring was how to have an adequate supply of academically and
professionally prepared teachers for the secondary school. Kandel
thought that nations needed to solve this problem if secondary
students were to have an education rather than mere schooling. He
pointed out that the demands on teaching ability will be greater in
educating all students, than for the few, who had been chosen in the
past on the basis of ability or wealth.

Writing about the mission of the secondary school teachers, he
said:

It is on the teachers then that will rest the burden, as
the burden of successful education has always rested, not
primarily of inspiring pupils with their own faith, and
enthusiasm in some special field of study, but seeing the
significance of that field for the development of the pupil's
whole personality.41

While Kandel knew that the capabilities of secondary school
teachers were crucial for the successful future of democracies, he
nevertheless took a realistic view of the problem. He was aware
that the only thing he could do was to raise the problem as one that
had to be faced, since it had not been faced in any nation. He was
not too optimistic about the outcome of the problem of having poorly
prepared teachers for the secondary school. He cited the work of
Professor Charles Hubbard Judd, who two years earlier had concluded
in his book, Unique Character of Secondary Education, that there may

41 Ibid., 540.
not be an adequate supply of competent teachers even in the United States.

In writing the *History of Secondary Education* Kandel attempted to trace the rise of those factors which led to the widespread unrest in educational systems in Europe and America in the 1920s and 1930s. These factors were technology and industrialization which changed man's pace of life and his way of viewing his place in society, and the meaning of democracy. By that he meant democracy was weakened by the overemphasis on individualism which lead to man's unrest in education and in society.

Kandel, writing, in 1930, saw a worldwide crisis in secondary education. In the United States, he felt, this was brought on by a departure from tradition. In other countries it stemmed from the idea of who should be educated, the elites or the masses. Some of the tensions were caused by the conflicts which arose between following the main literary tradition or providing for the admission of new knowledge, and the attendant problems of providing for the needs of different social classes. Additional pressures on the secondary school came in trying to meet the demands of changing social and economic conditions.

Lecturing in England in 1933 or writing for educational administrators in the United States the year before, Kandel drove home his points on history and secondary education. He showed that societies needed a political and social awakening to be able to demand for their citizens equal educational opportunities. They needed this awakening to understand that the citizen needed to have
dignity as a person. The individual in society also required the recognition of being a worker who would be valued beyond the point of mere literacy. This meant that the individual needed to be able to think for himself and have the mastery of important subjects.

Kandel's London talks were known as the Payne lectures and were delivered at the University of London Institute of Education. He spoke about the expectations that had existed for elementary and secondary education. He showed that there was an attack on the traditional differences between an elementary education for the masses and a secondary education for the few. In addition, he said that at the time there was in the leading nations of the world almost the same demand of secondary education for all.

The ideal of a common primary education for all students followed by a postprimary education had at that time been accepted, according to Kandel. This was the case even though the problem of appropriate distinctions of the types of education according to abilities and needs had not yet been satisfactorily worked out. The principle of postprimary education had been accepted by countries that were both democratic and totalitarian. As to that goal of education, Kandel said this in one of his lectures:

The aim of education is not merely to impart knowledge and information but to develop personality and character - mind and body, emotion and will - according to the individual's potentialities. The experiences which are to promote the growth of the individual must be selected from his cultural environment rather than his inner consciousness or the caprice of the moment.42

Kandel's London lectures had been preceded by his writing about the secondary school which was obviously an important topic at the time. In an article on secondary education in Europe and in the United States, he discussed a matter which was also current at the time. The matter was the question of the equivalence of subject values. In European secondary schools modern languages and sciences became as important as traditional classical studies. In the United States, Kandel said, any subject taught competently for any length of time became as highly regarded as any other subject.

Thus, adopting the quantitative measure called the "Unit" made it possible to introduce any subject into the secondary school curriculum. As national wealth increased in the United States the principle of equal educational opportunity made high schools in every section of the country more accessible. By 1932, Kandel pointed out that fifty percent of adolescent students were enrolled in American high schools. Regarding equal educational opportunity, Kandel credited the great educator Comenius with being one of the forerunners of the idea. Kandel felt that Comenius was three hundred years ahead of his time when he urged the adoption of equality of educational opportunities irrespective of sex, place of domicile (rural or urban), or social class (noble or common).

Kandel wrote much about important historical topics such as: nationalism, totalitarianism, democracy, industrialism, the historical background to higher education in the United States, and

their impact on education in general.\textsuperscript{44} His considerable efforts in writing about these topics are evidence that in his middle and later years he concentrated more on the recent past rather than on the more remote past, which he had done as a beginning historian of education. His output on the recent past was so vast that he may not have had enough time to concentrate on early history, although to be sure, he did not neglect important periods in the history of education, as his \textit{History of Secondary Education} demonstrated.

Another major important work by Kandel was \textit{The Impact of the War Upon American Education}, published in 1948. It was a study prepared for the Committee on War Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies. Some five years earlier Kandel, in an unpublished paper, Kandel wrote on the topic of \textit{The Secondary School and the World At War}. This work was found among Kandel's private papers located in the Archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace. In this paper written while World War II was still being fought, Kandel said:

\begin{quote}
For education the war and its demands have added little new: they have only hastened a trend to accommodate education to the immediately practical concerns of the moment. Much will have been gained from the ordeal by which we are being tried, if we are stimulated by a realization of the great causes for which men are sacrificing their all to take the long view of education and the contribution it can render to make men free and keep them free. This has always been the task of liberal education.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{44} Kandel's ideas on nationalism, totalitarianism, and democracy will be discussed in the next chapter which sets forth his philosophy of education.

\textsuperscript{45} I.L. Kandel, "The Secondary School And The World At War" the author. This paper was based on a talk Kandel gave at the University of Pennsylvania, March 26, 1943. Archives Hoover
Kandel was not surprised by the adjustment of American education to the immediate demands of the war crisis. He said that this was a symbol of the patriotism of American teachers. He believed however that real patriotism regarded plans for the future as well as for the immediate welfare of the nation. He saw no protests from secondary educators about the postponement of culture until the war was won. By this he meant that preparing secondary students for warfare by means of specialized training was sacrificing an entire generation of students who were then in school. Kandel saw protests however from other quarters including that of important political figures such as Wendell Willkie. Kandel cited a speech at the time given at Duke University by Willkie.46 Regarding plans for the immediate welfare of the nation, Kandel said that even during the war it was important to emphasize general education in order to have human values which would give meaning to life. He said, "These values are inherent in the study of the liberal arts which tell the story of man's struggle for freedom."47

Kandel later wrote a more comprehensive and better known work which discussed the impact of war on American education and was published in 1948. Kandel used the intervening years from the end of the war to the writing of the book to further reflect on the consequences of the global conflict and its meaning for American

Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1-31.


47 Ibid., 30.
education. The name of the book as mentioned before was *The Impact of War Upon American Education*. This was a critical report of educational activities during World War II. It emphasized the developments of secondary and higher education. The work highlighted, in two chapters, the problems of higher education. In its entirety, however, the book encompassed education at all levels. It presented a lucid account of how World War II affected the American system of education and the manner in which the system responded to the needs of the nation during this great period of crisis.

For many Americans, seeing that there were many of their own men who did not qualify for the armed forces was a rude awakening. The schools took much of the blame for the lack of preparedness and the high illiteracy rate which disqualified large numbers of men. Kandel blamed the schools also, but not entirely. He gave two reasons why. For one thing, the skills needed for fighting the war in all of its ramifications were too broad and too numerous to have been anticipated. Secondly, many men who had received training did not use their skills due to the unemployment which existed during the depression. Kandel certainly did not let the schools off easily, however. He said:

A public which had always prided itself on its educational system and the amount of money spent on it was informed that large numbers of young men had to be rejected by the Selective Service either because of illiteracy or because of physical deficiencies. While there was at no time a fear about the morale or the patriotism of the American people, there were some who expressed alarm lest a somewhat easy-going educational theory which had been dominant for two decades might have made the problem of discipline difficult. The word discipline, which had virtually disappeared from the
literature of education except to be derided, was again seriously discussed. Despite the constantly increasing enrollments in high schools and colleges since World War I, when the hour of trial came, it was found that the supply of personnel adequately prepared in mathematics, sciences, and the foreign languages which these institutions professed to teach was inadequate. Although federal funds had been available for vocational education since 1917, the number of workers with the skills needed both in the armed service and in war industries was not large enough to meet the demands.48

In the book, Kandel pointed out that the impact of World War II was more general and diffuse in the United States than was World War I. Educational institutions were affected to a very considerable degree, some more than others. The range was from primary schools to universities but included also were high schools and teachers colleges. Mothers, in large numbers, went to work for the war industries and this caused dislocation in many families. Children had to be provided for and this along with the rise in juvenile delinquency gave rise to different types of problems. In addition, a crisis was caused by teachers leaving their jobs in schools for service in the war or to work in war industries.

New demands were placed on educational institutions because of the war. The regular programs of high schools gave way to programs, to a large extent that dealt with education for victory and vocational preparation.49 Colleges and universities donated their resources and efforts to prepare their students for armed service and for occupations which helped meet the war needs. The high


49 See Appendix XIV for Kandel's explanation of this type of program. From Kandel, The Impact of War, 90-93.
schools, colleges, and universities found themselves in jeopardy because they were threatened with the loss of the traditional academic studies, except those seen as directly contributing to the war effort. Kandel argued that "The nation's system of education, no less than other social institutions, was subjected to searching inquiry. The issue was not only whether the system could meet the test of war, but whether it was adequate to meet the demands of the peace that would follow the war." 50

In 1951, Kandel contributed a chapter to a book entitled Education in a Changing World. He named the chapter - "Educational Reorganization in Relation To the Social Order." Discussing the function of the transmission of education, he said,

This function - the conservation or transmission of the cultural heritage - is still the primary object of education and is intended to equip the younger generation with the skills and knowledge and ideals which will enable it to take its place in the social group and contribute to its survival. There is also another purpose, which is to provide the future members of a society with a common understanding, and common objects of allegiance on the basis of which they may be able to co-operate for their mutual welfare and the welfare of society. 51


50 Ibid., 5.

51 Kandel, in C.H. Dobinson, 36.
Kandel depicted the first fifty years of American education in the twentieth century as having experienced changes based on child study and psychology and on Progressive education. He distinguished child study and psychology which he said led to school improvements, from Progressive education which largely was responsible for poorer schooling and for pointing to traditional education as being evil. He emphasized differences between public education in the beginning of the century and the middle of the century. In the beginning, elementary school teachers were expected to present a certain body of prescribed knowledge and information, primarily through textbooks. Or, in the case of secondary school teachers, to present one or several closely related subjects on which students would then be examined. The goal of education at that time was "the harmonious development of the pupils."52

By 1930, Kandel tried to demonstrate that Progressive education was not working well in the American public schools. He even used Dewey's writing to support this position. Paraphrasing Dewey from an article he wrote in 1930, Kandel wrote, "John Dewey stated that the reactions against traditional educational experiments were marked by a great variety of new experiments but had no genuine sense of direction except an exaggerated and unfounded concept of freedom without a sense of responsibility or regard for the rights

of others." 53

By midcentury, Kandel saw that a drastic shift in the role of the teacher had taken place. The teacher by then was expected to be a superperson with the expertise "of psychiatrist, social scientist, scientist, and an individual of considerable culture who was also a man or woman of action, as well as hygienist, guidance and welfare officer, and able to participate in extracurricular activities." 54

For the student at midcentury the goal was to develop the whole personality and prepare him to meet his vital needs through an education whose main thrust was life adjustment.

Kandel saw that in spite of the great array of problems that existed in the American public school by the middle of the century, much progress had been made. In terms of numbers of students being schooled in the first fifty years of the century the United States set an example for the rest of the world. These numbers included children, youth, and adults who were enrolled in the nation's educational institutions. The amount of money spent on education also set an example for other nations who could see how our priorities were set. Equal educational opportunity, the assimilation of large numbers of immigrants, and public support for the idea that schools safeguarded the ideals of democracy all led Kandel to conclude that, "There still survives in the background of the American mind the eighteenth-century notion of man's

53 Ibid., p 5.
54 Ibid., p 3.
perfectability or improvability."55

In a chapter that Kandel contributed to the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, Kandel said,

The primary function of formal education has always been to induct the young into the culture of the society.... The way in which a child should go has been determined by the culture of the society in which he is to play his part as a member, and the ultimate purpose has been to secure the solidarity, preservation and survival of society."56

In concluding Kandel's historical outlook on the young and on schooling, perhaps one of his latest statements, published in 1959, was the most suitable. After a long and illustrious career he still held to his beliefs in the transmission of culture and knowledge from one generation to another and the role of the school in molding youth. In the article entitled "No Humble Posts" he said:

The oldest and most enduring function of the school has always been to induct the immature into membership in the group, society or nation to which they belong...the school is the one institution charged with carrying out a specific purpose....The school however, differs from the random, haphazard unsifted, and unselected experiences that life offers because the experiences that it is designed to provide are selected in order to achieve a definite social purpose. Education, then is a social process; its purpose is to prepare children and youth to take their places in the society which provides the school.57

To say that Kandel believed greatly in the historical mission of the school and its place in society would certainly not be an

55 Ibid., 224.


exaggeration. One of his most important aims of education centered around learning what is of greatest importance from the past, bringing these learnings into the present, and conserving them for future generations. He believed in the reproduction of the type in the society to which the individual belongs and that education must also afford opportunities for growth beyond the type. This meant the expansion of schooling from primary to secondary to higher education. It is, no doubt, correct to say that the transmission of culture and knowledge from one generation to another to produce knowledgeable, productive citizens of good character, through schooling was also an important feature of Kandel's outlook.

Kandel expounded on the theme of good character in an article he wrote toward the end of his career. The name of the article is "Character Formation: A Historical Perspective." He traced the history of early character formation to the early Hebrews and Greeks and showed that despite the changes throughout history the moral basis for determining good character had not really changed. He said in the article:

The one aim which has persisted through the ages has always been the formation of character....So far as the past is concerned, despite the social and cultural changes that have taken place, the moral facilities considered desirable and approved by a society are based on certain eternal verities which have not changed and which make social cohesion, stability and survival possible.58

CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF ISAAC LEON KANDEL

Isaac L. Kandel's educational philosophy based on Essentialism was unequivocally opposed to many of the tenets of the Progressive philosophy of education.¹ He advocated a system of educational ideas that operated within a political framework and a climate of democracy, as opposed to totalitarianism. He vehemently opposed totalitarianism of either the communist left or the fascist right.


He says:

Essentialism... applied to positions asserting education properly involves the learning of those basic skills, arts and sciences which have been useful to man in the past and are likely to be useful in the future... Among these necessary skills are reading, writing, arithmetic and desirable social behaviors... necessary elements... in every sound elementary curriculum. At the secondary level... history, mathematics, science, language and literature... The learning of the tool skills and the arts and sciences requires effort and diligence on the part of the student. The teaching of these necessary skills and subjects calls for mature teachers who know their subjects and are able to transmit them to their students. Progressive education... is characterized by: 1) a focus on the child as the learner rather than on the subject; 2) an emphasis on activities and experiences rather than an exclusive reliance on verbal and literary skills and knowledge; and 3) the encouragement of cooperative group learning activities rather than competitive individualized lesson learning. Progressivism in education encourages the use of democratic procedures that were to effect community and civic reform. It also cultivated a cultural relativism which critically appraised and often rejected traditional beliefs and values.
He believed that if the sound philosophy of Essentialism were put into practice it would contribute positively to the continuation of a free and civilized society.

The key person, for Kandel, in advancing society to higher and higher levels of civilization was the teacher. The teacher transmitted the best of inherited cultural learnings to the student, while the school mirrored society. He refuted what many Progressives or Social Reconstructionists believed, that the school should build a new social order. Kandel's philosophy of education impacted directly on the work of the elementary school, the high school, and the university. He philosophized on what he saw as beginnings and endings of particular eras in education, and he wrote on the philosophy underlying national systems of education (which will be covered in the following chapters on comparative and international education).

This chapter focuses on Kandel's philosophy of Essentialism, his repeated and pointed attacks on Progressive education. It depicts his emphasis on the teacher and teaching. It shows his deep aversion to totalitarianism, his ideas on political democracy, along with his quest for freedom and individual responsibility in society.

Writing in the *Harvard Education Review* in 1956, Kandel described how the advantages a philosophy of education could accrue by extrapolating from different aspects of general philosophy. He viewed political and social philosophy as being important components

---

of general philosophy. All of these aspects of philosophy would then contribute to educational thought which in turn could improve the practice of education.

Kandel also believed that the history of education, and comparative education provided important lessons for a sound philosophy of education. He pointed out that the components of general philosophy were useful in determining the nature of values. Contrary to Dewey, he thought that general philosophy could help raise education above the pragmatist idea of growth as an end in itself. In contrast to pragmatism, problem solving would no longer be the only stimulus and method of thinking, and the pursuit of "mere" knowledge would no longer be an unworthy goal.

Kandel emphasized the study of political and social philosophy because, he thought, they were the most powerful determinants of education. He thought this because of his belief that what happened in society, outside of the school was as important as what happens inside. Those philosophical insights based on political and social philosophy, which enhanced freedom and individual liberty within the framework of democracy, were thought to be the most worthwhile. In addition, in a philosophy of education it was necessary to show the relationship of practice to theory. The philosophy must be eclectic and not wedded to any one source of derivation. This was so because education was a complex matter and the many ideas brought forth from more than one source was thought to be necessary and important for developing a philosophy of education.

In his diminutive Festschrift on Kandel, Brickman discussed
Kandel's active interest in educational philosophy. According to Brickman, Kandel was an important theorist in educational philosophy even though he enjoyed greater attention in other branches of education such as comparative education and history of education. Kandel published other works on the philosophy of education in journals, periodicals, yearbooks, monographs, and textbooks.

Brickman's opinion was contrary to the general view that Kandel was not an important figure in educational philosophy. Brickman, commenting on Kandel's publications on educational philosophy, said:

His more sustained works in educational philosophy are "The Dilemma of Democracy," an Inglis lecture which is devoted to the foundations of secondary education; "Conflicting Theories of Education," a group of related essays and addresses written during 1937 and 1938; an extended analysis of "The Philosophy Underlying the System of Education in the United States;" and his Kappa Delta Pi Lecture, "The Cult of Uncertainty." 4

Brickman recognized that Kandel's philosophy of education emphasized developing the child's potentialities in terms of knowledge, information, personality and character. Values were to be wrought by the traditions and the heritage of the human race. These values would enable the young student to have a better understanding of the present. The understanding of the present in turn would provide the necessary intellectual preparation for the foreseeable future. Education was thus a sociomoral process which

3 Brickman, 408.

4 Ibid. Works are mentioned in chapter II of this dissertation as being based upon Kandel's interpretation of educational and social history. Certain works of Kandel including these, are representative of his historical outlook as well as his educational philosophy.
led to the building and rebuilding of the person and of society. A sociomoral process for Kandel meant those factors in society which promoted the highest tenets of behavior leading to individual rights and corresponding responsibilities. Citing Kandel, Brickman wrote, "the primary function of education is to promote the fullest development of each individual as a human being, to prepare for enlightened citizenship, and to cultivate interests which can be continued throughout life." In this light, the content of formal education needed to be carefully ordered and carefully defined rather than being presented in terms of episodes of only immediate and present oriented subject matter. This differed significantly from the Progressives' approach.

The most suitable labels that Brickman could find for Kandel's school of philosophical thought were "conservationist - reconstructionist, an Essentialist or a rational humanist." A conservationist - reconstructionist is one who wanted to constantly improve society but who used the positive elements handed down from the previous generations as building blocks for the continuation of such growth. An Essentialist was one who followed the ideas of that philosophy as defined in footnote 1 of this chapter. A rational humanist was one who sought improvement for all people everywhere based on a planned and proven schema which had its roots in the past but emphasized the continued improvement of society. Brickman's terminology describing Kandel's philosophy appeared to be accurate.

---

5 Ibid., 409.
6 Ibid., 410.
since Kandel's writings reflected those categorizations at one time or another throughout his career.  

Ulich said about Kandel as a philosopher. "Though not a systematic philosopher he was aware of the transcendent element in all deeper expression of human existence." Bereday perceived of Kandel as one whose personal style was that of a philosopher. Cremin's viewpoint of Kandel as a philosopher was that his writings were not systematic expositions of any particular point of view. They took the form of sharp criticisms of the negative tendencies of contemporary educational policy.

Kandel, along with his esteemed colleague, the eminent William Chandler Bagley, (1872 -1946) a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, who Gutek called "Essentialism's most articulate spokesman," believed that the teacher was of prime importance in the educative process. Brickman pointed out that Kandel enjoyed quoting or paraphrasing the old dictum, "As the teacher, so is the school."

Kandel's perception of a lowering of educational standards in the schools of the United States provoked him to speak out against

7 Kandel is usually thought of as an Essentialist.
8 Ulich, "In Memory to I.K. Kandel," 255.
9 Bereday, "Memorial to Kandel," 149.
10 Cremin, 6.
12 Brickman, 409.
what he saw as the double standard existing inside of the schools.

There is, he wrote,

one part of our educational system, secondary and higher, in which there is rigid selection both of instructors and students, in which there is no soft pedagogy, and in which training and sacrifice of the individual for common ends are accepted without question. I refer of course, to the organization of athletics. If only the spirit which dominates the side show could be transferred to the main tent, education would vibrate with a new life.13

Kandel, according to Brickman, was a critic of the shortcomings of the traditional schools even though he certainly was tradition minded.14 However, his criticisms of Progressive education were more penetrating and carefully construed. Kandel viewed Progressive education as being constructed upon pragmatism. "a philosophy of precariousness and rootlessness."15 He claimed that a considerable number of leaders of the Progressive movement in American education used cliches in renouncing the traditional school and they did this in a mindless way.16 They often described a school that no longer existed, referred to it as traditional and contrasted it with the best type of Progressive school. But he was more than just a caviling type of critic. His sustained attacks on Progressive education may have had an impact on the Progressive movement and caused it to be more consistent in its doctrines. He certainly

14 Brickman, 410-411.
15 Brickman, 411.
16 Brickman, 410. said, "Kandel defined a cliche as a, "bromide with the fizz gone out of it."
wrote and spoke forcefully against Progressivism in education. He was a keen critic in the field of educational philosophy.


By incisive probing argument a clarion call sounds for a return to culture: to fundamental long-range educational planning; to emphasis on content rather than methods or techniques; to "equality of educational opportunity" achieved through well educated teachers, capable of critical examination of theories taught rather than led.17

One of Kandel's last books was a biography of William Chandler Bagley, published in 1961. There is little doubt that Kandel's philosophy of education was influenced18 by his close association and friendship with Bagley, a great educational philosopher. His characterization of Bagley as a stalwart educator was evident in the title of the biography. Bagley, who objected to being labeled a traditionalist preferred to be called a stalwart. By that he meant one who made systematic orderly progress the key feature of his educational program.

According to Kandel, Bagley "felt that it was as important to


18 See Appendix XV of this chapter for some of Bagley's more notable philosophical statements on education. They are excerpted from Kandel's book on Bagley: William Chandler Bagley: Stalwart Educator (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961). Chapter 5 "Bagley's Philosophy of Education"- pages 77 - 111

The attempt was made in this appendix to show how much Bagley's and Kandel's philosophy shared elements in common. It was conceivable, of course, that Kandel may have selected those statements of Bagley's with which he was most inclined to agree.
cultivate a sense of discipline, responsibility, and duty as to stress the rights of the individual to freedom of self determination and self-expression.\textsuperscript{19} Bagley was the acknowledged leader of the Essentialist movement in America, and Kandel certainly was one of the movement's most constant and articulate spokesmen. Bagley's motto for education in a democracy was "Through Discipline to Freedom.\textsuperscript{20}

Living successfully in civilized society, for Kandel, depended on reconciling conflicts between authority and freedom, stability and change, common social purposes, and individual rights and duties. While the intellect in Kandel's educational philosophy provided the underpinning for the growth of human beings, man is also a creature of emotions, feelings, and impulses. Experience, coupled with a healthy emotional framework, led to a reality centered life.

Templeton thought of Kandel's basic educational orientation as one which resembled the Greek view of man and society.\textsuperscript{21} This was especially true insofar as the Greeks attempted to understand the universal or the whole of which man is a part. For Templeton, Kandel was primarily concerned philosophically with man as a whole person involved with other persons and participating with them in the makeup of societies, reaching for perfection and freedom. The


\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{21} Templeton, 5.
educational experiences the learners needed in order to become serious and responsible citizens.

So strongly did Kandel feel about the teacher having been the prime mover in the education of the student that he even advocated using indoctrination in certain situations that he thought required it.25 A good example of this was Kandel's conviction that democracy was the one best political system.26 Paradoxically, he would inculcate this through education, even to the point of indoctrinating the ideals of democracy onto the student by the teacher.27

In 1939 Kandel gave a speech to the Association of First Assistants of the New York City's public schools. He centered his talk around the theme that American teachers needed to use the opportunity that teaching gave them to teach democracy. During the

25 By indoctrination Kandel meant the use of persuasion, repetition, and directly presenting one's viewpoint to others to have them agree upon and embrace the viewpoint presented. Thus, in a high school class studying the forms of government, Kandel would advocate that the teacher indoctrinate the students with the idea that democracy was the one best form of government.

26 Writing about democracy and indoctrination Kandel said, "American education should make no pretense of neutrality about this great social objective. Our schools should be deliberately designed to provide an education in and for democracy", in I.L. Kandel, The End of An Era Eighteenth Yearbook of The International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University. (New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College Columbia, 1941), 108.

27 Kandel defined democracy in the following way:

Democracy makes respect for the individual human being its basic and abiding moral purpose. It seeks to develop a way of living together - social, economic, political - which is in harmony with this regard for the intrinsic worth of each person....Democracy holds as a corollary, that the individual is not to be regarded as a pawn of the state or of any other institution. Ibid., 109.
discussion that followed, a retired New York City school
superintendent, Dr. John L. Tildsley disagreed with Kandel's
position. Tildsley said, "if it is wrong for Germany to teach
Nazism and for Italy to teach fascism, then it is wrong for us to
teach democracy." In addition to teaching democracy Kandel
believed that teachers should realize the importance of accuracy,
hard work, and time on task for their students. They should also
acknowledge the need for moral standards for the individual as well
as for society as a whole. While he did not define morality his use
of the term was based on conventional ethical standards.

By 1938, Kandel thought progress had been made in the operation
of the traditional school. This progress, he thought, would not
have occurred even twenty years earlier. He saw a breaking away
from the lockstep pattern of standardization to the trend of giving
more attention to individual differences and guidance. He believed
in more freedom for the teacher as well as for the child. He
castigated educational reformers who saw only the child in the
educational landscape, without taking notice of the teacher and his
vital role in the educational process. Freedom for the teacher
needed to be linked to a sense of responsibility, both socially and
professionally.

The Essentialist sensed the need for the individual to
understand his total environment by having his social and cultural

28 "Democracy Urged as Teaching Aim," New York Times, 22
October 1939, sec. I, p.22.
heritage presented to him by the school.29 This gave purpose to the life of each individual and helped the person by providing sources for continuing progress and advancement. So the central role of the school was to transmit the cultural heritage to the students so they may become involved in it. The school organized the cultural heritage so it could be broken down into subject matter wholes, that were taught to students on grade levels according to their age. The teacher was the mature agent of the school who presented this subject matter, thereby transmitting the culture to the younger generation.

Kandel credited the historian Charles A. Beard with being the first person to use the term Essentialism in the field of education.30 What were the essentials that Kandel saw as being important in Beard's work? First, it was the three R's and those aspects of natural science which did not depend on time, place, and circumstance. Other essential subjects were those which encouraged a respect for the fabric of society, political ideas and institutions, government, freedom, and the elements of democracy. Added to these were those factors which led to knowledge and interest which made human life worth living. Finally, the rules of conduct and ethics would be important essentials.

Regarding the growth of the child, the traditionalist or the Essentialist agreed with the Progressive educator that education encouraged growth. He would not agree with the Progressives'
emphasis on spontaneity through the interaction of children with their environments. Nor should growth be self-directed. It required nurturing through a carefully cultivated environment to a model or models in the minds of the teachers and parents. The Essentialist believed that the school functioned in order to put the child into contact with particular components of the good life; those, society believed and continued to believe were important.

A planned education was imperative for the Essentialist. Kandel was very concerned that an education which was not carefully planned, one founded on the momentary choice of activities would lead to severe consequences for the child; consequences such as extreme nervousness, for example. Along with a planned education went subject matter, the purpose of which was to provide cognitive maps for the student. Subject matter was based on direct corpuses of experiences and activities that human beings found to be of the utmost importance for both survival and continuing progress.\(^{31}\) Subjects needed to be kept in the curriculum as valuable tools.\(^{32}\) Subjects also provided the backdrop for experience by which the student learned and developed, all the while giving important meanings to his learnings. Subjects should also be enjoyed and appreciated on their own and not only as a means to an end. The pupil’s response to the material presented was proof in itself that the subject functioned in his life.


\(^{32}\) A subject is a body of knowledge that has its own integrity and method. Subjects were history, literature, mathematics and languages among others.
The individual and his innate nature on the one hand, and his complete environment, including the culture and civilization on the other hand, provided the school with the fundamentals of curricular content. The Essentialist saw that the Progressives' emphasis on the needs, interests, and purposes of the student were to be noticed but the framework for meeting these needs were subjects which really represented the logical organization of man's experiences. Subjects, therefore, were the realization of the standpoint, adeptness, and instruments which man had cultivated for his development and endurance in a given society. Subjects should be acquired directly not incidentally, and knowledge which is part and parcel of subject matter should be derived cohesively not functionally.33

The learner could not gain meaningful progress until he acquired important antecedent knowledge or knowledge organized by the teacher for the student in contrast to pragmatism. This was something that activities and projects alone could not provide. So the student must have knowledge, facts, and information along with values and ideals; a knowledge of the structure and not just the form; the what, or acquisition of knowledge, instead of the how, or methodology. The Essentialist was opposed to the Progressive position that knowledge should be limited to that which can only be used and applied in the present. Kandel believed that at this stage

33 Directly meant the imparting of knowledge from teacher to student. Cohesively meant the presentation of subject matter in complete wholes rather than in parts that were intended for presentation to the learner as he "needed" certain information at a particular time.
the traditionalist became the Essentialist who saw a certain continuity between the past, the present, and the future; a continuity which must present essential learnings to the student.

Kandel saw the teacher as having a much greater experiential background than the student. Therefore, the teacher was the right person to impart information and plan for his students. If the student did not receive the teacher's expert advice he would certainly receive advice from less qualified or unqualified persons elsewhere.34

For Kandel, each new generation needed to grow fond of the essentials and aim for understanding that which was important. In discussing what the important values were, Kandel drew upon the work of Charles Beard who said:

While education constantly touches the practical affairs of the hour and day and responds to political and social exigencies, it has its own treasures heavy with the thought and sacrifices of the centuries. It possesses a heritage of knowledge and heroic examples - accepted values stamped with the seal of permanence....Education must keep alive memories, linking the past with the present and tempering the sensation of the hour by reference to the long experiences of the race. It must kindle and feed the imagination by bringing past achievements of the imagination into view and indicating how new forms of science, art, invention and human association may be called into being.35

Ulich believed that Kandel agreed with pragmatism's emphasis on the spirit of experimentation. But this was only a qualified agreement. Kandel would concur with experimentation but not without direction, a vision of truth, or the acceptance of an authority who

34 Ibid, 39.

had a democratic set of viewpoints. For Ulich, Kandel's classification as an Essentialist "is correct if it means that he is a believer in man's ability and obligation to understand certain principles which help him to distinguish between good and evil, despite all the tragical errors and influences to which he is exposed. Otherwise civilization is bound to rot in the marrow."36

Kandel drew on the work of such Progressive educators as Dewey and Bode to expound his ideas of Essentialism. He used their criticisms of the progressive movement to show that facts and ideas are coherent wholes which must not be presented piecemeal. He also showed that traditional subjects had educational value the ignoring of which could be risky for society.37

By 1955, Kandel reflected upon the Essentialist movement that was not as successful as he thought it might be when its goals were defined some twenty years before. He certainly became (along with Bagley) one of Essentialism's most articulate spokesmen.38 In his 1955 book, The New Era in Education Kandel pointed out that the Essentialist movement took the middle road between the school that was subject-centered and the school that was child-centered.39 The Essentialist emphasized the importance of the teacher who both had a mastery of the subject matter and an understanding of a child's


38 Templeton. 232.

interests and development. The teacher who had the professional preparation leading to these strengths could mediate between subjects and the process of child development.

In summing up Kandel's Essentialist philosophical position on education, Ulich shared this insight:

Kandel...has never systematically dealt with "ultimate philosophy." But there is a permeating trend in all of his writings...which causes me to believe that his moral convictions are inspired by a religious interpretation of man as a participant in a cosmic order from which he receives his life and to which he owes reverence. From this deepest source of conviction has probably come this inner security that characterizes Kandel's educational philosophy.40

Kandel did much more than expound on his philosophy of Essentialism. He often spoke out or wrote scathing books and articles denouncing Progressive education. In these denunciations he did not always try to balance his remarks by presenting arguments for Essentialism. While he was in his eyes a reformer, he became imbued with the idea that progressive education was a harmful revolutionary movement.41 But, Kandel was not against change in itself. Rather, he opposed such radical changes as the Progressives advocated, which would eliminate subject matter laid out in advance. He also opposed Progressives' emphasis on the relativity of important values. He was against the excessive importance attached to the child's felt needs and the total rejection of the cultural heritage. His satirical and hostile writings angered many Progressives for

41 Cremin, 7.
more than a generation. He did not alter his criticisms in the 1930's when his ideas were not popular and he consistently reiterated his views into the 1950's when his ideas became more popular.

Kandel pointed out that the progressive reforms of education in the past stopped short of trying to show that the past was not relevant to the present. But the modern Progressives tried, he thought, to make a clean break with the past, while focusing on the present and looking toward the future. Educational traditions were founded on social stability and the idea that life was predictable. The modern Progressives would begin with unpredictability, find stability to be unacceptable, and they would rebuild forms of society for some unknown future. So continually and vehemently did Kandel condemn Progressivism that Templeton, who generally had a very high opinion of the rationality of his work, said, "It is doubtful if any other development in American education aroused him to a more intense pitch of intellectual and emotional excitement and fervor than Progressivism."

In Kandel's book *The Cult of Uncertainty*, published in 1943, he traced the roots of American Progressivism to the 1900s and saw its origins in both pragmatism and the concerted study of the child. The central focus of the book was Kandel's attack on Progressive education and educators, especially in the United States. He pointed out though that Germany and the Soviet Union too were

---

42 Ibid.

43 Templeton. 339.
adopting progressive theories of a radical nature. While Great Britain, the British Dominions, France, and the Scandinavian countries had not embraced progressivism because of their strong social and cultural traditions.

In Germany there was a political and cultural split with the past after the disintegration resulting from her defeat in World War I. What followed was the establishment of the cult of the individual which led to a movement to establish a new culture. This, according to Kandel, coupled with other causes of chaos and confusion left the way open for any demagogue who could, through demagogic practices win control of youth.

In Soviet Russia, educational policies were designed to make a complete break with anything deemed to be bourgeois. While noting well the complete failure of this radical policy, the Soviets, after fifteen years of observing that their innovations did not result in the desirable objects of social allegiance, restored discipline, and examinations to their schools. They even restored orderly curricula and courses of study, distributed official textbooks, and brought back the formal study of the Russian classics in literature.

An important theme of this book was to search for those permanent cultural values and return to a basic culture which contained the ideals and values which men lived by. Those who opposed these essentialist values wished for nothing too fixed in advance. This led to a philosophy of precariousness and the glorification of the present. Kandel's thorough discussion of Progressivism in American education centered on one of its more
recent theories (recent at that time) of education which "have been built on one phase of the American tradition - the worship of change as progress - and the tradition of having no traditions, of which the philosophical formulation appears to be a mere rationalization."\textsuperscript{44}

This progressive educational philosophy led to the establishment of the child-centered school, the new-order school and the community-centered school. In opposition to this were those who insisted that there was something permanently left of culture, certain ideas, and values. These should be continued and transmitted by the schools to pupils who share in a common fundamental background of life. So, for Kandel, the argument was between a cult of change and disorganization, and a culture of permanence: between anomie, alienation, and rootlessness, suffering from a lack of authority and, rooted authority, which created social stability within a common culture. Throughout the book the Progressives were accused of undermining democracy with their laissez-faire educational system.

One reviewer, writing in 1943, found an annoying feature in The Cult of Uncertainty.\textsuperscript{45} He thought that Kandel was intimidated or beguiled by the great name of John Dewey. Kandel he said, severely castigated progressivism, but not Dewey, who was one of its chief advocates. Rather, Dewey was treated with very great respect. The

\textsuperscript{44} Kandel. The Cult of Uncertainty, 102.

critic said the book was an attempt to persuade others to embrace traditional education, while everyone knew that Dewey was unequivocally opposed to traditionalism.

Kandel believed that the most successful child-centered schools were not operated by the Progressive educators. Rather they were those that were indebted to the skill of teachers who were expert at their subjects and who were kind and understanding to their students. These successful schools, by and large, taught students effectively without undue emphasis on their needs, interests, drives, and urges. These schools struck a balance between emphasis on the subject and interest in the child.

In discussing the American roots of Progressive philosophy of education, Kandel likened the emphasis on change and reconstruction to the tradition of rootlessness in America along with American optimism and hope for a better future. In one phase the philosophy highlighted scientific method, experimentation, and the uses of technology. In a later phase an emphasis was placed on the reconstruction of the social order with its emphasis on every person being in a position to enjoy the better things that life had to offer. The same chapter in which these thoughts appeared was written by Kandel in another major English work entitled, The


Everything that has ever been done in the past has been severely criticized by progressive education according to Kandel. This would include the existence of intellectual and moral values which have been intact throughout the history of civilization. Progressives blamed the traditional school for holding on to outdated traditions, schooling the most elite sectors of society historically, and handing down knowledge with sacred authority. The results were conformity leading to standardization. What was needed according to Kandel's interpretation of the Progressive philosophy was nothing short of a total reorganization of the school and even a complete revolution.

Progressive educators who began with the disorganized and random interests of the child were trying to look to the child as finding his own way out of this confusion and disarray. Traditional educators were insistent that the school was an institution whose purpose was to fulfill certain aims and objectives, and these should supply the basis for the scope and sequence of the material. Kandel said, "From progressive education they are willing to borrow certain principles of method but on the understanding that a methodology is not a substitute for a well-founded social philosophy of

---


Kandel believed that it was necessary to organize subject matter which the history of the human race had sorted out as the most valuable for its perpetuation. The teacher was the person needed to organize and present such material. The progressive position of having the teacher act as a bystander who was available to offer advice and guide the child when called upon was absurd. Direct instruction from a teacher to the student was needed. Anything short of this was degrading to the teacher's position, and only teachers and not new devices make up a school. As Kandel argued "There is far greater hope for social progress in the responsible freedom of a master teacher than in the undirected freedom of progressive education." 51

Kandel believed that children should be helped by the school to go from an immature to a mature state where they themselves recognized the components upon which their experience was built. These components were the subjects which humanity has continued from its experiences for both enjoyment and utility. 52 It was in the environment itself where the imprint of the past and the seeds of the future were to be brought forth. The curriculum therefore must incorporate the knowledge and information which would familiarize the pupil with his social, cultural, and intellectual heritage, and

50 Ibid., 86.
51 Ibid., 86-87.
introduce him to the world around him, as well as prepare him for the future.

Progressive education ignored these purposes of the school as an institution organized to promote these particular ends. Rather, it focused on the child and considered him to be the beginning point, the middle, and the end of the process of education. The Progressive philosophy attacked the school as promoting formal and artificial aggregates of content which did not spring from the backgrounds of children. In addition, the content was mistakenly defined in advance and the students did not grasp the essence of what it was that was to be learned. Also, the arrangement of time schedules into different subjects, rather than into activities or projects, led to a very rigid and narrow type of mind which could not apply what was to be learned to solve problems that arose.

Kandel suggested that the Progressives had overlooked the positive changes made in the curriculum by traditional minded educators. He saw these changes as being the discarding of subject matter that was purposeless and trivial, with a better focus on the emphasis of functional values. In most subjects there was a certain basic and formal content which had to be learned directly, not incidentally as the Progressives would have had it. The Progressives wanted to value knowledge gained from subjects only for immediate use to solve problems or meet new situations. But this emphasis, Kandel thought, did away with providing for continuity which ended with enduring knowledge.

53 Ibid., 96.
Kandel pointed to the ideas of Plato, Bacon, and the leaders of universal compulsory education as being part of humanity's heritage. Plato's idea that knowledge was virtue, or Bacon's thought that knowledge was power were ideas no longer thought to be important. The framers of universal education who spoke about opening a school and closing a jail also were no longer respected. The Progressives had therefore no faith in intellectual training.54

Kandel traced the history of progressive education and found that the emphasis on the individual and his own experience had always been a portent of great social change.55 From ancient Athens, into the seventeenth century when new possibilities opened up, in the period of Rousseau, and the French Revolution, it had its roots. It demonstrated the same lack of standards, the same antagonisms to what was construed to be authoritarianism, and the same glowing respect for the creative spirit. This translated into experimentation with no given in the past. This phenomenon was also found in modern literature, art, and music.

Kandel believed that the progressive philosophy was a protest against modern technology and the machine age.56 It attempted to prevent the individual from becoming a mass person. It encouraged change in civilization, discarded permanent values, and placed value only on the present to the exclusion of the past. Man must be self-


56 Ibid.
sufficient entirely and human nature needed to be altered. Nothing was certain. everything was in a state of flux and all human happenings must be experimental as befitted the scientific age.

The correct role of the school, Kandel suggested, was to be determined by society and it was society that made the decisions as to what changes should take place in the schools. The school and its teachers decided upon major societal and cultural transformations, they did not lead in making the changes as the Progressives would insist upon. Nor should the schools build a new social order as proposed by Dr. George Counts, a leading social reconstructionist whose progressive ideas, as presented in his famous book. Kandel rejected. The book, published in 1932 was entitled Dare the School Build a New Social Order?

Kandel thought, univocally, that not only could the school not build a new social order but that teachers as a group should not attempt to unilaterally lead the way toward social change. Kandel posited the argument that, "The school can only build the social order which society desires and derives its coloring from the social scene; it does not create or modify it but strengthens and gives reality to it." Kandel's perspective on the progression of Progressive education in the United States was that the twentieth century began with Dewey's idea that the cleavage between school and society

---


needed to narrow. That while the school is a small society it must
illumine the life and interests of the society of which it is a
part. Just as this idea began to be accepted in the domain of
educational theory, Kandel said some theorists realized that society
also changed and therefore the schools needed to prepare students
for a changing civilization. Finally, the schools were called upon
to build a new social order and teachers were asked to become
involved and lead the way. Teachers were asked to help build this
new social order which would take privileges away from the elites
and restore rights to the lower classes.

So, according to Kandel's conceptualization, from the beginning
of the twentieth century to the early 1930s, the emphasis had
shifted from the cult of the individual and his God given right to
make his own choices, demonstrate his own initiative, and make his
own standards as he moved along.59 This shifted after the first
twenty years of this century, (and it was the main educational
philosophy of education in the United States), to a new,
collectivist social order with its emphasis on the masses.

It appears that Kandel objected to the idea of the schools
building a "New" social order, one which would lead, rather than
mirror, society. He thought that schools, in fact, did build a
social order. By that he meant that the school could really do
nothing but build one. The reason for this was that the only
material which education had available to it was comprised of the
cultural and tangible environment of both school and life.

59 Kandel, "Mobilizing the Teacher," 474-475.
Education failed if it tried to break away from the past and build a "new" social order by dealing with maudlin approaches to the child's growth and by a surface display of activities and creative arts without a substantial background. Kandel said, "The school is the instrument for maintaining existing social orders and for helping to build new social orders when the public has decided on them; but it does not create them." 60 Kandel had no qualms about saying that "the school is the servant of society." 61

Kandel believed in a philosophy in which man desired stability more than change, security more than insecurity, and established societies instead of new social orders. 62 He criticized Progressives who wanted to mobilize teachers and organize the schools to build an new social order. This was disruptive of the entire fabric of society. He would limit the role of the school to transmit knowledge, foster intelligence, and develop critical abilities which would include discussions of controversial issues. He believed also that the Progressives needed to look at themselves with candor, realize the consequences of their own manifestos regarding the origins of social crises, and deal with removing the causes of social disorder instead of building a new social order. 63

Kandel was so opposed to progressive schooling that he was

60 Kandel, "Can the School Build a New Social Order?," 148.

61 Ibid.


63 I.L. Kandel, "Education and Social Disorder." Teachers College Record 34, no.5 (February 1933): 359-367.
ready to co-op it. In a bit of semantic word play, he said he believed that if one were to examine a Progressive child-centered school at close range a teacher-centered school would be revealed. Such a teacher would be inspired by a full array of her subjects and would make the students respond to a pattern already "fixed-in-advance" in her mind. He also blamed the Progressives for attacking intellectual education and emphasizing the emotions without their being aware of it. Progressives were actually promoting a retreat from reason.

Kandel wrote articles in allegorical form which ridiculed the Progressives. He also wrote more serious sounding articles gaining the attention of an audience that was willing to read what he said about Progressivism and Essentialism. His humor regarding Progressive education would appear to be much funnier than the following introduction to one of his articles, if it were not for the fact that most, if not all, of his writings were of a very serious nature. His "humorous introduction" read:

And Herbart begat apperception and apperception begat interests and interests begat ideas and ideas begat conduct. But a new lord arose and smote Herbart and cast him out with all his terminology and with effort and with discipline and created new interest in his own shape and likeness, an interest born of the individual needs and urges, and interest


66 I.L. Kandel. "The Fantasia of Current Education" American Scholar 10 (July 1941): 286-297. These articles (notes 65 and 66) serve as examples of his allegorical form in the former article, and the serious writing in the latter.
begat thinking and thinking begat study and out of study there was born socialized recitation: the socialized recitation and interest begat activity leading to further activity, and activity begat the project and the problem; and out of these twain there was begotten creative activity and out of creative activity came education for a new social order. And the latter end is worse than the first for it knows not whence it has come nor whither it is going.67

Finally, Kandel castigated the Progressive philosophy of education for promoting the study of controversial issues among students not mature enough to engage in such study. While promoting this, the Progressives placed their emphasis on the techniques of controversy instead of judgements or values. This, he felt, only brought cynicism and skepticism instead of beliefs in absolute values. The Progressives would assume that the focus on studying controversial issues whose solution has escaped even the world's experts was easier than the study of such traditional subjects as mathematics, languages, literature, and history.

Kandel, a proponent of democracy warned educators of the dangers of totalitarianism. He gave examples of the accusations levelled against democracies by those who accepted either left wing or right wing totalitarian systems. Some of these criticisms were, that democracy led to anarchy because of its excessive individualism, there was no common purpose or loyalty, and there was a lack of spiritual values. This lack of spiritual values led to a lack of unselfishness which under totalitarianism enabled the individual to sacrifice his interests to that of the group.68 In

67 Kandel. "Mobilizing the Teacher." 473.

addition there was said to be an absence of real leadership and of important ideals which should be a part of both public and private life.

In rebutting these charges Kandel pointed out that these arguments did not negate the basic "principles, upon which the idea of democracy is based: they center, rather upon certain misinterpretations or abuses of these principles." In a society with democratic representation there was no absolute liberty. Liberty existed which represented a fair compromise between society's interests and the interest of each person. In order to make democracy workable, individual rights must be balanced with a sense of duty and responsibility.

Kandel argued that the democratic ideal recognized the right of an entire nation of citizens to exercise their voices in choosing their form of government. In addition, they have the right to criticize and express their collective and individual will through those regular channels which were present in a constitutional government. The main tenets of both democracy and liberty were that they stood for strong beliefs in the value of human personality. With a particular broadmindedness and willingness to see the other person's point of view in a democracy, went the fundamental guarantees of the democratic nation "freedom of thought, freedom of belief and expression, and freedom of voluntary organizations."  

69 Ibid., 4.

Kandel was of the opinion that nothing was more important to American society than that the schools vigorously promoted the meaning of democracy. Without this active role of the schools, the potentialities of individual students would have no frame of reference. Kandel cited Washington, Adams, and Jefferson on the relationship of education to democracy, the essence of which was to protect democracy through education.71

Writing in 1937, that in spite of fascism and communism, and in spite of the fact that some educators did not realize it, "democracy is on the march."72 Combining democratic ideology with religious doctrine, Kandel said in a speech to students at Columbia University in 1940. "Totalitarian ideologies claim they have given their followers something to die for; our task is to discover something to live for and that, for men of culture, is to make the will of God prevail."73 This speech was found among Kandel's personal papers in the archives at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace.

Writing in The Making of Nazis74, when totalitarianism of the right and of the left was presenting itself as a danger to the free

71 Ibid.


world, Kandel wrote that democracy was being challenged by Communism, fascism, and Nazism. The challenge was whether democracy could succeed in balancing individualism with social allegiance and the ideal of people working to benefit society. Kandel discussed in the book, the rise of Nazism, National Socialism and Education, Educational Theory, Adapting Education To The New Social Order and The Challenge of Totalitarianism. But he knew about German totalitarianism long before he wrote the book. 75

He traced the ideals of democracy back in time in the English - speaking world and showed that there was the predisposition on the part of citizens of democracies to take the ideals for granted. So much was this taken for granted that it was not even realized that it should be the everyday job of the school to promote democratic ideals in order to preserve them. "Democracy and liberalism are not merely forms of government but ways of life which have to be learned anew by each generation." 76

While democracies emphasized freedom, for Kandel, there needed to be certain restrictions on freedom if the child was to develop. Training the child to think and to reflect, make choices that require initiative and resourcesfulness, must come from the school

75 Many years before writing this important book, Kandel wrote a lengthy article in the New York Times. The article showed one of the paths leading to totalitarianism. Kandel wrote about the physical training in the German schools from early grades to the University. This curriculum was devoid of sport, had only military service in view, and he wrote about its damaging effect. Isaac Kandel, "German Schoolboy Ignorant of Sport" New York Times (2 June 1918), sec. 4, 5.

76 Ibid., 136.
which selected valuable and important experiences for the student. This implied a plan and the concept of giving the student direction. As the plan and the direction became available, certain intellectual curbs on freedom became apparent. So what we had with schools in democratic societies was education for freedom. The process was from external discipline imposed on the student by the school and the teacher to self-discipline. This self discipline had to be based on the understanding of the behavior and the acceptance of the behavior that was expected in a social group.

The ideas of true education and the preservation of democracy were fulfilled by promoting education for freedom, in tandem with putting education in contact with life. This would enable the student to adapt to his changing environment with flexibility. Kandel developed his own democratic creed which consisted of sixty principles upon which a democracy should be based. Each of the sixty principles is included in Appendix XVII.

Templeton summed up Kandel's work as a philosopher by saying:

> Philosophers like Kandel often assume the difficult responsibility of relating the best in the present to the past in terms of the future, of tempering the excitement of the fast pace with the spirit of caution and studied consideration. They define strengths and weaknesses. They steer a course somewhere between the extremes of the ultra-conservative and the destructive radical in thought and action, and often as not they are labeled reactionaries. But these thinkers are always necessary if the progress of civilization is to be insured, if it is at all be holden to the transmitters and synthesizers in the realm of ideas.78


78 Templeton, 338.
To sum up this chapter on Kandel's educational philosophy, it is clear that he was an Essentialist, who was teacher-centered, concerned with subject matter, and the development of responsible citizens. He was a critic of other philosophies, especially Progressivism and Social Reconstructionism. Finally, his philosophy of Essentialism will be examined again in the treatment of comparative education, in the next four chapters.
CHAPTER IV

KANDEL ON COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION:

BASIC ELEMENTS OF HIS THEORY AND METHODS

This chapter focuses on Isaac L. Kandel's theories of comparative education, his theories on international education, his methods of comparative education and his methods of international education. In order to understand Kandel's major theories and methods in comparative education, it is important to consider how others have influenced him. Chief among those, without doubt, was his teacher and mentor from the University of Manchester in England, Sir Michael Sadler.

Sadler showed an active interest in education from his early undergraduate days. He was responsible for the rapid expansion of extension lecture courses at Oxford University from 1885 to 1895. By 1893 Oxford was providing lectures for almost 400 courses given in various areas in England. Much of the value of this extension work was diminished because students were leaving school at early ages. Therefore he became interested in secondary education. He then became a world renowned expert on secondary schooling.

In 1895 Sadler became director of the office of special inquiries and reports for the British Government's Department of Education. From 1895-1903 the office became a famous research
bureau. Under Sadler's leadership eleven original monumental volumes containing carefully sorted out articles were published. The best known articles were written by Sadler who was a specialist on German education. These volumes set an extraordinary standard and may have been among the originators of the entire study of comparative education.

More than anyone else in the field Sadler helped Kandel set his basic position or framework for the study of comparative education. Throughout Kandel's very long and extremely productive career he repeated some of the voluble language of Sadler, in part if not in full measure. So often did Kandel do this that one can readily see how strong Sadler's influence was on him throughout his career.

Kandel presented what may be the most popular of Sadler's ideas on comparative education. Kandel quoted him even in his major book written toward the end of his career: A New Era in Education. These famous and wise quotes were from a book by Sadler, published in 1900, entitled How Far Can We Learn Anything of Value from the Study of Foreign Systems of Education? The eloquent quotes are follows:

In studying foreign systems of education we should not forget that the things outside the schools matter even more than the things inside the schools. and govern and interpret the things inside. We cannot wander at pleasure among the educational systems of the world, like a child strolling through a garden, and pick off a flower from one bush and some leaves from another, and then expect if we stick what we have gathered into the soil at home. we shall have a living plant. A national system of education is a living thing, the outcome of foreign struggles, and difficulties 'of long ago'. It has in it some of the secret workings of national life. It reflects, while seeking to remedy, the failings of national character. By instinct it often lays special emphasis on those parts of training which the
national character particularly needs. Not less by instinct and tradition of our own national education. more sensitive to its unwritten ideals, quicker to catch the signs which mark its growing or fading influence, readier to mark the dangers which threaten it and the subtler workings of hurtful change? The practical value of studying in a right spirit with scholarly accuracy the workings of foreign systems of education is that it will result in our being better fitted to study and understand our own.¹

Kandel, impressed with Sadler's ideas quoted above, based much of his theory on them: especially the part about "the things outside the school matter even more than the things inside the schools."

This statement was used in many of Kandel's writings on comparative education throughout the decades.

The other famous quote of Sadler's used by Kandel, although much briefer, was no less popular than the very long quote. Sadler pointed out in the same book, that the student of comparative education must, "try to find out what is the intangible, impalpable spiritual force which in the case of any successful system of education, is in reality upholding the school system and accounting for its present efficiency."² Again, this quote was used by Kandel and repeated throughout his illustrious career serving as a springboard for much of his theory.

Bereday, corroborated the repeated uses by Kandel of Sadler's work. He wrote: "As one authority put it, he stuck his nose behind the educational systems to look at the essential though much


² Ibid., 9.
overquoted Sadlerian intangible, impalpable spiritual forces."³

Armed with Sadler's inspiring and insightful words Kandel was to become known also for his own original ideas in developing his theory and method of comparative and international education. Perhaps Kandel's theories and methods of comparative education for which he was known best were to be found in his landmark book Comparative Education which will be analyzed in Chapter VI of this dissertation.

He believed that the main value of the comparative approach to the problems of education worldwide was in helping to determine the causes which generated these problems in the first place; in comparing their differences; and lastly in trying to determine what solutions to the problem are attempted by what nations and why. In qualifying this, Kandel explained, again in Sadlerian terms: "In other words, the comparative approach demands first an appreciation of the intangible, impalpable spiritual and cultural forces which underlie an educational system; the factors and forces outside the school matter even more than what goes on inside."⁴

The comparative education field must be based on analyzing the social and political values reflected by the school, because the school represents these ideals and transmits them in order to progress. It is not possible to understand, value, and evaluate the


essence of a nation's educational system without knowing its history and traditions. In some measure. It is also vital to know and understand the forces and attitudes which control its social organization, and the political and economic conditions that give rise to its growth.

All of the myriad of devices, practices, methods, and organization which comprise a system of education cannot be moved from one ambience to another. Kandel supported his theory of the negative effects of wholesale educational borrowing by pointing to the failures of bringing the English system to India, the American system to the Philippines and Puerto Rico, and of foreign systems to China. Other examples of these failures according to Kandel occurred in Persia, Egypt, and many South American countries.

He believed that certain practices could be adapted from one country to another but he did not see anything but failure in one nation trying to assimilate the practices of another nation, without thoughtful adaptation. While he believed in a theoretical base for education he strongly believed that comparative education should also be based on the prevailing practices.

One of the essential components of his theoretical base was.

5 In a rather poignant example of the recognition of past failures in importing foreign educational systems to China, Kandel told about one of his Chinese students. "A former Chinese student of mine had written a very satisfactory dissertation on education in England, France, Germany, and the United States. When he came to say good-bye to me, I asked him which of the four systems he would recommend as a model for his own country. "None", he answered; "I hope we will have a Chinese system".

that by critically studying foreign systems of education one's own philosophy would be challenged, enabling the comparativist to develop a much clearer and more sound understanding of the background and foundation underlying the educational system of his own nation. The journey, both literally and figuratively into the realm of another nation's educational system enables the comparative educator to build new attitudes and new viewpoints which may be obtained from understanding the reasons for constructing systems of education and the methods of operating them.

Kandel gave a complex but pertinent example of how one could develop a greater appreciation and understanding of one's own system by looking at other nations' systems. The example was to examine the relationship between democracy and education. Comparing democracy in England, France, and post-World War I Germany, and the challenge to democracy in Italy and the Soviet Union, cannot but help bring a clearer picture of the American meaning of democracy and what it meant for education. Kandel commenting on this said:

The different shades of meaning that attach to this ideal have their resultant effects on educational organization and practices and lead to different interpretations, not only of the concept of equality of opportunity toward which democratic countries are moving, but even of standards of culture and of methods of instruction.6

Kandel viewed comparative education as a branch of politics as the term was used thousands of years before by Plato and Aristotle. He interpreted comparative education not in terms of procedures used in school classrooms but as part of the dynamics of the study of

6 Ibid., XX.
humanity, organized onto different nations, in order to preserve itself and make progress. He also believed in the positive aspects of nationalism. He meant by this that all nations are important and they have contributed to the world's progress and the advancement of civilization.

Comparative education could contribute to the development of internationalism which sprang from a realization of the importance of nations other than one's own. The focus for this is the educational system of each nation which contributed to the world's advancement. Each nation's schools passed on to the young those values and ambitions which are advocated by the nation itself.

So convinced was Kandel of the crucial role of the Sadlerian "intangible, impalpable forces." in the study of comparative education, that he wrote:

A study of foreign school systems which neglects the search for the hidden meaning of things found in the schools would merely result in the acquisition of information about another educational system and would be of little value as a contribution to the clarification of thought, to the better development of education as a science, and to the formulation of a comprehensive, all-embracing philosophy of education thoroughly rooted in the culture, ideals, and aspirations which each nation should seek to add to the store of human welfare.7

Adding to ideas about the intangible forces, Kandel often spoke of the scent, the shape, and the color of a people which made them and their nation unique. So the forces, both material and spiritual, made up an ethos of a people leading to the things men live by and live for. The things that men live by are their

7 Ibid., XXVI.
political and economic organizations and the institutions which make workable the continuing process of a community's social life. The things men live for are their spiritual and cultural life, their own language and literature, their ongoing traditions and heritage, and their set of beliefs and their special loyalties.

Kandel believed in two types of nationalism. the one whose educational system would contribute to world progress. while the other would have the opposite effect. Aggressive nationalism was the militant, destructive type. The other emphasized intellectual growth, spiritual growth, and participation in the brotherhood of nations: stressing peace and collaboration versus war and isolation.

Kandel favored the acquiring of a philosophical attitude to gain a better understanding of comparative educational problems. This philosophical attitude served two major purposes: the first enabled the educator to better enter the totality of his own nation's educational system, through the study of his own. the other was the viewpoint that this totality should offset the specialization and partial answers provided by the scientific study of education alone.

Comparative education is interested in discovering how one nation differs from another in establishing and operating its school system or systems. It seeks to identify the factors which explain these differences. The same interest and type of question apply to nations' similarities in relation to their educational systems. So, form is of greater importance according to Kandel, than studying the different internal aspects of an educational system. This, however.
appears to be inconsistent with what Kandel actually did. It appears that he gave at least equal, if not more, weight to those internal details of a nation's educational system than to the external forces he said were of greater importance.

This study of form helps to understand the goals of the political, social, economic, and cultural policies that a nation through its educational system formulates for its citizens. Thus, viewing the changes in German education made it possible to understand the Nazi mindset for war. The changes in Soviet attitudes toward its former allies were evident from the study of its postwar history textbooks.

Discussing comparative education's emphasis on form, Kandel wrote:

It sets out to find explanations of a particular "form" in the culture pattern and transition that have shaped the outlook and way of life of a people, in the political theories and ideals that define its political ends, in the relation of the individual to the state and its social and cultural institutions, and in the nature of the state itself. It is this kind of approach that serves as a challenge to examine the roots of the educational system of one's own nation.8

Comparison brought a clear perspective to those educational convergencies and divergencies that existed between systems. If one did his work well in the field he would develop a certain sensitivity to problems nations have in common and the myriad of ways in which the problem can be approached and solved under existing national conditions.

As late as 1955 Kandel felt that no educational system in the

world was, as yet, balanced. Since they all were in a state of becoming, their forms, goals, and directionality comprised the raw material for the study of comparative education. He was of the opinion that comparative education as both a study of education and as an organized subject of study began as a result of the unrest in education in all of the countries of the world following World War I. So he would date it from the year 1919, recognizing that in various forms, other than organizational, comparative education had been around for many years prior to the date he more or less selected for its beginning.

Writing in 1939, Kandel saw a bright future for the field. He quoted from Lester M. Wilson, Professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University who said:

There is no reason why Comparative Education should not prove as interesting and fruitful a study as Comparative Politics. The time will come when men realize that the structure of a nation's educational system is as characteristic and almost as important as the form of its constitution. And when it does, we shall have our educational Montesqueuies analysing educational institutions and our Bryces classifying them.9

Kandel depicted comparative education as a difficult field which required a high degree of scholarship. The field was so sophisticated and delved so broadly and deeply into the marrow of a nation's existence that not too many researchers had the required abilities. The abilities encompassed a comprehensive understanding of education in its entirety. Along with this demanding job went

the digging into the social, political, and cultural backgrounds from which education gathered its meaning. Added to this must be a knowledge of those foreign languages which would enable the researcher to unlock the facts and ideas of these intellectual backgrounds.

In order to dig deeply into the above backgrounds, it was important for the researcher to have a respectable knowledge of political theory and practice, anthropology or the patterns of culture, economics, public opinion, and sociology. And important as it was to know educational theory and practice, it is even more relevant to know the more academic studies. It appeared that Kandel believed that only renaissance type of scholars could capably contribute to comparative education as a field of study. One might ask whether or not he took this job description exclusively from his own perceptions of his own outstanding abilities in the field.

Kandel was certain that if a researcher studied education in isolation, without working hard in the social, political, and cultural areas, his work would have no meaning; even if this study was centered upon one's own country. Interestingly, he drew fine distinctions as to what comparative education was and what it was not. He strongly argued that descriptive accounts of individual systems of education (country studies) or foreign systems described one after another in textbooks (area studies in some cases or global studies in others) by different experts in the field, was not in fact comparative education. He used the German word "Auslandspadagogic" for this type of writing. True comparative
education or "Vergleichende Padagogic" was totally different. In this case, one writer wrote about different educational systems of several countries from one particular point of view, the result of which was a genuine comparison.

While some experts in comparative education studies would agree with his definition, others would say that descriptive accounts are really part of comparative education because they are drawn upon for important and relevant information and contributions to the field. Ironically, Kandel himself wrote many descriptive accounts of educational systems of individual countries and it appears that many experts would classify these studies as being an integral part of comparative education. Understandably, if a descriptive account of a nation's educational system offered the reader little in terms of his or her own ability to make comparisons with other nations then Kandel's point has some validity. But often this is not the case. His own descriptive accounts of individual nations presented the reader with information which inferentially one could use to make one's own comparison of one's own choosing.

Kandel's knowledge of political science and comparative politics enabled him to discover that many of the real differences between national systems of education could be explained on the basis that the political nature of the various nations originated differently. Specifically, in terms of education in its varying components, he said:

Centralized or local administration and their relations, types of control and inspection, prescription of curricula and methods or freedom, the preparation of teachers, standards and examinations and the participation of the
public can be found most generally, but not always in the political aims of the state. The reservation "not always" is added because there are democracies with systems which are highly centralized because of the demographic conditions.10

As examined in chapter III of this dissertation, Kandel was a philosopher of education. However, it is difficult to apply his philosophy of education to his comparative educational work. It appears that he even believed that philosophies of education had no major role to play in comparative education. Judging from the title of one of his yearbooks, one could come to the conclusion that Kandel really believed in the importance of philosophy in comparative education. The yearbook was published by the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University. In 1929, he not only did the usual editing for the yearbook, but he wrote the entire yearbook himself. It was entitled, The Philosophy Underlying National Systems of Education.

It soon became clear that Kandel did not always mean philosophy even though he used the word. In the introduction he said, "For the student of education it is essential to understand the philosophy. if it can be called that. or the general background underlying education before he proceeds to the study of education itself."11

In looking at the yearbook itself, in its entirety, it is apparent that Kandel was not applying any philosophy of education to this


work, except for the use of the word philosophy in the title of the book.

"Philosophies," he wrote "are not the dominant influences in shaping educational systems: as much is taken from them as is compatible with the main aim, which is general and political." Kandel believed that there was a danger of confusing a philosophy of education with the real practice of education. He gave an example of a German educator who, steeped in the knowledge of American philosophies of education, visited schools in the United States. The educational practices she observed were not at all related to the influences of any educational philosophy.

Kandel said that a comparative study of philosophies of education would be important but it should not be mistaken for comparative education of which it is only a part. While it is difficult to spell out exactly what the part philosophy played, there is no doubt that Kandel borrowed the philosophical positions of Sadler and others to formulate his theories of comparative education. He borrowed from poets, educators, sociologists, historians, statesmen, philosophers, and literary figures. A few additional examples of such borrowing will be added to the earlier quotes from Sir Michael Sadler which started out this chapter. These will merely be a small representation of some of the work of others that influenced Kandel.

One of these persons was the sociologist Emile Durkheim who said, "Each type of people has its own education which is

12 I.L. Kandel. "Problems of Comparative Education."
appropriate to it and which can help to define it in the same way as its moral, political and religious organization. It is one of the aspects of its physiognomy.”

Kandel explained that Durkheim interpreted education as being determined more by a society's culture than by psychology even though psychology could contribute much to the improvement of instruction. Kandel said Durkheim did not deny that there were common elements in education which connected all of humanity.

Kandel quoted the German historian Wilhem Dilthey who said, "A comparative consideration of educational systems should be undertaken and it will show that precisely here the individual forces are bound together through the progressive development of humanity.” Kandel believed that this statement was basic for understanding comparative education.

The last example is from the writings of poet Robert Bridges. Kandel selected this poem to end his most important work, *Comparative Education.*

Truth is as Beauty unconfined:
Various as Nature is Man's Mind:
Each race and tribe is as a flower
Set in God's garden with its dower
Of special instinct; and man's grace
Compact of all must all embrace.
China and Ind, Hellas or France.
Each hath its own inheritance:
And each to Truth's rich market brings
Its bright divine imaginings.
In rival tribute to surprise

13 Ibid.. 3.
14 Ibid.. 2.
15 Kandel. *Comparative Education.* 869.
The world with native merchandise.

Kandel drew inspiration from many others, John Stuart Mill, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Ralph Waldo Emerson among them.

Kandel was especially sensitive to the educational problems of developing countries. Lacking modern, sophisticated nomenclature, he referred to them early in his career as "backward nations" and later in his working life as "underdeveloped nations." However, there was no lack of sophistication in his ideas on the role that comparative education could play in the promotion of national systems of education and of nonformal approaches to education in these developing nations. He did not use such modern terms as nonformal education, or lifelong learning, but his ideas on these topics could be compared favorably with the best thinking available today to the contemporary comparativist or development expert.

Kandel was against the use of Western or European models of education in the developing nations. He saw that they were failures which at best considered only an elite group inside of the country, as the group to educate. He realized that elites were important for leadership roles in many of these newly formed countries, but he thought the masses of people needed an effective education too. They were also in need of modern health care services and practices, vocational training and guidance, and community cohesion, all of which would be necessary to raise the standard of living in the nation and to improve its infrastructure. He believed that these vital and relevant needs of the nation should be worked out nonformally even before formal educational methods should be
applied.

He realized that most of these developing nations were poor, agricultural nations in need of basic services and development. His knowledge of comparative education and its theories helped him realize that each nation was unique and needed to take advantage of its own strengths in order to build an effective educational system. The developing nations had problems which needed solving throughout the formal system: the primary, secondary, and higher levels. Since there were traditional historical precedents to draw from in the history of education, Kandel suggested drawing from past and even the present experiences of other nations: experiences that might work with appropriate modifications.

To sum up some of Kandel's most important theoretical constructs in comparative education, it may be said that he advocated: analyzing the causes which have given rise to the problems of each nation's educational system, comparing the differences between them and the reasons for such differences, and a study of the solutions tried by each nation. He looked at the deeper forces of what the school reflected through the lenses of sociology and political science, and his scrutiny of forces outside the school, within each nation, that helped to shape schooling and the school systems were all important aspects of his theory.

He tried to write comparative education without concentrating on a parallel history of the education of different nations, although he certainly did that too. He also encouraged those responsible for innovation in a nation's educational system to adapt
rather than assimilate another nation's practices, methods, and organization. Since Kandel was concerned with adaptation, the study of an educational system merely to learn the facts about it was useless. He concerned himself with the problems and the solutions, and the causes for differences between educational systems. A finely honed comparative education should provide the opportunities for a richer experience bringing about more exacting and valid judgements. The study of comparative education should prepare one to develop a critical approach leading to a clearer and more thoughtful approach to the analysis of one's own national educational system.

Kandel viewed education within a national context and attributed national characteristics to different nations. He believed that education must exist for some vital purposes and he thought that systems of education are greatly influenced by national ends. He thought of comparative education as being a process: a process which called for the continual application of the history of education into the present.

Kandel's theory of international education differed from his theory of comparative education. The goal of international education was not to compare but to promote a commonality among all peoples of the world. The most important aspects of this commonality were goodwill, friendship, brotherhood, and peace.

What type of thinking contributed to an internationalism in mankind? Kandel thought that Nicholas Murray Butler was correct in his concept of an International Mind. Butler said: [in a statement
found among Kandel's private papers]

The international mind is nothing other than the habit of thinking of foreign relations and business, and that habit of dealing with them, which regards the several nations of the civilized world as friendly and cooperating equals in aiding the progress of civilization, in developing commerce and industry, and in spreading enlightenment and culture throughout the world.  

International education contributed greatly to international cooperation which was built upon international understanding.

Just as Kandel was influenced by Sir Michael Sadler for the development of his theories of comparative education, so was he also influenced for his theories on international education by John Amos Comenius. Kandel called Comenius as others did too, "The Teacher of Nations." He described how three hundred years ago Comenius went to England to explain to Parliament what his plans for a Pansophic College were. According to Kandel, this Pansophic College called for a way to peace through the universal rededication to minds. This was part of his pansophic system which was a way of striving for personal virtue and worldwide peace. Along with this came an understanding of truth which would lead to knowing, doing, and looking for ways to do good towards one's fellow man.

Kandel compared the twentieth century to the seventeenth—the century in which Comenius sought harmony and peace among all nations. Today's international problems are similar to those three hundred years ago in that there is and was great global unrest. Describing Comenius as a visionary, ahead of his time, he provided

---

this quote from him:

There is needed in this century, an immediate remedy for the frenzy which has seized many men and is driving them in their madness to their mutual destruction. For we witness throughout the world disastrous and destructive flames and discords devastating kingdoms and peoples with such persistence that all men seem to have conspired for their mutual ruin which will end only with the destruction of themselves and the universe. Nothing is therefore more necessary for the stability of the world, if it is not to perish completely, then some universal rededication of minds. Universal harmony and peace must be secured for the whole human race. By peace and harmony however, I mean not that external peace between rulers and peoples among themselves, but an internal peace of mind inspired by a system of ideas and feelings. If this could be attained, the human race has a position of great promise. 

The greatest barrier to internationalism had been the traditional type of nationalism. This type of nationalism promoted only a narrow patriotism and an ineffective system of education from the point of view that there was little concern with international education. Negative teachings too often focused on a nation's military victories, territorial expansion, imperialism, or manifest destiny. The end result of these teachings had been the development of national superiority instead of a national viewpoint of being just one nation in a world of cooperating nations.

Thus, the promotion of international understanding and cooperation required a unique approach to the teaching of international education. This approach would concentrate on peace and the peaceful practices of countless men and women from all over the world. This would replace the more common teachings about war and its glories. The betterment of mankind would be emphasized in

---

this approach.

Kandel quoted from a historian's meaning of a nation. He said, "What constitutes a nation is not speaking the same tongue or belonging to the same ethnic group, but having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future."18 But he quickly pointed out that greatness does not refer to a nation's military heroes or leaders who prepared for war. Too often this was highlighted in the history textbooks of nations' schools. Kandel believed that the heroes of peace should be studied in the schools of the world. These were the men and women of thought and ideals. Examples of these were the unnamed statesmen, writers, religious leaders, teachers, inventors, composers, mathematicians, scientists, and all who had made contributions to human welfare. He only named some of the important mathematicians. This will be discussed later in this chapter.

The basis for international education must emanate from the teachings of each individual nation. Kandel did not advocate the same type of school system for every nation. But he believed that all educational systems could be uplifted by a common bond which had as its goal the promotion of international education. This education would look to the building of a new world order of peace, international understanding, and cooperation.

The educational mistakes of the past were quite glaring. Between World Wars I and II, education for internationalism failed because it was superimposed upon the traditional aims of an

18 Ibid., 154.
education for nationalism. Internationalism was not a mere addition to nationalism: both consisted of one continuous process. The League of Nations failed to achieve a successful approach to international education. In fact, no reference to education was even included in the League Covenant. Kandel was encouraged by the importance given to education when the United Nations was created on October 24, 1945, and when UNESCO was established on November 4, 1946.

Using his knowledge of political science, Kandel saw a way of making international education more effective through the United Nations. He would have the world organization redefine international law as an instrument to resolve conflicts between nations. Only through global statutory law, administered by an international agency, could international anarchy be overcome.

Unless there were modifications in national sovereignty, it would become increasingly difficult to develop through education an appreciation of the commonality of humanity. Realistically, Kandel saw that certain things could be done to promote international education even without a world government or a supergovernment. He believed, therefore, that the most important lesson to teach students in schools was that internationalism had to begin at home. One of the crucial lessons for pupils everywhere was overcoming xenophobic attitudes. It became the responsibility of education to encourage an understanding and appreciation of individuals whether they were fellow nationals or not.

International education was finally on the right path with the
creation of UNESCO. In the preamble to UNESCO's constitution, Kandel saw a ray of hope. Combining some phrases from it with his own words, he said:

that the "unanimous, lasting and sincere support of peace" must be secured and that peace must be founded, "upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind." developed through education to support the political and economic arrangements of governments. 19

Education for global awareness must begin with the student and his environment. But the environment was not a static entity: rather, it was something that developed and expanded in scope and meaning as the child developed intellectually. Education must be expansive in order to break away from the age old idea of treating the world as groups of distinct entities.

International education was required to focus on training all future citizens because violations of peace affected every person in each nation. From the international point of view, the broader dissemination of education and the increasing extension of educational opportunities became more crucial. To become a citizen of the world one has to develop a sense of responsibility for humanity everywhere. Every nation needed to prepare its children for the responsibilities of freedom and should develop its system of education according to its own conditions of its own environment and culture.

International education must be made an integral feature of national education in order to achieve the goals of international understanding. An analysis of Kandel's idea to teach international

19 Ibid., 160.
education through the regular school curriculum in the schools of every nation is discussed in the conclusion of this dissertation.

In this section of chapter IV, the focus is on Kandel's methodology of comparative education. He thought that comparative education methods were similar to those in other fields of research, such as in history and philosophy of education. However, he noted that to be a successful researcher in comparative education it is necessary to have research competencies in these other allied fields.

Kandel provided some of the reasons for his assumption that it was difficult to apply a methodology to the field. For one thing, the topics studied were often too broad. In addition, comparative education went so deeply into the formation of the existence of a nation that he thought few researchers could adequately follow the methodology required to understand the field.

Writing in the 1930's, Kandel frowned upon the use of statistics in comparative education. He even said they were worthless because of the differences in national terminology and because the methods of gathering data were quite different from country to country. The statistics of the costs of educational expenditures meant little to him because of the great cleavage in the buying power of different nation's currencies at that time.

At the time Kandel wrote his monumental work, *Comparative Education*, published in 1933, he did not think that it was feasible to set up standards which could attempt to measure the quality of national systems of education. He thought that it was feasible to
measure only basics in different countries by using the same system of tests, but he was unsure about quality measures of a system, in its best sense. He believed that it was doubtful whether the essence of quality could ever be measured.

Methodologically speaking, he thought that it was possible to compare problems and practices and offer solutions helpful to each country, taking educational notice of its unique culture. The comparative method in Comparative Education examined elementary and secondary education as well as general education in the light of the political, social, and cultural forces which shape the national system of each country. Kandel compared educational theory and practice in England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and the United States. He had the foresight to project that someday the scientific tools of statistics would add considerably to a competent methodology of comparative education. The literary knowledge of at least two foreign languages were significant tools for Kandel in his methodology of comparative education.

Kandel thought that many nations had almost the same educational problems, even if their solutions to these problems differed. He offered a long list of problems that could be carefully analyzed. The following is but a sample: What was the meaning of nationalism, freedom, and culture in a society? What was the scope of preschool, primary, post-elementary, or secondary school? What was the relationship between education and nationalism, and the individual to society? Who controlled the child's education? What was the status of teachers and how were they
prepared professionally? What should be the curriculum offered in each school? These were some of the questions Kandel asked in exploring the problems arising from such relevant questions.

In his methodology, Kandel discussed repeatedly the forces which underlie national systems of education. He also examined the nature of these forces that determined the success or failure of a system. However, he was aware that the examination of these forces could be overdone. What he meant by this in relation to the question of methodology was that, "It is an over-sophistication of a discipline to subject it to such an analysis that the parts never really fit together again." 20

If all the forces listed by those who would want to improve the methodology of comparative education were listed, comparative education as a field of study would no longer be viable. Kandel understood that these proponents of the subtler forms of social analysis were influenced by methods of cultural anthropology. But, he said that the work of the cultural anthropologist leads to an analysis of an entire society and not one of its institutions--the school.

Kandel was reacting to those comparative methodologists who failed to realize that important differences existed between those influences that effect formal education and the overwhelming variety of forces in the society that contribute to the informal education of the person. The anthropological influence, if overdone, could

result in a mass of information and forces that influence the nature and form of a system of education without giving a complete picture of the system. Kandel believed that his emphasis on examining phenomena external to the school to determine the nature of schooling was carried to extremes by some misguided researchers. In his own methodology, he did not clearly identify the forces external to the school which were vital. He attributed the confusion to cultural anthropologists and those they influenced. His attack on those who investigated subtle forms of social analysis was quite surprising in the light of his quest to examine those "intangible, impalpable forces."

Kandel insisted that students of comparative education needed to search for information into a system as well as to have information about a system. Perhaps one of his most important statements on the purpose of comparative education and its methodology appeared toward the end of his career. In a very lengthy statement he described this along with what he meant by learning about and searching into an educational system. He wrote:

The Methodology of comparative education is determined by the purpose that the study is to fulfill. If the aim is to learn something about an educational system, a description without explanation would be sufficient...From the point of view of comparative education such an account is limited, but is an essential first step in the process of study...If the discipline is worth pursuing, it is essential that the student search into the educational system or systems he is studying. His task is to learn what forces determine the character of a system, what accounts for differences or similarities between two or more systems, how one system proceeds to solve problems that it has in common with other systems, and so on. He will not find answers to these and many other questions from information about the fabric of the system, that he studies. Nor will he garner what should be the finest product of comparative study - ability to analyze
his own system of education and add something to the philosophy underlying it.\textsuperscript{21}

The study of comparative education is interdisciplinary and may frequently place greater emphasis on the ancillary studies than on education itself. Regarding its methodology it "may be considered a continuation of the history of education into the present."\textsuperscript{22}

Other methodological tools were a knowledge of political theories and a knowledge of the concept of the nation. Additionally, it was important methodologically to travel to a country and study its educational system first hand so that the comparative educator has insight into, rather than about, a foreign educational system. The study of comparative education led to a more effective awareness of the relations between nationalism and education but it linked up with the problems involved in the promotion of a program of international understanding by each nation's schools.

In 1961, at the age of eighty, Kandel continued to contribute to the growth of a methodology of comparative education. He saw the trend toward a scientific approach to research in the field and he frowned upon it. Apparently he thought that the research tools that best contributed to a methodology were economics, history, political theory, and national cultures. Some researchers such as Bereday thought Kandel was a proponent of a social science approach. But, evidence illustrated that Kandel was not totally committed to the role of sociology and anthropology in a methodology of comparative

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 271-272.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 273.
Kandel's methodology of comparative education has been described and classified by many other experts in the field. Kazamias and Massialas refer to Kandel's methodology as "historical functionalism." The basic ideas of this methodology were that education did not exist in a class by itself; it was inextricably connected with other social and political institutions; and it could best be investigated by looking at it in its social context.

Sodhi saw Kandel's methodology as being divided into steps. The first step was information about a nation's school system; an easy descriptive report. The report was divided into common sense categories such as elementary, secondary, and teacher education, and then a report followed these categories. The next step was historical-functional. Here the comparativist examines the historical, political, intellectual, social, and economic causes that are the bases for the problems in the particular educational system, since education alone cannot provide the needed information. The last step was called melioristic since Kandel was concerned with improving educational systems throughout the world. In addition, the methods applied to the study of other nations' educational systems should lead the comparativist toward internationalism and a


better understanding of his own country's educational system.

Noah and Eckstein credited Kandel with being the Father of comparative education. However they were also critical of his methodology: "What appeared in Kandel's work as persuasive conclusions are in fact important hypotheses remaining open for testing."26 Since all of Kandel's work, they said was aimed at explanation and his conclusions were supported by detailed knowledge, his work cannot be taken, in the absence of verification, as gospel:

The forces and factors (nationalism, political ideology, historical antecedents and so on) that Kandel identified as explanatory variables were obviously significant in toto. But his approach provided no way of judging their importance relative to each other. Nor was there apparent any criterion for the inclusion of some factors in the analysis and the exclusion of others, except on the basis of "self-evident truth."27

According to Noah and Eckstein, Kandel said that powerful social and other forces impacted upon nations' educational systems creating problems, since cultures responded differently in terms of their own characteristic and antecedents. For Kandel, the real value of comparative education was in comprehending this dynamic process. His methodology which stressed the collection of accurate data, emphasized the cultural-historical context in which the development of an educational system occurred and the importance of explanation. Noah and Eckstein thought that Kandel succeeded with the first two aspects of method, but not with explanation, in the


27 Ibid.
absence of scientific proof.

Trethewey viewed Kandel's methodology as having four stages: the first one was "description." In this stage the solutions to one or more of the problems experienced by all countries were described in both theoretical and practical terms. Stage two, he called, "explanation or interpretation." Here a study took place of the history and traditions of the forces and attitudes, and of the various conditions which have shaped the development of school systems. In this second stage the comparativist primarily used historical methods to explain why it was that specific ways of doing things in education had developed in any of the chosen countries' educational systems.

For Trethewey, Kandel's stage three is a "comparative analysis" which involved comparing the important differences between national educational systems and discovering the underlying reasons for these differences. Stage four was to "disengage certain principles or tendencies." building up an educational philosophy by observing practices actually taking place instead of basing the philosophy on metaphysics or ethics.

Trethewey criticized Kandel's methodology for lacking documentation. This made it impossible for a reader to either check his sources or examine his evidence independently. The strength of his case rested on his own reputation and personal authority rather than on objective studies that could be replicated by other

comparativists for verification. Therefore, Kandel's conclusions were always subject to argument or disagreement by other experts in the field.

Trethewey continued his criticism by attacking Kandel's value assumptions which occurred so frequently in his work. Kandel, he said, was not a dispassionate observer. He favored democracy and saw it as the basis of the reconstruction of society. For Kandel this meant that the school was the instrument of the social order and it cannot build a new social order. The goal of education was to discover what were the best elements in the social order which were vital to its progress and permanence. This type of social reconstructionism differed from that espoused by George Counts and others who believed that the school should be the instrument for broad social change and should lead society into a new social order. Lastly, Trethewey saw Kandel's work as being too general in scope, encompassing an elaborate scheme of information about a facet of education, but lacking in well designed theories.

Trethewey saw some positive aspects in Kandel's methodology: it contributed to a theory of causation, it established a base of accurate information about educational systems, it became cognizant of the need for the historical-cultural context in which educational systems develop, and it moved beyond descriptions to explanations and then to principles.

An important feature of Kandel's methodology was that it led to the realization that the study of a nation's educational system was an integral part of the fabric of society, not merely a system of
buildings existing for schooling the young. Understanding the social dynamics of the system through its thoughts had many implications. It led to the possibility of change and improvement of the development of institutions. It also extended ideas globally. The nation as an entity became the basis for comparison. It formed the foundation which helped to identify through a nation's school system, a nation's political and religious beliefs as well as the values, attitudes, and social practices that noted the special place of the school system in a given nation. So, Kandel's methodology led to a more comprehensive view of schooling as a system, while at the same time emphasizing that the system's ability to extend basic knowledge about the dynamics of societal growth helped to shape the methodology of comparative education. This was done by drawing from geography, history, political philosophy, and sociology to demonstrate how major forces and factors created new possibilities for educational innovations, and in other cases, showing how these forces and factors have imposed constraints. In both cases, understanding these forces and factors have molded the shape of what was being observed.

While Kandel did not use the word methods in writing about international education, as he did in comparative education, he clearly advocated a unique methodology which will be discussed in this section of this chapter and elsewhere in this dissertation. He believed that international education was an outgrowth of comparative education but was a separate area for study. The focus in international education is how nations, through their educational
systems. contribute to international cooperation and understanding. So the goal is not to compare educational systems of other nations, but to develop a commonality of humanity among all the peoples of the world.

Kandel was disappointed in the various nations, which between World War I and World War II, failed to promote international education in their schools, on any effective basis. England, he thought, was one nation which did do an effective job. He was also disappointed in the real lack of an emphasis on education on the part of the League of Nations. He referred to this point regularly in many of his writings.

With the formation of the United Nations and UNESCO, Kandel was encouraged that international education could succeed, and that his methods in the field would have a better chance of success. He believed that the first step in international education began at home, in each individual nation, and then this education radiated outward towards the rest of the world. The next step was to establish the idea in the schools that while differences among peoples of the world did exist, greater emphasis should be placed on discovering the elements common to all mankind.

Kandel had much to say on the harmful effects of stressing differences among people of foreign nations. He believed that it was a defect in education everywhere to point only to differences so they became exaggerated and the source of mistrust among people. The colorful, the picturesque, and the exotic foreigner became the deeply rooted stereotype which was then anathema to international
understanding and education.

The next step in Kandel's methodology was different from the way most experts thought, and in fact, from the way international education had been implemented in the schools of the world's nations between the two world wars; and in many cases is still being implemented. He would transform the negative features of nationalism to emphasize the positive features as the basis for curriculum building. The traditional concept was based on superpatriotism to one's own nation, aggression, militarism, and expansionism. Coupled with a fear and hatred of strangers, and strange countries, this concept of nationalism determined the educational policy of most nations. So, the practical aspects of this step was to emphasize the positive aspects of one's own nation, and other nations as well, through the regular traditional curriculum.

Kandel believed that the failure to achieve a high level of international education was because it was seen as something to be added to the regular school curriculum; something taught episodically such as through international assemblies, goodwill days, or the exchange of dolls, books or portfolios. All of these, Kandel thought, had their place, but students and teachers often regarded these activities as something external to the work of the school.

Kandel even considered special courses which lasted for a semester or a year and which taught international education, in one form or another, as being tangential; not an effective way to
present what should be presented to the students. So he frowned upon any courses that would separate the study of a nation's history from the study of international relations. Courses such as Civics, Morals, Citizenship, International Relations, Foreign Affairs, International Organizations for Peace, and Causes of Misunderstanding and Effects of War, should be studied by the university student only if he is going to specialize in International Relations as preparation for a career.

Examining the above method of education for internationalism, Kandel believed this approach to be a failure. His method was to approach international education in and through the regular school curriculum of each nation. All of the schools' subjects at every level would be included. He said: "that the development of international understanding is the concern of every teacher of every subject in every grade of the school, and that international understanding can only grow out of a proper teaching of nationalism." 29

This third step then is quite original and included the two ideas that nationalism and internationalism were bound together and should so be presented: and, international education should be included as an integral part of all course work, both in the primary and in the secondary school. Kandel realized that for his method of presenting international education through every subject in the

curriculum to succeed, it was vital to work with the parents of the students to garner support for the intended outcomes.

Harnessing nationalism to promote internationalism meant for Kandel that students first needed to have a positive view of their nation through emphasis on peace not war, showing how different people in a nation contributed in various areas to their national welfare. Once this was accomplished, the focus could turn to an international education which depicted one's nation working in harmony with other nations to achieve international cooperation based on international understanding. The study of other nations' peace heroes and the contributions of scientists, writers, musicians, poets, educators, and inventors could take place. Thus, after a student learned how his own nation contributed to the advancement of civilization and the betterment of humanity, he would learn how other nations' through their citizens, also contributed to global advancement. Kandel turned the pejorative emphasis on nationalism around, made it a positive construct, and developed it as having a key role in his methodology. He used it as the basis for and as a springboard to teaching international education.

No evidence has been uncovered showing that Kandel did any extensive writing on exactly how the subjects should be presented in order to teach international education. Noor is there much on what the content should be in terms of adding important learnings to this new dimension of a given subject. However, he did provide some examples as to how every subject could be developed. He pointed to the contributions of painters, sculptors, composers, and musicians
from many nations and how their contributions could be treated as such in the subjects of which their work is a part. The advancement of science was due to the great pooling of ideas and discoveries from the minds of men and women from many nations. Because children and youth were interested in the products and inventions of science the subject was able to offer, realistically and practically, the important lesson that scientific advancement is the end result of international cooperation. Further, its ideas should be incorporated into the curriculum without any concern about where they originated. This opportunity to construct a sense of international interdependence through science teaching was available in every classroom.

Humanities, languages, and literature all represented the accumulated wisdom of the ages. This fact, coupled with the stirring of children's imaginations to acquire some appreciation of how other people in other nations spoke, thought, and felt, provided the foundation for teaching international education in these subject areas. Kandel said, "The humanities provide rich opportunities for imparting a sympathetic realization that they have helped to bind centuries and generations together in a consciousness of common service."30

Kandel, convinced that his method was correct, included even such an abstract subject as mathematics in his methodology of teaching international education. He would have students, in

schools across the world, learning right in their regular mathematics classes about the contributions of different nations and their mathematicians to the development of the subject. He provided some specific examples of what nations' contributions should be highlighted in mathematics. He cited India for its contribution to our common numerals. Iraq to the multiplication tables and algebra. Egypt to surveying. Greece to the scientific treatment of geometry. Rome to engineering. England to Newtonian Calculus. France to analytic geometry. Scotland for logarithms. He also included Immanuel Bonfils of Tarascon, a Jewish writer of the 14th century, for developing decimal fractions.

Kandel elaborated on the subject of geography and its possibilities for international education. Geography lent itself to treatment as both a science and as one of the humanities. In its scientific aspect it dealt with the influence of the natural environment on man's advancement. In its humanistic phase, it demonstrated how men in different places in the world live and work. It also showed the growing interdependence that man reached in terms of obtaining raw materials and the manufactured products of the world.

All the economic forces that decided the health and welfare of people everywhere provided comprehensible materials for pupils in schools. This included the growth of transportation, the means of communication, commerce and industry, and even international finance. Children everywhere could learn that the countries of the world were dependent on each other for their very survival. Few
nations were totally independent or endowed with enough resources to live alone without regressing.

Kandel emphasized that in the teaching of history, the study of a nation's history should be part of the fabric of world history. Attention should be given to the influences that have developed from a cross-fertilization of cultures. A study of history should include a study of the international organization and the movements to establish them. These organizations were developed to improve human welfare throughout the world. These organizations included, but were not limited to, the Red Cross, the International Court and the Universal Postal Union. Along with this should come the study of prison reform, the abolition of slavery, and any of the vast number of international congresses of researchers in various fields of science and scholarship. Kandel said:

The study of these developments in human history would provide the necessary foundation for the study of the organization, aims and work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The essential purpose of such study should be not so much to impart a knowledge of the use and growth of agencies for international cooperation as to develop the "will and purpose and the desires of peoples and nations" upon which the success of such agencies depend. 31

The teaching of history should emphasize facts, but it is crucial for students to develop a sense of values and some concept of man's struggle for freedom and security. In addition, the study of history should emphasize those permanent values, hopes, and ideals, which all humanity share. Students must be trained to develop critical judgement, restraint, and caution in judging other

31 Ibid., 404.
nations. Students should try to understand other nations sympathetically without condoning dishonorable conduct which falls below an acceptable level of behavior.

Even though Kandel did not use the words method or methodology for his work in the field of international education it is clear that the use of regular school subjects to reach the children and youth in order to influence their minds and spirits was the start of a methodology. It would have been beneficial if Kandel would have written more extensively on that phase of international education because it was his most important vehicle for educating worldwide youth. His failure to systematize his highly original thought left it exclusively in the hands of the teachers of the subjects.

Ironically, Kandel would be the last person to want to continue to overload either the classroom teacher or the curriculum. But the adoption of his scheme would certainly add a new dimension to each subject: a dimension of global awareness that would call for much more professional training and preparation for classroom teachers.

and needless to say many more hours of hard work for teachers.

Impractical as it may seem, and perhaps impossible to implement effectively, without a complete restructuring of the schools.

Kandel's approach appears to have some good potential for the teaching of international education. For one thing nothing else has worked effectively at a grass roots level to influence the world's youth to become internationally minded. Under the present school conditions Kandel's plan could not work, but perhaps someday given the means to implement his plan, it could be tried, even if it now
sounds too utopian to succeed.

Impressionable youth, infused with the virtues of their nation and other nations, and the oneness of mankind are the hope for a peaceful world. The ideas of brotherhood and global peace are worthwhile goals for the educational systems of all nations. How these goals could be set in motion so they could be achieved is the key question.

The world's youth would be learning important aspects of international education all day, every day in their classrooms through each and every subject they studied. This day to day total teaching effort would be the beginning of a methodology of international education advocated by Kandel. He also supported other strategies in the teaching of international education such as UNESCO's effective global educational projects as well as the excellent work of other international organizations.
CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF KANDEL'S MAJOR WORKS IN COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION BEFORE AND DURING THE 1920S

Chapters II and III focused on Kandel's historical outlook and philosophy of education. Chapter V examines Kandel's most important work in comparative education written before and during the period of the 1920s. This is the field of educational studies for which he is best remembered. Brickman acclaimed Kandel's prominence as a comparative educator:

Most educators tend to connect the name of Kandel with comparative education, and with very good reason. From 1910, when his doctoral dissertation on teacher training in Germany appeared, to the present, he has continued to issue a ceaseless series of studies of varying lengths on educational conditions in various parts of the world.¹

While Kandel was a prolific author in comparative and international education, only his major works are examined in this and the following two chapters. In this chapter these include the following works:

The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany (1910).
The Reform of Secondary Education in France (1924).

¹ Brickman, 396.
Essays in Comparative Education (1930).  
Kandel's doctoral dissertation, the Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany was published before World War I, in 1910, to be exact. This was a period of growing democratization in the Western world. This democratization, along with the growing prosperity of the West gave rise to enormous power and flexibility.

Kandel, writing in 1909 and 1910, found however, in his study of German normal schools, that traditional authoritarian educational practices were still the norm. He discovered also that the development of democratization experienced elsewhere in the West had not reached these teacher training institutions. He strongly cautioned, in his dissertation, against America's borrowing such a system of teacher training. He believed that at that period of time in American history, the solutions to its educational problems should be found on the dynamic soil of America, without seeking elsewhere for answers to its educational problems.  

By the 1920s the world entered into a new post-World War I period. The beginnings of a new postbourgeois style of promoting mass society emerged by 1920 in the leading nations of the West. An

---

2 Kandel wrote many other important but less well known books, monographs, and reports on comparative and international education which are not included in this chapter. A significant number of these works are mentioned in chapters I, VI and VII. In addition, important writings have been analyzed in chapter IV, and are discussed in chapter VIII, which covers Kandel's contributions to comparative and international education.

3 This position shifted radically in later years when Kandel said he still did not believe in wholesale borrowing from other nations, but he was for intelligent adaptation of successful educational structures and practices.
attack against mass society was the focus in Kandel's book published in 1924, *The Reform of Secondary Education in France*. In the book Kandel showed a disdain for the schooling of the mass student and the production of mass man in society. The 1924 reform of French secondary education encouraged an education for elitism. Kandel believed that the goal of French secondary education should be the imparting of a general education to an educationally qualified body of elite students.

As the United States experienced a period of prosperity after World War I and developed a business model of democratic public education with its leveling out emphasis on credits and credentials, other Western nations did not share in this prosperity or in these educational changes. Britain, France, Italy, and especially Germany did not return to a postwar prosperity, while Communism took hold in the Soviet Union. In this period of post-World War I readjustment, Kandel favored schooling which emphasized traditional study and mastery of a subject. He was opposed to the mere accumulation of credits in secondary schools, where one credit was as acceptable as any other credit. He was in agreement with the French educational system with its emphasis on the mastery of subject matter. He viewed secondary education in the United States at that time as substituting mastery of subjects for a mere accumulation of credits.

During the 1920s and the period prior to that, Kandel had been building his worldwide reputation as an educational historian, philosopher, and comparative educator. By 1923 he finally was appointed a full professor at Teachers College, Columbia University.
after thirteen years on the faculty. Also in that year he was appointed to the newly founded International Institute of Teachers College, as an associate, and the editor of its annual Education Yearbook. His work with foreign students of comparative education at Columbia and his involvement with worldwide education experts enhanced his reputation during the decade of the 1920's enormously. His lauded work on the Education Yearbook, which encompassed the 1920's is included in Chapter VIII of this dissertation.

In this chapter, Kandel's third major work of this period will be discussed and analyzed. It is entitled Essays in Comparative Education. It was published in 1930 but it included work he had published or lectures he had given from 1925-1930. He included a section on European educational systems and their objectives within the social-political climate of the times. Describing German education, he pointed out that the goal was to develop a loyalty to the idea of a new democracy at a time in the late 1920s when there was an increase in German economic activity. He clearly depicted how Italy's educational system in the 1920s aimed to produce loyal fascists. The fascists under Mussolini experimented with the peacetime mobilizing of its nation's resources which had proven successful during the war years. The entrenchment of a communist system in the Soviet Union of the 1920's led to Kandel's portrayal of its educational system's goal as one which was to produce loyal communists.

Kandel's earliest major work in comparative education was The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany. Published in
1910, it is a detailed, in-depth account of how one nation, Germany, prepared its teachers. He drew some lessons, which are considered at the end of this work for the American educational system. He restricted his study to the regions of Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony.4

The book consists of ten chapters, and, an appendix, with normal school daily routines and timetables. Kandel traced the historical development of the elementary normal school indirectly to both Ratke and Comenius. They stimulated an interest in educational questions and contributed to the concept of teacher preparation.

The first person, in Germany, to directly recognize the importance of training teachers was Duke Ernest the Pious in 1654. He said, "It is very desirable that the teachers at their expense or with assistance remain in one central place and... through practice learn that... for which they will in the future be employed."5 In 1696 A.F. Francke set up the Seminarium praeceptorium at Halle, thus laying the actual foundations for the normal schools of Germany.

In 1748 J.J. Hecker established a normal school in Berlin which King Frederick the Great began to support in 1753. Normal schools then proliferated throughout Prussia until the end of the century.

4 Kandel did not state why he selected these three regions of Germany for his study. Perhaps it was because these were the largest regions, and they may have provided the most successful models for training elementary teachers. There were quite a few other regions of Germany which was called the "Deutches Reich" in 1910, including: Schleswig, Holstein, Mecklenberg, Hannover, Oldenburg, Braunschweig, Hessen-Nesau, Wurtenberg, Alsace-Lorraine and others.

5 I.L. Kandel, The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910), 5-6.
By the end of the 1700s, according to Kandel, the teacher commanded little respect, but both teachers and students at the normal schools showed the same eagerness as pioneers. It was this enthusiasm that gained the respect and the support of Germany's leaders.

By the 1800s, Pestalozzi's influence was felt in the German normal schools. Pestalozzi's followers in Germany believed that future teachers needed to have intellectual training beyond elementary school subjects. They also thought that normal school courses must be extended to three years and that future teachers needed to be taught to think rather than being trained as in machinelike fashion.

Kandel concentrated on the preparation of elementary school teachers in this work, "since the training of secondary school teachers presents an entirely different problem." By 1821 there were twenty-eight normal schools in the country. Saxony was much more liberal than Prussia and by 1877 included the normal schools officially among its institutions of higher learning. Kandel wrote more on Bavaria later on in the book.

According to Kandel, "the evolution of the German elementary school teachers into a professional class is a phase of history of the development of the political emancipation of the German people." Kandel viewed the struggle of elementary teachers as a battle "against obscurantism and clerical domination."

---

6 Ibid., Preface.
7 Ibid., 18.
8 Ibid.
Interestingly, by 1909 he viewed the position of the teachers as being inferior to that their colleagues reached one-hundred years earlier. Therefore, he viewed the normal schools, whose progress was constantly thwarted by reactionary forces, as being victims of the influence of tradition than were most other German institutions.

From the history of the elementary normal schools, Kandel proceeded to a chapter on administrative authorities. He observed in all three states a system of administrative decentralization subject to a process of checks. Kandel identified local and centralized administrative functions, but within each state all the schools were similar. Curricula based on local needs were not implemented since local initiative was tied entirely to the externals of school management. In this well researched book, Kandel continued, treating such topics as preparatory training of teachers, the normal schools, and the normal school curriculum, professional subjects and practice teaching, the teacher at work, the in-service training of teachers and the training of women teachers.

In the chapter on the preparatory training of teachers, Kandel compared and contrasted the systems of Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony. At that time, 1909, in Germany, candidates for teacher training were fourteen years of age. Selection was based on an application which included certificates of baptism, and health and vaccination records certified by a state-approved doctor. In addition, the candidates' previous school records and conduct were considered. Entrance examinations, both oral and written, were used as additional
criteria for entrance to this first stage of teacher training for the three year course. After three years, successful candidates went on to normal schools for three more years, if they qualified.

Kandel pointed to the rigid uniformity of the required courses in preparatory training to which he attributed the totally Germanic principle of "Measuring qualifications by the amount and character of subject matter covered instead of by intellectual efficiency." Kandel believed that the career of a boy who attended the normal school would be narrowly restricted to the exclusive choice of being a teacher.

Prussia, according to Kandel, played the most important role in Germany so that her leadership in education was generally accepted. Regarding normal school education at that time, Kandel observed:

the discipline of the normal school is indeed rigorous. The work of every hour of the day is definitely mapped out in the daily ordinances of each school. Instead of being brought into contact with the world in which some measure they are to be leaders, the normal school pupils are carefully withdrawn from it. Free organizations and societies among the pupils are unknown or are very rare.

With Germany's emphasis on the training of its teachers who specialized for six years, the system, in 1909, required three years of initial preparation along with academic work, and three years of academic and professional work. Practice teaching began in the fifth year of training in the practice schools which were attached to every normal school in the three states Kandel studied.

Graduates of normal schools were only given a probationary

---

9 Ibid., 39.
10 Ibid., 43.
status which then led to taking a qualifying exam enabling them to have a permanent position. Female teachers were in the minority but the trend showed a rapid increase in their number throughout the country. Kandel presented a thoughtful analysis of the comparative differences between the German, American, and English systems of training elementary school teachers. In Germany he found direction, systematization, monarchy, and strict bureaucratic control. In America and England he saw democracy, local control, little or no systematization and many different systems and normal schools. He said that, "Differences of nationality, of environment, of traditions mean differences of ideals and attainment."

Kandel saw that the German normal school worked well for the Germans because they emphasized reverence for authority and believed that some knowledge was sought by the masses. The German goal differed from the American which encouraged individuality and equality of opportunity. In contrast to the vagueness of definite subject matter content in the United States, Germany's aims were definite and precise. Kandel concluded that Germany had little to offer America in the field of elementary education. He thought that the system which such early American educators as Mann, Stowe, and Bache praised in the 1840s was still the same system he himself saw in the early 1900s.

Kandel was of the opinion in 1910 that educational borrowing would not be effective for the United States, even in terms of particular adaptations. He especially saw a danger of borrowing

11 Ibid., 121.
from the German normal schools which, he believed, succeeded in Germany but would not work in the United States. He saw a danger in applying bureaucratic methods in education. The German emphasis on superior authority and dictatorial methods would not develop the qualities of personality desirable for the American teacher.

In the matter of borrowing, he wrote:

The lessons which the early reformers wished to emphasize have been well learned...the elements for further progress are within this country. And after all the problems which have to be faced are American, the conditions which education must meet are American, and the ideals which have to be realized are American. The solution, therefore, must be discovered on American soil.12

To be sure, Kandel's knowledge of the German language, his acquaintanceship with its history, his first hand experience in studying there, his on-site visits, and research at their normal schools, and his extensive use of educational sources led him to his conclusions. Instead of saying that America should take what seems good from Germany regarding the training of teachers, and modify what is borrowed to make it fit the American system, Kandel rejected any borrowing at all. Perhaps his in-depth research provided him with a deeper context which enabled him to determine that, at that point in time, America would profit best by seeking its own solutions to its educational problems. Theoretically, Kandel saw educational systems reflecting their cultural and historical context. This relationship to context weakened wholesale borrowing.

In 1924, Teachers College, Columbia University, published Kandel's The Reform of Secondary Education in France. Kandel's main

12 Ibid., 126.
concern in the book was the problem of readjusting secondary education to the needs of "modern" post-World War I democracies. His special problem was how to define liberal education and culture, with which the secondary school was intimately involved. He selected France and its reform of secondary schools because he believed it was one of the world's most educationally, advanced countries in the 1920s.

Kandel wrote the book over a three year period, after many lively discussions with the person most responsible for reforming French education, M. Leon Bernard. As the Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts from 1921-1924, his second term in office, Bernard was responsible for the reform of 1923, which bore his name. The reform, as we shall see, was all too short-lived.

The book was 156 pages long, divided into seven sections and it includes many appendices. Section I is the "Introduction." In Section II, "The French Tradition" is discussed. Section III is entitled, "The System Under Criticism." Section IV is "The Bernard Reform." Section V is entitled, "The New System." Section VI is entitled, "Secondary Education for Girls," and the last section, VII, is the "Conclusion." The appendices cover the reform's decree issued on May 3, 1923. They also include the reports by an inspector of The Academy of Paris and the Minister of Public Instruction, that preceded the decree. Among the other appendices are the new time schedules and programs for boys in the secondary school, the establishment of special courses in Latin, and schedules for secondary school girls.
For Kandel, the most positive aspects, even the greatness, of the French secondary schools was its forthright effort and dedication in promoting classical traditions. After reviewing the history of teaching the classics, Kandel introduced the reform of French secondary education of 1902. The system of education from 1902 to 1923 was the basis for the decree of May 3, 1923 issued by the president of France, which initiated the reforms Kandel examined in this book.

In the introduction, Section I, Kandel discussed secondary education, primarily but not exclusively, in the western world. He discussed important issues and raised some crucial questions about the nature of secondary schooling especially in Germany, England, the United States, as well as in France. He believed that everywhere in post-elementary education nothing had yet been answered with any certainty.

Kandel credited France alone with attempting to reform secondary education in 1923 as a solution to these crucial questions. Among the more important questions were the following:

At what age should secondary education begin? Should secondary education be for all or for an elite? What is the meaning of liberal education in a democracy? What should be the nature of secondary school studies, general or partly general and partly vocational, and if general what should they include?13

Impressed with French education, he saw it as greatly influencing Eastern European and Latin American education. He believed that the French reform of 1923 would deeply influence countries outside of

the sphere of the usual French educational influence.

Kandel's Section II. "The French Tradition," succinctly analyzed the system which began in 1902. He depicted the following structure which existed from 1902-1923. A seven year course was separated into two cycles, the first of four years duration and the second of three years. The first cycle was to be completed by age fifteen and the second by age eighteen. There were two sections in the first cycle, one for Latin and the other emphasizing French and science. Students wanting the classics could take Greek in their third year. In the second cycle there were more options, each lasting two years, after which students could take the first part of the test, for the diploma, or baccalaureate. In this cycle, students studied Latin and Greek, science and modern languages and no Latin, Latin and science, or Latin and advanced modern languages. In their last year students specialized in philosophy or mathematics and then were tested for the second part of the examination leading to the baccalaureate. This type of education was for boys only. Girls were trained under an older system which was two years shorter and focused primarily on learning homemaking skills.

Section III is an analysis of "The System Under Criticism." By 1912, ten years after the reform of 1902 there was a crisis in French secondary education brought about by admitting modern school subjects on the same plane as the classics. The French language was seen as being corrupted by foreign influences and French literary expression was viewed as declining. Critics in France said that this led to a failure to think with clarity and precision. The
solution proposed to this problem was "a return to the classical humanities as the simple sources of French language, culture and civilization." 14

The criticisms continued and meshed with other problems caused by World War I. When Bernard became Minister of Public instruction in 1921, the problem demanded to be solved. At that time, Kandel believed that the majority of Frenchmen favored secondary education only for the elite instead of for the masses. He, himself favored selective secondary education.

Section IV dealing with the "Bernard Reform", examined the minister's proposals to return traditional culture to France. 15 Social injustices were to be redressed as well, so that the poor could benefit from secondary schooling if they had the necessary academic ability. The reform emphasized Latin and Greek, and critics labeled it as antidemocratic and reactionary. Not so Kandel, who strongly favored the reform. He saw it as advancing the educational opportunities of the poor boy, providing an elite for France, and in general, advancing the interests of the country.

Interestingly, Kandel had no problem accepting elites in his definition of democracy, for he believed that people had different abilities and should be educated to match their talents even if it led to an elitist society. It may seem inconsistent, and perhaps it is, that Kandel's great interest and advocacy of democracy would at

14 Ibid., 10.

15 For a look at the Bernard Reform, officially known as the Decree of May 3rd, 1923, see Appendix XVIII at the end of this dissertation. From Kandel, Reform of Secondary Education, 78-80.
the same time encourage the promotion of elites. This is certainly
a viewpoint which has been and still is debated strongly by those
who view educational elites as antidemocratic. These critics may
agree with the need of societies to provide for the educationally
different, those below or above the intellectual norms, but they
would discourage the direct, unabashed support and encouragement of
elitist groups as advocated by Kandel.

Kandel also favored a return to classical education in the
French reform. He wrote, "A classical education has the double
advantage of providing a cultural training and a thorough discipline
in discrimination, precision, analysis, reflection and moral
training." 16

Combining his ideas on democracy and classical studies in this
1924 work, Kandel wrote:

Democracy does not demand that education should be
reduced to a mediocrity indulgently determined, which ends by
determining the character and quality of the studies. On the
contrary, it demands that we form by a genuinely classical
education an elite among the best endowed and the most
capable, no matter what their rank or condition. 17

The reform proposed a policy that the masses were not to be exposed
to secondary education as was true in French secondary education
before the reform. Only the ones with ability including the lower
classes should be provided with such opportunities.

The changes encompassing the reform went into effect for the
class entering secondary school in October, 1923. These changes are

16 Ibid., 23.
17 Ibid., 14.
discussed in section V. "The New Systems." While many structural aspects of secondary education in France stayed the same, there were significant changes. For example, secondary education now began at age eleven for everyone. Prior to the reform, some students in presecondary schools began studying some secondary subjects at age nine. A system of scholarships awarded through competitive examinations enabled lower income French students to matriculate to secondary school.

A major change of the reform was that in the first four year cycle every student was required to study Latin for four years and Greek in the third and fourth year, for two years. This seems to have been the most significant curricular change under the reform since the second cycle did not present such a radical departure from the prereform era.

French and the classics were given the greatest period of time under the reform. Kandel pointed out that if the programs succeeded in the future, in the years following the reform (also the years following the publication of the book) "all pupils will have a good foundation in classics. all will cover the same amount of mathematics, sciences, and history and geography in the first six years."18

Section VI is comprised of only one paragraph on secondary education for girls. Changes for girls came about in a reform issued on March 25, 1924. Girls who wanted to be homemakers could continue on the track set for them prior to the reform. The only

18 Ibid., 27.
change was a six year curriculum instead of a five year course. Other girls could select a track similar to the boys under the reform of 1923. The only difference in this pursuit of the baccalaureate (the secondary school diploma) was that there were provisions for the girls to pursue subjects considered appropriate for them.

Kandel ended this informative and highly detailed period piece with section VII, his conclusion. In it he reviewed the more important functions of the reform. He considered the correct objective of the secondary school in France to be the imparting of a general liberal education for an elite.

Kandel defended liberal education as training for the mind and defended its separation from both vocational education and early specialization. He did not explain the entrance examination system for acceptance to the secondary school under the reform (he only mentioned that poor children who do well on competitive exams for scholarships will not have to take the regular entrance exams). Nor did he discuss the examinations required for entry prior to 1923. Kandel did mention that the secondary school was considered to be a diploma mill prior to the reform of 1923. Since there was no basis for comparing entrance requirements before and after the reform, one can only infer that it would be the elite who would be able to succeed with the new classics curriculum introduced by the reform, with its required four years of Latin and two years of Greek. Perhaps this would explain, in part, at least, how education for an elite class would be substituted for the prereform diploma mills.
that were to have existed in the secondary schools of France.

Kandel predicted success for the reform based on his erudite analysis of French education and culture. One of the great disadvantages of writing a book covering reform without waiting to see whether reform worked is that the outcome of the reform can only be predicted, it cannot be reported. The vantage point of time is missing and perhaps that is what creates the void in a work such as this, even though it is so compact and information rich.

In terms of comparative education, contrasting the French secondary school at that time with the American secondary school, Kandel insightfully pointed out:

The school is a place for study and little else... The pressure from the home and from society in general is further supplemented by the privileges attached to the obtaining and possession of certain certificates and diplomas... The pupils' interests are not distracted by the opportunity of garnering grace by piecemeal installments of such subjects as strike his fancy: each subject gains cumulative value from a continuance either from entrance into school or from the time when it is begun, until a desired goal instead of a certain number of credits is reached. The incentive lies in mastery of the subject not in the accumulation of points in a system in which generally speaking, one point is as good as another. In other words, the French hold that both what is studied and how it is studied matters: American theory tends to emphasize the latter.

As he had done fourteen years earlier, in examining the German Normal schools, Kandel immersed himself in the study of a foreign

19 To support the idea of the lack of time to see how the reform would work, one has only to realize that only two weeks after this book went to press the reform was already diluted. On August 9th, 1924 a temporary decree initiated by a new French political and educational leadership added modern languages to the first cycle of the secondary school. Kandel, himself acknowledged this in an appendix of the book.

20 Ibid., 31.
educational system. This time the country was France. He thoroughly discussed the problems and solutions of the French secondary schools. He took a stand for reform on the basis of his belief that the classics should be an integral and vital part of secondary school education in a country which had a tradition of teaching the classics.

Kandel's *Essays in Comparative Education*, published in 1930, consists of seventeen lectures and articles compiled into one volume. These represent different aspects of the then current developments in education from a comparative approach. Kandel said about these lectures and articles that: "They represent current tendencies in the past five years rather than an attempt at a systematic description of the educational system of any one country."21

The first article is entitled "Comparative Education as a Subject of Professional Study." It first appeared in the *Educational Outlook* in 1926. In this article Kandel discussed the rationale for studying comparative education. The primary reason for studying it was to analyze the causes that have produced similar educational problems in different countries. Coupled with this was the comparison of the differences between countries' educational systems and in the solutions attempted. The comparative study of education must be based on the ideals, both political and social, which are reflected by the school which transmits these and which

leads to progress. "In other words, the approach demands first an appreciation of the intangible, impalpable spiritual forces that underlie an educational system: the factors and forces outside the school matter even more than what goes on inside it." 22

Kandel saw the world at that time as an entire educational laboratory where various types of solutions were being sought to the same genre of problems. He claimed that the student of education could not risk ignoring the procedures being attempted under different conditions from those under which he was working, anymore than could the chemist or physicist. He also sought a spirit of internationalism being derived from comparative education. This was based on the realization that every country in education was making a contribution to the work of the world. He suggested that the study of comparative education would help in the development of a philosophy of education which would be founded on many experiences.

The second article in the book is entitled "The State and Education in Europe." This was based on a lecture Kandel gave in a course he taught at Columbia which was called, "Contemporary Educational Movements Abroad." In this article, Kandel emphasized the development of the educational systems of France, Germany, and England. He examined the context for the strong state control of education in France and Germany and the rather amorphous control in England.

In comparing the three countries, Kandel stated that the French objective of education was to have her citizens be loyal to

22 Ibid., 3.
Kandel briefly wrote about Italy, Russia, and the United States in the article. In both Italy and Russia, he thought, education was based upon the idea that the child belonged to the state. Italian education was based on producing loyal fascists while the Russian aim was to produce loyal Communists. Kandel was writing about Stalinism in the Soviet Union and the fascism of Mussolini in Italy. The United States needed to have a better concept of Americanism. Kandel said, "Until that is achieved, American education is likely to be at the beck and call of new theories, changing devices, and uncertain objectives."23

Kandel elaborated on American themes in the book, in articles entitled, "The American Spirit in Education," which was originally an address given at Teachers College in 1928 to a group of German educators, and "The Meaning of American Education," a lecture he had given in Berlin in 1928 and published in Dutch in 1929.

In the former, Kandel dealt with the emphasis in America on liberty for the individual and of the passion of democracy. These, coupled with individualism, and a readiness to cooperate for the
common good. were part of the American landscape. These ideals and characteristics led to the basic principle upon which the educational system rested; the public expenditure for providing for the educational equality of opportunity. In the latter article, local control of education is a concept Kandel said was difficult for Europeans to understand. America's lack of traditions was apparent, leaving it in a constant state of reconstruction.

Perhaps a chief difference between the American and European systems, Kandel noted, was that all education in the United States, from the kindergarten to the university and beyond, was a complete whole. Each stage differed from the other due only to the maturity of the person to be educated, without social class distinctions. It is quite possible that Kandel was exaggerating this latter point, given what we now know about the history of rich and poor, and minority group students in the United States. Yet he was speaking in general terms, comparing America liberalism with European ideals of sharp class distinctions, and there certainly was a difference. Kandel was discussing education in the United States in terms of its structure rather than the impact of socio-economic variables.

Comparing public education, both elementary and secondary, between traditional European systems and innovative American systems, Kandel concluded that both are "arriving at an educational theory that has many points of resemblance."24 Yet he pointed out that while a country such as Germany had high standards, only the relatively few achieved a high quality education. America, on the

---

24 Ibid., 70.
other hand, recognized that the function of education was to serve all students and prepare them to take their place in a changing world. This went beyond the educational ideal which both Europe and America recognized, which was to conserve and transmit the heritage of the human race.

In one key article entitled, "The Educational Situation," based on a lecture delivered at an Oklahoma Teacher's College in 1928, Kandel discussed educational reform in the United States and most other countries. He believed that everywhere reform was taking place nothing of great educational significance could be accomplished without including the public at a highly significant level.

Kandel gave examples of parent interest in education in the United States, England, Germany, Holland, and Mexico. Kandel saw this pattern of public involvement in education as a very worthwhile cause. He wrote boldly: "This activity on the part of the public is tending to make the teaching profession more than ever self-critical and is lifting the task of teaching above the level of routine and craftsmanship to the level of a profession and almost of a science."25

In the same article Kandel emphasized that both American and foreign educators could learn much from each other. Every nation, he felt, had something to offer students of education. "Education is today moving in the direction of international norms, because the aims of intelligent democracies are approximating to similar

25 Ibid., 72.
In this sense it appears that Kandel had shifted his position from the one he took earlier in his 1910 book on *The Training of Teachers in Germany*. In that work he clearly stated that the solutions to American educational problems can be found only on American soil. In *Essays in Comparative Education*, written from 1925-1930, the world had changed considerably. The post-World War I era brought democracy to Germany and a loosening of the rigid norms in education, and a movement, however weak, of regionalism or decentralization to France.

Perhaps it was this international movement towards democracy that caused Kandel to say in this latter work that educators could learn from each other transnationally, and every country could offer educators something: implying, perhaps, that some borrowing could lead to some solutions of their nation's educational problems.

In "Standards of Achievement in European and American Secondary Schools," based on a lecture to New England educators, Kandel discussed important differences between European and American secondary schools. European educational opportunity was to be sought through a variety of different types of schools rather than by a single institution such as the American high school. The American high school was seen by Europeans as promoting mediocrity. Kandel agreed with these Europeans. Both Kandel and the Europeans believed that American students in secondary schools were allowed to fumble around until they were able to select the standard and

26 Ibid., 81.
combination of courses tailored to them. In European schools, on the other hand, the standards remained fixed for the different types of courses.

Kandel clearly favored the better education European secondary schools provided their students, but he recognized that Europe did not attempt to educate such huge numbers to such high a level as did the American high school. Yet Kandel did recognize that the American high school failed to graduate large numbers of students. While the high school in America had a great burden compared to the distribution of the burden in Europe to a variety of schools, the American school should have been flexible enough to give its best students an education involving the best intellectual training. "It has an opportunity today of proving that the cult of mediocrity is not necessarily the consequence of democratic education."27

Kandel proposed that the way to gain such flexibility was to introduce junior college work into the American high school for more able students. Only then, he thought, would it be on a par with the secondary schools of Europe. He ended Essays in Comparative Education with an article entitled, "International Understanding and the Schools." based on an address delivered to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, in 1925.

This essay might possibly be Kandel's most erudite and creative article in the entire book. In the essay, given originally as a speech, Kandel developed a rather unique theme of international understanding based on an intelligent approach to appreciating and

27 Ibid., 154.
applying a constructive approach based on a respect for nationalism.

What did Kandel mean by the term, international understanding?

He defined it thusly:

Broadly speaking, it is that attitude which recognizes the possibilities of service of our own nation and of other nations in a common cause, the cause of humanity, the readiness to realize that other nations along with our own have by virtue of their common humanity the ability to contribute something of worth to the progress of civilization.²⁸

He pointed to the spirit of international cooperation in the fields of athletics, music, art, literature, science, and technology. After analyzing the impact of these fields across national boundaries he turned to the schools to ask, "What can the school do to promote such international understanding?"²⁹

He believed that the promotion of international understanding in the schools did not require adding another subject to the already overtaxed high school curriculum. He felt that adding another subject with specialist teachers and departmentalization would lead to compartmentalized thinking on the subject, instead of developing citizenship. Kandel thought that every high school subject could contribute some knowledge impacting on international relations. The larger aim of the school in this matter, he said, was to promote certain ideals such as fair play, cooperation, service, and justice for all people everywhere in the world.

Kandel's goal in international understanding was for the student to leave high school with the knowledge that civilization

²⁸ Ibid., 228.
²⁹ Ibid., 230.
has been a collective achievement, and that the student's nation had contributed to it, as had other nations. Civilization was a heritage shared in common and a joint responsibility of all nations.

Interestingly, as the Western world's economic systems were collapsing toward the end of the 1920's and the beginning of the 1930's, Kandel's work in comparative and international education was blossoming. His previous twenty years of writing, editing, teaching and lecturing, and worldwide travels to study educational systems had a cumulative effect on his work. His prior work served as a springboard for him as he produced his magnum opus, *Comparative Education* in 1933.

In the following chapter, this major work, along with others that he wrote in the 1930's will be summarized and analyzed. A short description of the general, political, social and economic patterns will be presented to provide a backdrop for his illustrious writings. Kandel's writings in the decade of the 1930s helped to make him prominent in the fields of comparative and international education.
CHAPTER VI

AN ANALYSIS OF KANDEL'S MAJOR WORKS IN COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION DURING THE 1930S

The social, political, and economic climates were at a very low ebb with the start of the great depression of 1929, when the New York stock market crashed. Panic spread from one country to another country, causing massive unemployment. The depression worsened because the unemployment situation reduced purchasing power. Conditions in the highly developed industrialized nations also worsened as some countries such as Britain and France failed to take extreme measures in order to restore their economies. Consequently they muddled through.

In the United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt began the "New Deal" in 1933, coincidentally, the same year Isaac L. Kandel's famous book, Comparative Education was published. Emergency public works programs were begun while efforts were made to control prices and agricultural production. While these efforts never reached high enough proportions to end the huge unemployment, at least the worst ravages of the great depression were assuaged. The innovations of the New Deal were supported by the public at large and the nation managed to maintain itself on somewhat of an even keel until the economic situation improved as America entered World War II during 1941 against the Axis nations: Japan, Germany, and Italy.
In the 1930s, the Soviet Union under Stalin and his policy of forced collectivization of agriculture somehow avoided the problems of the West with its massive unemployment and its reduction of purchasing power. By 1932, Stalin announced the great success of the U.S.S.R's first Five Year plan. The planned mobilization in the U.S.S.R. resulted in a swift expansion of industry.

Italy, under Mussolini continued its fascist attempts, in the 1930s, to make the State a great entity. This was accomplished by exalting the military virtues and experimenting with peacetime solutions such as the collectivization of natural resources. The State overrode class and individual concerns in order to profit the nation as a whole.

The following works by Kandel will be discussed and analyzed in this chapter:

Comparative Education (1933),

The Making of Nazis (1935),

"Comparative Education", Review of Educational Research, (1936),

"Intelligent Nationalism In The Curriculum" in International Understanding Through the Public School Curriculum (1937).

Perhaps no other decade of his writings was as important for Kandel as the 1930s. Kandel's Comparative Education, was a classic that made a significant contribution to the graduate study of comparative and international education. It was a landmark book written in a literary style. It expressed an optimism and humanism for mankind in spite of the Great Depression taking place at the
time. It placed the schools within the deeper context of the politics of the societies it described. It was considered to be the most important textbook in the field for many years. The book in effect was a major study of educational changes and progress made in several of the leading countries of the world from the end of World War I to the beginning of the 1930s. Kandel examined these changes in terms of the forces which helped shape the cultural and educational institutions of each nation. He included in this study the stated hopes and aspirations of each of the six countries. The countries were the United States, England, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia.

Kandel traveled extensively to all of the countries except Russia for first hand information used in this book. For Russia, (as he referred to the Soviet Union in the book) he used secondary sources. Kandel's massive work broke through the boundaries of the more provincial type of textbooks used before its publication. It included more than descriptions of foreign school systems written just from an educational viewpoint. It included differences in national environments and it made comparisons on the basis of general trends and principles. It also regarded educational problems of other nations as being vitally important for comparative education.

While Kandel's reputation was greatly enhanced internationally for his book Comparative Education, this reputation was further distinguished by his book the Making of Nazis published two years later in 1935. His book was one of the first studies of education
under the Nazis and it warned the world of the dangers of Hitler with his racist platforms and his proclivities for war, subjugation, and bestiality. Written before World War II and the Holocaust, it was a prophetic account of how Hitler and his Nazi thugs gained complete control of the German apparatus of education, formal and informal, to mold German youth to completely achieve their Nazi goals.

Kandel was not a stranger to German education. By the time he had written *The Making of Nazis*, he was already a recognized expert on the topic. However much his past writings had contributed to a knowledge of German education, this book broke new ground for comparative educators worldwide. It is considered to be an important book to this day.

Germany and the world saw the rise of Adolph Hitler to Power in 1933. As chancellor he obtained dictatorial powers by changing the constitution and eliminating any political opposition. In a relatively short period of time, Hitler, as leader of the Nazi party, rebuilt the armed services, ended unemployment by putting people back to work, and expanded the base of industrialization in the process. As the Nazi's prepared for war, they persecuted the Jews in Germany even before the Holocaust's final solution. They continued the pattern of economic mobilization that they were familiar with in World War I. Hitler and his Nazis experienced considerable popularity with the majority of the German nation's people. The invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany started World War II on September 1, 1939. Against this worldwide backdrop of poverty,
unemployment, and then war, Kandel contributed some of his best known work to the fields of comparative and international education.

Kandel's 1936 article, "Comparative Education," published in the Review of Educational Research, and included in this chapter, was a key article at the time. Written as a short summary of some of the advances in comparative and international education, Kandel emphasized that by 1936 comparative education had become an organized branch of the study of education. Kandel discussed the purposes for studying comparative education and listed some of the most important resources for study such as national and international organizations and important textbooks in the field.

The last of Kandel's work which is discussed and analyzed in this chapter is his writing in International Understanding Through the Public-School Curriculum. This was published in 1937 as the Thirty-Sixth Yearbook Part II, by the National Society for the study of Education. Kandel co-edited the book and contributed a chapter entitled, "Intelligent Nationalism in the Curriculum."

Amazingly, this optimistic chapter on nationalism and international understanding was published at a time when the democratic, civilized World had totalitarianism's "big guns" aimed at its "vital organs." Instead of capitulating to the war machines set up by the axis powers in the latter part of the 1930s, and admitting the total backward step this meant for the democratic powers, Kandel saw the period from 1918-1937 as only a temporary setback. He incorrectly believed that peace would prevail even at that point in time, and he advocated a formal educational approach
to the strengthening of nationalism in all nations as the key to mutual international cooperation.

**Comparative Education**, Kandel's "magnum opus", was published in 1933.¹ The framework for the book is as follows: chapter I is entitled "Education and Nationalism," chapter II "Education and National Character." After this section there is a different scheme for chapters III through IX. Following chapter IX is the Summary and Conclusions, followed by an appendix consisting of a bibliographic note, with references and questions for each chapter. In chapters III through IX Kandel discussed what he regarded as the six leading educational laboratories of the time, England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia and the United States.

After discussing the relationship between education and nationalism in chapter one, and the growth of national systems using examples of the six countries as manifestations and transmitters of national character in chapter two, he then compared the educational problems in these six countries in the rest of the chapters.


The eminent American historian of education, Ellwood P. Cubberley wrote the editor's introduction and Kandel wrote the

¹ The English edition also published in 1933 went under a different title - *Studies in Comparative Education*. It was published in London by Harrap.
preface and then his introduction. Cubberley described this tome thusly:

The book is, to a large degree, a study and interpretation of world progress in educational organization and adaptation in terms of those deep-seated national forces which shape the cultural institutions of mankind, and as such should form an adequate basis for a course, long needed by advanced students in education in our colleges and universities, which will be in effect a philosophy of world educational changes and progress stated in terms of national cultures and national hopes and aspirations.²

In both the preface and the introduction Kandel discussed the methodology involved in treating the comparison of educational systems. The basic elements of his theory and method were outlined in chapter IV of this dissertation. The discussion in this chapter of both his theory and method will be presented primarily as they relate to the structure of the book being analyzed rather than as broad concepts to be developed.

Briefly stated, Kandel's method in this study, was to be able to understand the meaning of both elementary and secondary education in the light of political, social, and cultural forces. These forces determined the nature of national systems of education. In most of the world's countries (probably referring to the affluent industrialized nations of the West) he saw similar problems in education. The solutions which different nations proposed for their educational problems, however, were shaped by cultural and traditional differences characteristic to each.

Kandel mentioned that the only country described in this book

---

in which secondary sources were used was Russia. He visited four
countries in preparation for the book. England, France, Germany, and
Italy. and of course as a United States citizen he was already
familiar with this country. What should be mentioned before this
book is analyzed is the sheer amount of total material that Kandel
used for the six systems of education he described, and the vast
amount of material he used in the book. He then analyzed each
system in its political, cultural, and economic contexts. He used
a broad based historical approach and he utilized nationalism and
national character as constructs for the defining and explication of

3 Kandel viewed culture in two ways, the first as belonging to
totalitarian regimes and the second to democratic governments: the
first. Kandel saw as a thing of the past, while the second applied
to the present reformist period which he saw at the time of writing
the book. He must have been aware however, that his first view of
culture could not apply only to the past. It applied to the
totalitarian regimes of fascist Italy and Communist Russia, and it
would soon apply to Germany with the coming of the Nazis to power
under Hitler on January 30, 1933. the same year Kandel's book was
published. In fact. Kandel did recognize the totalitarian nature of
both Italy and Russia in the book and with certain reservations he
was still optimistic about Germany and its national educational
system. For the first definition of culture, the one he thought of
as belonging more to the nineteenth century. he said:

Culture as a common basis of nationalism was a state product,
a part of the state machinery to promote like-mindedness and
loyalty, and hence a definite part of the state system of education.
training all to be alike: from this angle culture becomes a force
bent and directed to national ends conceived from the political
point of view in order to secure discipline, duty, obedience,
efficiency, and public service. The nation is divided into those
who lead and those who are led, those who define the culture which
is to become the medium for indoctrinating the masses. and the
masses upon whom it is imposed.

Ibid., 8.

Kandel's more modern definition of culture:
implies the spontaneous expression of the individuals of a nation:
it arises out of the free interplay between individuals and their
environment, among themselves.

Ibid.
his position.

At one level it appears that Kandel's writing on the six nation's in this book is nothing more than an encyclopedia of facts about their educational systems. But at a deeper level the data he presented did have a central focus. He applied a framework of a national philosophy for each country and the data were controlled up to a point because all of the nations were subsumed under the same topics.

In order to better understand this book one must know what Kandel meant by a national system of education: "a national system of education may be defined as one in which free and equal opportunities are afforded to all according to their abilities and in which education is actuated by certain common purposes." Each national system, however, was a manifestation of the nation which had begun it, and it communicated something special to the group which comprises the nation. This being the case each individual country developed the educational system it wanted or one that it deserved to have.

In chapter I, "Education and Nationalism," Kandel discussed the worldwide unrest which followed World War I, a war which to him was one of the world's greatest crises. The role of education thus changed from being primarily an instrument of social control to one of the key aids for social reconstruction. The scope of education

---

4 Ibid. 85.

In his discussion of criteria for formulating this definition of a national system of education, Kandel admitted to the difficulties in establishing a definition.
also changed to include not only the child and the adolescent but the preschool child and the adult as well.

Kandel's view of social reconstructionism was totally different from that of George Counts and other American Reconstructionist thinkers. Kandel saw the school as the servant of society, not capable of building a new social order. Learnings from the past should be welded with the best aspects of the present social order to promote permanent values necessary to preserve and enhance civilization. Counts and others favored a social reconstructionism that focused on the school as the instrument for effective social change and a new and fairer social order. Count's position in this matter was set forth in a pamphlet he wrote in 1932, entitled, Dare the School Build a New Social Order?

Kandel said that the two strongest forces, responsible for the theoretical development of education were the democratic ideal and the realization of the worth of the individual. He even believed (naively, no doubt) that democratic ideals were having some influence on fascism and Communism. He saw education as being approached from the two types of nationalism which he recognized. One type saw culture as the free expression of groups or individuals; the other type saw culture defined by the State organized to seek a universal mind and a universal outlook.

Kandel repeated his idea that post-World War I national systems of education were being influenced by democracy, although he offered no concrete evidence or examples of how this was actually happening in totalitarian countries. If the improvement of all the relations
of the individual to society was, along with other aspects of democracy, not making a greater impact, it was due to the worldwide economic depression or simply because of traditional inertia.

In the discussion on nationalism and the schools, Kandel argued that the entire issue of curriculum and curriculum making was decided by the national viewpoint of the relationship of the individual to the State. If the curriculum was determined by the dictates of the State then that would not be the true meaning of nationalism. If, however, the true meaning of nationalism prevailed then national culture was the interaction of individual and group interest that encourage freedom and local initiative. These interests are: intellectual, physical, esthetic, and moral. In the last analysis, any differences between national systems of education were due to the content of each subject and its use rather than to the particular subjects themselves. All subjects may have narrow nationalistic ends and this was more the norm than the entry of educational considerations to their content, presentation, and emphasis on outcomes.

Kandel provided some excellent examples of how either a nationalistic or an apolitical educational philosophy can be presented. History, for one, may emphasize bigotry and prejudice, or patriotism based on xenophobia rather than on loyalty to a nation's ideals; or history can be quite neutral and be taught with the objective of what comes next by developing an appreciation of the progression of events. Geography may be presented with an emphasis on land lost to conquest, on national boundaries, or on the
differences between nations: or it can be taught objectively as a scientific field of study which examines the relationship of man and his environment.

No two countries can have the very same educational systems. Nor can any country claim that its educational problems are unique. What is unique is the manner in which each country tries to solve the problem. "In other words, each nation today constitutes an educational laboratory which yields solutions to the same problems in different ways determined by peculiar social traditions and conditions."5

Because of this concept, Kandel believed that wholesale educational borrowing from one nation to another would be ineffective. Educational systems and practices of one country had to have major adaptations and changes before being transported to another country. He warned that failure to make profound adaptations would run the risk of stampeding local traditions and genius, and the unique social, economic, and political conditions of the receiving nation.

Nationalism had nothing to fear from the development of international understanding. The cooperation of all nations led to the rational development of a world civilization and culture. The development of international understanding resulted from a nation's educational system.

Kandel ended this chapter with an opinion that major forces of a nation must be reckoned with. He said:

5 Ibid., 14.
Whatever future developments may bring, this fact will always remain true, that a philosophy of education which does not take the major forces that would and shape national life into account is likely to remain formal and barren. The development of education as a science is possible, but only in a very limited sense. The human element is too complex and human relations are too involved and complicated to be as easily defined and measured for educational purposes as some enthusiasts for a science of education would claim. 6

In chapter II. "Education and National Character." Kandel discussed the relationship between them. While readily admitting that it may be dangerous to use such a generalization as national character, he proceeded with its use and included it as a chapter in the book. Noting his own warning, he employed the rubric of national character because he believed that his analysis would avoid the deplorable results that usually follow discussions of national character: the attachment of pejorative labels to different national groups. So Kandel said he had no intention of labeling all people of a given country as having the same character because they were citizens of the country that produced them.

Kandel presented his rationale for using national character as a construct:

If generalizations are used it is only in the sense that certain groups are likely to act in ways different from other groups according to their history, traditions, environment, ideals, and intellectual outlook; it is not necessary as a consequence to accept the theory that a nation has a soul or mind. Since human beings are what they are, there is room in every group for the varieties of character and modes of behavior, and yet when they behave as a group they may collectively manifest the common imprint of those factors which have welded them together. 7

6 Ibid., 21-22.
7 Ibid., 23.
Kandel believed that it was important in comprehending the impact of a national system of education to consider the application of a nation's character upon its education. He examined the national character of each of the six nations for the balance of the chapter. He compared the various nations even as he discussed them individually.

He generalized about the English (and other national groups), and his reading of history. His generalizations were more assumptions or hypotheses to be proven, rather than proven facts. He correlated the nations' systems of education with his suppositions of national character to show a correspondence between both. Therefore, the Englishman relied on common sense rather than intelligence, on spontaneity and voluntarism rather than on centralized state planning. This has led to a system of education based on variety and a loose national authority which advised, stimulated, and encouraged instead of controlling and prescribing.

The Frenchman was a man of intellect and thought, a man of ideas who was not terribly concerned with the results of his thinking. The outstanding features of the French were logic, planning, orderliness, and the emphasis on reason. According to Kandel this was the explanation for the French acceptance of centralized bureaucratic educational system of organization and the reverence of an unbroken chain of traditional culture. The French were more concerned with maintaining continuity in their culture than with the democratization of their society.

The German, lacking spontaneity, was subsumed under the rule of
method, discipline, and organization to the point where life easily became mechanized. These traits were coupled with hard work, persistence, and respect for knowledge and science for the purposes of advancing material culture. This set of traits has impacted on the German educational system, which was well known for its thoroughness and effective adaptation of means to ends, and the exercising of unequivocal external authority. This has led to great educational uniformity which advocated a cult of the rational.

The chief characteristic of American life was liberty, or freedom to determine one's course in life. The American had an aversion to theory and was a rebel against tradition. Being practical resulted in the rejection of serious thought. These traits were coupled with a rampant individualism and a suspicion of big government. This has led to an educational system emphasizing local control and local involvement in educational affairs. The people's faith in democracy resulted, in turn, in a faith of equal educational opportunity. There was a rejection of the idea of educating an elite because of the ideal of democratization in education. The American was optimistic, a trait which led to both educational change and progress on a grand, nationwide scale.

The Italian was strongly devoted to hard work, thrift, a respect for tradition and customs, and a willingness to become subservient to a hierarchical arrangement of administration. He was a hero worshiper, had a flair for the dramatic, and a cultivated esthetic appreciation. Kandel felt that it was too early to determine the effect of national character on what was then a new
way of life under Mussolini and fascism.

The same situation existed in Russia in terms of it being too early to judge how national traits of the prototypical Russian impacted on a national system of education. The Russian though was patient, apathetic, and a fatalist, ready to accept what happened next to him. The leaders of Russia, according to Kandel were ready to transform the Russian mentality to match the goals of the Communist revolution.

Kandel summed up this chapter with several points: a successful national system of education must spring from and adjust to the ethos of the nation; because of the differences of national characteristics an educational system of one nation cannot be transferred to another without important modifications; the student of education must familiarize himself with the cultural background of the nation he studies; and lastly, there should be an awareness of the improbability of educational theories and practices becoming applicable on a universal basis.

Kandel's emphasis on national traits and characteristics or national character, brilliant in the way it may have been researched, developed, and refined, cannot be treated as fact because trait theory for entire populations cannot be proven empirically. Kandel's ideas or generalizations on national character overlooked the very crucial point that there are as many differences within a given homogeneous population as there are differences between national groups. Other comments and criticisms of Kandel's paradigm of national character and education will be
covered in the final chapter of this dissertation.

Analyzing Kandel's work fifty-six years after *Comparative Education* was written could easily lead to errors based on the idea of presentism: seeing the past through the prism of the current state of the art in a particular subject area. While Kandel did construct his chapter "Education and National Character" through the knowledge available to him at the time, one could now call it dated at best and erroneous at worst. Yet, Kandel did write in this same chapter: "Theories and principles in the conduct of human affairs can only be adopted as working hypotheses to be checked and modified in the light of all the factors and circumstances which are likely to condition them."\(^8\) Perhaps this applied also to his ideas about national character.

In chapters III through IX, the basic framework of each chapter, the overview, will be presented and analyzed. Omitted will be Kandel's discussion of each of the six countries. The reason for treating these chapters in this manner is the sheer length of this book. Inclusion would in a sense be a replication of the tome-like nature of the book. The frameworks provided by Kandel at the beginning of each chapter form the basis for writing about each separate country. Thus any comparisons between the six countries can be obtained by first understanding the general topic under consideration in each chapter.


---

\(^8\) Ibid., 44.
Tretheway points out: "In fact, it could be argued that the bulk of the book (Comparative Education) is taken up with a series of national case studies in juxtaposition, not comparison, for these are limited to overview statements which begin each chapter and which draw attention to any trends or patterns." Therefore, interesting as it might be to discuss these "juxtaposed" national systems, a more fruitful approach may be to look for and analyze each overview in each chapter.

Chapter III, "The State and Education," opened with the question in education of who shall have control over the child—the family, the Church, or the State. Kandel traced the question back to Plato and Aristotle, the Romans, the Church in the medieval period, and the Church and State during the Reformation. During the present period the State assumed the largest share of control. This began to grow with the beginnings of the political idea of

---


10 Bereday explains juxtaposition as it is used technically in the field of comparative education. Juxtaposition is the first step in comparative education. He says:

In approaching this stage the first procedure is to focus upon the common comparative framework in which analysis can be made. The account for each country will then have to be adapted to fit the central framework. At this stage, each country remains "juxtaposed," or written up separately. Direct comparisons are limited to the introduction or conclusion.


What Trethewey calls overview statements, Bereday calls the introduction. Both agree that this is where comparison takes place and this is the approach used in analyzing Kandel's Comparative Education.
nationalism and the further idea that a nation's welfare and even security were dependent upon education. He traced the idea that the child belongs to the state to early theorists in each nation, although in England and the United States the establishment of national systems was on a decentralized basis, because of the more democratic philosophy prevailing at that time. Two principles forming the basis of the relation of the State to education have survived into the twentieth century in all six countries. One principle was that the State had a right to a complete monopoly in education. This included jurisdiction over public and private education at all levels. The second principle in the democratic nations was the doctrine of giving freer play to the development of group interests by having the State place itself in a more cooperative role of encouraging responsibility and initiative and moving away from its emphasis on authority and control.

Without providing any concrete evidence in support of his position, Kandel saw in the authoritarian states of Russia and Italy, an emphasis in education on the same principles which applied in the other countries, and which highlighted the individual rather than the masses. In France, the strong relationship of the State and education had survived to the present, according to Kandel. "It is only within the last fifteen years that education as the right of the individual to equality of opportunity has been reasserted." In Germany, the inflexible idea of the unitary authoritarian State received a serious setback after World War I. The constitution of

11 Ibid., 49.
1919 focused on the democratic rights of the person and of groups to self-realization under guarantees of protection from the State.

In England, the principle of state control never became a strong influence on English thought. Incorporated into the English system of education was the doctrine of laissez-faire, which generally meant little or no interference on the social institutions by the State. Education would be provided for national stability to groups in need of central government assistance, but the bulk of the population were to provide their own education. Education in the United States depended upon universal education and equality of opportunity. Kandel believed that the relation of the nation to education in the United States was unclear and indefinite.

The control of education in the United States had been exercised under the idea of local control, with authority, being vested in the individual states. Italy, under Mussolini, in 1922, began a political experiment based upon criticism of both liberalism and democracy. Russia, too, would fit this description. In Italy, the State came first. The school existed in order to educate the masses. Control was in the hands of the fascists.

Therefore, education became the central thrust in incorporating the ideas of the fascist State. The State in Italy became a moral and spiritual entity deciding on which moral truths would have total validity. The State had the right to control education and did exercise this control through a hierarchical administration in which local decision making was not considered to be part of the effective process of control.
Kandel quoted from Mussolini's Minister of Education, the philosopher, Giovanni Gentile, who in 1922 commented on the role of the State in education:

The State's active and dynamic consciousness is a system of thought, of ideas, of interests to be satisfied and of morality to be realized. Hence the State is, as it ought to be, a teacher; it maintains and develops schools to promote this morality. In the school the State comes to a consciousness of its real being.12

In Russia, the name which Kandel used instead of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Communists were in control of the party. Because the aims of Communism were to continue the class struggle and develop the new man, education became the linchpin of the permanence of the State. Writing about Russia and Italy, Kandel said.

The State has a life and destiny of its own and its citizens are merely instruments for the attainment of those ends which are defined "by those who know." Beyond these common principles... each country has adopted its own solution of the economic problem.13

Elsewhere in Kandel's writings he was highly critical of both Italy's totalitarian system of the right and Russia's totalitarian system of the left. In this work he was more or less descriptive. Kandel described situations in both countries that paradoxically depicted the schools in these two countries as being educationally free but politically not free. Writing this in the early thirties, he explained:

The new ideals, it is true, have been imposed by force but... force is giving way to propaganda through educational

12 I.L. Kandel, Comparative Education, 69.
13 Ibid., 65.
institutions. . . . in both countries the administrative authorities are content to set the stage, to define clearly the purposes and aims of education, to develop an administrative and teaching personnel which, if not actively, at least passively, must accept these purposes. Beyond this, teachers are free, with the resulting paradox in both countries that courses of study are not prescribed in detail, teachers are expected to organize their syllabuses in accordance with the local environment, and the method of education which is virtually described is the activity method. The individual is free, but the scope and range of his freedom are circumscribed. 14

Concluding this chapter Kandel claimed that every State had the type of education it wanted to have. The relationship of the State to education was a force in all nations that dominated education. Education as a tool of social progress over the long period of time reflected the dominant traits of the environment as a whole.

In chapter IV, "The Organization of National Systems of Education," Kandel discussed some important distinctions necessary to understand the nature of national systems. He provided a criterion for determining what a national system was. It was that a system of education may be called national if it was controlled by a central administrative authority. This authority dictated almost every component of its organization, curriculum and methods, and standards of examination. France was an example of such a system. Italy's Ministry of National Education with its complete control was established in 1929.

England, Germany, Russia, and the United States would not have a bona fide national system of education if this were the only criterion used. England's mixture of public and private schools

14 I.L. Kandel, Comparative Education, 312.
with almost no control from the central board of education would appear not to have a national system of education. Germany, Russia, and the United States, each having its own state system and with either limited or no federal supervision, would also appear to be lacking a national system of education.

Therefore, Kandel applied additional criteria for the purpose of determining whether or not a country had a national system of education. If, he wrote:

it is governed in all its parts by a national ideal and common national purposes.... if it provides a well-coordinated and carefully articulated gradation of educational opportunities free and open to all at public expense.15

He summed up the discussion of national systems of education by remarking:

a national system of education must from the point of view of its organization, be unitary in character, offering equality of opportunity to all according to ability, and differentiated, with a greater variety either of courses in the same school or of schools organized on a functional basis.16

Kandel made the important point that in each of the six countries discussed and compared in this book, there was an absence of a plan for an organized national system of education. First came secondary schools and higher educational institutions for training the nation's leaders. Following this was the provision for compulsory elementary education, which came much later and with no design for articulation with the secondary school. Historically, in

15 Ibid., 84.
16 Ibid., 88.
several of the countries such as England, Germany, France, and Italy, a partnership existed between the Church and State. The Church gradually relinquished its control to the State which was concerned with promoting national welfare and its own national ends. Preschools and kindergartens were established after elementary schools. They had a different theoretical framework from the elementary schools. Vocational education, either through a system of apprenticeship or through special schools, developed in a different stream from elementary and secondary schooling.

"Historically the different branches of education which constitute a national system have thus developed more or less independently, have been influenced by different social and other forces, and were not the results of organized planning." 17

In Chapter five, "Administrative Education," Kandel discussed the management of the vast enterprise of schooling and the inculcation of a system of administration. He discussed the tremendous growth of schooling as a public enterprise worldwide and hence the need for the organization of education. In respect to administration, Kandel believed that the administration of education related to the principles of efficiency of any large organization. However, it was crucial to make the distinction that business organizations are concerned with production or sales but education dealt with human beings, and the success of its organization diminished if its goal was standardization. Concerned with standards though, Kandel distinguished between the two:

17 Ibid., 86.
standardization was not the same as having standards of quality.

Administration was governed by the particular theory of the state and the theory of education peculiar to the individual country. Generally, the authoritarian State embraced a highly centralized system, while the federatative state operated with a minimum of governmental interference, delegating to the schools a certain degree of responsibility for its own administration. The former system sought to control the entire educational system, while the latter established only minimum standards and permitted the schools to operate with local efforts. The outstanding characteristics of the English and American educational systems were the absence of nationwide uniformity and the wide range of variable allowances in schools at local levels doing their work in response to local needs.

For Kandel, a good definition of educational administration was, "To enable the right pupils to receive the right education from the right teachers, at a cost within the means of the State, under conditions which will enable the pupils best to profit by their training." In the ideal system, where both local and central administrative authorities cooperated, central administrative functions should: aid educational effort, promote an efficient organization, suggest the attainment of minimum standards, and have an accurate reporting system.

Kandel used the terms, "externa" and "interna." He defined them in the following way: "the externa... make it possible to bring

18 Ibid., 211.
the right pupil to the right school under the right teacher; they ensure that equality of opportunity which democratic systems of education are seeking to provide." In fact, these externa include the mechanics of an educational system which attempted to maximize the conditions under which schooling could optimally be conducted. Specifically, the externa included laws dealing with compulsory education, the length of the school year, the condition of the building, medical inspection and health, class size, teacher salaries, pensions, and qualifications, and the entire coordination of the system.

"The interna, those aspects of education for the promotion of which teachers and pupils are brought together, are the curricula, courses of study, methods of instruction, textbooks, and standards." The interna were the specifics of education which could not really be legislated, if progress and professionalism were to be encouraged. If a nation wanted stultification it could prescribe the interna but for an effective educative process it was more productive to allow freedom of experimentation and professional growth of teachers, which allowed for the education of better adjusted human beings.

France and Italy were highly centralized. The Soviet Republics and Germany were centralized but were manifesting the start of decentralization. England incorporated a blend of centralization and decentralization, while the United States was decentralized but

19 Ibid., 216.

20 Ibid.
leaning toward more state control and increased Federal Government participation.

Kandel realized that there was no pure system of education or educational administration. He saw a trend toward systems of administration which would mediate effectively the demands of both local and central governments. If this happened then educational administration would enhance the equalization of educational opportunities and promote "those facilities which will ensure the transmission, interpretation, and advancement of national culture." 21

In chapter VI, "Elementary Education," Kandel provided a brief overview of the importance of elementary education in the Western world. He said that, "The history of elementary education, more than any other branch of education is an epitome of the social and political history of each nation." 22 Historically, it had been the function of the elementary school everywhere to convey a certain amount of information. The work of the elementary school was considered to be completed when the students were released from their obligation to attend under compulsory education laws.

At the beginning of the twentieth century elementary education began to change. It went from a terminal point for the masses to an institution which prepared all students for a common foundation with the view of a next step: the secondary school which provided a differentiated education. Europe followed the pattern of this

21 Ibid., 228.
22 Ibid., 349.
provision for further schooling which had already been set in the United States.

At the time this book was published, 1933, Kandel wrote about the continuing changes in the elementary schools of the nations selected for study in the book. The idea of an elementary school was altered by the concept of it being called a primary school instead, with the added expectation that there be a secondary school afterwards; a continuous system of education. While the completion of elementary school did not infer that the masses would attend, at the very least, the concept that education could be provided on a continuum was being developed.

In this chapter Kandel discussed the changes taking place everywhere from the less advantageous aspects of traditional education to a different type. Remarkably, not even mentioning the word "progressive," he wrote positively about the precepts of Progressive education. In his other writings, as mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, Kandel either discussed the progressive ideas pejoratively, or he tried to fuse some of their more favorable ideas with his own essentialist framework. In this chapter on elementary education, one would have difficulty referring to Kandel as an Essentialist.

Discussing and welcoming the change from a traditional school to a new educational philosophy Kandel wrote:

The individual...learns through his own experience—through sensory, perceptual, motor, and emotional activities; he must be a free and active participant in his own education, and the function of the school is to provide the environment which will introduce the learner to a variety of many-sided experiences, growing out of and related to his
interests, needs and capacities. Not knowledge for its own sake, but knowledge related to life.  

So, it appeared that Kandel was coopting the ideas of the progressives for his own. He continued in this chapter to explain that the above ideas were positive changes in the departure from a rigid, formal, traditional elementary school. Later on in the chapter Kandel spoke of the extremists who wanted activity for the children only to be related to the child's direct experience. He advocated learning that teaches the young to be responsible to themselves and society. Active methods of instruction must blend into the accepted social values.

Kandel concluded the chapter by pointing out that elementary education was only one stage, but it was a vital one, nevertheless. Its mission was to lay the foundation for learning throughout one's life. Without actually using the modern term "lifelong learning," Kandel was ahead of his time as an educator who advocated it. He said, "The elementary school can only interpret the life of the society which it serves, express the highest aspirations and ideals which society sets before itself."  

In chapter VII, "Preparation of Elementary Teachers," Kandel reviewed the history of the topic, briefly in his overview. He then explained why the preparation of elementary teachers needed to be longer than the traditional two or three year initial period of training. He saw the trend as one which would provide a complete

23 Ibid., 352-353.
24 Ibid., 359.
general education in a secondary school, followed by preparation for teaching being provided by an institution at the university level. This would mean delaying the early choice of teaching as a vocation. He also advocated continuous growth for teachers after graduation by means of conferences, study groups, and summer courses.

When education was more or less instruction in a fixed core of subjects, then initial training with periodic further study was suitable for the situation. However, with the reform of the school and its new place in society, situations changed considerably so that an initial period of training lasting two or three years was no longer appropriate for elementary teaching.

These changes in the preservice preparation of elementary school teachers included but were not limited to: the need to reexamine and revise subjects and curricula on a regular basis, the active involvement of teachers in constructing courses of study and the very real need to keep up with the latest professional educational theories based on the results of experimentation in the field.

Kandel saw a considerable improvement in the status of elementary school teachers in the six nations from the beginning of the twentieth century to the 1930s. No longer was it considered a job with low esteem but it was on its way to becoming a profession, and the preparatory period was an important if not crucial aspect of professionalization. Kandel wrote: "Improvement of status will have the further salutary effect of directing the interest of teachers away from preoccupation with their economic condition toward closer
study of the more fundamental and important problems of education.\textsuperscript{25} Kandel would have been surprised if not startled to learn that for decades to come, even in the years approaching the twenty-first century that his prediction was completely wrong; that in most of the countries included in the book, and perhaps even in most of the nations of the world, elementary or primary school teachers are still vitally engaged in mass efforts to improve their economic situation.

In the national reforms which took place during the early decades of the twentieth century, Kandel mentioned that significant changes in the preparation of elementary school teachers had occurred. The attempt had been made to lengthen the general, all-round education of the prospective teachers. The trainees were given deeper and broader insights into the content and the purpose of the subjects they were to teach. The association was made between presenting the study of special methods and the study of each subject, in the attempt to professionalize subject matter. Finally, in teacher training school, newer subjects such as sociology, special aspects of psychology, and tests and measurements had been gradually added to the curriculum.

In chapter VIII, "Secondary education" Kandel pointed out that secondary education may be one of the most difficult problems facing the educator and statesman at that time. After providing a brief historian overview, he elaborated on the then current problems of

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 527.
secondary education in the nations treated in the book. A central theme was a clash of democracy in the United States, England, France, and pre-Nazi Germany versus Communist Russia and fascist Italy.

Democracy had been called upon to meet the challenges of the totalitarian right and left. Kandel described the economic crisis worldwide which had caused universal unrest in the secondary school. Unemployment following the economic crisis along with mechanization of industry, led to significantly fewer opportunities for secondary school youth. Kandel emphasized the importance of education for the national well being.

At the beginning of the twentieth century the United States started to depart from the elitist secondary education of Europe. The American rationale was to provide every student, male and female, with the opportunity to attend a secondary school. This was in fact a provision of equal educational opportunity. Secondary education in Europe remained constricted because of the limited and traditional ideal of liberal education.

Despite the success of the United States in expanding and providing secondary schooling at public expense, Kandel was still critical. He believed that the growth of the secondary school had not been guided by any clear purpose. By the 1930's in the United States more than three hundred courses were being offered to high school students. In a blistering attack on this, Kandel said:

A haphazard aggregation of subjects which are put together on the mechanical principle that all subjects taught for the same length of time have the same value, and which are adapted to the interest and abilities of the individual
pupils. seems to furnish the basic foundation of a secondary education. 26

English education was noted for its emphasis on the social skills involved in being a cooperative citizen. Intellectual training was not a priority in the English secondary schools but learning fair play was. Kandel saw an improvement however in England's secondary schools from the early 1900s to the early 1930s. He believed that a quote of a former English director of education was an accurate statement of its schools. The quote was:

The Secondary Schools are doing a great work. Every year they turn out nearly 100,000 boys and girls with minds comparatively trained, with a fairly solid mass of necessary knowledge, with self-respect and a sense of responsibility, with a love of fair play and an incipient civic sense which they have learned on the playing field. 27

The French secondary schools were committed to the growth of general culture and education of the power of reasoning. The system was purposely designed to select an elite. Students were introduced to a complete heritage of the humanities through the study of the classics. "French secondary education seeks to develop the spiritual and intellectual sides of the individual, not by amassing knowledge but through a critical approach to it." 28 Kandel believed that every Frenchman would agree that the secondary school system in France was for the few, meaning that it was intellectually aristocratic.

Kandel found secondary education in Germany wanting. The pre-

26 Ibid., 628.
27 Ibid., 635.
28 Ibid., 635.
World War I objective which provided for comprehensive cultural training was deficient because of the great pressure on the students. The emphasis was on the subjects and not at all on the students. This led to a narrow type of encyclopedism. The new German aim continued to emphasize intellectualism but not entirely. It became clear that intellectual training alone did not improve the total personality. A change in subject matter content was being accompanied by a new approach to methods of instruction which was being designed to give significant opportunity for individual participation. This reform in theory was not as difficult as the problem of retraining secondary school teachers.

Secondary education in Italy was considering reform with two objectives in mind. The first was to establish different types of postelementary schools: general, prevocational, and vocational. The second was to structure secondary schools to provide for the careful selection of gifted students for matriculation to the universities. This would be accomplished by examinations of a competitive nature. The goal was to reduce the very large number of students who sought admission to the overcrowded professions and public service jobs by attending the university. Particular emphasis was given to the vitalization of Italian culture.

In the reform of the Russian secondary school there was no place for the traditional culture. This type of culture was construed to be an inheritance of the undesirable bourgeois. Russian secondary education was a higher component of the unified labor school which was devoted to training students for the
Secondary education in the United States was still in the process of reconstruction as it had been for the past quarter of century. At worst it did not have faith in scholarship nor in a cultural tradition. At best it was called experimental, trying to adapt course and curriculum to the individual student. "It is seeking to reinterpret culture in terms of life to be lived under the peculiar social and economic conditions of American life. In practice it represents a blend of the old and the new." 29

The problems of the American secondary school as compared with the European schools were caused by disposing of the traditional faith either in general training or formal discipline. The goal was to meet the differentiated needs and capacities of the individual student in the absence of any distinct guidance of either social or cultural designs. These problems were magnified by the swift increase in student enrollment and the lack of the necessary supply of well trained teachers.

In Chapter IX entitled, "Secondary School Teachers," Kandel pointed out that historically the preparation of secondary school teachers received much less attention than the training of elementary school teachers. Since the function of the secondary school was to prepare scholars, the only qualification required of the teacher was a complete mastery of his subject. The goal, then, of mastery was considered to be wholly sufficient insofar as preparation was involved.

29 Ibid., 637.
When the departure from subject matter took place, as in the English secondary schools, the emphasis then was on the personality of the teacher. The goal became one of producing students of good character. The problem in terms of teacher preparation was that scholarship could be obtained by university study but there was no system for training of the personality.

When the secondary school served only the elite, which implied that the students had a certain cultural background, academic preparation for teachers was considered adequate. This changed when the doors to the secondary schools opened to everyone. Then it became apparent that if secondary education was to effectively be a continuation of primary education then the gap between the trained elementary teacher and the untrained secondary teacher had to be closed.

Professional educators became aware that education was more comprehensive than mere instruction in subject matter. The purpose became one of training the whole person and it called for a new approach to secondary school teacher preparation. What did this new approach encompass? It covered the study of values in education, understanding the student, of subject matter on a broad basis, and the adaptation of the subject matter to the student.

In Italy, both elementary and secondary teachers were being trained to know their subjects better. The recent trend was to emphasize both the broad cultural foundations as well as subject matter. There was also an emphasis on spiritual penetration proposed by Gentile which Kandel left unexplained.
In France, England, and the United States, the preparation of secondary teachers included the study of the theory, psychology, and history of education, along with methods of instruction. But there was no attempt to relate these courses in any way to the required academic courses, in the arts and sciences. Kandel said that there were certain exceptions to the study of education courses in these countries but he gave no clue to what they were.

Germany was more advanced than the other countries but academic preparation was reserved for training in the universities, while professional preparation was reserved for selected secondary schools. While this still was a better system than that of the other nations it was not as good as the German preparatory schools for elementary teachers. It lacked, according to Kandel, "freedom, initiative, and growth which should be the ends of a thorough professional preparation." 30

An interesting and significant omission exists in this chapter. Kandel, who had to rely only on secondary sources for his information on the Soviet Union (or Russia as he primarily referred to this country in the book) completely left the Soviet Union out of this chapter. He made no mention at all of secondary education in the Soviet Union nor did he explain the reasons for the omission.

Chapter X, the last chapter, is entitled, "Summary and Conclusions." Kandel analyzed the condition of education in the world (as he defined it: the nations selected for this book) in the early 1930s. He discussed the tempo of educational reconstruction

30 Ibid., 830.
as well as the serious economic impact of the depression. He indicated that the provision of elementary schooling was no longer adequate to meet the needs of the twentieth century as it was for the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century the welfare of each nation depended upon providing the individual with educational opportunities which would enable him to reach his potential.

Anticipating contemporary trends in the period since World War I Kandel discussed the variety of educational arrangements that the nations were already conceptualizing in the early 1930s. Putting this variety into a framework of lifelong learning, Kandel stated:

The new educational program accordingly contemplates the provision of care for infants, creches and nursery schools, kindergartens or maternal schools, primary schools, post-primary or secondary schools differentiated and varied according to the needs and abilities of the pupils, vocational schools, colleges and universities, and adult education, ranging from schools for the liquidation of adult literacy to the organization of opportunities for advanced studies.31

Kandel seemed to have been ahead of his time, not only in recognizing and advocating "lifelong learning." but recognizing also, that if education were to advance significantly it had to depend upon the willingness of the public to both understand its dynamics and to support it. More than fifty years after Comparative Education was written, reforms are taking place especially in urban areas of the United States, but elsewhere as well. These reforms are insisting on and clamoring for public participation in the affairs of education and public schooling.

Kandel discussed the issues of both central control and local

31 Ibid., 861.
control of school systems. He recognized that centralized systems of education may accomplish higher standards of achievement than locally controlled systems, but he also recognized their weakness: they do not usually respond well to public demands for change. He said, "The least centralized systems often reflect the variety of forces and influences which give character to a nation."32

The English system's strength, he believed was the idea of a workable balance between central and local control. He thought this idea was being embraced in Germany, Russia, and the United States, in regard to the administrative function in education. In Italy, he believed it was taking place in terms of the freedom which was allowed teachers in the organization of curriculum.

Kandel discussed similarities and differences in his comparison of national educational systems. The main area of difference was due to the differences in national background. The similarities arose because of the fact that the basic aim throughout the history of national systems was always the transmission of the cultural legacy and the continuation of society.

Older countries, such as England and France, were seen by Kandel as less ready to yield or change what they consider to be the vital basis of their traditional national foundations. Germany was purportedly trying to adjust its new forms of social organization to the progressive growth of selected traditions as a basis for national unity. Italy and Russia were combining activity methods with political indoctrination, thereby allowing freedom within

32 Ibid., 863.
certain inflexible limits. In the United States the pattern was to construct a tradition that saw to it that traditions did not become permanent. He saw that this pattern was responsible for change and progress in America.

In concluding this chapter and the book, Kandel discussed the value of comparative education. It is a valuable study because it examines how nations live and think. It develops an appreciation of the different factors which contribute to every nation its special characteristics. It throws light on the meaning of education for national welfare. It encourages the discovery of those forces which enable nations to understand and cooperate with other nations. A comparative approach helps to develop a greater sense of each nation's strength and promotes patriotism based on the understanding of the positive contributions of nations to human progress. All too often patriotism is developed which stresses the differences among nations, leading to xenophobia. The solutions that nations offer are different because of their unique history and traditions.

Kandel believed that what is crucial for the development and progress of humanity as a whole is color and variety of life: education is a real entity becoming spontaneous only if it is motivated by the cultural foundations of the people whom it seeks to serve.

In this massive, tremendously detailed, and scholarly work, Kandel provided the reader with a complete history of the educational system of each of the six nations under study. He also offered an unequivocal prescription as to what ought to be done to
improve education in these countries. Perhaps his strongest theme in this book was that school systems follow the nation and society in which they happen to be. He analyzed the condition of the pupil, the teacher, and the organization of the school in every conceivable manner, leaving little out of his comprehensive explanations and his broadly sweeping elaborations.

Step by step, Kandel took the reader through the development and problems of national systems of education. He had first hand experience with five of the six countries he wrote about. He showed how the systems grew haphazardly, what positives they offered and how they needed to improve in order to best serve and influence their clientele.

The Making of Nazis was published in 1935, two years after Hitler came to power as the chancellor of Germany on January 30, 1933. The book covers the years 1933-34. Kandel used German publications entirely in his book and he included Hitler's infamous book, Mein Kampf (My Struggle). Brickman aptly describes Kandel's book as "probably the first work of its type by a non-German."

Kandel analyzed the German publications and official regulations which dealt with the philosophy of education in Nazi Germany. He stressed the lesson for democracy by writing that the German effort to merely change the constitution in 1919 did not make a considerable impact because the country lacked a democratic tradition. Germany's experience in allowing Nazism to flourish while the Weimar Republic was on a shaky foundation led Kandel to
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warn. "that men may lose their heads through freedom as readily as for it." 34

Kandel radically shifted his position in writing this book. In his previous book, **Comparative Education**, published two years earlier, and written for the most part before the Nazis came to power he was optimistic about the Weimar Republic. In writing about the reform brought about by the German constitution of 1919, especially as it related to the protection of the individual and his right to education. he said. "Domination and prescription. the characteristics of an authoritarian state. have been replaced by stimulation. advice. and counsel which mark a government based on the idea of partnership and cooperation of all parties concerned." 35

Kandel wrote **The Making of Nazis** not only to provide information on developments in Germany education, something he had done for many years, both before and after 1935, but to warn those who placed their faith in democracy of the imminent dangers of totalitarianism. It is divided into four chapters and a bibliography. Chapter I. "National Socialism and Education" provides some background on the rise of the Nazis. Kandel attributed their coming to power on certain historical events and certain German characteristics. These included the Treaty of Versailles. the failure of the League of Nations. the hostility of a
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34 I.L. Kandel. **The Making of Nazis** (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935). 136. He meant by this remark that if a nation did not have a tradition of democracy, a change of constitution would not help them.

defeat of a nation, the series of one economic crises and "the political incapacity of the Germans themselves." 36

On the purported political incapacity of the Germans. Kandel cited three sources, all German writers, who pointed out Germany's political deficiencies. While these three writers presented their ideas on the matter informatively, Kandel used their ideas as completely factual. He attributed Germany's political failures to the ineptitude of grafting a democratic system on to a nation whose people's highest ideals had historically, been not at all consistent with democratic principles and a democratic way of life.

Kandel saw National Socialism as a way of reestablishing the German totalitarian state only on a grander and more penetrating basis. He showed that liberalism was equated with Marxism saying:

Liberalism, particularly the liberalism of the German Republic is on all occasions deliberately and contemptuously referred to as Marxism: this is part of the general program of the National Socialist Party to uproot and to destroy ruthlessly all traces of the ideals upon which the Republic was built. 37

The German student bodies, particularly at the secondary and university levels, were seen by Kandel as a lost generation, one which had not really adjusted to the Weimar Republic. Enrollments at the schools soared after 1918, unemployment was very high and this led to competition in the professions and scapegoating against Jews. Many students became reactionaries and supporters of extreme nationalism. Hitler's National Socialist German Labor Party thus
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was a catchall term which appealed to the nationalists, the Social Democrats, Germans who feared foreign influences, and a Labor Party which attracted the workers.

Kandel realized that historically there were both positive and negative sides to nationalism. In much of his writing on nationalism Kandel showed that the positive aspects would include a nation's awareness of how it had uniquely contributed to the progress of civilization and the peace of the world. Nationalism in its best form would aim at cooperation with the other nations of the world to make certain that the boundaries of all nations were upheld and the rights of the citizens in every nation respected. All nations could be proud of how, in one form or another, its citizens contributed to the advancement of learning and the betterment of mankind.

For Kandel, the nationalism of Nazism represented the apex of its negative side. The evils of Nazi nationalism knew no bounds and respected no national boundaries. Its self-serving theories of racial and national superiority raised the evils of nationalism to new heights. Instead of world cooperation as its goal it promoted world conquest. Its theories of racial superiority, inferiority, and sub-humanness led to a nation of brutes who followed a dictator down the path of totalitarianism and national revenge for its past defeats at the hands of other nations. Instead of sharing with other nations and contributing to world harmony, Nazi nationalism promoted only its own aggrandizement leading down the path to a desire for world dominion.
Kandel discussed at the length, the virulent forms of National Socialist inspired racism and anti-semitism which swept through Germany. He named some of those leaders in power who were responsible for their widespread dissemination. Among these names were men such as Hitler, Goebbels, Rosenberg, and Ernest Krieck, who was the leading Nazi educational theorist at that time.

Kandel discussed what he thought was Hitler's pacifist facade, but he warned that behind this facade was a strong appeal to militarism and a heroic interpretation of life. In a prophetic way, Kandel exposed some of Hitler's evil intentions in writing.

"Hitler's fervent wish that all Germans from the cradle up send up a prayer for arms to the Almighty is likely to be fulfilled." 38

Obviously, Kandel read Hitler's Mein Kampf very carefully, and he believed that Hitler was totally serious about the outrageous anti-semitic and totalitarian ideas in the book. He knew German history, the language, and current events, well enough to judge Hitler and his evil intentions, when many westerners at the time either could not or chose not to. Kandel knew, for example, that the book, Mein Kampf was written by the man who got down on his knees when World War I began to thank God that he was privileged to be living at that time.

Kandel wrote about the impact of the Nazis in Hitler's Germany on young children as early as 1933. He described and elaborated what was happening from an account he had read in the Times Educational Supplement of that year:

38 Ibid., 14.
In order to lose no time primers have been prepared along the lines suggested by the Fuhrer, and military toys of all kinds have been increased. Fairy tales are being revised in order to develop the right attitude of mind: thus, the wolf in Little Riding Hood is the Jew, and the witch in Hansel and Gretel, two good German children, is the Frenchman. 39

In the closing pages of the first chapter, Kandel captured the essence of the Nazi movement in describing how Hitler was the law and the will of the people. In practice this meant that all spiritual and material life was subordinated to the interests of the State. The leader, Hitler, organized a hierarchy to organize religion, language, economics, law, education, science, and culture. 40 Everything became part of a grand design of societal control under one central government.

At all levels of the Nazi bureaucracy, free thought and free communication were contained and suppressed. Kandel explained this suppression by pointing to the Nazi leaders who showed direct
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40 Kandel said that science and mathematics were not yet subordinated to the interests of the state at that time. He did mention however that there were some articles which had been published in educational journals depicting a uniquely German quality in its mathematical contributions.

Kandel used the German word "gleichgeschaltet" without actually defining it. He discussed it in the context of subjects such as math and science not yet being "gleichgeschaltet." According to Webster's Third International Dictionary, s.v. the word means: the act, process, or policy of achieving rigid and total coordination and uniformity by forcibly repressing or eliminating independence and freedom of thought, action or expression.

Kandel often employed the use of foreign terms in his writings without defining them. Why he assumed the reader would know these terms is anybody's guess. The sprinkling of these terms can act as a barrier to understanding what Kandel was trying to convey.
contempt in matters of reason and intellect. The primary reliance of the top leaders was on emotional and irrational appeals.

In Chapter II of the book, entitled "Educational Theory," Kandel said that the Nazis had two central educational tasks. One was to eradicate the educational reforms under the Weimar Republic, and the other was to construct a new educational philosophy based on Nazi revolutionary ideas. Any liberal gains in decentralization, teacher creativity, parent involvement, internationalism, and concern for the individual pupil and his environment, were attacked and eliminated by the Nazis who received their inspiration on these matters from Mein Kampf.

In the place of these Republican gains in education was the emphasis on the development of social responsibility, discipline, and obedience. "The bases of education must be the group, ancestral tradition and hereditary form, so that it may be organic and that the individual must realize his membership in the group and the school its duty to the State."41

The greatest importance in the hierarchy of educational values under the Nazis was placed first on physical education, second on character building, and last on intellectual training. A boy grew to be a man and learned to obey so that he may command by receiving training in physical education. Great pride was taken in achieving well-formed bodies. Character education emphasized loyalty, sacrifice, keeping quiet when being punished, either justly or unjustly, strength of will and joy in responsibility.
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Intellectually most of what was usually taught might be cast aside because what was not used was just forgotten. Each student was to be taught only the things that would be useful to him and his community. The study of more than one language, presumably the mother tongue, was considered to be a waste of time.

General education should not play a major role in a student's education. Rather it should be reduced significantly and it should be followed by heightened specialization which leads to a vocation. History, which focuses on the world and the race question, should be taught. It should be used as a guide to the future and to preserve one's own people. The focus should be on patriotism, national pride and national heroes. This education must result in military service for boys, and, for girls, it should prepare them totally for their careers as mothers.

The Nazis criticized the universities for failing to save the country. They were engaged, it was thought, in minute and insignificant research and the idea of academic freedom was thought to be obsolete. The Nazi goal was to instill in the universities the idea of the perpetuation of the nation in the light of biological and racial theory, which no doubt meant "nordic superiority".

For the Nazis, the task of the university was one of guarding, protecting, and teaching the various cultural possessions of the country. Students and teachers must unite politically. They were to unite through mandatory participation in labor, sport (either of a military or quasi-military type) and defense service, along with
national-political training.

Under the Nazis, the school performed only a limited function of education. Youth organizations such as the Hitlerjugend rounded out formal schooling with its emphasis on physical training and political activities. The ethos for every young man was that of a political-soldier who is given discipline, training, and order. (Disziplin, Zucht, and Ordnung) Kandel thus reported that, "the totalitarian concept has penetrated into every corner of the educational system."43

Chapter III is a lengthy one entitled "Adapting Education to the New Social Order." In the chapter Kandel elaborated on some of the themes he discussed in the previous chapter. He showed how the Nazis gained total control of the complete formal and extracurricular educational apparatus. By formal institutions he meant the elementary, school, the secondary school teacher training institutions and the universities. The extracurricular organizations were confined to the Nazi youth movement. These organizations belonged to a council and were affiliated with the Hitlerjugend (Hitler youth). He also showed clearly how the schools and universities, along with the powerful youth groups were altered from their pre-Nazi days, to reflect unequivocally Nazi
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44 Other Nazi youth groups were the S.A., Arbeitsdienst Gelandesport, Wersport Kameradschaftshauser and the Bund deutscher Madel for female youth. The Hitlerjugend was the training ground for the S.A. (Sturmabteilung). It was an advanced group used for military purposes.
doctrine with its total allegiance to Hitler and his ideas of "German greatness and Superiority."

Whatever liberal traditions had existed before the Nazi's came to power, died quickly under the threat of imprisonment or dismissal for liberal thinking teachers. This was even true of the elementary school teachers in Germany who, Kandel said, had fought long and hard for liberalization of the schools and their rights for the previous one-hundred years. Kandel wrote. "If there were any protests from any part of the teaching profession, they have not been made public; on the other hand, there have been some outstanding examples of sudden conversions which cannot be reconciled with the philosophies, political and educational, previously held by the converts.45

Thus, under Hitler's beginning years of 1933-1934, strict discipline was returned to the schools and the teachers. Great emphasis was placed on militarization of physical training through open country sport and military sport.46 Since the Versailles Treaty prohibited German youth from participating in military
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46 Open country sport was called "Gelandesport" and it was the foundation for military sport. "Gelandesport" consisted of marching excursions and simple activities of a recreational nature. These were not supposed to be artificial or commercialized, rather, spontaneity was advocated. These activities included folk songs and music, folk art, and folk dances.

Military sport was referred to as "Wehrsport". It consisted of the following: marching, digging trenches, going under or cutting barbed wire, bayonet drill, gas defense and throwing models of hand grenades. Girls supplemented their physical training with courses in first aid, child care, and dietetics which including quantity cooking.
matters. the early Nazi militarization set limits for its youth.

There were ultranationalistic changes in the teaching of history based on racist theories of Aryan superiority whose goals were to develop national pride, and emphasize a national heritage and national heroes. Along with these sweeping changes came a new regulation which regulated school journeys and excursions so German youth could familiarize themselves with their land and customs.

Kandel covered a wide range of Nazi regulations put into effect in 1933 and 1934: regulations such as the one on heredity and race knowledge passed on September 13, 1933. Kandel translated from the decree thusly:

> The knowledge of fundamental biological facts and their application to each individual and group is a condition sine qua non for the renewal of our people. No pupil, boy or girl, should be allowed to leave school for life without this fundamental knowledge.47

An earlier decree issued on April 25, 1933 was a regulation announcing a quota system "numerous clausus" for secondary schools and universities. It severely limited the number of Jews admitted to these institutions of higher learning.

A decree of July 22, 1933 instructed employees of the Ministry of Education to give the Hitler salute with their arms upraised both on and off duty. Another decree of the same date required everyone in any educational institution to use the salute during the singing of patriotic German songs. Each lesson must start and end with the raising of the right arm together with the words "Heil Hitler."

One of the most important educational innovations mentioned by
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Kandel in this book was the "Landjahr" (year in the country) which began in Prussia in 1934. Each student who finished eight years of elementary school had to spend nine months of the ninth year in the country. The innovation was intended to be a form of national-political education, with physical toughening through contact with the land. Solidarity was a goal and it was to be achieved through the closeness of community life, offsetting the negative environment of the city. The "Landjahr" was not considered to be part of formal schooling. It was used to promote cohesion under the principles of National Socialism.

Under the Nazis, education, like everything else in Germany, was organized on the principle of hierarchical leadership. This was referred to in German as the principle of "Fuhrerprinzip". An example of this in education was that the Nazis decreed a school principal to be completely in charge of the school, instead of being only the first among equals as was his position during the Weimar Republic, before the Nazis took control.

The last chapter in the book is entitled "The Challenge of Totalitarianism." For comparative education Kandel pointed to problems of democracy. He wrote:

So far as education is concerned it can be asserted that democracies do not seem to be as conscious of their task as are those states which the recent Revolutions have produced. The ideals of democracy were defined so long ago in the English-speaking world that there is a tendency to accept them for granted as much as the air we breath, resulting in a condition of mind which fails to realize that it should be the everyday task of the school to inculcate them if they are to be preserved.48
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For Kandel, the most important issue in education was for the people living under democratic governments to meet the challenge of totalitarian governments: Communism, fascism, and Nazism, and to rediscover democracy's basic principles. This meant enriching the life of every person and help him become a better member of society. It also meant encouraging each individual's free development and setting before him goals of social allegiance to help him guide his behavior.

Kandel published a major article on comparative education in October, 1936. The title was simply, "Comparative Education." In the article he discussed some of his ideas on the methodology in the field. This was examined in chapter IV of this dissertation which dealt with his theories and methods.

In this article, Kandel explained that comparative education was not new: what is relatively new was that by 1936, the time this article was published, it became an organized branch of the study of education. From 1916 to 1936 foreign school systems were studied because of the instability in education caused by the turmoil of World War I, and the widening of the framework of the study of education. Right after the war began, the warring nations evaluated their own educational systems and compared them with other nations' educational systems. The result of this was a search for new approaches in education and a consequent widespread and vigorous interest in comparative education, along with a considerable expansion of its literature.

Kandel made the interesting point that, while material in the
field written in English was increasing, the comparative educator should still be proficient in at least two foreign languages. He did not explain why but one can only assume that he thought it necessary to read primary sources in languages other than English.

Kandel was emphatic on insisting that comparative education should not encourage blanket educational borrowing from one country to another. He made this point many times in his long career. He only favored adopting practices directly if a nation carefully modified the theory and practices of the country it wanted to borrow from. He wrote:

> There are today enough evidences of the failure of such attempts, which in most cases is not a criticism of the theories or practices but rather proof of the thesis which has been emphasized up to this point that educational systems reflect the ethos of their environment and that all that can be transported is the idea to be modified and applied to the ethos of the new environment.

Perhaps a current example of what Kandel meant is that the United States should not think of borrowing educational ideas and practices on a wholesale basis from a country like Japan without proper modifications, taking the differences in culture into consideration. American educators and government officials who advocate such indiscriminate borrowing from Japan would be well advised to take Kandel's advice into consideration before borrowing.

Kandel gave examples of the failure of such borrowings in South

49 In all of the extensive research for the preparation of this dissertation there has been not a shred of evidence uncovered which revealed where or how Kandel became proficient in learning the foreign languages he so frequently employed.

American countries, China, Persia, and Egypt. He lauded Mexico for adapting what they did from the outside to their own national character and attitudes. Adapting other nation's educational practices and theories by significantly altering them to suit the new environment was a key point of Kandel's.

In the article, Kandel discussed the purpose of comparative education. He said, "the purpose of comparative education, as of comparative law, comparative literature or comparative anatomy is to discover the differences in the forces and causes that produce differences in educational systems." Kandel felt that most of the advanced countries had similar problems, or even the same problems, but the solutions were different. He gave an example of this by showing that all countries were concerned with the education of the adolescent but few were willing to try the solution of America's answer: the comprehensive high school.

In the article, Kandel wrote about sources of information for the student of comparative education. He listed the then current sources such as: the Bureau International Education, the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, the International Institute of Educational Cinematography, the World Association for Adult Education, the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, the Carnegie Corporation, the U.S. Office of Education and others. He concluded with a discussion of the available textbooks in the field, including his own monumental, Comparative Education.

---
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In 1937 the National Society for the Study of Education published a major work by Kandel who was a co-editor (along with Guy Whipple). It was part two of the thirty-sixth Yearbook entitled, *International Understanding in the Public School Curriculum*. Kandel himself wrote a chapter in the book: "Intelligent Nationalism in the Curriculum." In this chapter, Kandel presented his highly original theme on the relationship of nationalism to teaching and learning about the meaning of global understanding.

Kandel took a positive and optimistic stance toward the promotion of international understanding, even at a time when parts of the world were at war or preparing for global warfare. He denied that progress in the control of world affairs was not being made as many persons said at that time. He clearly understood the serious reasons why people were pessimistic about the chances for success in education for international understanding. He acknowledged the "disregard of pact after pact, and to the nullification of one treaty after another."52 In spite of the considerable emphasis on aggressive nationalism during that period of upheaval in international affairs, Kandel, rightly or wrongly, could not admit that the world was at the brink. Neither could he foresee that fifty million people would die in the war which was to take place in the years following the writing of this chapter. He admitted there were overworked munitions factories but he said that mankind could

---

not accept the situation as an ongoing set of normal conditions. If this were true, he believed, then life would again be terrible, aggressive, and limited.

Kandel took a historian's view which led him to believe that it had taken hundreds of years for mankind to establish law and order, to organize legislative government and to embrace the ideals of democracy and the establishment of equalization of individual rights in any particular country. With this in mind, Kandel viewed the years from 1918 to 1937 as merely a brief period, a period in which he was not able to admit that failure in international relations was a fact just because the world was not in an acceptably peaceful era. He even said that more people than ever before were negating the idea that war was inevitable and they were working towards solutions to the global problem of imminent warfare. One could argue with the notion that Kandel could not accept the realities of the distinct possibilities of war, but certainly no one could say that he was anything but optimistic about the condition of global affairs at that time.

In discussing the educational impact of international understanding, Kandel developed the nonmainstream idea that the failure of international cooperation in the previous twenty years was due to educators choosing the wrong course of action. He raised some exceedingly interesting points: educational emphasis was put on internationalism prior to any effort being made to dispel the evils of the ideas inherent in nineteenth century nationalism; internationalism in its many manifestations too often has been
discussed too abstractly; this being the case, international relations have been perceived as being separate from nations and their concrete realities.

Thus, according to Kandel's views too many international conferences in Geneva, Switzerland, and elsewhere, have been held in lieu of focusing on the real meaning of nationalism. Too much sentimentality about internationalism or mistaking internationalism for cosmopolitanism resulted in global failures between nations. Kandel emphasized that nations must continue to survive if internationalism is to exist because internationalism was a phenomenon that exists between nations.

Kandel took to task those who would criticize patriotism and loyalty to one's nation. He said, "such criticisms of patriotism are as valid as would be the charge that one is less loyal to his family, his community, and the multiplicity of social groups of which one may be a member."53 However, Kandel did distinguish between this type of constructive patriotism and the destructive patriotism which advocated the notion "that love of one's fellowmen stops at national frontiers, if it means that it must be based on malice to all and charity toward none outside one's own national group."54

So for Kandel, international understanding was not to be misconstrued as an alternative to being patriotic or loyal to one's country. Rather, he saw it as nations comprehending one another.

---
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acknowledging their interdependence, and having an awareness that all nations could contribute to the cause of humanity. This construct of international understanding helped to explain that each nation may have its own particular characteristics with room for differences of race and character. In addition, each nation became a member in the building of the world's civilization.

Kandel credited teachers, except in totalitarian countries, with being vitally interested in the progression of a workable idea of nationalism and international understanding. But he felt that teachers too often mistakenly initiated projects for promoting international understanding that were not part of the regular curriculum. So wedded, it appears, was Kandel to formal education that, in his opinion, programs that were outside of the school's curriculum were doomed to failure. Programs such as peace demonstrations, special international assemblies, good-will days, or exchanging books and dolls all had their place, but they were seen as being short-lived, without a significant educational impact.

Even special separate high school courses such as Civics, Citizenship, Foreign Affairs, International Relations and Causes of Misunderstanding and Effects of War were seen by Kandel as being extraneous. Indeed, so strongly did he feel about this that he claimed the entire Yearbook, of which his chapter was a part, had for a theme, "the development of international understanding is the concern of every teacher of every subject in every grade of the school, and that international understanding can only grow out of a
proper teaching of nationalism. "55

Kandel believed that every subject, activity, and experience in every nation was the result of humanity's entire efforts. The reservoir of culture was drawn upon by many minds and races, throughout time, from many nations. If educators would only adopt the maxim that nothing human is alien to them, this would go a very long way in terms of making progress in international relations. Science, mathematics, music, and art transcend national boundaries in the sharing of ideas and experiences. The social sciences, too, had meaning in the international arena because of the rich opportunities for examining national problems in their world setting.

Kandel concluded in this chapter: "The end to be achieved is an understanding of civilization and culture as a collective achievement--the common heritage and the joint responsibility of all nations--and patriotism will be no less as each pupil learns the part that his own nation has played in this achievement."56

Kandel's approach to international understanding appeared to minimize the negative aspects of nationalism even while acknowledging these negatives as they existed at the time in totalitarian societies. His idea of approaching international understanding through formal schooling and traditional subjects seemed to be sensible enough, providing each nation produced enough teachers with an international outlook. It is conceivable though
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that while even having enough of these global-minded teachers in the nations of the world, the demands of the job might be too great to include an international dimension.

As teachers wrestled and continue to do so with enormous problems of dropouts, equality of educational opportunity, racism, strikes, bureaucracy, overcrowded schools, etc. one may legitimately ask whether Kandel's approach, sensible as it sounds and original as it may have been, is indeed practical, realistic, and workable.

That Kandel believed formal education could promote such great international understanding is clear evidence of how much faith he had in it. After two world wars were fought globally and they wrought such terrible destruction to mankind and to civilization, Kandel still believed that international cooperation and understanding were the roads to peace and the advancement of civilization.

The 1930s ended with much of the world at war with the entry of the United States to the war in December of 1941, the war became a global one, devastating mankind but, in victory, salvaging the democracies for future generations in particular and civilization in general. Kandel's important works of the 1930s added a greater dimension of depth to the domain of comparative and international education. He continued his important writing on many different countries after the 1930s ended. He devoted much energy to education during and after the Second World War. He also wrote about the importance of international organizations such as the United Nations and UNESCO.
In the last chapter (VII), dealing with his major works in comparative and international education, are included some of his most important work from the years, 1944-1961. Three books and five articles written during these years are discussed and analyzed. These works depict Kandel's maturity as he reached the latter part of this career. The pressures of World War II which loomed on the horizon of the 1930s were over. The scourge of Nazism and fascism gave way to a new reality for the world and for Kandel. A call for peace and multinational organizations to ensure the peace became focal points for enlightened citizens everywhere. The next chapter illustrates Kandel's concern with international cooperation even before World War II ended. An attempt will be made to show how Kandel's work in the 1940s, 1950s and even into the early 1960s elevated comparative and international education to new and enduring heights.
CHAPTER VII

AN ANALYSIS OF KANDEL'S MAJOR WORKS IN COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE DECADES OF THE 1940S AND 1950S

During the 1940s and 1950s Isaac L. Kandel's reputation was enhanced in the fields of comparative and international education. While some of his most important work was written in the 1930s, his later work is also viewed as being significant. He continued to teach, lecture, and write voluminously in the 1940s, and he carried on with his lecturing and writing even after he left teaching in 1950. As a polished writer and accomplished comparativist, it appears that much of his writings in the 1940s and 1950s were more direct, clearer, and less repetitious than some of his earlier writings.

In this chapter the following major books and journal articles by Kandel will be discussed and analyzed:

- International Cooperation: National and International, 1944
- Education in an Era of Transition, 1948
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The 1961 article was written when Kandel was eighty years old. He died in 1965. Because of its importance and because it was published soon after the 1950s came to a close, it was included for analysis in this chapter.

As the 1940s opened, Germany and her axis ally, Italy, followed by Japan in 1941, won stunning and aggressive victories which continued for the first three years of the decade. After conquering Poland and sharing the spoils with Russia, in 1939, Nazi Germany attacked and conquered Denmark and Norway in 1940. This was followed by successful invasions of France, Belgium, and Holland. Almost all of Europe had been conquered without much resistance by the Nazi war machine. Russia was attacked by the Nazis in June of 1941, preceded by a quick and successful invasion of Greece and Yugoslavia. Kandel's concerns about Hitler's evil intentions, described in the previous chapter came true, perhaps to a greater extent than he had realized when he wrote The Making of Nazis in 1935.

On December 7, 1941, the United States fleet was attacked at Pearl Harbor and America declared war against the Japanese. Hitler shortly afterward declared war against America and the global war had begun. By the fall of 1942 the tide was beginning to turn against the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese. A great coordinated effort of the United States, Britain, and Russia led to a counterattack against the Germans which was the very beginning of
the allies' success. The early Japanese victories were contained and by 1943 with the fall of Mussolini the Italians withdrew from the war. By 1945 Germany and Japan were completely devastated and both surrendered to the allied powers.

During the war years Kandel was busy thinking about a future global peace and about international cooperation. As the ravages of war continued in 1943 he was commissioned to write a major work for the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation. The name of the book, published in 1944 was Intellectual Cooperation: National and International. Kandel and others on the committee noted the horrors of the war and the massacre of innocent people at the hand of criminal youth hardened by the criminal societies they represented.

In the book, Kandel dealt with the failure of the League of Nations to include education as an important concern of that world organization. He showed how the totalitarian governments of Nazi Germany, fascist Italy, and Imperial Japan adapted education to their revolutionary ideologies. He cited evidence to show that, in fact, teachers worldwide had supported movements for world peace at the close of World War I. This was obviously not enough, however, to prevent World War II.

A significant portion of the book continued to show why the valiant efforts of teacher groups and others could not attain the goal of universal peace. Kandel believed that it was the spreading cult of national loyalty and patriotism which gave rise to national prejudices, instead of a feeling of pride in the contributions that
each nation could make to the world at large.

As Kandel wrote this book on behalf of an American national committee concerned with the future and with a permanent arrangement of world peace, he cautioned against the type of thinking that would equate setting up administrative machinery as the only road to peace. In addition to elevating education to an international status through an international organization, it was important to educate every person to the worth of every human being regardless of race, color, or creed. He advocated a world citizenship which would grow out of a local and a national citizenship.

In 1948, three years after World War II ended, Kandel's important work, *Education in an Era of Transition* was published. In the book he discussed wartime and postwar efforts at reform in education in the advanced industrial nations of the world. He discussed emerging educational problems of a postwar world and he posited some solutions to these problems. He was optimistic that the establishment of UNESCO and the United Nations would lead to a better world.

Kandel wrote in the book that the study of comparative education could make important contributions to the promotion of international understanding and cooperation. He cautioned against an overemphasis on the use of statistical and measurement techniques in studying education. He believed that in an age of transition when the fate of the world depended upon education, a fuller and richer understanding of what education meant must take place. By studying the meaning of education in the light of the political,
social, economic, and cultural forces of various national systems of education. Comparative education could shed light on the hopes, aspirations, character, and culture of nations. This, in turn, would help nations gain a better view of those aspects of national life that they intended to transmit to the next generation through the schools. By means of this process nations would reconstruct their schools and contribute to a better world order.

The decade of the 1950s led to a rebuilding of the nations engaged in World War II. It was an era of economic prosperity and initial optimism in world affairs brought about by the establishment of the United Nations, UNESCO, and other international agencies whose aim was world development and peace. The yoke of colonialism was cast off by people everywhere and new nations came into existence. Science and technology made important breakthroughs in the 1950s and the exploration of space had its beginnings. The discovery of important new drugs made many infections and some chronic diseases curable. Communications improved as did global air travel. Through television the world started to become a "global village." All of this took place against the backdrop of the cold war that developed between the Soviet Union and its satellite nations, and the Western democracies led by the United States.

Compulsory universal primary education was successfully spreading to nations throughout the world while money was being spent profusely as the answer to the young nations' development needs. It would not be known until many years later that money spent on formal education was not the complete answer to successful
development. UNESCO acted as a clearinghouse for new ideas in education and helped encourage the growth of successful programs with worldwide impact.

Much of Kandel's major work was brought forth in the articles he wrote in the 1950s. In his 1952 three part series entitled "Education. National and International," he expressed a positive attitude over the expected impact of the United Nations and of UNESCO with their emphasis on international peace and education. However, he cautioned that this alone was not enough. He saw a misguided nationalistic patriotism as a roadblock to international education and world peace. He advocated the idea that internationalism begins at the local level in each nation. Each nation through its schools must foster an international education and help students overcome the negative and narrow features of a primitive nationalism. An advanced form of nationalism would be able to promote the role of each nation's culture and show how it contributed to a wider international forum which would lead to world peace through education.

In his 1955 article, "The Study of Comparative Education," Kandel distinguished between comparative and international education. Comparative education studied the educational systems of two or more countries. It explored the underlying causes to determine why the educational systems of the world differed from one another. International education dealt with the development of global attitudes directed by instruction in the schools.

Kandel's 1956 article entitled, "Problems of Comparative
Education." criticized the research he had recently read on national systems of education. This research centered on the study of the educational systems of eighty nations. He did not doubt the accuracy of the report but he did question its almost complete uniformity. He proceeded to discuss the correct use of comparative education as a body of study which could deal effectively with the nuances he was convinced existed between the systems.

Kandel discussed the difficulties inherent in studying comparative education which were: the wide range of disciplines that one needed to know in order to become a competent comparativist, the expense in visiting foreign nations to study their schools, the difficulties of learning foreign languages, and the lack as of 1956 of a reliable methodology in the field.

The last major article included in this chapter is entitled: "Comparative Education and Underdeveloped Countries: A New Dimension." Written in 1961, it was insightful for its understanding of the role of nonformal and formal education in the development of newly formed independent nations of the world. His emphasis on nonformal education as a prelude to formal schooling was an important system of thought for Kandel. It predated many of the writings of other experts in the field who waited longer to see the negative impact of the grafting of colonial systems of education onto the systems in the developing countries.

Kandel's most important book published during the decade of the 1950s was: A New Era in Education: A Comparative Study. It was a complete revision of his best known work, Comparative Education.
published twenty-two years earlier. He included the United States, England, France, and the Soviet Union in this study. He was an established expert on England, France, and the United States, and their educational systems. As in his former book, however, he had to rely on the literature available in English for information on the Soviet Union.

As the dangers of totalitarianism of the right abated with the defeat of Nazi Germany, Italy, and Japan, Kandel was able to concentrate on Soviet Communism, a system of government he also found to be unacceptable. He admitted that his information on the Soviet Union was dated, in part, in his New Era in Education: A Comparative Study. But he said it was important to study the character of education under a totalitarian regime in order to compare it with those basic values of democracy and of education under the influence of nontotalitarian systems of government.

Kandel produced this book as a follow up study to his 1933 Comparative Education. His concerns in writing this book had to do with the broader aspects of education, and the growth of the individual as well as the nation, within the framework of a supportive political system. In the preface of the revised book he reflected upon the world situation since he had written his original work in 1933. He wrote:

The crises through which the world has passed since then and the demands for reconstruction to the losses caused by World War II as well as the challenge to the ideals of democracy from Communist ideology have intensified the recognition of the important part to be played by education for the fullest development of the individual and the greatest welfare of a nation. But the forces that determine the character of education in any nation have a significance that is of
greater importance than the details of its organization and practice. Hence the study of the backgrounds can contribute more to an understanding of the educational system than mere description of it.¹

Kandel's monograph, Intellectual Cooperation National and International was published in 1944. A rather compact book, on international education, it was published for the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation. This committee was a nongovernmental American branch of the Organization for Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations. The organization "was looked at askance by governments and never taken seriously by the world of scholarship and science."²

This report was written to recommend and analyze ideas which would develop better relations between governmental and nongovernmental United States agencies in international cultural relations. Kandel began with an analysis of why statesmen between the two world wars did not succeed in utilizing the world's intellectual resources in order to seek peace. He pointed out that the League of Nations did not concern itself with education in any effective manner.

Another reason for the failure of intellectual cooperation to take hold globally was that attention was only paid to intellectuals without any attempt to build grassroots support for the idea among


the majority of the world's peoples. The result of his was that there were programs informing people about the aims of international cooperation. However, they did not succeed because these proposals were additive to nations' school programs instead of integrated into the educational plans as a whole. Kandel reiterated the same point in the chapter in which he wrote for the National Society for the Society of Education.

Kandel said that even if the League of Nations rejected education as a way to provide leadership for international cooperation, teachers everywhere (not administrators) under the aegis of national and international organizations were ready to promote international understanding and universal peace. He gave examples of conflicts between the authorities in Germany and France and their teachers' organizations. Teachers in these countries were in favor of world peace and international understanding. Yet the authorities' aims were at cross purposes: they stressed both nationalism and militarism instead. England was an exception. There the governmental agencies and the teachers' organizations worked diligently to promote international understanding.

In contrast, Kandel found little attempt in the United States' elementary and high schools to study international relations or promote international cooperation. In discussing teachers in the United States, Kandel said for the most part that they were not in favor of educational programs for international understanding. This was in 1930. By 1934 he saw an attitudinal shift on the part of United States' teachers who by then appeared to be very interested
in international issues. Unfortunately, Kandel offered no explanation as to why he thought American teachers shifted their position on international cooperation from negative to positive.

Kandel offered his own prescription for the promotion of international understanding: "in any movement to promote international understanding, education must be viewed as a whole, and that foundations and principles upon which national systems of education rest must be investigated more searchingly than they have been in the past." If this idea was not adhered to, many conflicts would arise. Intellectual cooperation would still be manifested by only a few intellectuals, but in too many cases there would be a neglect of their own nation's educational systems, which would decrease intellectual life and thereby diminish intellectual international cooperation.

Kandel offered no evidence in attributing the youth revolution that he claimed took place in the Western nations between the wars, to the lack of effective teaching about the goals, the system, and the work of the League of Nations. He believed that the failure to teach youth about the League led to a frame of mind which, linked to two decades of economic depression, led to this malaise in youth. The frustration of the young and a lack of leadership by the adults added to the youth revolt. Torn between two opposing forces, Kandel exclaimed, "the revolt was an expression of the conflict in the minds of youth between the demands of nationalism and patriotism and the pattern of a new world whose potentialities they seemed to sense
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better than their elders."  

Kandel offered no discussion of the revolt of youth, other than mentioning it. He did not describe the revolt in any way nor did he name the countries where the revolts took place. Therefore, one is left entirely to his or her own resources in trying to understand this phenomenon in any of its aspects; its widespread effect, and its aftermath.

Kandel traced the devotion of national loyalty and patriotism to the nineteenth century spirit of national self-consciousness. This cult of national loyalty provided for the development of prejudices and hatred rather than in a sense of taking pride in what one's country contributed to the welfare of the other nations of the world. Kandel, however, also saw nationalism as a positive force and he combined it with internationalism.

It is too often forgotten that the development of nationalism forced men out of narrow sectionalism and competing factions into membership in larger social units, and that it directed loyalty away from the petty and selfish local interests to loyalty to the nation. That development must continue until men are bound together by a spirit of loyalty and cooperation in the interests of the progress on humanity as a whole; patriotism would then mean pride in the consciousness of the service of one's nation to human progress.  

Kandel presented his original ideas on nationalism and internationalism in his other works. He tried to elevate comparative education ideas from national frameworks to international spheres. Specifically calling upon the schools to promote the spiritual and international interdependence in the

---
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world. Kandel urged that history be taught in a way which would emphasize the human race's collective accomplishments: achievements which men in the past, and men of all races have added a great deal to.

Kandel was not so naive as to emphasize nationalism unduly in only positive ways. In the book he discussed those negative features of nationalism which worked against the respect for other nations and the spirit of global international cooperation. He examined how nations arose and developed their own educational systems. The emphasis on national interests broke down any attempt at a unified world outlook. Kandel advised that the forces which led to this disintegration be understood and overcome. However, he did not clearly explain what these forces were.

Kandel did discuss one barrier to international cooperation. That was the realization that all national systems of education did not have equal status. These considerable educational inequities Kandel found in many countries of the world. They included great illiteracy, little or no opportunity to attend school, and a wide gap existing between large numbers of students attending elementary schools and the relatively few students attending secondary schools.

Kandel argued brilliantly for the global coordination of ideas beyond military, political, and economic interests. He said, "unless a common human ideal can be achieved through the realization of the interrelation of different branches of intellectual activities. each national group will continue to go off in its own
Kandel wanted recognition and expansion of both the International Organization for Intellectual Cooperation and its worldwide branches including the nongovernmental United States organization. Kandel did not mention in this report that the National Committee of the United States of America on International Intellectual Cooperation was a nongovernmental agency. He merely said that private efforts advanced the cause of intellectual cooperation. While mentioning that the United States was not a member of the League of Nations, he also neglected to say that the United States contributed to certain international organizations but not to the agency dealing with intellectual cooperation. So any dealings between the League of Nations and the United States of America on Intellectual Cooperation, were unofficial.

While Kandel credited this private nongovernmental agency with doing fine work in promoting educational and international understanding, he failed to point out how much more could have been done if it were a government agency instead of a private one. Instead of pointing to any failure, Kandel developed a theme that stressed a greater role in the future for this agency, thus trying to promote it in a positive way. Acknowledging its past accomplishments in stimulating the use of media in worldwide communications, sponsoring a study of copyright, fighting for rights of intellectual workers, and doing other meaningful organizational work, Kandel felt it could be more effective. It could provide
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important leadership in research and education as they impacted on the welfare of mankind. It could also serve as a coordinating agency for intellectual cooperation. It could have a plan which it did not heretofore have. This lack of a plan lead the National Committee in America to lack coherence.

The National Committee of the United States of America on Intellectual International Cooperation should become, Kandel said, part of an International Education Organization. Intellectuals could play a vital role in uniting the nations of the world and advancing culture and civilization. They could advance the ideas of those unsung heroes of peace who have contributed to man's great heritage. The motto of this global organization could well be "We enjoy the fruits of other countries as if they were our own."

Kandel quoted from the words of Pericles in suggesting this motto.

The most important specific function of an International Education Organization should be to enhance the status of professional teachers, because without this improvement the best proposals for the restructuring of education in the world would not work. Kandel explained in this report that the League of Nations did not advocate the creation of such an International Office of Education. He thought the reason such a crucial organization was not promulgated was due to the fear that such an organization would exert undue control over each nation's educational system. He certainly thought this reasoning was misguided.

Other important functions of this International Organization would be to observe, gather, and disseminate important information:
The dissemination of such information would help to make the world conscious of destructive elements in education which threaten its stability and on the positive side would stimulate healthy emulation among the countries of the world. The backward countries would be stimulated to catch up with the best that has already been achieved, and the more advanced would be encouraged to make new progress.7

Clearly, the League of Nations was found to be deficient by Kandel, especially in terms of promoting international cooperation. Writing this report while World War II was still wreaking worldwide havoc, he looked toward the future for an end of the hostilities and the building of this other, stronger, global educational organization. He believed that the role of intellectuals worldwide was not just to promote international cooperation among themselves but to extend their leadership to the masses through education.

Regarding the contributions of the National Organizations of Intellectual International Cooperation, including that of the United States, Kandel concluded with the idea that, "The foundations of international understanding and cooperation as well as of a world order must be laid at home in each nation."8

*Education In An Era of Transition*, published in 1948, grew out of three lectures which Kandel delivered at the University of London in February 1948 at the invitation of the Academic Council of the Senate for the University. The headings for the three chapters in the book are the same as the names of the lectures. They are: I. Proposals For The Reconstruction of Education, II. Emerging Problems, and III. The Study of Education.

7 Ibid., 74.

8 Ibid., 76.
In chapter I. Kandel initially made the point (without the use of examples) that throughout history great advances in education have followed crises in the affairs of men. These crises resulted from different changes: political, social, economic, and cultural. He described 1948 as one of those periods. This era was a crisis period because of the terrible global war that ended three years earlier, and also because of World War I. which put the world into a quickened tempo and tore it apart. These wars were considered to be a test of the educational systems of the participating nations. Of course, Kandel admitted that there may not have been any truth to the claims of nations that their educational systems contributed to their war effort, but he noted that the claims were made nevertheless.

The nineteenth century was the era, in the most advanced nations of the world, for the development of universal elementary education. By World War I many educational systems were becoming shapeless, bloated, and ineffective. Kandel explained that this meant that teachers everywhere were being poorly prepared and they were dissatisfied with their status. Except for the United States, dual systems of secondary education, one for the elite and one for the masses, came under heavy criticism.

A considerable lag occurred between curriculum and instruction, and the new theories of child development and advances in the process of learning. By World War I, with the technological advances of industry, it became possible not to depend on child and youth labor. Elementary education was no longer thought to be
adequate preparation needed for contemporary living.

In England, France, Germany and the United States there was a strong movement to provide for additional equal educational opportunities, and instruction was focused on individual student abilities and aptitudes. Reform was in the air in these countries but it encountered strong traditions and often fell short of its goals. Kandel wrote about Germany, which tried to initiate a type of secondary school called "Deutsche Obershule," which was to have a curriculum based only on German culture with no foreign languages. The German universities said they would not accept their students. Kandel said, surprisingly, and without any explanation, "and an excellent plan for a modern secondary school was wrecked."9 One might have thought that Kandel would be against such a school because he had criticized German nationalism so severely in his many writings. Since he did not explain, there is no way to know why he was in favor of such a type of school which would eliminate foreign languages. In addition, this differed considerably from his views presented in chapter V of this dissertation, on French education.

World War II and its aftermath brought about a global awareness that education must emphasize international understanding and cooperation. Kandel cited examples of country after country: the United States, England, New Zealand, France, Canada, and Australia that loudly proclaimed, in one form or another, that nothing was more important than the education of a nation's children.

The essential aspect of this educational reconstruction according to Kandel is the recognition of the worth of each individual as an intelligent and cooperating citizen on the one hand, and on the other as a human being with intellectual and emotional potentialities to be developed. This recognition represents a radical change from the conception that the state comes first and that the individual must be molded according to its needs. It is in fact, the response of democracies to the challenge of totalitarian forms of government.10

Kandel saw the opposite effect taking place at the same time in the Soviet Union's educational aims. There the emphasis was on the training of students to become patriotic and to love the country and Stalin, their leader. Kandel based his assumptions on the Soviet Union gathered from the work of George Counts who wrote extensively on that nation.11

In concluding this chapter, Kandel discussed the equality of educational opportunity. The difficulties in this area he said stem from the fact that all educable youth do not have the same abilities and aptitudes. Another difficulty in reconstructing education is to shift from selectivity of students at higher levels to the distribution of educational resources to assist each pupil to perform to the best of his ability.

Kandel spoke of the future and of guidance which he referred to as the highest task in education. Guidance for Kandel meant that the student should receive the right education from the best teachers available, at an affordable cost so as to profit by this
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training. Given this most important task of guiding students, it is noteworthy that Kandel devoted little space to this topic in the chapter.

Kandel was optimistic that restructuring in education would take place globally even with the crisis brought about by the necessity of rebuilding much of the world after the devastation of World War II. Time was on the side of education he thought, because it took about twenty-five years for new theories and ideas to be implemented. It is possible that Kandel's optimism was misguided in this case, if only for the reason that nothing stands still. The practitioner waiting for the right time to implement the new ideas may also be changing and moving in unforeseen directions. Thus the prediction that things will get better in education even if it takes a quarter of a century to implement new ideas, fails to take into consideration the fact that there may not be an inert status quo.

The second chapter is entitled "Emerging Problems." The first problem discussed is the realization that governments acting alone cannot effectuate major changes without the consent of the people involved. He said, "The great bulk of the people must not only understand what is afoot, but must also take an active part in working out the kind of educational system they want for themselves and their children." 12

Kandel then discussed the organizations in the United States that involved the public and enlisted their support in promoting education. He pointed out that the next problem identified in
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restructuring education was to determine the nature of secondary education. Kandel expressed dissatisfaction with all of the educational systems in the late 1940s. In general, for secondary schooling there were three curriculums, the academic, the practical, or the technical. Kandel saw none of the structural arrangements, either the American comprehensive high school or separate high schools that were being proposed in France, as meeting student needs for the majority of adolescents.

Finding the right education for the student was his goal, even if the goal was elusive. For someone like Kandel who advocated that secondary education in France should promote an elite class, it is startling to learn in this book that he was not pleased with the system. It is conceivable that Kandel tried to advocate educational restructuring that he thought would suit the particular country best. So in his 1924 book on the reform of secondary education in France he advocated education for the elite. It is possible that he altered his opinions without saying that he had, after evaluating the country's educational system for a number of years.

At any rate, he pinned his hopes on guidance and the guidance movement in the United States, England, and France. Again he reiterated his position that guidance of students was the major problem of the twentieth century. He spoke of both diversity and equality for students in secondary school as being complementary.

The success of guiding students to live up to their potential was based upon upgrading teaching to make it a real profession everywhere in the world. Yet, Kandel said, nowhere are teachers
provided training that can favorably be compared with the preparation offered other professionals. He advocated both paying teachers more money and a breaking away from any harmful traditional training practices. He did not elaborate on what these practices may have been.

Kandel discussed the new developments in education, focusing on the whole child. He delineated the school of thought which would build the entire curriculum on the basis of student interests and experiences, from the other school of thought which would take notice of such interests and experiences but would emphasize past learnings in order to transmit the cultural heritage. With this latter group other methods would be used which were effective and appropriate, instead of a complete reliance on activity methods. Without mentioning names, it is clear that Kandel was referring to the Progressives in the former case and the Essentialists in the latter case.

Kandel brought forth in this chapter a plea for the elimination of war and the cultivation of international cooperation and understanding. He was greatly encouraged by the establishment of UNESCO whose success depended on the world's teachers. Some of the important work that he did for UNESCO is discussed in the following chapter on Kandel's contributions to comparative and international education.

He closed this chapter with a statement from the National Education Association, which he thought underscored best the principles of education in this era of transition. This statement
declared that it was important for the general purpose of education:

To provide for every child, youth and adult attending a public school, college or university the kind and amount of education which (a) will cause him to live most happily and usefully according to the principles of American democracy, and (b) lead him to contribute all he can to the development and preservation of a peaceful, co-operative and equitable world order.13

It would be in keeping with Kandel's ideals to say that he probably would want to apply these principles to every child in the world and not just to American children.

The last chapter, "The Study of Education," focused on the purposes of education or the values which underlie the process of education. Kandel stressed spiritual values of a nonsectarian nature: values that would enable democratic societies and their schools to unite in common, with their objectives clearly set. Kandel said, "There must be imparted through instruction a body of common traditions, loyalties, and interests as objects of social allegiances to constitute the basis of community life and stability within which the individual can be free."14

Kandel emphasized that teachers needed better professional preparation but they also needed an excellent liberal education. He thought that the two should not be separated. He opted for a broad education, one that did not overemphasize quantitative and statistical measures. These were useful he said, but only as tools not as educational ends in themselves. Kandel agreed with Plato's view of the nature of education. It was determined by theories of
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society or the culture of society. and influenced considerably by other fields: psychology, ethics, politics, sociology, and economics. Kandel related education to political theory and the organization of society. He elaborated considerably on what education meant in this chapter. He related it to other fields of study in order to broaden the learning and perspective of the teacher. Quoting John Dewey, he said, "education signifies the sum total of the processes by means of which a community or social group, whether small or large, transmits its acquired power and aims with a view to securing its own continued existence and growth."15

Kandel was very pleased with the establishment of the United Nations. He was not sure of the immediate success of the organization but he wanted to give it a chance to succeed. He believe that through it the world was given another chance. He was delighted that the teaching profession now had direct representation through the establishment of UNESCO. He wrote that, "Education in the past has too frequently been used as an instrument for national policy. Teachers have a new responsibility to promote the idea that a sound concept of nationalism is not incompatible with the idea of an internationally interdependent world."16 This was a position he took and one he repeated in many of his writings.

Kandel concluded this chapter and ended the book with a discussion of how the study of comparative education could contribute significantly to international understanding and
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cooperation. He wrote, "its function is to study the meaning of education in the light of forces--political, social, economic and cultural--which determine the character of various systems." He was of the opinion that the study of a nation's educational system reveals a considerable amount of information about the nation's character, culture, and even aspirations. This is important because these are the facets of life which a nation chooses to transmit to the generation being schooled.

From January to May, 1952, Kandel published a three part series in The Educational Forum entitled "Education, National and International." The first article is subtitled is "Obstacles to International Understanding." In the article Kandel lauded the fact that after so many years education, through the establishment of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), was given a place beside other agencies established to promote international understanding and cooperation. Now at long last education was recognized as being part of a vital agency that could promote a new world order.

Kandel's initial reaction to the establishment of UNESCO was soon tempered with the notion that setting up the organization was only a start. He cautioned, "If the organizations or agencies are to succeed, more thought and attention must be devoted to the development through education of a complete reorientation of minds and attitudes on all matters that concern the welfare of
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In the article, Kandel elaborated on the theme: Obstacles to International Understanding. He looked at education historically and found it to be an instrument of narrow nationalistic policy. Therefore, responsibility for international relations was avoided at all levels in public schools everywhere. Patriotism—misguided, was the biggest obstacle to an enlightened internationalism.

War and the heroes of war were lauded in countries throughout the world; instead of heroes of peace, "those men and women of ideas and ideals, the religious leaders, the inventors, the artists, the writers, the composers, those who have contributed so much to the improvement and advancement of human welfare." So this penchant for glorifying war in all of its manifestations is surely to develop in students, attitudes favorable to war. It may, in addition, instill contempt if not hatred toward other countries.

The job of restructuring education is the responsibility of each individual nation. But, Kandel believed that even more was needed to be done than this. He thought that the United Nations needed to legally regulate the sovereignty of nations just as people living within nations are regulated by law. He was against individual powerful nations in the United Nations having veto power which he felt was putting national interests before the interests of mankind. The implication of all of this for schools and students
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"is that internationalism begins at home and that international politics are increasingly becoming national politics." 20

All of the world's educational systems needed to overcome those negative aspects of nationalism which built intellectual and actual barriers between nations. Without having the same pattern of education for all nations of the world, educational systems must help to build a different world order based on peace, international understanding, and cooperation.

Kandel saw that the primary issue of this era was whether education, in promoting internationalism, was consonant with the goals of education of individual nations. In concluding this article Kandel cited a portion of a statement in the Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO, which he thought succinctly summed up the position he set forth in the article:

that the "unanimous, lasting, and sincere support of peace" must be secured and that peace must be founded "upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind," developed through education to support the political and economic arrangements of governments. 21

The subtitle of the second article is "Foundations of National Education." In this article, Kandel restated his position of the first article which discussed the history of education as an instrument of an intolerant nationalistic policy. Discussing the different national viewpoints or ways of doing things—the culture of the nations, Kandel asked how would it be possible to develop attitudes of international harmony.
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He saw human beings as being very similar everywhere, but molded by their own nation's culture they bore the imprint of their particular country. Education needed to begin with the pupil and his environment, with the teacher as intermediary. While national systems of education have constricted the students' environment inside national boundaries, this historical pattern need not be continued. Education should be conducted everywhere as a means of adaptation to a continuously expanding environment.

The family should no longer be ignored in the education of the child; nor should all the constituent parts of his cultural environment. Included also must be a dream of a new world order with the realization that every nation is dependent on every other nation. Kandel made the salient point that,

A broader concept of patriotism needs to be established than that propagated by patriotic organizations. It should be defined in terms of duty and responsibility, of loyalty and service to one's group, to the community, to the nation and to humanity. With its roots in affection for and attachment to one's immediate environment, it can and should be broadened as the individual grows through the expansion of experience, whether direct or vicarious.22

Kandel was able to see through the artificialities of emphasizing abstractions in teaching patriotism; the love of this, the love of that. Rather it should be learned by doing practical duties, duties to oneself, one's family, community, nation, and finally to the world. Learning fair play, justice, and good comportment, together with a strong sense of decency are important virtues for humanity.

Mistrust of foreigners, a basic xenophobia, is a characteristic that must not be emphasized in nations' schools, Kandel said. Education for nationalism must go hand in hand with education for internationalism. He also continued to hammer home the point that education, nationally and internationally, should have high moral and spiritual goals as their most important aims. What seems to be lacking in his paradigm for a better world through education for international understanding, at least in this article, is a concrete plan which could overturn the historical patterns of the narrow nationalism that he saw at work in all of the world's countries. His leap from failure to success appears to be not only a quantum leap, but it also is deficient in terms of practical, workable realities which would in fact go beyond the borders of selfish nationalism. In this article, one gets the impression that Kandel's lofty emphasis on morality cannot, in the absence of certain steps and a concrete design, stand up against the long and undesirable historical pattern of nations' practicing "realpolitik"—the politics of reality.

Again, as in the previous article in this series, Kandel discussed UNESCO and its emphasis on the need to enhance education in order to realize the objective of intellectual and moral unity of mankind. He also discussed borrowing again. He quoted from his mentor the great English comparative educator Michael Sadler who said:

Education is a thing far too closely intertwined with the fibre of national life, too intimately bound with its past history and its social and political conditions for it to be practicable, even if it were desirable, to import an
In addition Kandel made these two final points in this article: international understanding must stem from the development of a nation's culture and education for international and cooperation must be bound together into the core of national education. He admitted that it was necessary to find ways to implement these principles in practice.

The third and last article in the series is subtitled, "Educating for International Understanding." Kandel recognized that in schools everywhere the curriculum was too weighty. In addition, he believed that the best approach to teaching students was through the regular school curriculum. For both of these reasons he was against emphasizing special courses in international education in elementary and secondary schools; courses that were not part of the standard or traditional curriculum. He said, "there is scarcely a subject now taught in primary and secondary schools through which the desired attitudes cannot be developed and from which some contribution to international understanding cannot be drawn."24

Kandel would add another dimension to every course in the traditional curriculum in order to emphasize that men and nations are bound to each other in terms of all the contributions their citizens have made to a global fund of knowledge. In art, music, history, science, geography, and even mathematics, stress would be
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placed on what one's nation and what other nation's have contributed to the development of the particular subject. Teachers would then be able to help their students gain a new respect for important learnings leading to better international understanding and even international cooperation. If all nations through their educational systems would add this international dimension to their curricula, then education will have done its part in contributing to a unified but not a uniform world.

Kandel offered specific ideas on what each subject could emphasize for the purpose of promoting international cooperation. In history, the gradual development of international movements and organizations could be highlighted to show how this led to the establishment of the League of Nations and the United Nations, the Universal Postal Union, Red Cross, International Court, organization for prison reform, the abolition of slavery, and the international organizations of scholars are some of his examples. The goal of teaching history would change from only acquiring knowledge to instilling in the student those permanent values, hopes, and ideals that all mankind have in common.

Kandel tried to develop the idea that international understanding and cooperation could be developed at the grassroots starting with individual students in schools throughout the world. His proposal for adding new dimensions of internationalism to traditional subjects appears to be highly original. He tried to avert frivolous and short term effects that he felt would result from the arrangements that were generally adopted, the utilization
of special courses promoting the idea of internationalism.

Nowhere in this article or in this series does Kandel deal with the point that his adding new dimensions to traditional subjects might constitute an overload for teachers. He mentioned his concern that new subjects would add to an already strained curriculum. Elsewhere he emphasized that the teacher is expected to do too many things and to represent too many roles in his everyday work. Why Kandel did not think new dimensions to be added to what teachers were already teaching would be a problem for them is something we cannot know. It appears that he was aiming at the presentation of multiple outcomes in each subject area. For this to work, there must be very highly skilled teachers and time to be able to thoroughly plan and implement their work. Kandel's emphasis on the way to teach is salutary; on the how to do it is another question. He thought it was unnecessary to add courses in international relations except at the university level where students could specialize in the field. But he realized that more needed to be done to promote international cooperation than relegating it to the schools alone.

He advocated programs for adults to buttress his plan for children and youth in the schools. In addition he called for adult support of what the school should be trying to do to improve the teaching of international understanding. He also advocated the process of cultivating the spirit of internationalism by starting at home, having experiences in small clusters, enlarging out into the community, and gradually to the nation. Each nation would then
contribute to global international cooperation. Kandel concluded the article by writing:

The development of international-mindedness does not mean the abandonment of national-mindedness; if it means anything it demands an informed consciousness of the place of one's own nation in a world society and the contributions it can make to a world society whose survival depends on the maintenance of peace and relief from the fear of war.25

In 1955, at the age of seventy-four, Kandel published an article in The Educational Forum entitled, "The Study of Comparative Education." He emphasized the point in the article that comparative education did not only encompass the study of educational systems, its organization, administration, curricula, methods of instruction, the status of teachers, etc. He thought that it had to explore and learn about the underlying causes to determine why the educational systems of the world differed from one another. It sought to also determine their aims and purposes, what their beginnings were and what in general may emerge.

As late as 1955 Kandel saw that it was still difficult to compare standards of achievement in the schools of different countries. This was true even in the area of literacy because the standards used to define and quantify it would frequently vary from nation to nation. While it was difficult to compare standards, it was not too difficult to compare the concepts and fundamentals underlying different systems. He specifically meant that, "A comparison can be made of the effects upon such systems of political theories, of available economic resources and of the culture

25 Ibid., 407.
patterns, as well as of the philosophical principles upon which they are based."26

Kandel distinguished in this article between descriptive accounts of foreign individual educational systems, each written by a different writer, and writing about the educational systems of several countries by one writer with a single point of view. (He also made this distinction in some of his other writings as mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation.)

The latter, Kandel considered to be comparative education, but the former he did not. This is remarkable for more than one reason. For one thing, Kandel himself wrote many books and articles on individual foreign school systems which are considered to be an important part of the literature of comparative education. Secondly, according to his definition in this article, it is not clear whether he would consider writing about one system and briefly comparing it to another system in the same book, to be comparative education or not. An example of this is how own book entitled, The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany, which was discussed at the beginning of this chapter. The book is a descriptive account of a single foreign education system's training of teachers. Only at the very end of the book did Kandel discuss the issue of whether or not the United States could profit from adopting Germany's system of training elementary school teachers. Would this be comparative education or not according to Kandel's

definition? It probably would not because it did not really present a balanced comparison, devoting equal space to both countries' systems. And yet, if we were to follow his definition then much of his work and the work of other great scholars could not be thought of as comparative education.

Kandel continued to make another important but, by more modern standards at least, arbitrary distinction. He distinguished between comparative education and international education, saying that they are not at all synonymous. International education dealt with the development of particular intellectual and emotional attitudes directed by instruction in the schools. It only impacted on the character of an educational system tangentially. It is difficult to say why Kandel drew such hard and fast distinctions in areas that shared such similar patterns, areas of interest, and the commonality of ideas. 27

He continued in this article to discuss a favorite theme of his, which is the inappropriateness of educational borrowing where one country borrows en masse from another country. He said this only leads to failure. Ideas can be borrowed but must be modified to suit the particular culture of the borrower. He gives examples of historical educational borrowing and the cross fertilization of

27 While some experts in the field would agree with Kandel's distinction, others would not. Torsten Husen, writing in the authoritative International Encyclopedia of Education, however, says: "International Education...overlaps to some extent with comparative education but goes beyond it in its international orientation."

ideas: Roman education through the influence of the Greeks. Jewish and Arabic influences on Christian thought in the middle ages, etc.

Kandel discussed education under totalitarian and authoritarian systems, and under democratic government. He raised the obvious points based on the goals of the different types of political systems' totalitarian control by the State, of the individual; versus the emphasis on liberty and the idea of maximalization of the individual's potential, and of his freedom to participate in educational and governmental decisions. Kandel summed up this article by saying:

the study of comparative education...recognizes and safeguards the existence of national cultures and systems of education...reconciling their conflicting interests. This field of investigation has sought to promote an understanding of educational systems in the light of their culture, their political structure, and their national aims. For it is through education that the hopes, aspirations and problems of a nation can be understood.28

In 1955, Kandel's book, The New Era in Education - A Comparative Study was published. It was a revision of his 1933 volume, Comparative Education. The New Era is less than one-half the length of his earlier volume and it is much more readable. It is not nearly as detailed, has a more lucid style, and provides an immediate translation for foreign words and phrases. As mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, it appears that Kandel provided the reader with translations of foreign words for the first time in the New Era in Education.

In this book the countries selected for study were England,

28 Ibid., 15.
France, the United States, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In his 1933 book Kandel referred to the U.S.S.R. as Russia. Omitted from this study were Germany and Italy, both of which were included in his earlier book.

As he had mentioned in *Comparative Education*, the only country Kandel did not have direct experience with was the U.S.S.R. Again, as he had done earlier, he had to rely on secondary sources for information on the U.S.S.R. Since Kandel did not read Russian he had to rely solely on the literature which was available in English for *The New Era*. In the preface to the book Kandel admitted that the details he incorporated into his study on the U.S.S.R. may not have been up to date. After admitting this, however, Kandel said, "but the character of education under a totalitarian regime is, it is to be hoped, clearly presented to serve as a backdrop, as it were, to the fundamental values of the ideal of democracy and of education under its influence, to which this book is dedicated." 29

This book is divided into ten chapters. Unlike his earlier book, *Comparative Education*, there are no appendices and study questions at the end of *The New Era in Education*.

Chapter I is entitled, "The Content and Method of Comparative Education." Kandel depicted 1955 as an era of crisis, and he began this chapter with a discussion of this particular crisis. Even though World War II was over, ending the dangers of right wing totalitarianism, Kandel was fearful of the perceived dangers from

---

left wing totalitarianism i.e. the Soviet Union and its satellites. Kandel saw this post-World War II period as the cold war crisis. The future of democracies, he said, was just as much at stake in 1955 as it had been in both world wars. Without naming the Soviet Union, Kandel said, "Today's struggle is to save the democracies from subjugation to the Behemoth of totalitarianism, to liberate human beings from subjection to the monolithic state, and to preserve those moral and spiritual values for which the democratic state exists." Kandel did not have to name the Soviet Union in the above quote for the reader to know at a glance that it was the Soviet Union he was referring to. He had made this clear in the preface and at the very beginning of chapter I.

In chapter I Kandel showed his disappointment that education was not high on the list of priorities for the nations of the world in the postwar plans for reconstruction. He discussed, as he had in many other works, the idea of the intangible forces in education. He hammered home the point that answers to important educational questions are provided not only by the traditions of education, but by political, social, and economic forces as well.

Writing in this chapter about the major concern of comparative education at that time, Kandel said:

The important fact that stands out is that national systems of education today constitute more than ever experimental laboratories dealing with similar problems, to the solution of which traditional cultural backgrounds and current political and social aims as well as economic forces will contribute more than any universal theory of education. It is with this situation that comparative education is

30 Ibid., 5.
concerned, since it seeks to analyse and compare the forces that make for differences between national systems of education. This can only be done by starting with certain concepts or problems.31

In chapter I Kandel discussed what he saw as being the two most important educational issues of the period. The first one was the prolongation of school attendance while the second issue was the provision of equal educational opportunities for all students. He did not elaborate on either issue. Rather, he joined the issues together and discussed their implications. He said they both were involved with the reconsideration of curricula, matters of guidance, the way students are distributed according to their abilities and aptitudes, and the organization of schools and the courses they offered.

Underlying both of these issues was the ability of a nation to financially support an extended and differentiated school system. In addition, the most pressing demands of a rapidly increasing school population, he predicted, would be felt for at least another ten year period. This involved providing more school buildings at a time when costs were high and materials scarce. Kandel touched upon the worldwide shortage of teachers at that time. He saw this as the most serious barrier to the advancement of education necessary to reach the new stage demanded by both the defense of democracy and by educational theory.

Concluding chapter I, Kandel pointed out that was a worldwide state of educational disequilibrium. He wrote:

31 Ibid., 8.
No system of education anywhere, not even in the United States has reached a stage of equilibrium; all are in a state of becoming and the directions, aims, and forms constitute the materials for the study of comparative education. The promise of new educational reforms of a few years ago has not yet been carried out, but the patterns of these reforms and the issues in education are sufficiently clear and definite to provide the basis for study.32

Chapter II is entitled, "The State and Education." In this chapter Kandel briefly discussed: the expansion of state authority, totalitarianism and democracy, the individual and the state, and the purposes of education. He also touched upon the state and values, freedom, education as conditioning, education as a socio political process, and movements for educational reform. Clearly chapter II's theme is the relationship of politics to education.

Kandel showed how the twentieth century extended the functions of the state which led to an exaggerated form of nationalism. The powerful forces of growing nationalism outweighed the modern utopian hopes for the creation of institutions which were to be designed, "to promote international understanding and international cooperation to insure peace for humanity."33 He took the reader through his discussion of totalitarianism and democracy and clearly showed his anathema for the former and his preference for the latter. In a democracy as opposed to a totalitarian government, he argued, "The state thus derives its authority not through fear and force, but by consent of its members."34

32 Ibid., 17.
33 Ibid., 19.
34 Ibid., 26.
Kandel depicted the impact of democracy and the impact of totalitarianism on the education of the individual. In a democracy an optimal education would provide for the growth of the individual so he or she could lead a full life and still contribute to the welfare of others and of the state. In a totalitarian system the education of the individual has as its primary aim the contribution that the individual can make to the strengthening and perpetuation of the state. Kandel meant Communism in discussing the impact of totalitarianism in this chapter. He believed all totalitarian revolutions have demonstrated how easily liberty could be lost and what needed to be done to preserve it. He believed that democracies were responsible for clearly defining the meaning of equality of opportunity in education.

Kandel wrestled in this chapter with formulating a definition of democracy. He wrote:

To define the democratic state is not easy, for it is not as clearcut nor as systematically organized as the totalitarian state, which, whether red, black, or brown, had a definite creed. Any attempt to define democracy would omit large areas of activity and life. It is a body of principles, ideals and values which is constantly expanding in scope and depth of meaning, as the culture of a society changes.35

Chapter III is entitled, "Forces that Determine the Character of an Educational System." Kandel, borrowing from Sadler, his mentor of many years ago, continued to place great importance on the forces outside of education which were responsible for shaping education and educational systems. In chapter III he continued his
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concerns for depicting the influence of such forces. He said: "The study of comparative education is not concerned primarily with analyzing how an educational system is organized or how it is administered in different parts of the world. It seeks rather to discover why in each nation or society or group it is organized and administered as it is."³⁶

In chapter III of this book Kandel showed that from a political perspective education cannot be an autonomous entity. He pointed out that education could not either escape from the influence of the indigenous cultural patterns. Nor could education proceed without regard to the unique environment which organized it in the first place, and which it is to serve. Along with this, Kandel emphasized that historically the one apparent principle was that as societies developed and expanded educational systems to provide education to its members, it also gave the residual functions of society to the care of the school. "As non-school agencies for education, whether formal or informal, fail to perform their tasks, they are gradually transferred to the school, if society considers such tasks valuable or important for its own welfare."³⁷

In chapter III, Kandel discussed briefly, the family and the home, the nursery school, the emancipation of children and youth, the residual functions of the school, the prolongation of infancy, technological changes and education and education and the environment. He also discussed the changing values of youth and of

³⁶ Ibid., 45.
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society, pointing to the diminution of spiritual values in the United States, England, and France. Kandel believed strongly in spiritual values but he also stated his position of pluralism in this chapter. Moral standards were important standards to live up to but it was equally important to maintain the variety of ways of responding to one's environment. "Certainly as a guide for educational activities what is needed is variety set in a framework of national unity."³⁸ For Kandel it was important to have a pluralistic country without tampering with its national unity.

Kandel ended chapter III with a discussion of cultural borrowing among the nations of the world. He discussed the idea of the compatibility of nationalism with the idea of internationalism. Each country could progress and make valuable contributions to other countries without giving up important national features. He again, as he had done in so many other of his works, pointed out in discussing school and society, "the things outside the school matter even more than the things inside the schools, and govern and interpret the things inside."³⁹

Chapter IV is entitled, "The New Pattern of Reconstruction." Kandel briefly discussed democratic versus totalitarian methods. He compared education by fiat in the U.S.S.R. with the slower processes which recognized the consent of all concerned in the democratic nations of the United States and Britain. He portrayed the totalitarian state as one which did not tolerate pressure groups or

³⁸ Ibid., 62.
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any criticism for that matter. He believed that when criticisms of
the government disappeared or were inactive, the political health of
the people was lowered.

The remainder of chapter IV is concerned with the movements, extant at that time, for the reform of education. While he gave a brief history of reform in the democratic nations, the bulk of Kandel's work in this chapter centered upon the educational reforms that began as World War II was being fought. The focus for the reform movements were Britain and France, with some discussion of reform in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.

In England, a White Paper issued by the government set the course for post-World War II reform. It was issued during the war, in 1943, and it was entitled, "Educational Reconstruction." It recommended a reorganization for nursery schools for children between three and five, and compulsory education from five to fifteen (later sixteen). It covered reform in the primary school, the postprimary school and new arrangements of finances to be made between the Board of Education and the local authorities.

In France, the plans for reconstructing education took root while the French government was still located in Algiers. The French recognized the educational defects of their prewar system. They attempted to formulate a plan which would pull together the discrete divisions of the system into a unitary whole. The reforms were outlined by M. Rene Capitant, Commissioner for National Education in 1943. Other plans followed as the French continued to study the need for educational reform. Concerns were for providing
for equal educational opportunity, new methods of instruction, extension of the age of compulsory full-time and part-time education, guidance classes, more balance in the secondary school curriculum, and raising the standards for entrance to the universities.

Kandel also discussed international postwar reforms, especially in the area of equal educational opportunity, formulated by UNESCO and the International Bureau of Education in Geneva. Kandel credited the United States with making great strides in the area of providing equal educational opportunities to all of its citizens. But he pointed out toward the end of the chapter that, "It must be recalled that the principle of university elementary education which was enunciated in the eighteenth century has not yet been firmly established in many parts of the world." 40

Kandel was realistic in his assessment of educational reform. He realized that the pace of educational change was slow. He was aware that the principle of universal elementary and other necessary educational plans and reforms needed to be understood. He predicted that much experimentation would have to take place in certain countries before plans for educational reform could be understood, formulated and implemented.

Kandel devoted the entire chapter V to the topic, "Equalizing Educational Opportunities." At the outset Kandel discussed the problem of providing equal education to all. He wrote, "If the premises upon which it is based are examined, it becomes clear that
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genuine equality of educational opportunities must be considered at every level of education, from the preschool to the university."41

Tracing the historical development of the principle, Kandel credited the Enlightenment with its emphasis on reason and the freedom of individual thought coupled with the idea of man's perfectability. This movement which took place in the latter half of the eighteenth century combined the ideas on education with the social and political ideas of the times.

Kandel discussed primary and secondary schooling in this chapter. Under primary school he mentioned the elementary school tradition, national economy and education, the transition from the old to the new, the school and social services, and instruction and class size. In the section on secondary education Kandel mentioned such topics as types of schools and courses, the allocation of pupils, equality and curriculum, education and social unity, a liberal education, and one school or three.

Kandel viewed universal compulsory elementary education as a step in the right direction, a great leap forward in the progress of education. In most of the world's nations except the United States for one, elementary schooling had historically meant a type of education instead of a ladder in a continuous process of schooling. Elementary schools everywhere, except in the United States had been looked upon as an institution designed for the poor, the lower class, or the working class. Changes took place more readily in providing for equal opportunity for elementary age children in
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countries with an industrial base.

Kandel discussed the retarding practices of the worldwide phenomenon of using children to do tasks requiring manual labor, particularly in rural areas or less developed nations. He touched upon the problem of nations failing to adapt the curriculum of the school to the environment with which the students were familiar. He recognized that equal educational opportunities could not be delivered to students in many countries until there was improvement in roads and the means of transportation. Students, in other words, must have accessibility to the school before they can even attend classes.

Writing about the disparity between the enactment of laws and their enforcement regarding compulsory school attendance, and other problems with compulsory education, Kandel wrote:

The enactment of laws for compulsory school attendance has been widespread throughout the world. Nevertheless laws may be on the statute books but their enforcement may be neglected, as may be gathered from the study of statistics of illiteracy in many parts of the world. Laws are frequently passed before schools are made available or before there is accommodation in existing schools. Attendance may not be adequately enforced or may be unsatisfactory because of bad weather, distances, or ill health. What has happened in many countries which enacted compulsory education laws relatively recently may to some extent be witnessed in the more advanced countries as a result of the unanticipated increase in the birth rate following World War II. Under such conditions children in over-large classes often taught by inadequately prepared or overburdened teachers are deprived of their right to equality of educational opportunity.42

In the matter of secondary schooling Kandel believed that the most important problem involved in equalizing educational
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opportunity arose from the difficulties involved in examining the purposes of secondary education. He blamed the overemphasis on the academic curriculum at the expense of a more diversified curriculum for secondary school students. He disagreed with those parents and others who saw other types of education as being inferior to the academic. Crystalizing the issue of secondary education and equality of educational opportunity, Kandel said:

Equality of educational opportunities has come to be confused with identity of opportunities, as though all pupils could be expected to profit equally from the same type of education. Social equalitarianism seriously affects proposals to provide some form of secondary education adapted to the ages, abilities, and aptitudes of the pupils.43

Kandel believed strongly in sound guidance practices and programs for secondary school youth. He said that guidance was at the heart of providing a system of equal educational opportunities for all secondary school students. He admitted that new techniques needed to be found by researchers in order to discover the abilities and aptitudes of students transferring from the elementary school to the secondary school. He clearly believed that guidance techniques to be effective must not select students but rather distribute them to the type of schooling which was best tailored to their abilities. Stating the solution succinctly, he wrote, "The fundamental principle that should be followed, if equality of educational opportunity means the provision of the right education for the right pupil under the right teacher, is to discover what a pupil can do
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and help him do it."44

Chapter VI is entitled, "The Administration and Organization of Education." While Kandel does write about the four nations in his previous Chapters I-V, it is with chapter VI of this book that in-depth comparisons begin. The comparisons continue through chapter IX. After a discussion of modern educational systems, Kandel discussed the various aspects of administration: centralization, its purpose and function, uniformity and diversity, factors which determine its character, decentralization, professional freedom, and educational finance.

While Kandel did believe in efficiency in the administration of an educational system he saw it as adapting itself to the educative process rather than to the industrial model. He believed that centralized systems of education and scientific principles of management could not help to implement sound educational theory successfully. He felt that a centralized system molded the person into a preconceived political pattern and placed the emphasis on securing cultural uniformity. Regarding scientific management, he wrote:

The principles of scientific management developed in business and industry can be applied only to a slight degree in the administration of education. The success of business and industry depends upon the production and distribution of products that are uniform in size and quality. Education, however, is devoted to dealing with human beings, and, while it is concerned with standards, it cannot be either successful or efficient if its aims are designed to securing a standardized product.45
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Kandel devoted the remainder of Chapter VI to discussions of administration in the four countries, England, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States. His discussions of England and the United States are approximately twice as long as those of France and the Soviet Union. This appears to be a considerable disparity in terms of what was being compared among the four nations. Certainly, Kandel's sources for the Soviet Union were limited because he could not do research in Russian, but there was no lack of materials available to him on the administration of French education.

Kandel gave a short historical account of the four nations' traditions of educational administration. He then proceeded to show how their systems changed significantly, developed, and planned for future changes. He also discussed some of the problems that each nation was experiencing at the time he wrote this book. In addition he touched on the subject of educational finance.

In his discussion on English educational administration Kandel clearly showed how the philosophy of having a loosely coordinated and articulated educational system with its emphasis on local authority and control worked. Quoting an English government education official on this topic, he wrote:

Our plan of decentralization, the relation of partnership between the Board of Education and the local authorities, the weight that was offered to local sentiment, the policy of constant consultation, and the great reluctance of the Board to apply coercion were all part and parcel of a great desire to foster the spirit of individualism, originality, and
Kandel mentioned that the English form of educational administration operated under the principle of freedom which made possible and encouraged flexibility and emphasized successful adaptation to unique local conditions in the nation.

In his briefer accounting of French educational administration he discussed the French tradition of centralization. He showed how he thought it differed from the centralization that existed under totalitarian governments. The primary purpose for the French centralization was to create a sense of national unity and solidarity as the French nation faced threats to its security both externally and internally. This did not mean, however, as it did in totalitarian governments, the subjugation of the individual to the State. Kandel thus was much less critical of French educational centralization than in those governments which were not democratic. He did admit that the French system was bureaucratic and he predicted educational reconstruction in the future. He discussed the freedom in France to have private schools since the state did not have a monopoly on education.

Kandel mentioned the elimination of illiteracy in the Soviet Union under the Communists. He also discussed the totalitarian features of the U.S.S.R., its educational system, and its attempt at duping the rest of the world into thinking it was a democratic system. Kandel carefully, but briefly, outlined the administrative aspects of the educational system. He showed how everything that
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was educational was under the control of the government or the Communist Party under Article 14 of the Soviet Constitution. He wrote:

Although there does not exist a central authority for the administration of all education throughout the U.S.S.R., uniformity is secured, first through the supervision and definition of policy by the Communist Party and secondly by the acceptance of the policies and practices of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republics as a model.... The aims of education are the same throughout the U.S.S.R. 47

In his lengthy discussion of educational administration in the United States Kandel discussed the American tradition of having a strong faith in both education and the ideal of equal educational opportunity. He mentioned education as being a vital public concern and the role of the federal and state governments in education. He saw the control of education and its administration as being delegated by the states to local units. He discussed the roles of the local boards of education and the chief executive officer who was to effectively serve each board--the school superintendent. He noted the expansion of the authority of each state in education but he did not see this as a threat to local control. He said:

Despite the expansion of the functions of the state authority for education, the principle of leaving as much initiative as possible with the local authority is safeguarded. The control of the curriculum and courses of study and the selection of textbooks by the state legislature or board of education are open to criticism. In general, however, local authorities enjoy a great deal of independence despite the fact that the states are assuming an increasing portion of the costs of education. 48

Chapter VII is entitled, "The Education of the Child." In this

47 Ibid., 171-172.
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chapter Kandel gave equal space to a discussion of education of the child in England, France, and the United States. The section of the U.S.S.R. is briefer than the others. In this chapter's overview Kandel discussed preschool education, elementary education, and the new pedagogy which shifted the emphasis from the subject to the child. Along with an emphasis on individual differences of opinion the new pedagogy, according to Kandel, stressed the child's personality as well as his intellect. "Education as a development of personality meant that it could not be limited to intellectual training only but must contribute to the development of the whole child--intellectually, emotionally, and physically." ⁴⁹

After a brief discussion of the child as an active being in need of guidance in the school by its teachers, Kandel went on to discuss and compare the education of the child in the four nations under consideration.

In England the chapter included sections on nursery schools and classes, infant schools, and junior schools. The nursery school was for pupils from three to five, the next stage of school life was compulsory education from ages five to seven in the infant school. The junior school was the third section that comprised the stage of primary school in England. It received students at the age of seven plus and sent them upward to some type of secondary school at age eleven plus.

Primary education in England was conceptualized in terms of activity and experience instead of knowledge to be acquired and
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stored. Kandel made the important point, however, that even in the English primary schools, activities and experiences had to be eventually organized into subjects which would utilize the activities and experiences in terms of modes of instruction. Quoting from the influential report issued in England in 1937, the Handbook of Suggestions, he wrote:

> it is the function of the school to preserve and transmit the traditions, knowledge, and standards of conduct on which our civilization depends; and if the child at school is to assimilate the various highly systematized bodies of subject matter presented to him, due regard must be had to his natural interests and the way in which he acquires his everyday experience.50

Kandel pointed out that in England the school trained children to see and understand the world around them. He saw a trend in nature study, geography, and local history and he compared these to similar paths of study that the Germans called "Heimatkunde" and the French "etude de milieu"—environmental studies. Other important educational aspects were the physical well-being of the children, developing their own interests and learning to do things as well as learning from studying books.

In French education, Kandel discussed the movement for preschool children; maternal schools or "ecoles maternelles." These were schools open to children between the ages of two and six and attendance was voluntary. These schools could be established anywhere in the nation where there was a community of more than 2,000 persons. For smaller communities, infant classes attached to elementary schools were organized. The ecoles maternelles were

---
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separate from the primary schools. These schools like the English nursery schools promoted physical and mental health of young children in a peaceful atmosphere in order to ensure their sense of security and healthy emotional development.

Compulsory education in France began at the age of six and ended at age fourteen. Kandel traced the complex objectives or instructions which the French employed in their elementary schools to 1887. He showed their changes and their development to 1945, and to 1947 for the later years of elementary schooling. Historically the study for the certificate of primary studies "certificate d'etudes," which was issued at age twelve was criticized for garnering too many facts without showing the uses to which they could be put. By 1945 the instructions were modified to make learning simpler and more effective. The instructions sought to bring the work of the school closer to life to give what the French called the "bath of realism". This included the use of audio-visual aids in the instructional program.

In discussing the methods of the "bath of realism," or the new education Kandel wrote:

They emphasize respect for the personality of the child and stimulate his activity; reading and writing are taught by the global method; statements are presented by pupils to their classmates; investigations are conducted by teams into the local environment, natural and human; and pupils study by themselves or in cooperative groups. These methods are far removed, if they can be put into practice from the overemphasis on facts that used to prevail.51

In the U.S.S.R. the education of the child was modified since
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the revolution. The Soviet plan to destroy family life did not succeed but the day care centers for children of the newly emancipated women were put into place. In his brief section on the U.S.S.R. Kandel discussed nurseries, kindergartens, and primary schools.

The nurseries were open twenty-four hours each day to assist women who were working night shifts. Teachers, domestic workers, and nurses worked shifts of lengths varying from six to eight hours. These nurseries under the supervision of governmental health authorities were provided by the women's employers wherever there were sufficient numbers of women employed. There was an emphasis on close parental cooperation and mothers were trained in child care practices and parental education. Infants remained in these nurturing environments until they were three years of age.

From age three until age seven a Soviet child could attend a publicly maintained kindergarten. Kandel was of the opinion that the Soviet kindergartens were similar to those of the other nations discussed in this book. The basic differences were, in his opinion, those that espoused preparation for living under Soviet Communism. Quoting from a Soviet educationist, Kandel depicted this phase of Soviet thusly: "Children are taught to love their Soviet Motherland, their people and leaders; are brought up in a collective spirit; they are taught to acquire working and organizational habits."52

Soviet primary school education was made compulsory beginning at age seven, for seven years everywhere in the country, beginning
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in 1949. The program and the textbooks were the same everywhere. Kandel portrayed the use of the textbook as the chief tool in Soviet primary education. Communist ideology was all pervasive throughout this period of schooling, and the inculcation of patriotism and nationalism prevailed since 1945.

The last section of this chapter dealt with the education of the child in the United States. At that time, 1955, Kandel observed that the nursery school did not yet acquire a recognized position in the American public school system. He also showed that kindergartens were not often found in school systems with local populations below 2,500 people. The elementary school was organized into the three sections of kindergarten-primary (to Grade three), intermediate (Grades 4-6), and upper (Grades 7-8). The upper grades offered, in many cases, the same curriculum as the first two years of the junior high school. At that time in the United States, Kandel pointed out that the most common organization for elementary school was eight grades, articulated with a four year secondary school. There was also the pattern of six grades articulated with six years of secondary schools, either continuous or divided into three year junior and three year senior high schools.

After a brief discussion of the American nursery school, which Kandel compared with the English nursery school in terms of its similar aims, he briefly discussed the kindergarten movement in the United States. He showed the early influence of Froebel and Montessori and explained that their ideas were discarded as being too formalistic. Outlining the reform of the kindergarten movement
which had taken place early in the century in America. Kandel wrote:

"The chief emphasis in the reform was placed upon the development of good habits, training in cooperation with others, sound physical progress through a variety of activities adapted to their stage of growth, and mental progress through a variety of experiences--play, storytelling, music, rhythm, creative occupations in art and manual work. No attempt is made to begin instruction in the three R's but the variety of activities and experiences that make up the program are intended to serve as a foundation for the later study of formal subjects."

In the balance of the chapter Kandel discussed elementary education. He saw it as being very successful judging it from one criterion, the 90 percent of American children who were in attendance at that time. He was critical of the continuation of Progressive education and its manifestations of the period, the child-centered school and the community-centered school. He saw the latter type of school as being the dominant progressive school of the period of the early 1950s. His attacks on Progressive education and his espousal of Essentialism in this chapter were very similar to many of his earlier writings on the topic.

Kandel was critical of those who at the time claimed American children tested well in school. He believed that after a few years of leaving school young persons actually forgot what they learned in school even if they tested well while in school. He also believed strongly that the schools belonged to the public and not to the bureaucrats who operated them. He ended this chapter on the education of the child with these comments:

"The chief source of the changing fashions in American Education has not been the desire to adapt education to
rapidly changing conditions. It is to be found largely in
the attempt to bring into education the methods of
experimentation and research which have produced the rapid
advances in science. It is forgotten that teaching is an art
... and that the human being is not the same kind of material
as that which with the scientists deals in a laboratory.
Further, there is a cultural heritage ... a map to be
explored and for which each generation needs to be trained.
Finally, the revolt of the public or parts of it is an answer
to the question "To Whom Do Schools Belong?"54

Chapter VIII is entitled, "The Education of the Adolescent."

After a lengthy introduction in which Kandel wrote about the history
and traditions of secondary education, he began his comparison of
the four nations' secondary school systems. Again, as in other
places in this book, Kandel's writing about the Soviet Union is much
briefer than the lengthy discussions of the educational systems of
the three other nations. Perhaps this is the chief weakness of this
modern, informative, and well written book. It is a weakness, which
as discussed earlier, was admitted by Kandel. Operating with dated
material of disproportionate length leaves room for criticism of
Kandel's comparisons of the Soviet Union with the United States,
England, and France. In this chapter Kandel wrestled with the
complexities of providing schooling for adolescents in these four
nations.

In discussing English education Kandel mentioned the act,
entitled the Education Act, of 1944, which called for secondary
education of all. He discussed its provisions for secondary
education which called for publicly maintained grammar, technical,
and modern schools. In addition he included a discussion of the
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private or independent schools which covered the "Public Schools." The examination at age eleven plus would determine the type of school a student would attend. Kandel seemed to be most impressed with the newer type of school in England, called the secondary modern school. He believed that it showed the most promise because it had to be pioneering and experimental. He saw it as a school which provided a curriculum having a wide range of activities that helped students prepare for life and for recreation. The teachers were to enjoy greater freedom in instruction and in content than was heretofore possible. For some unexplainable reason Kandel favored this type of "progressive" schooling for adolescents in England. It was well known that he usually attacked progressive education.

Kandel next discussed the French tradition of secondary education. He pointed to the criticisms that were certainly not new, that the secondary school in France was too reliant on the use of books, and that there was too much rote memory with little relation to the modern world. Kandel showed the shift that took place in French secondary education with its newer emphasis away from the subject, to the child. This emphasis on guidance (orientation) was to prepare each student in the best way for his destiny as an adult. In attributing the introduction of secondary school guidance to France, Kandel credited M. Jean Zay, who as Minister of National Education began the movement. He wrote:

M. Zay was ... responsible for the introduction on an experimental basis of classes d'orientation or guidance classes ... which would advise pupils on the courses best suited to their abilities on the basis of an accumulation of observations by a group of teachers, parents, and physicians. This measure was important because of the number of pupils
who were not competent (non-valeurs) in the courses they chose.\textsuperscript{55}

Kandel cited a 1954 series of reports which emphasized a new approach to secondary education in France. The reports suggested that French secondary education meet the needs of preparing students for a society which was changing with extraordinary speed. The training of the mind should not be neglected in the secondary school but it should be geared to problem solving. Emphasis was on, "awakening a spirit of research, to cultivating initiative, and to developing an open mind free from prejudices. The educated man should have a critical sense and ... should be ready with the means and methods to make adaptations to changing conditions."	extsuperscript{56}

In the Soviet Union secondary education was coeducational from 1918-1943. Kandel reasoned that coeducation was abolished in the larger cities by 1943 when the nation was able to afford separate schools. Another reason for its abolition was due to the discovery that the needs of boys and girls differed psychologically and they also differed in their intellectual and vocational interests. In 1940 tuition fees were begun in the upper levels of secondary schools even though the Soviet Constitution prohibited this. The charging of fees was lifted by 1947.

Kandel depicted the secondary school in the Soviet Union as one which emphasized the language and literature of Russia, as well as the native language and literature where Russian was not the native
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tongue. Other subjects studied were astronomy, history, geography, foreign languages, drawing, singing, and physical training. Literature and history were slanted to present the cult of patriotism and the predominance of the U.S.S.R. as a major world power. These subjects, begun in the fifth year of school continued for six years.

Kandel presented evidence to show that the Soviet secondary school student spent much more time in fewer years studying chemistry, literature, natural science, history, and geography than his counterpart in the United States. He cited one Soviet expert on this topic who showed that the Soviet course of study, "is a more profound one in the Soviet school and gives the pupil a much broader and systematic knowledge than do schools of the United States."57 Kandel also gave a capsule comment on the powerful impact of Soviet extra-curricular activities and organizations on Soviet youth.

In the last section of this chapter Kandel explored the following topics and related them to the education of the adolescent: secondary education and cultural changes, articulation with primary schools, the comprehensive high school, aims of high schools, education of the gifted, curriculum, life adjustment education, and extracurricular activities.

In the very important section on the comprehensive high school in the United States, Kandel portrayed this type of school as one which was open to all without tuition offering both general and vocational education in the same institution. It was uniquely

57 Ibid., 298.
American, performing the tasks which in other nations were assigned to different kinds of special schools--trade, industrial, commercial, household, and fine arts, etc.

Kandel named some of the better comprehensive schools operating in the nation at that time. In a critical manner, however, he said this about the American comprehensive school:

The comprehensive high school which is attended by all the children of all the people is the response to the American ideal of education in a democracy. It is not only considered educationally more efficient than separate schools but is regarded as essential for developing a sense of social unity and solidarity. Neither argument has been proven in practice... the high school course is satisfactory for 20 percent of the pupils with academic ability and 20 percent who plan to enter a skilled vocation, but it is unsatisfactory for 60 percent of the pupils who derive no profit from their attendance at school.58

Kandel strongly believed that the American comprehensive high school, which was attended by students of a wide variety of intelligence, catered primarily to the average student. Because of the great variation of students who attended Kandel thought that sixty percent of them were being miseducated. Citing a Harvard educational report, Kandel depicted a secondary school system in the United States that was "too fast for the slow and too slow for the fast."59 He cited another report of the Educational Policies Commission to support his critical remarks.

Chapter nine is entitled, "The Preparation of Teachers." Kandel had been writing on this topic for forty-five years, since the publication of his doctoral dissertation, The Training of
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Elementary School Teachers in Germany. After writing an overview for this chapter he compared teacher preparation patterns in England, France, the U.S.S.R., and the United States. In the overview, Kandel said that he believed that teaching was a profession:

For apart from its social connotation, the most distinctive character of a profession is that its practitioners must have a prolonged and specialized preparation leading to a mastery of certain principles and techniques which are themselves based upon a specialized body of knowledge. Professions emerge as soon as there is developed a body of knowledge on which principles and techniques are based. Medicine, law, engineering, and architecture have emerged in this way. A number of occupations are today passing through the stage of semi-professions to become professions in time. Teaching has thus become a profession.60

In spite of Kandel's proclamation that teaching had become a profession by 1955, he no doubt would have received quite an argument from tens of thousands of practitioners both in the United States and abroad. These teachers could rationally argue the point that if teaching were really a profession then they would not be striking regularly in order to obtain a livable wage from their employers. What Kandel seemed to overlook in his statement was that, unlike the practitioners of law, medicine, engineering, and architecture, teachers could not set their own fees or, in far too many cases, be paid a salary commensurate with their training.

In his section on England, Kandel discussed: proposals for reform, the McNair Report, the present system of training, national advisory bodies, training college courses, preparation of secondary school teachers, certification, salaries and pensions, and in-
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service training. The McNair Report issued in 1944 recommended that teachers in England at the primary and secondary levels become a unified profession with a basic salary scale and with all teachers being designated as qualified teachers provided they have successfully completed the required minimum two year period of teacher preparation.

Kandel described in a clear manner the complex machinery which involved area training organizations working with teacher training colleges to improve the preparation of teachers. He described the setting up of a national advisory board which was appointed in 1949 as a result of the McNair report by the Ministry of Education. The membership of this National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers represented area training organizations, local education authorities, and national associations of teachers. The function of this council was, "to keep under review national policy on the training and conditions of qualification of teachers, and on the recruitment and distribution of teachers in ways best calculated to meet the needs of the schools or other educational establishments." 61

In his section on France, Kandel included: the tradition of teacher preparation, proposal for reform, the present system, admission requirements, course of study, certification, higher normal schools, in-service training, and preparation for secondary school teachers. As part of the discussion of traditions, Kandel pointed out that the Vichy government suppressed the normal schools
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which had been established in 1879. They were suppressed because they were considered to be bulwarks of radicalism. In restoring the normal school in 1945, the French government upgraded this institution so that the future elementary school teacher should be well educated in addition to being professionally prepared.

By 1945 all the normal schools in France were boarding institutions or "internats," with some provision for partial borders and for day students. Admission was by a competitive examination or "concours" and not by a qualifying examination or "examen." The students were educated at the cost of the government. By 1946 the length of the normal school was extended by decree to four years leading to the baccalaureate. The normal school was closely aligned with demonstration schools attached to them.

In the U.S.S.R. considerable attention was devoted to the preparation of teachers. Kandel quoted Lenin. "We must raise our teacher to a height such as he has not attained and never will be able to attain in a bourgeois society."62 This status was not reached, Kandel explained, due to the fact that so many teachers were needed to meet the rapidity with which the number of schools and students increased in the Soviet Union.

As of the early 1950s the Soviet institutions for the preparation of teachers were organized on three levels. The normal or teaching schools had a four year course for students who finished seven years of school and who wished to teach in preschools or primary schools. Pedagogical institutes prepared students to
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specialize in teaching grades 5 to 7, in a two year course of study for students who completed ten years of school. These institutions were under the control of the Minister of Education of each Soviet Republic. The third institution was the higher pedagogical institute which prepared students wishing to teach in grades 8 to 10. This was a four year course of study for graduates of the ten year school. This group of teachers was also recruited from students who took a five-year course, including professional studies, at a university. This institution was under the supervision of the Minister of Higher Education.

The last country in this section was the United States. Kandel discussed: current issues, institutions for the preparation of teachers, the choice between academic and professional subjects; the transition from normal schools to teachers colleges, administration of institutions for teacher preparation, the curriculum, in-service training, and the appointment and status of teachers.

As of the writing of this book, institutions for the preparation of teachers fell into two categories according to whether they were controlled publicly or privately. Pointing out that there were no national requirements or standards for certification in the preparation of teachers, Kandel said:

The institutions under public control numbered 432 in 1952 and were provided by states (315), counties or townships (27), municipalities (61), and school districts (29). The 661 private institutions were either secular (169) or denominational (472). The total of 1,093 institutions fall into another category according as they are normal schools, teachers colleges, liberal arts colleges, with education departments, or schools or colleges of education in universities. The normal schools usually offer two year courses to prepare teachers for elementary schools; the other
institutions offer four year courses or a fifth year where demanded by certification requirements for the preparation of teachers for both elementary and secondary schools. Kandel pointed out that the only characteristic that all of these teacher training institutions had in common was that their students were admitted only if they were high school graduates.

Kandel rebutted the criticism that teachers were not educated broadly enough or completely familiar with their subject. He also disagreed with those critics who said the time spent on professional studies encroached too much on the time that should have been spent on general cultural education. His reply was that these criticisms may have been true when teacher preparation was only two years and there was no opportunity for teachers to obtain a secondary school education. As preparation in the United States was extended for elementary teachers to three and four years, and to four and five years for high school teachers, this was no longer the case. He said the time spent on professional studies was only one-eighth to one-sixth of the total teacher preparation course.

Chapter ten is entitled, "Problems and Outlook." It is a short concluding chapter which summed up Kandel's thoughts on the four educational systems discussed in the book. He saw these four nations as being representative of most industrialized and developing nations, insofar as the similarity of the problems they were encountering at the time, and that is why he selected them for inclusion in this book. He believed that the problems of education in underdeveloped countries fell into an entirely different category.
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because of a rising nationalism and the realization that concerns about food, clothing, housing, and health were priorities that had to be met first.

Kandel lined up the democratic countries of England, France, and the United States along with other democracies, against the Soviet Union and those countries which had already been compelled to embrace its political and educational system. In the former case he believed that education was for enlightenment, while in the latter case education and propaganda were indistinguishable. He said the differences between the democracies and the Soviet bloc nations became clearer if one looked at secondary school trends:

In the countries behind the Iron Curtain the nature of secondary education is determined by the needs of the particular five-year plan adopted by the state and is becoming increasingly technical and vocational with an emphasis on mathematics and natural sciences. In democracies the aim of secondary education is to produce citizens and workers with broad interests as human beings.64

Finally, in this chapter, Kandel briefly discussed such problems as: the phenomenal birth rate increase in all countries after World War II; the problem of raising the school-leaving age in democratic countries; providing preschool opportunities; the maximizing of postprimary education; the improvement of instruction; and, the unification of the teaching profession as it related to general education, professional preparation, and basic remuneration.

In 1956 Kandel published a major article in the *International Review of Education*. It was entitled, "Problems of Comparative Education." He discussed at the outset the problem he recently
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encountered in reading the summary descriptions of approximately eighty educational systems. He said that except for their being categorized into three different groups—industrial, agricultural, and totalitarian, he could not tell one system of education from another. He could not discern, "the color, the scent, and the shape of a nation or a national group."  

While Kandel believed these accounts to be accurate, they were totally unable to communicate any real meaning because of their almost total uniformity. Comparative education's worth as an academic study centered on being able to analyze and compare systems of education and the components that determined and molded them. Therefore, the presentation of the legal basis of a system of education, its organization, a discussion of its different types of schools, and their curricula was wholly inadequate.

Kandel was of the opinion that comparative education was difficult because it depended significantly on knowing many disciplines outside of the field of education. In a strong statement, Kandel said, "It may even be claimed that a knowledge of political theory and practice, of economics, of public opinion, and of sociology is more relevant than a knowledge of the theory and practice of education." He had a great working knowledge of education and its many aspects. However, his background in the fields of history and philosophy may have led him to believe
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education was less important than other fields in the study of comparative education.

It may seem unusual that a serious minded educator like Kandel would put the study of education on anything other than a coequal basis with other disciplines. However, he was influenced by the great English comparative educator, Sir Michael Sadler, who was his teacher at the University of Manchester. In this same article, Kandel quoted from Sadler. One can easily see where Kandel obtained his opinion about education and other disciplines by examining the first part of Sadler's statement: "In studying foreign systems of education we should not forget that the things outside the schools matter even more than the things inside the schools."  

Again, in this article, as in the previous article discussed in this chapter, Kandel distinguished between the aims of comparative education and the aims of international education. He also discussed the difficulties that afflicted comparative education as a field of study. One difficulty was the tremendous scope of the various disciplines one had to draw on in order to understand the intangible forces which underlie nations' educational systems.

A second problem also related to the scope of the field. Kandel questioned whether comparative education could be studied successfully without directly observing school systems in several different countries. This called for having money to travel
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67 Kandel's point that other disciplines were of more importance than the knowledge of the field of education will be discussed in the conclusion of this dissertation.
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extensively, and a working knowledge of foreign languages as well. He believed that complete reliance on the educational literature was not warranted. What was needed he said was first hand visitations and observations in order to check the literature. The primary purpose of comparative education was to go deeply into the study of national educational systems, not just learn about them.

The third difficulty he saw in the field of comparative education was that a methodology had not yet evolved by 1956. This is significant and interesting as well, because many of his contributions to a methodology of comparative education were written before 1956. Yet in spite of his own contributions he did not see a totality in terms of an effective and suitable methodology. He wrote that a methodology involves the question:

What do we compare? The answer should be that the comparison is ideas, ideals and form. It can be assumed that all children as human beings are born with the same central tendencies... Under what conditions do they become...national persons. How is the educational system designed to produce such differences?69

In this article, Kandel pointed to the vast differences between the minority of industrial nations and their educational systems and the majority of agricultural nations and their educational systems. He discussed poverty briefly and its negative impact on students in the poorer countries. In addition he also discussed the relative deprivation of nonmainstream students in the richer countries.

He focused on the problem of the absence of standardized terminology and statistical reports in comparative education. He
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advocated the publication of an international glossary of educational terms as one approach towards the solution to this problem. He also advocated an international system of uniform records and reports that would be clear, accurate and standardized.

Kandel discussed briefly, the training and course work of the prospective comparative educator. He said:

The major contribution should be to make the educator "better able to enter into the spirit and tradition" of the educational system of his own nation, to become sensitive to certain common problems in education in different parts of the world and the different ways in which they are solved because of differences in national cultural conditions, and to enrich his philosophical insights and understanding of education. Comparative education is not an academic study but an essential aspect of professional preparation.70

In 1961, Kandel published what may have been one of his most insightful articles in his years of prodigious scholarship in comparative education. The name of the article was "Comparative Education and Underdeveloped Countries: A New Dimension." He discussed an appropriate model of education for the newly independent nations, former colonies of the rich industrialized nations.

Kandel called for a new beginning in these nations. He felt that the type of educational systems which had been developed under industrial and technological conditions in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was not appropriate for these underdeveloped agrarian nations. He recognized also that a gap had to be closed in these poorer countries between the poor and undereducated majority and the affluent minority who had access to much more education
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especially at higher levels.

Kandel believed that educational development in these agrarian nations had to be planned and implemented thoughtfully and carefully. In raising the educational levels of the population there must be an awareness on the part of the indigenous leadership that upward educational mobility takes time and patience. There must also be the realization that a change in the value system is often a difficult and unsuccessful path for people in less developed nations. For the young, especially, caution was necessary because of the likelihood of the creation of a wide gap between parents and children due to an attempt at educational betterment.

Without employing the contemporary term frequently used in the parlance of modern comparative education, "nonformal education," Kandel conceptualized much of this type of education in this article. One might think in reading this 1961 work, that it was the work of a comparativist writing in the late 1980s: perhaps even an expert on nonformal education. Kandel wrote:

It is obvious from what is known from cultural anthropology that the first need of the so-called underdeveloped areas is not to disseminate literacy but to direct education to the improvement of living-of health and hygiene, nutrition, and methods of agriculture.... ...A program of literacy can be built up after a desire has been created to know more about the methods demonstrated, about care of health and hygiene (personal and public), and about the environment in which they school is located.\(^7^1\)

It appears that Kandel's advice was quite sound. Only within recent years have comparative educators and development experts

begun to realize that the grafting of models of education used in industrialized nations onto the educational systems of third world nations would not help improve the educational systems of these nations, because of the reasons Kandel conceptualized. There was a need first to improve from within the basic conditions of life for people in these countries.

Kandel suggested using the idea of 4-H clubs for youth in these agrarian nations. He knew that land improvement could not happen just by improving students' ability to read. He was aware of the problems of health and malnutrition, which included the wrong kinds of diet, in many of the developing nations of the world. In keeping with the idea of "nonformal education", Kandel thought that it was important to develop the agricultural economy, but in addition, to prepare youth for jobs as skilled craftsmen, machine operators, dieticians and nurses. He said, "To set the same standards for secondary education as are set for the baccalaureates or the certificates and matriculation of European systems is to miseducate a large majority of the secondary school population." 72

Kandel also wrote on formal education in the developing nations in this landmark article. He saw the systems of formal and nonformal education as being inextricably bound together if nations were to proceed and progress from a less developed status to the status of more advanced nations. He wisely set priorities for developing nations that would enable their citizens to benefit from nonformal education before undertaking formal education.
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He saw that primary education in poorer nations was often hindered by an absence of compulsory education, and entry to school was allowed at any age that fell within the legal requirement. Classes were often comprised of infants and pubescent children which was discouraging for everyone. Kandel recommended definite limits to this type of miseducation while setting up longer terms of schooling gradually. Incorporating an important principle of nonformal education and applying it to formal systems of primary and secondary educational systems, he wrote: "The gradual challenge of new ideas on matters recognized to be of direct concern and relevance should help to stimulate a desire to learn more and to lead to purposeful reading."73

Kandel saw the problem of secondary schooling as being more complex. Most people in the developing countries, he felt, equated secondary education with academic work, providing a way to become separate and distinct from doing manual labor. So it would not be an easy task to educate students either nonformally or vocationally, especially if the population viewed these as being watered-down curriculums. Kandel recommended that these poor countries look to the successful programs geared to promoting marketable skills as was being done in both the United States and the Soviet Union.

A new approach to higher education was also recommended by Kandel. He believed that it was important to modify the traditional forms of higher education if people were to receive adequate preparation for leadership roles in the developing countries. He
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recommended that in working under the auspices of UNESCO and the United Nations, students in the developing countries should be trained at universities in the advanced countries, as university teachers, in order to set up universities in their own country. Secondly, he believed that it was important to adjust the number of admissions to the universities in the poorer countries. He said, "The adjustment of such numbers must be related to the opportunities for employment, if the danger of an educated proletariat is to be avoided." 74
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CHAPTER VIII

KANDEL'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Many scholars throughout the world have given credit to Isaac L. Kandel for his pioneering work in comparative and international education. Among those who have lauded him for his outstanding efforts have been scholars who in their own right are important educational luminaries. These scholars such as William Brickman, Harold Noah, Max Eckstein, Lawrence Cremin, Robert Ulich, and George Bereeday were among the long list of comparative and other educators to laud Kandel for being a pioneer and a major contributor to the field.

Templeton, whose dissertation on Kandel has been cited in this work, regarded Kandel as having made a valuable contribution to American educational theory through his comparative educational studies. But it was not only for his contributions to American education that Kandel was praised. Templeton also pointed out that Kandel was a pioneer and recognized authority in international and comparative education for many years, throughout the world. According to Templeton, Kandel significantly influenced the entire field of comparative and international education.

Kandel's work in these two fields has been of such magnitude that to span the gap between his earliest contribution to Peter Sandiford's *Comparative Education* and his more recent *The New Era in*
Education is a huge undertaking. This is true in terms of his many publications and professional activities in all parts of the world. His sizeable contributions call for redefining the scope, aims and methodology of the field of comparative education.\(^1\)

Templeton believed that Kandel's work was important to American educational theories because it involved an analysis of the various approaches nations have adopted in order to understand and find solutions to their common educational problems. Each country could benefit from this process and be offered a way to encourage educational progress. In addition, this process could greatly aid international unity. Quoting from Kandel, Templeton cited his contribution to the spirit of international education. This contribution included:

> the development of an internationalism not on emotion or sentiment, but arising from the sense that all nations through their systems of education are contributing, each in its own way, to the work and progress of the world, and from a realization of the ambitions and ideals, which each nation is endeavoring to hand on through its schools.\(^2\)

From the time Kandel completed his doctoral dissertation in 1910, he was a major contributor to comparative and international education. His dissertation, *The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany*, was published by Teachers College, Columbia University in 1910. Kandel did visit Germany and its elementary teacher training schools to write this dissertation. He was fluent in German, knew its history of education well, and researched his
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While he determined that Germany did a creditable job in preparing elementary teachers, he would not recommend borrowing such a harsh and even despotic bureaucratic system for the United States. He showed that the success of the German system encompassed antidemocratic methods, superior authority, and dictatorial approaches. In analyzing the German system on a comparative basis, Kandel felt that its methods would not promote the development of those necessary qualities which were important for a teacher to have. German approaches stifled initiative and quashed the human personality to the extent that a nation such as the United States would not profit from incorporating its teacher training methods into its own system.

After an exhaustive and careful look at Germany's teacher training, Kandel recommended that America not continue to praise it as was done by Horace Mann and others in the 1840s. Kandel's thorough research was an important contribution cross-culturally. His ability to see the virtue of a given nation's educational practices, without recommending continued borrowing due to vast cultural and sociopolitical differences between nations was a major contribution to comparative and international education at the time.

Kandel's historiography was an additional important contribution to both fields too. His knowledge of the past permitted him to see a broader and deeper context than would otherwise be possible. His comparisons were solidly grounded because he had a historical perspective of a country's educational
system, its contemporary situation, and its possible future directions.

His tenet which espoused the cause of having the best teachers in the classrooms for children and young persons was and still is an enormous boon to an insecure profession. He was aware that education was prone to accepting frivolous innovations and mindless practices that could, in some countries, change directions rapidly. Thus, in the United States, for example, he cautioned against change for change's sake in education. In international education, therefore, the teacher would be the linchpin between the child and his environment, mediating between the two in order to facilitate international cooperation between and among nations. Teachers everywhere were responsible, Kandel felt, for promoting this cooperation in their own classrooms.

Through this process, Kandel advocated a healthy and positive nationalism which would extend itself beyond the borders of a given country and show what the country has contributed and could continue to contribute to the advancement of civilization. In practice, it seems that Kandel would overburden teachers with the teaching of international cooperation and education. However, he was certainly correct in believing that the teacher was the key person responsible for the child's education. He was also correct in believing that international cooperation should start with each student, teacher, parent, school, and community being imbued with the spirit of internationalism.

Writing in 1945, Kandel said:
What renders a consideration of the teacher's part in One World is that the whole issue which now confronts all concerned with the future of education has been obscured by devoting too much attention to means and to little to the end to be achieved. So far as school education is concerned, and for the majority of pupils in elementary and high schools, the end to be achieved is of the greatest importance. That end is the development of the good neighbor ideal, and that development must begin with the pupil's own environment and branch out to the community, the nation, and the world. It is nothing less than the cultivation in each one of us of the recognition of the worth and dignity of human beings regardless of race, color or creed. There are some who would define the ultimate end to be attained as a sense of world citizenship, but that sense can only become a reality as it grows out of and is continuous with local and national citizenship.  

Kandel's early concern with teacher education and with the professionalization of teaching began early in his academic career and continued to the very end of his career. In his doctoral dissertation, he wrote:

However perfect a system of training teacher previous to their entry into service may be, it must be recognized that the utmost that a normal school can be expected to do is not to produce finished teachers but to fill the pupils with a desire to continue their further education.  

In 1962 Kandel was still contributing to the worldwide attempt to improve teaching by improving the qualifications of teachers in the classroom. His book published in Spanish by UNESCO was devoted to teacher improvement. It was entitled Hacia Una Profesion Docente, (Towards a Teaching Profession).

As we approach the twenty-first century, the emphasis on professional teachers is finally being given the just place it

---


4 Kandel. The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany, 97.
deserves in the educational systems of many nations. We can appreciate Kandel's continued efforts and his prescience in writing on this crucial subject. In his UNESCO monograph he said:

When so much depends on the quality of the teacher, he cannot be considered as an artisan, capable of using the tricks of an occupation learned in a relatively short period of teaching. Today teaching requires a preparation so complete and varied as in any profession. It might be difficult to conceive of a time when the preparation of a teacher is so extensive as in which one can disregard the conditions that would make the preparation attractive, but the public even in those advanced countries should realize that someday the best guarantee for education to be converted into the most advantageous and prudent manner is the quality of the teacher, "the soul and sustenance of the school," as he has been called.5

Kandel was one of those educators who realized that higher pay by itself would not attract youth to a career in teaching unless those factors leading up to professionalism also improved. He emphasized another dimension for professionalizing teacher training in underdeveloped countries. This dimension included developing a sense of duty to the public on the part of prospective teachers. To overcome the phenomenon of brain drain in the underdeveloped nations, teachers in these countries should be inculcated with the spirit of responsibility towards the community where they perform their duties. Kandel insisted on a common foundation in the professional preparation of all teachers. Teachers should have a clear understanding of their society and its ideals, objectives, purposes, and significance.

Teachers should gain this understanding by studying the

disciplines which comprise a common core of basic subjects important
to the development of civilization. Teachers must not only impart
knowledge, they must also help students sustain their interest and
elicit their participation. The teacher must no longer be only an
instructor: he must become an educator who comprehends the nature of
the environment and the world so that his understanding would
capably prepare the younger generation.

From 1914 to 1919, at the invitation of the United States
Commissioner P.P. Claxton, Kandel made important contributions which
were discussed earlier in this dissertation. His work on education
in England, Ireland, Germany, and France was published by the United
States Government Printing Office and it advanced Americans' knowledge of foreign school systems. Also, as discussed earlier. Kandel assisted the noted educator Paul Monroe in a study for President Woodrow Wilson. Kandel prepared the translations of foreign school laws and administrative regulations which promoted nationalism. The study encompassed Prussian, Austrian, Japanese, French, Belgian, and Dutch school laws and administrative regulations.

Kandel's involvement in the publication and translation of materials on foreign school systems extended American perceptions of comparative and international education as fields of study. His work was added to these new areas of study, lending an increased respectability to them. His research was thorough, scholarly, and timely. His service with Professor Monroe laid the groundwork for Kandel's involvement in a new and meaningful long term project.
sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University.

One of the Kandel's major contributions to comparative and international education was his participation in Columbia University's International Institute of Education. The Institute was established in 1923 by The International Education Board and its founder, John D. Rockefeller. Funding also provided Macy grants which were the gifts of Mr. V. Everit Macy. According to the Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University:

The International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, was established in 1923 to carry out the following object (1) to give special assistance and guidance to the increasing body of foreign students in Teachers College; (2) to conduct investigations into educational conditions, movements, and tendencies in foreign countries; (3) to make the results of such investigation available to students of education in the United States and elsewhere in the hope that such pooling of information will help to promote and advance the cause of education.6

Kandel was an associate of the Institute working under Paul Monroe who was the director. By the years 1927-1928, three hundred and forty-nine students from fifty-four nations were enrolled at Teachers College through the International Institute.7 There is no available evidence to ascertain the particular contributions Kandel made to the Institute per se. aside from his contribution to comparative and international education, through his editorship of


As an associate of the Institute for its twenty-three years, it is assumed that Kandel carried out his share of duties in accomplishing the goals of the Institute. The program was a powerful factor in contributing to international understanding. A basic objective of the Institute was to assist foreign students of education in visiting schools in this country. Funding was made available to seventy-five to one hundred students per year to visit schools in New England, the Middle States, and the South. These visitations to American public schools helped foreign students develop a better awareness of the academic courses they would pursue at both Teachers College and in the entire university.

Some foreign students at the Institute even published books on American education in their respective languages, based on their visits to schools in the United States. The staff engaged in cooperative educational ventures with ministry of education officials in other countries and they received many foreign visitors. Members of the International Institute staff also gave lectures on American education at foreign universities. In addition to assisting foreign students of education the Institute also assisted American students in their quest to learn about education in other nations. Also, the project was involved in investigating the conditions of foreign educational systems. The American students at the Institute took certain courses in comparative education offered by the staff and relied on the assistance of foreign students in the program to learn about the educational
systems of particular countries. Added to this was the opportunity for some of the American students to work under the supervision of a staff member in a European country in the summer.

While there is a lack of information on Kandel's direct role and contribution to the Institute as a whole, we can surmise that he contributed to its overall success as a staff member. In this capacity, he also contributed to its direct role in influencing comparative and international education. The Institute's work ended after 1944. Fortunately there is ample evidence that Kandel played a tremendous role in one facet of the Institute's work. He was the editor of its educational yearbook for all of its annual twenty-one volumes. Each year the Institute issued a yearbook which consisted of approximately twelve sections on contemporary education in different countries. The articles were written by outstanding indigenous educators who were paid a stipend for their contribution. The plan of the series was to treat the most important countries every fifth year so most of them could be included more than one time.

As was mentioned above, the last educational yearbook was published in 1944. It appears that with the cessation of the yearbook the work of the Institute came to a close. As the editor

---

8 While there were a total of twenty-one books dated from 1924-1944 on the title page of each consecutive yearbook, they were in fact published from 1925-1944. Twenty-one volumes were published in twenty years because the 1932 and the 1933 yearbooks were both published in 1933. The Macmillan Company published the first three year books in 1925, 1926 and 1927. While the remaining eighteen yearbooks were published by the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
of each of the yearbooks. Kandel's job was also finished. He said in the preface to the last yearbook:

The editor has to announce with regret that the present volume will be the last in the series. In bringing the series to an end the editor wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to the Rockefeller Foundation and to the Carnegie Corporation of New York which made the publication of the Educational Yearbook possible, to the cooperation of the many contributors throughout the world who responded so readily, and to his secretary, Miss Katherine M. Gilroy, whose assistance in preparing most of the volumes for publication has always been invaluable. 9

At least one source points to the disappointment felt over the discontinuance of the Educational Yearbook. This was in the form of an undated letter from a professor in England to Kandel. A copy of the letter was found in the Kandel file of the personal papers of William F. Russell. 10

From Professor Brian Stanley
Department of Education
King's College
University of Durham

I do think the discontinuance of the Yearbook will be a blow to the study of comparative education and that many will think it most unfortunate that T.C. should withdraw from a service to the world which no other institution


is so fitted. and in a way so bound. to perform. The Yearbook has kept Teachers College in the front of the mind of those who study education. Those I have told - the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports, the British Council, and Fred Clarke - have all expressed regret.

In addition to his role as editor of this internationally acclaimed series of yearbooks, Kandel wrote the introduction to each book. He also was the author of the entire yearbook which was published in 1929 as, The Philosophy Underlying National Systems of Education. He was the author of the second part of the 1934 yearbook which was entitled, The Making of Nazis. This was published as a separate book in 1935. Again, in 1941, editor Kandel authored the entire yearbook which was entitled, The End of an Era.

As mentioned before in this chapter there is little evidence to show what Kandel did at the Institute other than his outstanding contributions to the esteemed educational yearbooks. Perhaps the closest we can come to any significant mention of his other work at that time comes from Brickman. He mentioned that the turning point in Kandel's academic career came in 1923. That was the year he obtained his appointment as a full professor at Teachers College and became an associate at the International Institute of Education. Brickman said:

Now he had an opportunity of concentrating his attention on comparative education and making that subject an integral part of the foundational studies in his specialty, and writing voluminously in the form of books, monographs and
articles. Dr. Kandel achieved an enviable reputation as editor from 1924 to 1944 of the internationally cited "Educational Yearbook" of the International Institute.11

Kandel's introduction to the first yearbook in 1924 discussed the plan of the yearbooks. He theorized that the world would become an aggregation of nations which would serve as educational laboratories, each committed to the solution of the same problems by methods unique to each and every nation. Even as early as 1924 Kandel was saying, as he did in his introduction, that one country's solution to its educational problems cannot be entirely incorporated into the system of another country. Yet he believed that a great deal could be gained for the progress of the world by an educational exchange of experiences. He had faith in this process just as he did with the exchange of scientific and intellectual experiences which contributed to the world's progress. Wisely, he wrote, "Educational systems cannot be transferred from one country to another, but ideas, practices, devices, developed under one set of conditions, can always prove suggestive for improvements even where conditions are somewhat different."12

Kandel had in mind that the Institute's yearbook act as a clearing house in education, a vehicle for which educational experiences could be shared and standards discussed or actually be set in place. He hoped that educational ideals and philosophies would also be exchanged. For editing the twenty-one yearbooks

11 Brickman, 391.

12 I.L. Kandel, ed., Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College Columbia University (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925), IX.
published between 1925-1944. Kandel became internationally known as a leader in the fields of comparative and international education. This contribution was made at a time when there were not too many sources in these areas of study. He wrote the introductions and edited each comprehensive yearbook.

In the three major writings that he himself did for the yearbooks, in 1929, 1934, and 1941, it was the latter one which he rescued single handedly. Because of World War II Kandel could not rely on obtaining the services of the collaborators he needed to write the book. No authors in the totalitarian or invaded nations would be at liberty to write as they wished, and authors from the free countries were too busy with defense jobs to make their contributions. Rather than break the continuity of the series, Kandel acted as author as well as editor of the 1941 yearbook entitled, *The End of an Era*.

While some of the yearbooks had as their format single case studies of particular countries' educational systems at one point in time, other of the yearbooks were more comparative. These dealt with certain broad themes, such as the education of the child, the education of the adolescent, and the preparation of teachers, transnationally. His introductions described the yearbook under consideration for the particular year, and the projected problems and solutions on a broad basis for the future. His erudition and scholarship manifested in his editing and his introductions make it very clear that the yearbooks were important contributions to international and comparative education.
Kandel's questions opened up these fields to careful analysis by educators worldwide. A sampling of these questions that were, and still are, so thought provoking are: What are the forces that determine a national philosophy of education? What is the effect of political theory of a nation on education? What is the relation between education and social philosophy? What are the purposes of a national system of education? Who shall control the progress of education? What are the ends of the educative process? What educational influences of other agencies than the school are effective?

In an important statement that demonstrates the quality of Kandel's contribution to comparative education, he wrote:

The influences of geographical location and climate, of all that complex of traditions that constitute the social inheritance of a nation—culture, language, and literature, music and art, religion and science, common ideals and ways of living, love of one's country, group and national loyalties—all color the character of national systems of education. Because nationalism is a complex blend of all of these factors, national systems of education will diverge, and although the educational problems in general may be tending everywhere to be identical, solutions will inevitably differ in the end. It is this fact—that nations are, as it were, educational laboratories and experiment stations—that lends interest to the study of comparative education.13

One contribution Kandel made for which there is no known documentation, even in his personal papers, is the large number of students whom he taught over his forty years as a professor at Columbia University and other universities. As a pioneer in the fields of comparative and international education there can be no

doubt that he influenced many students through his lectures, writings, and personal interaction. He was also the advisor to those who took advanced degrees under his mentorship. It can safely be assumed that at least some of his students either by themselves, or by influencing other students, advanced the fields of comparative and international education to more sophisticated levels. It is also conceivable that in whatever ways these spheres of study contributed to the progress of education worldwide, at least some of this progress can be attributed to Kandel's steady, long-term, and often bold approaches.

Wherever one turns, it becomes readily apparent that Kandel made huge strides in studying the educational systems of many countries worldwide. He traveled to many countries, looked carefully at their educational systems, analyzed them, reported his findings to interested officials and citizens within the particular country and abroad. His involvement with foreign systems in both hemispheres was so intensive that it is necessary for the purpose of this dissertation to limit the number of examples of his work. For a commentary on Kandel's publications and educational activities, the reader is referred to chapter I as well as to the other sections of this dissertation.

In a little known work by Kandel, published in 1915, entitled, *The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Mathematics*, he compared academic standards between Europe and the United States and found the latter to be wanting. He reported on the normal schools and their curricula with a focus on training elementary school
teachers in mathematics. Included in the study were: Belgium, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. The study was published by the United States Bureau of Education.

Kandel, lucidly identified the problems that each country faced at the time and discussed both the strengths and weaknesses in the training of elementary school teachers in mathematics. He pointed out, for example, that in many countries there were lower mathematical requirements for women than for men in the normal schools. He also saw a trend at that time toward raising the standards for the training of elementary school teachers in general, and in mathematics in particular. Such incisive points, as these, made by Kandel and other authorities, were responsible for some of the changes that took place years later in the advancement of training for elementary school teachers. In this report, published by the United States Government Printing Office, Kandel had an audience of receptive educators who participated at the highest levels of educational decision making.

In 1918, Kandel contributed a chapter in a book edited by his friend and Columbia University classmate, Peter Sandiford. The book, one of the first modern books on the subject was entitled, Comparative Education - Studies of the Educational Systems of Six Modern Nations. Kandel contributed the chapter on Germany. Already an expert on German society and education, Kandel wrote prophetically about Germany and perhaps implicitly about all nations with totalitarian proclivities. He wrote about the educational
implications of Germany's tightly controlled system:

A nation's school system is but the reflex of her history, of the social forces, and of the political and economic situations that make up her existence. From the point of view of the state, education is not in the first instance regarded as a means of laying the foundations for future progress, but a method of conserving existing conditions and prevailing ideas.¹⁴

In 1937, Kandel visited New Zealand and Australia for several months. Three important but not very well known works emanated from his visits to these two countries. The writings serve as models on writing about foreign educational systems. In the same year the New Zealand Council for Educational Research released one of the works, a monograph entitled, Impressions of Education in New Zealand and Inverted Snobbery and the Problem of Secondary Education.¹⁵

He described the positives during his six week stay in New Zealand, the beauty of the country and the hospitality of the people. He also pointed out the high standards of education which were widespread and the slight differences between the educated classes and other classes, especially in the quality of their speech. He compared New Zealanders and their high intellectual ability, their insight, and their understanding of problems, with the best of what he had seen in the rest of the world.

On the other hand, he was candid enough to report that the New Zealand schoolrooms had too many pupils, too much homogeneity, and


¹⁵ In a footnote at the very beginning of the monograph there is the information which reported that this was the text of a wireless address which Kandel recorded while he was still in New Zealand.
too much emphasis on "success" in passing examinations, and a lack of instructional materials and equipment. He saw the need for the existing centralized educational system that operated there, realizing that it was a young country with remote areas that initially required centralized planning and controls. What he said about the system was that there was much too much school centralization. There was a lack of local control and freedom of adaptation to local conditions. There was also a lack of meaningful public participation. Obeying the edicts of centralized requirements was destroying teacher initiative and deadening the personalities of the students.

One would think that Kandel was reporting on the dysfunctions of modern urban educational systems that exist today even in developed countries. the way he was able to quickly grasp the impact of educational deficiencies in New Zealand's educational system. He also saw a division of administration of the schools with competing authorities for primary, secondary, and technical schools. He advocated a decentralized but unitary administrative system under the ultimate authority of one administrative unit. He did believe in a democratic administration, one that would educate its public and prepare it for change and adaptation.

If one would read the New Zealand monograph based on Kandel's 1937 talks in the late 1980s, without knowing the copyright date, one could easily suspect that Kandel was speaking about the reform of late twentieth century American education and of other nations' plans for reform. Thus, it appears that Kandel made great
contributions to education in many countries, even if his
admonitions and advice often went unheeded. If we would go back and
study what Kandel said fifty years ago perhaps we would not have to
spend so much money to study how to reform educational systems. He
had already laid the foundation upon which educators could have
slowly but surely built better and more effective educational
systems. His ideas for reform are still sound today.

His second talk was on inverted snobbery in New Zealand and the
problem of secondary education. While he believed in education for
everyone he did not believe in the same education for all. He saw
this attempt to educate students for the same goals which usually
included a university education and a raising of social status for
everyone, as "inverted snobbery." He believed in a type of
secondary education which would early provide a core of sound
general education followed by careful and deliberate differentiation
when more precise evidence of aptitudes has been secured. After
this should come the more specialized subjects. Not only in New
Zealand, but everywhere in the world of formal education Kandel
recommended an intelligent education for all students based on their
needs, interests, achievements, and a more scientifically
constructed measure of this aptitude. He said, in his own
inimitable way:

The fundamental problem to-day... is the proper
distribution of education—a problem which is as much a
social as an educational one. A timely reorientation of the
public mind on educational values and vocational
opportunities may save individuals and society from the worst
result of 'inverted snobbery'—overcrowding in some
occupations and a dearth of intelligence in others. 16

Kandel visited Australia for a four month period in 1937. A monograph based on his national talks was published in 1938 in cooperation with the Australian Council for Educational Research. The name of the book was Impressions of Australian Education. These lectures were broadcast on the Australian radio network on November 18th and November 25th, 1937.

Kandel visited every type of Australian school in each of their states. He had many favorable comments about the Australian educational system. He believed differentiated education was being provided according to the abilities and interests of the pupils and that students were being taught by uniformly well trained teachers. He also commented that these and other favorable aspects of education were provided by an enlightened centralized school system. He also lauded Australian teachers for their successful educational experimentation. He acknowledged that it was commonly assumed that such successful experimentation was impossible to achieve in centralized systems of education; yet, he witnessed many success examples in Australia.

Within the nucleus of successful education Kandel said he saw exceptions that were negative. Some regions were so remote that teachers were not given enough cooperation from inspectors who worked for the central authority. All in all, however, he lauded the Australian system of education and their centralized authorities

because they were working so well meeting the needs of many teachers and many, many students.

He saw great progress being made in Australian education, in primary education especially. He felt that secondary education was still too restrictive by not enabling enough qualified students to attend the universities. He would have the system of school inspection strengthened and the control of centralized authority lessened. The lessening of authority included the classification of teachers, the prescription of what should be taught, and in some cases the conduct of examinations.

Because of indigenous factors such as the size of the country, the remoteness of some areas, and the lack of local political structures in Australia, Kandel believed in retaining a centralized system for the nation. He wanted the central authorities to sanction even more educational experimentation. He also wanted to strengthen public opinion and participation in the schools.

From his visits to New Zealand and Australia, Kandel garnered enough data to publish a third book in 1938. It was entitled *Types of Administration with Particular Reference to the Educational Systems of New Zealand and Australia*. It was published by Oxford University Press in association with Melbourne University Press. Kandel compared the administration of educational systems in totalitarian nations such as Japan, the Soviet Union, Germany, and Italy with educational administration in France, England, the United States, New Zealand, and Australia.
Kandel's experiences in New Zealand and Australia added a new dimension to his writings and his ideas about centralization and decentralization. He was able to determine from his frequent visits to many countries that the type of system of education a nation had reflected its national and local circumstances. He often railed against centralized systems. But in Australia he saw a centralized system working well even though it needed improvement in its educational delivery services. He called for a decentralized system in New Zealand but with Australia he opted for a strengthening and improvement of its centralized systems.

Kandel contributed to the improvement of education in New Zealand and Australia. and his work in these countries led to his making an even greater contribution to the spheres of comparative and international education. He added much to his firsthand experiences by visiting such remote nations. What he gained in visiting these countries and their schools provided a broader spectrum in his work as a comparativist and an internationalist. In addition, he looked beyond the negative aspects of centralized education to extol some of its positives, as he had earlier in his writings on French education. This was in keeping with his belief that each nation was unique insofar as it had its own history, language, customs, geography, and, of course, its own needs.

Kandel contributed to the betterment of education nationally as well as internationally. Writing in the foreword to this third book, an Australian educator, K.S. Cunningham paid tribute to Kandel's contribution to Australian education by writing:
It will be found that Dr. Kandel does not advocate any swing to a decentralized form of educational control. He pays tribute to the efficiency of the present system but makes his chief contribution in pointing out the price which is paid to achieve this. His suggestions as to the best method of overcoming the disadvantages of the present situation are worthy of serious consideration by all who have the interests of Australian education at heart.  

In 1941, in cooperation with members of a committee of which he was the chairman, Kandel wrote an official report on high school education in Jamaica. Entitled the Kandel Report on Secondary Education in Jamaica, it was a comprehensive report advocating reform of the Jamaican secondary school system. Kandel was the only member of the committee to attend every one of its official meetings. This was typical of his dedicated attitude towards his work. The committee issued a list of thirty-one recommendations to improve education in that Caribbean island-nation.

Proving that he was not completely wedded to the past by his usual celebration of custom and tradition, Kandel pointed out that in Jamaica and elsewhere the past often becomes too encrusted with tradition. This effected the attitudes of teachers as well as other citizens. The past should not be worshiped only because it has been hallowed by time. He pointed out that often professional educators, especially practitioners, follow older routine methods because they are easier to follow. Thus "the best devised reforms are always in danger of foundering."  

17 I.L. Kandel, Types of Administration with Particular Reference to the Educational Systems of New Zealand and Australia (London: Oxford University Press, 1938).

Traveling to the farthest reaches of the earth to study the educational systems of other nations, or chairing an official committee charged with reforming education in a not too distant island-country, Kandel was always the quintessential contributor: a man of his time with an eye on the past, a vision of the future, and a dream of a better world through education.

Kandel was a believer in international education and an advocate of world peace. He supported such international organizations as the United Nations and UNESCO. He worked for both organizations at different times as a writer, editor, and consultant. In an unpublished paper entitled UNESCO, found among his personal papers at the Hoover Institution. He wrote:

> The Organization can make an important contribution by means of conferences, by collecting and disseminating accurate information on the developments in education, science, and culture, and by directing attention to new areas that need to be explored. It can encourage cooperation between nations in all branches of intellectual activity through the exchange of persons, objects of artistic and scientific interest and other materials of information. It can serve in general as a clearinghouse of information. 19

Some of the important work Kandel did for UNESCO and the United Nations is discussed briefly in this section. According to the research documents obtained from two separate visits to the UNESCO Archives in Paris, France and from correspondence received from the chief archivist at the United Nations Archives in New York, it appears that Kandel did this work periodically from 1946-1962. He made an important contribution to a book that dealt with

---

19 I.L. Kandel, "UNESCO", an unpublished, undated paper copied from his person papers at the Archives of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA. 17.
international literacy in the period after World War II. The book
was entitled, *Fundamental Education – Common Ground for all Peoples.*
published by the Macmillan Company of New York in 1947. It was
based on a report of a special committee (of which Kandel was a
member) to the preparatory commission of UNESCO in 1946.

In 1947, he was an editor and consultant for an important
report given at a meeting of a general conference of UNESCO member
states held in Mexico City on October 30, 1947. It was entitled
*Suggestions for a Study of Education from International
Understanding in the Schools of UNESCO member states.* See
Appendices X and XI showing letters Kandel received from UNESCO
officials inviting him to work on this project.

In 1949, Kandel participated in a human rights symposium. He
wrote a chapter in the book that grew out of the symposium sponsored
by UNESCO. The name of the book is *Human Rights – Comments and
Interpretations.* The introduction to the book was written by
Jacques Maritain. There were many other distinguished contributors.
The title of Kandel's chapter was "Education and Human Rights". The
288 page book was published by Allan Wingate publishers of London.
In the chapter, Kandel suggested that education should become a
human right and should be recognized as such universally. He
believed that the right to an education was of greater importance
than UNESCO had previously recognized.

In 1951, Kandel wrote an introductory book for UNESCO entitled,
*Raising The School – Leaving Age.* It was the first in a series of
six books on the subject of compulsory education issued by UNESCO.
Kandel emphasized that raising the school-leaving age involved much more than adding one or more years to the period of compulsory schooling. His approach was philosophical, describing the steps that were taken in countries that had established age 14 as the school-leaving age, and which planned to raise the age limit beyond it.

Kandel followed this book almost ten years later with an unpublished paper on the same topic. This paper was discovered among his private papers at the Archives of the Hoover Institution. He commented in this study that, in the years between the 1951 book and the later paper, progress had been remarkably slow internationally in raising the school-leaving age.

Kandel served for six months, from March-September, 1955, as a consultant to the director of the Division of Human Rights for the United Nations. He engaged in a study of discrimination in education undertaken by the Sub-Commission on Prevention and Protection of Minorities. Regrettably, neither the archivists at the United Nations in New York City nor those in Geneva, Switzerland could find the record of this study.

Lastly, Kandel wrote the book discussed earlier in this chapter, entitled Hacia Una Profesion Docente (Towards a Teaching Profession). This work was published in 1962 in Spanish by UNESCO's division in Havana, Cuba. Publishing this book three years before his death at age eighty-four is proof that Kandel had a lifelong concern with teacher preparation and the improvement of the teaching profession.
One of the key points of this chapter has been to show the depth of Kandel's commitment to and involvement with foreign countries and their educational systems. He traveled the globe, visiting some countries many times, in an era when travel was not as common nor as comfortable as it has become during the latter part of this century. Yet, he went to many places, saw a great deal, probed, and reported his findings on a wide variety of educational systems.

His research and writings made it possible for educators and other interested citizens to learn more about other lands, and peoples, other customs and educational practices. His works were often translated into languages other than English. Kandel brought education and educators into the limelight in many parts of the world, with his emphasis on better ways of educating people and a greater need for public participation. He did this without seeking the central stage for himself.

Usually practical and cautiously optimistic, Kandel saw the improvement of education as being a panacea for mankind. But as reported earlier in this dissertation, his words were not empty shibboleths on the topic of worldwide educational systems. He was not an armchair educational theorist. He went, he saw, he wrote profusely, and spoke carefully about different educational topics in many lands. He also, unknowingly, would subject himself to criticisms from latter day comparativists who would sometimes see him as a person with too little objective and reliable information and with too much ego. That he was not always correct in assessing
an educational problem cannot be argued. But it is also evident that Kandel put all of himself and his resources into the study of comparative and international education.

He often forged his beliefs on the anvil of firsthand experience. He demonstrated that it was helpful to examine other school systems carefully when trying to improve one's own system. Kandel's advice on the need to study other school systems in order to better reflect on one's own system has been a significant contribution to the domain of comparative and international education. There are many examples of educational improvements occurring in one nation on the basis of studying education in another nation. Conversely, there are also examples where national educational failures happen because those responsible for education fail to study and learn how successful educational practices in one country could be adapted to their own country.

Kandel's contributions, both tangible and intangible, have a great deal to do with the improvement of formal schooling and the consequent effective education of children and youth in different countries. These contributions were of a holistic nature rather than the result of a piecemeal approach. The spirit of this lifelong mission to improve education and civilization, measure by measure, can be felt wherever comparative and international education are studied and their learnings applied. Bringing to light the work of Kandel the scholar, and his countless contributions may possibly help to make other scholars aware of Kandel's hard work, steadfastness, his ability to communicate and
his high level of commitment to the ideal of worldwide educational improvement.

Describing the essence of Kandel's contributions, Robert Ulich said:

The unattainable—though sometimes frightening and discouraging—is as important in the life of a man as the attainable: our great aims are our guides for the very fact that they need the courage of unending vision as well as the painstaking devotion to the detail.

Isaac L. Kandel, the man, the scholar, and the teacher has shown us the virtues of both. 20

Praising Kandel once more, Ulich said of his contributions to the specialized study of comparative education, "as a result of his prodigious erudition and his painstaking scholarship, he knew more about the educational events in the countries he wrote about than most officials in their own national ministries." 21

Kandel had many academic honors bestowed upon him for his lifelong, pioneering work as an educator. The full accounting of these honors was given in chapter one of this dissertation. In a letter to the writer from a French government official it was confirmed that the French government bestowed upon Kandel, the Legion of Honor in 1937. 22 (Chevalier De La Legion D'Honneur) His complete titles were thus M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D. and Chev. Leg.


21 Ulich. "In Memory of I.L.K." 255.

Kandel. No evidence could be found in the published literature on Kandel. his own publications, his private papers or from the French government, as to why the French government awarded Kandel this very prestigious honor. Brickman mentioned that the French government elected him in 1937 as Chevalier of the Legion of Honor but no mention was given as to why he merited the honor. The closest we can arrive to an educated guess is that Kandel, as the secretary of the American Field Service Fellowship for French Universities from 1919 to 1924, assisted American or French students in some way connected with various French universities. Further efforts were made to garner evidence in this matter but they were not successful.\textsuperscript{23}

In an account of Kandel's impact as a comparative educator, the comparativist and longtime friend and admirer of Kandel, George Z.F. Bereday, paid him this tribute:

Kandel's contribution to comparative education is widely known. He greatly furthered the Sadlerian view that things outside the school matter as much as things inside for their proper understanding. He was the first to chop up the national units and to discuss on a more trans-national basis.

\textsuperscript{23} Early in 1988 a letter was sent by this writer to the Grande Chancellerie of the Legion of Honor in Paris, France. In April of 1988 a reply was received in French saying that Kandel did in fact receive the Legion of Honor but no information other than that was included. The writer went to the Legion of Honor in the summer of 1988 to further inquire about this matter with his correspondent at the Grande Chancellerie. The representative there had no further information in his records and he referred the writer to the archivist at the adjacent Museum of the Legion of Honor. After communicating with the archivist the writer was told the matter would be looked into. In October of 1987 the writer received the letter referred to in footnote 22 of this chapter stating that it was not known why the French honored Kandel. At present. therefore. it can only be said that he contributed something of importance to French education without our knowing the exact nature of the contribution.
elements such as administration or teacher training, thus paving the way to the problem approach. His precepts about on-the-spot observation of schools have not yet been replaced, even in the age of interdisciplinary teamwork. He advocated meticulous attention to primary documents, a sort of comparative explication de texte, which is regrettably becoming rare at present.24

Bereday went on to say in his memorial to Kandel that he was greatly proprietary about comparative education. He added that Kandel had pushed comparative education to exceptionally high standards in terms of the needs of the 1930's. Bereday concluded his remarks about Kandel by pointing to the fact that he was significantly recognized for his splendid contributions in the professional and academic circles.

As recent as 1985, the comparative educator, Phillip Foster wrote this tribute to Kandel:

pride of place must be given to Isaac Kandel whose teaching and research, conducted primarily at Teachers College, Columbia University, spanned a period of some five decades. With due deference to the work of other scholars, it would not be improper to regard Kandel as more responsible (in the English-speaking world at least) than any other scholar for the emergence of comparative education as a respectable teaching area in universities and other tertiary institutions concerned with educational matters.25


The first chapter of this dissertation included many observations which were made about Isaac L. Kandel's personal life. However, the biographical section was limited since relatively little information is available about Kandel's life either in published or unpublished sources. Surprisingly, even Kandel's personal papers which are located at the Hoover Institution in Palo Alto, California gave no indication that he was at all interested in telling the world about himself.

The scholars who knew Kandel well and who wrote tributes about him are William Brickman, Robert Ulich, George Bereday, and Lawrence Cremin. They are the key sources of information to us in learning about Kandel's personal life. In addition, Robert Templeton wrote a doctoral dissertation on Kandel's work in American education. Templeton did interview Kandel but reveals little about him as a person. Finally, some correspondence exists between Kandel and William Russell, the former dean and president of Teachers College, Columbia University. Even here, one can only catch a glimpse of Kandel's persona. Because of the paucity of information about him, no concrete attempt was made in this study to do a biographical portrait of Kandel, in any depth. It is, of course, conceivable that someday persons in possession of information on Kandel may provide more light on him as an individual.
This dissertation has focused on Kandel as a professional educator, a professor, and an education writer and speaker whose output has reached professional and lay audiences worldwide, far beyond the almost six decades of his productive career.

Since there is such a lack of information about Kandel's personal life, one can only get to know him through his professional career and publications instead of through any complete biography of his life. The closest we can come to a biography on Kandel is William Brickman's diminutive Festshrift which has been cited in this paper. If our data do not lead to a metabiographical study of the person, as elucidated by Professor Joan Smith, they do at least include one important aspect of metabiographics. That aspect is the search for meaning and factual truth as revealed from both Kandel's published and unpublished works. Smith refers to this aspect of metabiographics as a descriptive scientific approach in search of meaning.

The central theme of this dissertation has been Kandel's work in comparative and international education. However, two chapters, one on Kandel's historical outlook and the other on his philosophy of education, have been included along with his ideas in comparative and international education. He defined the field of comparative education as the study of history up to the present. His historical outlook helped shape his view of the domain of comparative and


2 Ibid., 8.
international education.

While Kandel recognized that major differences existed between the educational systems of all countries, his educational philosophy stressed the importance of having the best available teacher in every classroom in the world. This would allow each nation to shape its educational system optimally and enable it to grow qualitatively, even as each nation would take its own course in doing so.

Templeton said this about Kandel as a philosopher:

His may be a philosophy of affirmation instead of explanation, of evaluation and criticism of the new, the novel, for their genuineness and worth from the long range point of view and against a background of tested values and ideals. Philosophers like Kandel often assume the difficult responsibility of relating the best in the present to the past in terms of the future, of tempering the excitement of the fast pace with the spirit of caution and studied consideration.... But these thinkers are always necessary if the progress of civilization is to be insured, if it is at all beholden to the transmitters and synthesizers in the realm of ideas.³

Kandel saw history as a continuum, whose past needed to be presented anew to each passing generation, through the schools, so civilization could continue to improve. Thus, the steady and unremitting transmission of knowledge from the past to present and future generations was a major goal that Kandel advocated for all school systems in the world. He was comfortable with studying school systems in all parts of the world, but his historical outlook and writings were those of a scholar with a Western background and orientation.

³ Templeton, 338.
In many of his major studies on comparative or international education, the history of education in the country or countries under consideration was presented with an enormous sweep of events and with great detail. One could argue successfully that some of his studies were too detailed. Kandel strongly believed that one could not understand a nation's educational system without knowing a good deal about the history of the particular country.

One major criticism of Kandel's historical writing as it related to comparative education was his style. He seemed to take it for granted that his readers would know or should know what had happened in the past in the country he was discussing. His style and manner were both cumbersome and often imperious. On the positive side though, it is readily apparent that Kandel had considerable breadth in understanding history. This is often lacking in the perspective of many educators both in the United States and abroad. He was a highly educated person who had a working knowledge of many foreign languages. He had enormous zeal for his work which is manifested in the intensity of his writings.

Kandel was a renaissance man in comparative education. Immersing himself in different cultures, learning many foreign languages, traveling to many distant countries extensively, and writing comprehensively on the world's educational systems for more than fifty years was an extraordinary achievement. His sheer perseverance, was responsible for his high level of continuous scholarly output.

While Kandel did write on the educational systems of many
countries, he specialized in writing about America, England, France, and Germany. He was at home in these nations and worked his way into the very interstices of their cultures, describing their mores and, of course, their school systems. It is difficult to pinpoint exactly the specifics of Kandel's talent as an educationist. As a renaissance type of educator, he showed a comprehensive mind and he could write in sweeping macroscopic wholes or with very specific microscopic precision.

When Kandel wrote on an educational system, few details were omitted or considered to be unimportant. His storehouse of information was vast and his scholarship was prodigious. His incredible production of a huge number of works on comparative and international education, educational history, and educational philosophy are difficult to surpass. He was a Romanian by birth, of English citizenship, who became an American citizen as a young married man. He felt comfortable everywhere in democratic nations. He abhorred totalitarianism and he excoriated every type and dimension of it at every single opportunity.

Perhaps one of Kandel's great contributions was his emphasis on the need for having democratic societies in order for schools to best perpetuate the most important learnings that would be beneficial to each individual. Only democracies focused on the importance of the individual human being. His faults, though glaring, were human: he knew he was an expert at his work, and he did not resist the notion that he was the very best in his field. As Bereday pointed out earlier in this dissertation, Kandel's
Kandel's insights into comparative and international education, for the most part were without parallel for at least the first forty years of his career. He did not merely report on a foreign educational system. His writings went far beyond that. His format was to completely examine a nation's history, political system, culture, and language in depth. He did this in tandem with a look at the nation's formal educational system. He went to great lengths to try to prove what he had already believed, that the forces outside the school were more important than the forces within the school.

Kandel's comprehensive and thorough writing seemed to leave no stone unturned, but his inclusion of mounds of detail, facts, charts, the profound words of other famous writers, and very often a considerable sprinkling of unexplained foreign words and phrases, made him a difficult writer to read. It appears that it took Kandel about four and one-half decades to finally furnish the reader with an immediate explanation following the foreign words he used in his writing. The first evidence of his change of style came about when his book, The New Era in Education was published in 1955. For the first time, it seems, in one of his major works, he did not use unfamiliar terms without explanation. Perhaps other educators or his publisher had criticized Kandel for using such an abstruse style in his previous writings, or perhaps he just felt like writing in a
more modern style by the year 1955.

Kandel's cumbersome writing style is often compensated for by his profound sweep of his subject. This profundity was based on some important bedrock principles: a respect for the continuing contributions of child psychology and their impact on formal schooling, a love of learning and respect for the intellect, and a strong desire to see civilization continue and to progress through the direct impact of formal education. In addition, Kandel as a humanist was concerned about his fellow man. He paid tribute to the countless number of anonymous teachers who helped myriad numbers of students achieve success over the course of centuries.

Many of Kandel's educational ideas are in vogue today as we approach the twenty-first century. Yet, he has been given little or no credit for having advocated them. Among these ideas are: support for effective parent participation in the public school, a solid curriculum promoting the important and established learnings from the past, and an effective teacher in every classroom. Indeed, our shortcomings in the United States in the teaching of history and geography were pointed out years ago by Kandel who decried the watering down of the curriculum and the neglect of important subject matter. Books such as The Closing of the American Mind, Cultural Literacy, and other popular works of recent vintage have restated many of Kandel's ideas.4 These ideas advocated, for the well


educated person, an increased awareness of the past in order to better understand the present and prepare for the future.

One of the problems with Kandel's historical approach in his comparative education writings were the gaps created by the discontinuities in his work. Often he would write on certain periods in a nation's educational history and would include his comments on what was occurring in the present. No sooner did he do this than events would catch up with his work and either nullify what he said or alter it significantly. No doubt he could have avoided this had he concentrated on writing about more remote periods rather than on more recent ones, or on time frames that had just ended. This problem is typical in comparative education where institutional change is constantly occurring.

Kandel usually concentrated on specific periods and specific topics in his historical writings rather than on general history. Since his work was so specific, particularized, and recent, it often lacked the usual presentation of a detached frame of mind found in historical writings done by generalists in the history of education and in the field of history. In spite of this shortcoming, his historical writings were lauded by others as pointed out elsewhere in this dissertation.

Kandel revered what he considered to be important worldwide contributions of the past. For him, knowing about the past was a condition precedent to the understanding of the development of a global civilization and all nations' contributions to it. He dug deeply below the scholarly surface to show that traditions were
vital and contributing factors to the advancement of civilization. He believed that each generation of students should learn, in school, its own country's past traditions, in order to continue the best aspects of what may have been important contributions. His objective, though, was not to learn only facts, but to set in motion a process of constantly upgrading civilization through analysis of the formal school set up by societies everywhere.

No doubt, Kandel would have agreed with the thinking of the current Director-General of UNESCO, Federico Mayor Zaragoza, who recently wrote:

> The cultural heritage of each people is an expression of the thousand and one facets of its genius and of the mysterious continuity which unites all it has created over the centuries and all it has the potential to create in the future. The preservation of this heritage is an activity inherent in a people's vitality and creativity.  

Kandel's philosophy of education is more difficult to relate to his comparative educational theories than his historical outlook. Philosophically, Kandel was an Essentialist who primarily applied his ideas about Essentialism to American education and not to the education of other nations, at least not entirely or with such frequency. He may have ascribed to the Essentialist ideas of having very capable teachers in all classrooms everywhere, and of all societies transmitting their cultures to the young through the schools, but he reserved his most elaborate ideas for American consumption. This is understandable since he believed each nation to be distinct, with its own unique educational system.

---

Kandel consistently opposed random borrowing of educational practices from one nation to another because of the distinctiveness of each nation. He wrote extensively about the negative aspects of such educational borrowing done at random. He was not against nations sharing ideas and even careful adaptation of foreign educational practices. He advocated a steady flow of information transnationally but he cautiously recommended using a nation's special educational practices until the practices were proven successful on a wide scale, and not until the innovations were carefully studied and adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the borrower nation.

Kandel was a thorn in the side of the American progressives and reformers for many years. It appears that his very powerful statements, made continuously, denouncing progressive education and advocating essentialism, were for consumption primarily within the United States. He was not usually critical of progressive educational ideas or the Progressive Educational movement when he wrote for foreign consumption. Rather, in a surprising way, he seemed to advocate a synthesis of the strengths of the two very different philosophies of education. No explanation can be found to ascertain why Kandel wrote in such a different vein for different audiences: one way for those living in the United States, and another way for those living abroad.

There is no doubt that Kandel was a nemesis to progressive educators in the United States for many years. It seems unfortunate that he did not also advocate some synthesis of essentialism and
progressivism in the United States as well. Surely, essentialism with all of its positives, could have benefitted from embracing the emphasis on individual instruction, for example, which was advocated by progressive educators. Had Kandel joined forces with some of what the progressives espoused, it seems likely that schooling in America could have been improved.

Interestingly, Kandel did analyze and compare different philosophies of education in the United States and abroad. He believed that, while the new philosophy of progressive education was widely accepted in theory and in nations' official proclamations, in practice progressivism was embraced in differing degrees in the countries he studied. How widespread progressivism as an educational philosophy became, he thought, depended on the unique historical cultural traits of the country. These traits either discouraged or encouraged the implementation and management of new educational ideas.

Writing on this topic in the early 1930's, he said:

Older countries (England and France) with long established traditions of culture are less ready to sacrifice what is regarded as the essential basis of their national foundations: other countries (Germany) seek to adapt the new forms of social organization to the progressive development of selected tradition as a basis of national solidarity: others again (Italy and Russia) seek to combine activity methods with political indoctrination, thus permitting freedom within certain rigidly defined limits: finally, the United States building upon a tradition that tradition must not be binding, emphasizes changes and progress.6

Kandel was, to apply David Riesman's terminology, an inner-directed person. He was self-motivated and he did not place too

6 Kandel. Comparative Education. 867-868.
much emphasis on people's perceptions of him or of his work. Kandel's abruptness and strong opinions sometimes put him in a position where he pitted himself against a majority. In some cases this behavior even led him to withdraw from an organization or an educational enterprise. Two examples of this behavior are his withdrawal from the board of directors of the Comparative Education Society and his unwillingness to have his name associated with the report he helped to write for the first United States Mission to Japan. In the former case, Brickman, who rarely criticized Kandel, did take exception by writing:

"Turning now to the inner development of the Society, we can focus attention on the board of directors. Not long after the birth of the society, (Comparative Education Society) Dr. I.L. Kandel resigned from the board, mainly because he feared that the foreign trips would not rise above the sightseeing junket level. These fears were not realized, because of the academic-professional nature of the program, the seriousness of the travelers, and the policy of not recommending college and university credit for the foreign experience."  

As a member of the highly select group of American educators chosen to participate in the first United States Mission to Japan, Kandel assisted in the writing of the group's official report. However, he also wanted to write a minority opinion which would have allowed him to disagree with some of the report's findings. Because a minority report was not included he disassociated himself from the report and would not allow his name to be connected with it.

Perhaps Kandel's ideas would have had a greater impact if he had been more sensitive to the needs of students in the field of education.

---

comparative and international education. Ulich, for example, criticized Kandel's monumental work, *Comparative Education*, for missing the mark as an effective tool for teaching and learning. According to Ulich, both teachers and students in comparative education courses found this comprehensive work to be exceedingly dull and uninteresting. It missed the mark as an effective teaching tool because of its cumbersome style and the presentation of too much detail. Ulich pointed out that *Comparative Education* even failed to be revised or updated by the original publisher or any other publisher.

Kandel became a very important figure in the field of comparative education, even being referred to by many as the "Father of Comparative Education." According to Noah and Eckstein, Kandel deserved this appellation for his emphasis on the need to collect accurate data and his stress on the cultural-historical context through which a nation's educational system develops.

While Kandel insisted on the importance of explanation in comparative education, it may be that, at times, what he included in his explanations covering nationalism, political ideology, and historical antecedents did not meet a standard for determining how important they were in comparison with each other. In addition, it was only Kandel's choice whether some factors would be included in his analysis while other factors might be omitted. There were no

---


9 Ibid., 51-52.
objective criteria for inclusion or omission.

Even though Kandel's objective was to explain all of his work, he never fully accomplished this. This is the case even though he supported many of his judgments with a great deal of detailed information and broad explanatory ideas. According to Noah and Eckstein, "What appeared in Kandel's work as persuasive conclusions are in fact important hypotheses waiting to be tested."^10

Kandel became a revered name in comparative education but, too frequently, many of his important ideas are either not remembered or his work as a whole has been neglected. As a scholar he influenced other scholars, teachers, and policy makers in the United States and abroad. He focused on the need to improve education and educational systems everywhere. His writings ranged from specific topics on particular eras to comprehensive works covering every possible facet of a nation's educational system, from teacher training to administration, and from educational politics to educational psychology; within the framework of comparative and international education.

Kandel's overall philosophy of comparative and international education diverged from his domestic philosophy of educational essentialism and gave way to his total concentration on the need to politicize educational systems everywhere in the direction of democracy. He was less concerned with democratic practices or the lack of them inside schools and school systems, and more concerned with nations practicing democracy which he hoped the schools would

^10 Ibid., 51.
In discerning certain repeated themes in Kandel's lifelong work, one of them would be an absolute devotion to a democratic way of life. This would encompass freedom coupled with individualism and social responsibility. This prevalent sociopolitical theme showed up in his articles, speeches, monographs, books, and editorials in both his published and his unpublished work.

There were contradictions in Kandel's writings. For example, it was difficult to reconcile his wish to see democracy spread everywhere, with the conflicting idea that he espoused: that each nation was entitled to select its own form of government and its own type of school system. His personal feelings that nations throughout the world should embrace democracy clashed with his sophisticated professional, anthropological, and historical insights. These social scientific attitudes toward individual choice for nations were therefore outweighed by his primal instincts that found totalitarianism of the left and the right, Communism, or fascism and Nazism, repugnant and inimical to his belief in the advancement of civilization.

Ironically, Kandel would choose coercive methods in order to get people to embrace democracy. He would indoctrinate students with his ideal that a democratic way of life was the one which was best for them. So imbued with the fondness for democracy was he, that it is conceivable that Kandel did not even realize that the use of totalitarian means to achieve democratic ends was not in the best interests of democracy. Perhaps he should have been aware of the
dilemma since he wrote extensively about the German Weimar Republic's poor chances for sustaining democracy. Kandel said, in the case of the German Weimar government, which was extant between the two world wars, there was not too much hope of sustaining a democracy because of Germany's long previous history of authoritarian rule.

For reasons unknown, Kandel did not unduly concern himself with a system of democracy within the schools. He gave little weight to this even while he raised the banner to have democracies spread and enhanced everywhere. He believed that the young in America needed to be molded, not as the Germans did it, as he pointed out in his doctoral dissertation, *The Training of Elementary Teachers in Germany*, but molded by teachers who embraced the ideals of America.

How Kandel expected future citizens to want to follow democratic principles without being exposed to them fully as students in schools is not known. This is a dilemma for teachers and students even as the twenty-first century approaches. Perhaps Kandel was following what seemed to be the script of the times, wherein students were held to compulsory schooling without any thought being given to a hidden curriculum, student rights, or teacher-student planning. It is conceivable that Sadler's dictum, which Kandel used so readily, actually dissuaded Kandel from advocating democracy within the classroom. Sadler's dictum was that the things outside of the school matter even more than the things inside of it. Kandel was certain that the nation's political system provided the most important goals a nation could have. It
would be an error of presentism to be overly critical of Kandel since democracy within the schools has been emphasized much more recently than it was in Kandel's time. Furthermore, Kandel did emphasize a child-oriented public education as fundamental to a democracy.

Seth Spaulding, a contemporary comparative educator discussed the dilemma of having a nondemocratic educational atmosphere within a democratic nation. He said:

It is clear that children and young people learn little of democracy through many of the existing school programmes and teaching materials. In examination-oriented school settings, children can often recite dates, facts and figures concerning the history of their country and region, but may have little understanding of what democracy is all about. Presumably, a person must have certain knowledge, skills and attitudes in order to participate fully and effectively in the democratic process. What knowledge, skills and attitudes are these likely to be?

The usual prescription talks of the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy. These can be listed and memorized, and often are. But are they experienced in the school and university setting? Clearly, to the degree that students participate in institutional governance, this experience has a chance of developing a sense of what democratic is all about.11

There seemed to be no great concern on Kandel's part to deal with the tools of democracy within the school as an important aspect of a social process which should conceivably work in tandem with those democratic processes outside of the school.

Kandel was a leading proponent of the virtues of formal schooling and the development of formal systems of education throughout the world. It was through schooling that the youth of

every nation would become educated and would learn that every nation, including their own, made important contributions to the advancement of civilization. Everywhere he traveled, to Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Europe, South America, the Caribbean, and within the United States, Kandel tried to "spread the gospel" of the benefits of formal schooling.

He was also aware of the many limitations of the development of formal schooling. He wrote that nowhere in the world was there a nation which planned schooling for students of primary, secondary, and higher education at the same period in its history. Since these various age groups were provided for separately, certain discontinuities in planning led to a lack of articulation between the subsystems. Coupled with this was the haphazard way school systems were often set up, without adequate plans for teacher training and other key components necessary for successful schooling.

Nevertheless, Kandel never lost interest in the school and its mission of transmitting culture to its students. He shifted his position on advocating initial formal schooling for everyone late in his life, when he wisely looked at the problems of the developing nations. He came to realize that these poorer nations, often the victims of colonialization, had different needs. They would benefit more from first focusing on nonformal educational projects in preparation for the somewhat later stage of formalized schooling.

Kandel believed that writing about the educational systems of one country at a time was not actually comparative education. He
systems with one another could properly be called comparative 
education. This is especially interesting because many of his own 
works in the field were on only one nation's educational system. 
For example, he wrote single works on such individual countries as: 
France, Australia, New Zealand, The United States, England, Germany, 
Jamaica, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico. Of course, 
he did write comparative studies as he, himself, defined comparison 
but still, a great deal of his work was not of that nature.

If Kandel would have been consistent and had he adhered to his 
own unequivocal statements regarding what could be construed to be 
bona fide work in comparative education, then he would have produced 
more work comparing two or more systems and not so many reports and 
books on individual nations and their educational systems. This is 
certainly a perplexing problem with no easy answers. No evidence 
has been uncovered to show that Kandel was aware of the disparity 
between what he said about single nation works and the works he 
produced of that nature.

According to many commentators, Kandel's writings, including 
his single nation studies, are considered to be works on comparative 
education. For the experts, however, there is a split of opinion: 
those, like Bereday, would agree with Kandel that single nation 
 studies are not comparative education; others, like Olivera, 
disagree. Bereday calls single nation studies, "Area Studies," 
where one is not comparing anything. The author is merely asking 
the reader to make his own comparisons and draw his own conclusions. 
Bereday said: "There is one important difference between an area
study and a comparative study. A report on one country is within the realm of area studies, whether it is done in a descriptive fashion or an explanatory analysis."  

Olivera, on the other hand, said:

This means among other things that individual case-studies do not belong to comparative education proper. They constitute rather what is sometimes known as "international education". In other words, information on educational situations or problems such as exist in other countries or other societal groups. This information, whether limited to a single country or embracing the whole community of nations, is of course indispensable to comparative education, but only in the sense that the ground and the materials are necessary to a building. They are not the building itself, much less the architecture.  

In spite of the difficulties involved in determining how Kandel's single case studies related to the field of comparative education, they undoubtedly enhanced the reader's knowledge and understanding of the general operation of educational systems, even if all of his work did not lead to the development of principles and theories which he said were necessary for comparative education. His work also emphasized the importance of establishing a basis of correct data about educational systems, and the importance of the past and of traditions in understanding the framework in which they develop. In addition, he contributed a theory of school and society. Central to this theory was Kandel's statement that

the study of comparative education, continuing the study of the history of education and bringing that history down to the present, unfolds the intimate relations that must exist


between education and the cultural pattern of the group it serves. It is in fact impossible to understand any educational system and the differences between systems without going behind them to discover the influences that helped shape them.  

As mentioned earlier in this conclusion, one of the central virtues of studying comparative education, according to Kandel, was not to engage in educational borrowing from one nation to another on a wholesale basis. Rather, the study of the subject should enable one to sharpen his own ideas about his own nation's system as it exists by studying other systems. He felt strongly that all of the patterns, clusters, and detailed aspects which comprise an educational system cannot simply be transferred intact from one country to another. He believed that a nation could successfully adapt other nations' educational ideas and practices, but it could not successfully assimilate complete practices without making the necessary modifications. In order to borrow, one must first understand the political, social, and cultural forces which shape the uniqueness of national systems of education. He was interested in an analysis of the causes of these national differences.

Where Kandel did compare national systems of education, he did not concentrate on single themes and compare them transnationally. For example, he would probably not compare a theme such as corporal punishment in the schools of different nations in order to find similarities and differences. Perhaps the one exception to this would be his involvement with examinations internationally. But

this was not an easy theme. His work as well as the work of others in this particular area was quite complex.

Kandel's comparisons were often quite comprehensive; witness his work on six nations in his book *Comparative Education*, published in 1933. Instead of themes, we find broad categories for comparison such as: "The State and Education," "The Organization of National Systems of Education," "Administration of Education," "Elementary Education," "Secondary Education," "Preparation of Elementary School Teachers," and "Secondary School Teachers." This work, however, was so detailed and comprehensive, and it included so much historical material that, at times, one would be hard pressed to cull out from this work significant and actual comparisons that would be meaningful.

Kandel continued his pattern of comparing broad categories even in his later work which was a much revised and abridged version of *Comparative Education*. This was his book published in 1955, entitled *The New Era in Education*, published in 1955. In this book, Kandel changed much of the content of the categories, departing from those he used in his 1933 work. Here he includes such titles as, "The Education of the Child," "The Education of the Adolescent," "Equalizing Educational Opportunity" and "The New Pattern of Educational Reconstruction." All of these could hardly qualify as single theme research.

Templeton believed that *The New Era in Education* was simply a rehash of Kandel's *Comparative Education*, implying that nothing useful could be learned from it. This writer, after carefully
perusing the later work and comparing it to his 1933 work, found that it was a bona fide revision that was quite useful, and certainly significantly different from his earlier landmark work.

Through these two important works in comparative education Kandel wrote about the problems of various countries and their educational systems. He attempted to determine who controlled the child's education and how far the responsibility of society and the state reached in the education of its citizens. He effectively dealt with such difficult questions as: What is the meaning of freedom in an organized society? Should education be planned and administered on a centralized or decentralized basis? Who should plan the curriculum? What should the curriculum cover? What is the scope of the various branches of an educational system: preschooling, primary education, and secondary schooling?

Kandel's comparative approach emphasized the need for establishing a basis for procuring reliable information, the culling out of facts or information about the education systems of different nations. While he admitted that the mere reporting of facts was not adequate, he believed that it was an important first step in the process of comparative education. He then tried to explain educational systems by the historical analysis of causes. He followed this by generally expressing strong humanistic and international sentiments which he hoped would lead to the betterment of mankind.

Kandel's work did not include much documentation, which made it very difficult to either check his sources or look carefully at his
evidence independently. He used his own stature in the field and his own personal authority to present his strong arguments. He did not rely on the use of objective studies that were replicable or subject to testing by other comparativists. It is interesting to note that Kandel had a somewhat antiscientific and antitechnological bias. He felt that, historically, these movements produced changes in society that took place too rapidly, thereby leading to extreme alterations of the morally charged value systems that mankind had held for ages.

Kandel emphasized the use of national character in describing national traits in education. This was a position he ascribed to even later in his life and even after he realized that it was a position subject to considerable professional criticism. He used national character and national traits in education as a way to explain differences between nations regarding their educational policies and educational structures. While Kandel cautioned against the use of hard and fast generalizations about national traits and national character, he employed their use in a manner which suggested that they were true and immutable. Of course, we now know that they are not a sound basis for writing about a person, a group, or a nation. They provide such loosely and subjectively based ideas that they do not provide any solid foundation for arguments about causation in history. As late as 1959, Kandel complained about a trend in comparative education of replacing national character with the concepts of patterns of culture, normative standards and value systems, which represented to him "a distinction without a
Refuting Kandel's remark, Trethewey says:

Despite his reaction, however, the difference is between an approach that is intuitive and impressionistic and one that attempts to develop more scientifically based procedures for the observation and analysis of group life and its effects. The study of national and cultural differences, their origins and their effects on educational systems is still relevant, but the old notion of national character seems to have had its day.16

Kandel was an optimist even though, throughout his career, he wrote about one world crisis after another. At any one point in time one could readily find in one of his works a discussion of war, economic depression, rampant individualism and a lack of social responsibility within a democracy, totalitarianism of the left or right, the failure of the League of Nations, or any other of the problems he raised. After reading a particular work of his, it would then be easy to conclude that he was a very pessimistic person. This would be a superficial conclusion. He always hoped for the improvement of formal education as a means of enhancing civilization. He was optimistic that through the efforts of world organizations such as the United Nations and UNESCO there would be peace instead of war. While he was quick to see a crisis in education or elsewhere, he was also quick to posit solutions, never giving up hope for a better world, even in the darkest days of World War I and World War II.

Kandel's stated purpose of education as transmitting

16 Trethewey, 68.
civilization from the older to the younger generation would receive criticism from some modern thinkers. Kandel himself believed that formal education needed considerable improvement, but he believed that, by and large, it was the school that took the lead in the transmission of culture to a nation's youth. He staked his career on that premise. It would have been interesting to see how Kandel would have responded to some of the modern criticism of formal education. Since that is not possible, we can only surmise that he would trace the historical role of the school's contribution to civilization and forcefully rebut such criticism as James K. Feibleman's, who recently wrote:

Due to the marvels of modern universal education, most people have been trained for a life to be led in limbo. They eke out their anomalous existence somewhere between the abstract and the concrete. Common experience is not a baseline, it is a compromise, inherited in average form; the shreds of ancient knowledge and wisdom worn away at the edges by a constant rubbing against mediocrity. For intensification has come from two directions. The artists have genuine experience of concrete objects, the product of a high concentration for many years; while the mathematicians and experimental scientists know what it means to move among abstractions. But the education most people receive prepares them for neither.17

Kandel believed that international education as a field of study was not the same as comparative education. The former dealt with the development of particular intellectual and emotional attitudes directed by instruction in the schools. The latter dealt with determining the problems in education common to all nations, analyzing the problems, noting the differences between systems, and

---

the reasons for them, and providing the best solutions.

Kandel did not agree with those educators who would abolish the idea of nationalism, and a withering away of nations in order to reach a global oneness. While he certainly opted for a peaceful, cooperative and interdependent world, he took the minority position. This position held that nationalism should not be eliminated but strengthened to achieve these worthwhile global goals. He recognized some evils in nationalism throughout history, but he saw positive aspects, too, which could successfully promote international education. Quoting in part from Comenius on this topic, Kandel wrote in 1946: "The universal rededication of minds, the guidance of will and purpose and the desires of the peoples and nations of the world must begin in the schools of each nation. World understanding must begin at home."18

In his own unique manner, Kandel would have each nation's school system, through each classroom, teach international education as an integral part of the formal school curriculum. He completely disavowed the popular practice of teaching international education through assemblies, cultural activities and exchanges, or separate subjects added on to the school's curriculum. He saw some value in these efforts but as a whole he believed they failed to make the necessary impact on the student.

His plan called for each nation's school system or systems emphasizing, in every school subject, that nation's particular

contributions to internationalism. Each and every classroom teacher throughout the world would demonstrate to his or her students how the subject being studied has been a positive force in national and international affairs. The student would be taught that the nation's heroes were those men and women of the nation who throughout history contributed to mankind's betterment.

Kandel's elaborate and perhaps grandiose scheme would have the student become proud of his nation while at the same time learning history, geography, mathematics, literature, art, music, etc. The multiple outcomes would be knowledge of the subject, its contribution to the nation, and the contributions other nations have made to the world in each subject area. Kandel believed that this process would raise people's awareness of the importance of nations' contributions to world civilization and thereby lead to the interdependence of nations and the idea of international peace and cooperation.

Ironically, Kandel prided himself on being a practical-minded educator whose theories were rooted in long established and proven educational practices. Nowhere, however, does he really offer any concrete plan to help the teacher implement his utopian ideas about international education. Reporting in his writings that teachers everywhere were overburdened with an expanding curriculum and too many roles and duties to perform, Kandel surprisingly would add a new dimension to their teaching. He would add this global aspect based on his notion of nationalism. He believed that the one effective road to international education was the placing of national and international studies within the formal school
Theoretically, Kandel's ideas may seem to have merit, especially if international education could be spread throughout the world through peace, cooperation, and each nation's contributions to a new global reality. In current practice, however, these ideas seem too utopian to work, given the worldwide problems with formal education, which was also the case when he proposed these ideas. Kandel would have each teacher become a political scientist and philosopher, a global educator, and a subject specialist, who knew how his or her subject contributed to the development of the nation and even to the whole world. In addition to these demands, the teacher would have to find additional time in an already overcrowded schedule to teach international education. It seems likely that most classroom teachers everywhere would think poorly of Kandel's ideas about their role in the implementation of the subject. Perhaps in the future Kandel's ideas will be considered in an effort to teach international education.

Kandel's other ideas on international education seem to have more merit: the strengthening of nongovernmental agencies which could contribute to international cooperation, along with the strengthening of UNESCO and the United Nations. Certainly these ideas seem more workable and realistic, although even here the world's governmental agencies are now operating on a crisis basis.

All in all, Kandel has made many positive and permanent contributions to comparative and international education and he aided them in becoming more serious fields of academic studies. The
late comparative education expert, George Bereday, in writing about Kandel said:

The passing of Professor Isaac L. Kandel has cast a somber shadow over the field of comparative education. We have lost a great scholar, a great statesman and above all a great man. Professor Kandel belongs to the generation of universitarian humanists who will not be easily reproduced in our age of more technological, more rushed, more narrowly specific applications. Nothing can match the towering stature of that passing generation and the inspiration they provoked.\(^\text{19}\)
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Teachers College faces the New Year with resignations.

And a little Childs shall leave them.

Some educators have resigned from the Teachers' Union but are staying on at Teachers College; there is no report yet of anyone resigning from Teachers College to stay on with the Union.

There is no truth in the report that the American Legion is joining with the Teachers' Union to help in building a safer and more democratic Teachers College.

It is reported that New College, Oxford, is greatly relieved by the report that it need no longer fear competition from New College, New York.

The New York Times discovered recently that a member of the Teachers College faculty had "nothing to say"; some of his colleagues have known that for some time.

Others, however, think that The New York Times may have made a mistake in the name.

Teachers College is still a respectable address; it is even used by those who are neither students nor teachers there.

In an exclusive interview to The Daily Owl a member of the Teachers College faculty stated that the Teachers' Union is not yet prepared to adopt the democratic principles in vogue at Teachers College where no resignations have ever been known to take place.
I. J. Mundel

We come from Teachers College,

the home of Alpatrick and Lewey.

We try to disseminate knowledge,

but the reaction of many is "Phoney!"

We teach in Teachers College

with Newton, Childs, and Counts.

What they are adding to knowledge

of democracy constantly amounts.
Professor I. L. Kandel
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York, U. S. A.

Dear Professor Kandel:

Under a recent agreement between the governments of the United States and China, Chinese colleges and universities are given the financial facility to invite visiting professors from the United States. The Peiping National Teachers College has submitted an application to the authority concerned in the hope to have the honor of your presence. Since China has been copying indiscriminately, during the last five decades, foreign educational practices without being aware of their historical origin, cultural and social background, as well as the significance they stand for, I believe that a series of lectures on comparative education by an authority like you will do us much good.

This institution is the biggest of its kind in the country with fourteen departments of undergraduate instruction corresponding to the subject divisions in the secondary schools and a graduate school of education. Our library contains an ample collection of material on both secondary education and comparative education in general. You will be free to decide upon the nature of the lectures to be delivered or courses to be offered in case our plan will be approved and you are willing to come.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I am
Respectfully yours,

Shuyung Chin
Professor of Education and
Head of the Department of Education.
Grand Hotel - Wellington

July 1, 1937

My dear Will,

I have only just heard from Alan of Lester Wilson's sudden death. The news was a great shock to me, since I left him well and cheerful. Lester was a charming level-headed friend and I will miss him greatly.

Jessie, Helen and I had a splendid trip down here with but two bad days on the boat. When we arrived at Java, I found an invitation for us to lunch with the Governor of the Fiji Islands and another from the Director of Education - another Russell - to broadcast the lecture that he had invited me earlier to give. I gave my lecture in the afternoon to a capacity hall of the most mixed body that I have ever addressed - Europeans, Indians, Chinese and fussy Fijians cut across into Protestants and Catholics.

We arrived in Auckland on June 9th and had a royal reception. We reached the hotel at 9 a.m., and at 9.30 I was already at the State Teachers' College and I have been going ever since. They seem to be simply hungry for the "word." I came down to Wellington and spent most of the day with Dr. Basky in charge of the Research Council. On the following morning I was taken in charge by the President and Secretary of the M. Z. Education Institute - the Junior School Teachers Association - and started up the West Coast, stopped in Auckland for a week, picked up Jessie and Helen, and drove down the Centre and Eastern Coast to Wellington. I have lectured to six branches and have met about 1300 teachers, and still have to speak to the Wellington branch on Monday. Tomorrow I go out across. It's a great burden to carry the whole of T.C. American Education and Comparative Education on my shoulders, but I will do my best.

This tiny country with its million population seems to have all the educational problems of the rest of the world plus some of its own making. I have not quite got the hang of the social legislation, but education does not seem to have got its share yet. The 40 hour week is playing the deuce with things at present. In hotels hours of meals are rigidly fixed; journalists are in a hole in distributing their time; factories for the present cannot turn out enough to meet the demand and prices are going up, so that guaranteed wages will in a short time mean little more than before; a guaranteed wage scale for juvenile labor from 15 to 19 or 21 is drawing youngsters from school, and so on and so on. Things may straighten themselves out, for the present government has only been in power for 18 months and the Opposition is very weak. But in the meantime statism is growing stronger and initiative is strangled. And yet a country in which a large part of the population is riding on the backs of sheep while holding on to the udders of cows has a difficult job.

(over)
And with it all everybody talks about the weather and no one is doing anything about it. Everybody huddles around a small fire and no one thinks of closing windows or doors. We have got used to it all now but the first few days were quite trying.

Malherbe and his wife have arrived, Boyd of Glasgow is due soon, and the rest of the party arrives on July 9. I had planned to leave with the group immediately after the Conference, but I had word today that I may be asked to stay for further consultation for a week longer. In any case my Australian address will be c/o Australian Council for Educational Research, 145 Collins Street, Melbourne.

Please remember me to Chloe to whom Jessie has already written. Jessie and Helen join me in sending you our kindest regards and best wishes for a good rest this summer.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Jess
Dr. I. L. Kandel,
International Institute,
Teachers College,
Columbia University,
New York.

May 31, 1958.

Dear Dr. Kandel,

Thank you so much for your letter of April 19. I ought to have replied immediately but it happened that we were extremely busy with our Commandant Exercises.

The splendid talk, you kindly gave us last December, was well received in all our educational circles. The Under-Secretary of State made a résumé of the speech in Arabic, sent mimeographed copies of it to all controllers, and asked them to write their comments. His idea was to draw attention to the points discussed and to find out their reaction in the light of our practices in Egypt.

The "Ulam" which is a monthly magazine published by the Government Teachers Association published the article in full in English in spite of the fact, that Arabic is the language of that magazine.

In our Journal of Modern Education we published a translation of it in Arabic at the time. I have sent you under separate cover:
1. The copy of our magazine in which a translation of the speech appears,
2. The résumé in Arabic prepared and signed by the Under-Secretary to the Ministry of education, and
3. The speech in full, in English, as published by the "Ulam".

Hoping that you will repeat your visit to Egypt in the near future, and extending to you from all the educators in Egypt our heartiest greetings.

With best wishes, from both of us to Mrs. Kandel and yourself, to Alan and Helen.

Yours very sincerely,

[Signature]

Amir Bektar.
Dear Dr. Kandol,

As a token of my heartfelt gratitude for your kindness in permitting me to translate your distinguished monograph into Japanese, I am sending under separate cover a sketchy Japanese abstract, which is, so to speak, rather rough and highly appreciated by consommates. I beg you will greatly please me by accepting and using it for your study or for other purposes.

I am immensely delighted with the copy of your lecture you delivered in London in 1962 which you were kind enough to send me as a supplement of the "Intellectual Cooperation: National and International." I was just about to come to ask you if there are any such supplement or sequel to it, and, if not, what are your opinions about carrying out the intellectual works, both national and international, in this critical period of the cold war. Filled up with the hope of reaching insight and truth going studies, your monograph has furnished us the first principle underlying the intellectual works for peace, but it does not. To our great regret, treat of the question arising from the situation which has developed after the World War II. I should think that this principle will do anything for any people, and all that is necessary and important is to help them. It is, however, only too true that USSR and other satellites are not likely to cooperate with USA.
and other free nations. What can we do for it? People here seem to be forgetting the war we have had yesterday and recalling things of pleasant days more and more to their minds. Journalism here is showing much less interest to the pacifist movements which were so popular on the morrow of the war and requiring much more space for problems of recreation, sports, and entertainments. They say all that they don't like war and another war will be calamitous, but they don't like to spend time and money sufficiently for such work that are regarded as too long ranged to be taken up at present.

I mention this to show you the prevailing mental climate of our country. The fact that there has appeared not a revolutionary criticism for any translation may be explained in the light of this state of things and mental climate.

I know that the situation we are facing involves problems of interpretation of life and philosophy as well as military, political, economic and social problems, and that the favorable solution of all these problems can never be attained but for the wisdom in this state of mind, how much I shall feel honored and privileged if you would kindly guide me further more in the study of international relations and understanding! And then I shall be very glad if you will permit me to translate your three lectures for our public, and let me know from time to time how the government officials, teachers, writers, scientists and other intellectuals of your country are dealing with this question of paramount importance of our time. With renewed thanks,

Yours sincerely,
Further evidence that brain work is "out-of-date" among the young Germans is obtained by statistics which the Nazi magazine Die Junge Deutschland (Young Germany) publishes. In March of this year, the first batch of pupils left the "Adolf Hitler Schools" having passed their final examination. These schools are supposed to be "model schools" from the Nazi point of view, and they have been opened with the main purpose of producing the academic aftergrowth of Nazi Germany. It is significant which kind of professions these model Nazis have chosen: Political leaders, 67.23 per cent.; officers in the Services, 10.92 per cent.; students of science, 7.15 per cent.; teachers, 4.62 per cent.; medical doctors, 3.35 per cent.; students of economics, 2.94 per cent.; farmers, 2.1 per cent.; and various other occupations 1.68 per cent. It may be noted that nobody appeared anxious to study law or theology, professions for which there is no demand or need in Nazi Germany. Before the Nazis obtained power, the highest percentage of all the pupils who had passed their leaving school examinations took up the study of law.
December 18, 1944

Dean William F. Russell
Teachers College

Dear Will:

I do not remember whether I sent you a copy of the suggestions on dealing with education in Germany which I sent to Lt. Rizzo last May. I had forgotten about it until I saw the enclosed report on "Allies to Control Teaching in Reich" in yesterday's TIMES. Do you see any connection between the two?

Please return the newspaper clipping to me.

Sincerely yours,

L. Kanigel

Professor of Education
APPENDIX - VIII
Memorandum on Education in Germany in the Transition Period

1. Eliminate all Nazi textbooks.

2. Dissolve the Hitler Youth which was a stronger agency for Nazi indoctrination than the schools. The Hitler Youth leaders and the leaders of the student organizations in the universities should be under careful observation, as well as the Deutscherführer in the universities.

   All the special Nazi schools (Bergaorden, Nationalpolitische Erziehungsmittelaen, and Molf-Khitler-Schulen) should be closed and the personnel (teachers and students) kept under observation.

3. In so far as any teachers will be found accessible to the new order they will be found more among elementary school teachers than among secondary school or university teachers. No university teacher appointed after 1926 is likely to be reliable. The elementary school teachers have had a long history of liberalism (since the beginning of the nineteenth century). The secondary school teachers in the main are likely to be unreliable.

4. If schools are to be reopened, it would be well to prohibit the teaching of history and biology (race theory) at all levels. There is a precedent in the fact that the teaching of history was suspended for a time in fascist Italy and in Soviet Russia until appropriate textbooks were made available by the authorities. The teaching of geography might well be limited; before 1914 pupils in elementary schools were taught the shortest routes to Paris and Baghdad.

5. The question whether formal instruction of any kind should be given is worth considering. Schools can be conducted without formal instruction of a serious kind, as they were in Soviet Russia for many years after the revolution. There will be a greater need for physical, moral, and mental regeneration than for schooling in the traditional sense. The schools will be convenient centers for relief work through which parents can also be reached. Manual occupations and socially useful activities would probably be of greater value than formal instruction. Much can be learned from the work of the Near East Relief about 1926 and from some of the experiments with evacuated children in England.

6. The most carefully selected textbooks furnish no guarantee that work in the classroom will be above suspicion. The Germans were never able to suppress the continuance of the nationalist spirit among the Poles or among the Alsatians, nor could the authorities of the Volks Republic prevent teachers, especially in the secondary schools, from sabotaging the Republic, despite the revised textbooks.
1 May 1950

Dear Mr. Edwards,

The chief weakness of the U.S. Education Mission to Japan was the small number of members who had had any experience with educational systems other than their own. This consequence was that not enough attention was paid to the educational tradition of Japan, and its strong and weak points. Hence the imposition on Japan of the American system of education. The same process has been followed in the American Zone in Germany.

I feel some regret that a few of us did not sign a minority report on some of the recommendations. There was one occasion when Dean Wideralski and I protested against the proposal to throw the doors of the universities as wide open as possible. No attention was paid to the protests, although I placed special stress on the fact that one of Japan's serious troubles had come from the overcrowding of intellectuals and consequent agitation.

I do not know whether I can answer your questions satisfactorily.

1. Some change in the organization of the Japanese educational system was overdue. The opportunities for secondary education were limited to a small group only. What was needed was a break after the first six years and different types of secondary schools to which pupils could be a signed in accordance with their abilities. This is the basis of educational re-organisation planned in France and England. The weakness of the American comprehensive high school, whether in the 6 years or 3 years plan is that both the gifted and the below average are neglected. The American administrator would not admit it, but that is the essential point made by President Eisenstein in his "Education in a Divided Age."

2. I have referred to the one occasion when there was no unanimity. I am not sure, but I think that I objected to the proposal to decentralize administration as too sudden a departure from Japanese practice.

3. I never felt that the Civil Information and Education Section of GSE at all attempted to impose its own views on the Mission. I never saw or heard any report of recommendations for reform proposed by this body. I was impressed with the excellent work on Japanese education that had been prepared for us but they were in no way in the nature of a "steer" in any particular direction.

On the language question we were wholly objective and based our proposals on the fact that the only way to facilitate a democratic system of education and government was to develop literacy on a much larger scale than was possible with the existing printed language.

4. I do not recall that the cost of the proposed reforms was ever discussed by the whole Mission; it may have come up in the Committee on Organization and Administration.
I think the majority of the members of the Mission would have given priorities in the following order: (a) Regrouping of schools; (b) textbook revision; and (c) normal school expansion and teacher retraining. I would have put (a) first of all.

I hope that the information that I have given you is satisfactory. If there is anything that I can add I will be glad to do so. I am still firmly of the opinion that the proposals to reform the educational systems of Germany and Japan have been rushed through too rapidly. I would like to have seen side by side with these proposals a plan to bring reliable German and Japanese teachers to the United States or France or Great Britain to live with their respective educational systems rather than be told or lectured to adopt them.

In view of the fact that I did not submit a minority report, I think that my name had better not be used in anything that you publish.

I expect to be back in New York in the last week in June and can be reached c/o School and Society, 15 Amsterdam Avenue, New York 23.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. J. Dixon Edwards,
413 West 117th St.,
New York 27.
APPENDIX - X
29th September 1947.

Dear Dr. Kandel,

I should like to confirm our telephone conversation this morning although official arrangements will have to be made through our Personal Office. We should like to invite you to assist us in the preparation of the final seven parts of the Inquiry into Education for International Understanding. The drafts of these parts of the Inquiry have been PREPARED AFTER CONSULTATION with a number of educational authorities throughout the world. We should like your criticism and assistance in a final examination of the nature and scope of the remaining parts of the Inquiry. We believe that the Inquiry is so important that UNESCO ought to have your judgment and perspective before submitting the Inquiry to the General Conference.

Since it will be impossible for you to come to Paris at this time, we are making arrangements to have Mr. Kemarky come to Manchester to work with you. He will be writing to you to-day with respect to the actual nature of the Inquiry. You will also hear shortly from the Personal Office in UNESCO about the exact details of your relationship with UNESCO.

You can be sure that we are most grateful to you for your willingness to cooperate and I look forward to seeing you personally during the course of the year either here or in England.

Sincerely yours,

Professor R. WALTER,
Acting Head of the Education Section.

Dr. J. L. Kandel,
School of Education,
University of Manchester,
Manchester,
England.
APPENDIX - XI
BY AIR MAIL

September 29, 1947

Dr. I. S. Kandel,
Institute of Education,
University of Manchester,
Manchester, England.

Dear Dr. Kandel,

I am delighted to hear through Dr. Gallow that you will be able to give us your wise counsel regarding UNESCO's "Study of Education for International Understanding in the Schools of Member States".

I look forward to working with you on this project.

Enclosed you will find a tentative draft which I have made out during the last few days. I am also enclosing "Education it" which was a previous outline submitted to members of the Panel for their criticism. You will notice that a few changes have been made in the various parts contemplated for the study and that only the alternative form for the section on Teacher Training has been used in final draft. All the people consulted felt that the first part of the section on Teacher Training was unnecessary and too long.

As usual, we are working under great time restrictions. The tentative paper should have been ready for mimeographing by October 3rd, but it was absolutely impossible because of the pressure of other work, particularly the Seminar. As shall, however, need to prepare this document as soon as possible in order that it may be translated into French and mimeographed before the Mexico Conference.

As I think you know, part 1 was circulated in April to Member States and we now have orders from 14 governments which I am now summarizing in a separate paper for the forthcoming Mexico City Conference. I
have included the questions for it in the present document in order to show the scope of the study and in order to encourage governments which have not already done so to answer it, in conjunction with the other parts.

According to present plans I shall leave Paris either Friday night or Saturday morning of this week (October 3rd or 4th) and shall plan to stay in London Saturday and Sunday. I shall expect to leave Monday morning for Manchester and contact you immediately upon arrival there. I shall stay as long as we need to work together, but will hope to return to Paris as soon as possible to complete work on this tentative guide and on the summary of part I regarding teaching about the United Nations and its specialised agencies. I am leaving on October 15th for the States. It is of course impossible to know how long I shall need to stay at Manchester, but I am thinking in terms of 3 or 4 days. I hope that this will be adequate for our purposes.

I shall look forward with great pleasure to this opportunity of meeting you and working with you.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Section of Education.

Facts. Tentative Guide for a Study of Education for
Intern. Underst. in the Schools of Unesco Member
States
Education 44.
APPENDIX - XII
Teacher: Where do we live?

Pupil: We live in Europe.

Teacher: What is your Fatherland?

Pupil: Germany is my Fatherland.

Teacher: All together. — Germany is our Fatherland.

Pupil: Germany is our Fatherland.

Teacher: Who is our Landesvater (father of the country)?

Pupil: Emperor William II is the father of our country.

Teacher: Why is he called Landesvater?

Pupil: Because he rules the German fatherland.

Teacher: No.

Pupil: Because he cares for the land and its people as if he were the father.

Teacher: Yes. He cares for the land as a father cares for his children, whence comes the name. What is the emperor called? All together.

Pupil: The emperor is called Landesvater.

Teacher: Germany is shut in by many other lands. What country is to the west?

Pupil: France.

Teacher: We shall hear something about this country to-day. What country are we to hear about to-day?
Pupil: We shall hear about France to-day.
Teacher: Once more.
Another Pupil: We shall hear about France to-day.
Teacher: All together.
Pupils: We shall hear about France to-day.
Teacher: What is the name of this country? (Teacher had written the name on the board.)
Pupil: France.
Teacher: Who has ever heard of it? (Several hands were raised.) What have you heard?
Pupil: It is a republic.
Teacher: All together: France is a republic.
Pupil: France is a republic.
Teacher: What is a republic?
Pupil: A republic has no king, only a ruler.
Teacher: Not exactly.
Pupil: France is not ruled by a king, but by a president.
Teacher: Who is the ruler of Germany?
Pupil: The Kaiser is the ruler of Germany.
Teacher: And after his death who will be the ruler?
Pupil: The crown prince.
Teacher: And how is it in a republic?
Pupil: The president is elected by the people as often as they wish.
Teacher: Yes, in a republic the president is elected for some four or five years and he may be elected more than once. He rules only for a certain number of years. How long does a king rule?
Pupil: A king rules for life.
Teacher: What are the boundaries of France (pointing to the map)?
Teacher: The western boundaries of France are the Atlantic Ocean and the Bay of Biscay; on the south the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean Sea; on the east, the Alps, the Jura, and Germany; and the northern boundaries are Belgium and the English Channel. Give the boundaries of France. (A pupil pointed to the boundaries while another pupil recited.)

Pupil: The western boundaries are the Atlantic Ocean and the Bay of Biscay, the southern boundaries are the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean Sea; the eastern borders are the Alps, the Jura, and Germany; on the north are Belgium and the English Channel.

Teacher: Now let us consider the east boundaries of France more closely. They are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, and the Archbishop Field. All together: The eastern . . .

Pupil: The eastern boundaries are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, and the Archbishop Field.

Teacher: Now one pupil alone give the boundaries on the east.

Pupil: The eastern boundaries of France are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, and the Archbishop Field.

Teacher: Now give me all the boundaries of France.

Pupil: The western boundaries of France are the Atlantic Ocean and the Bay of Biscay; the southern are the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean Sea; the eastern boundaries are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, and the Archbishop Field; and Belgium and the English Channel on the north.

Teacher: What you told me of France was not very much. Can any one give me the name of a ruler of France?

Pupil: Napoleon I.

Pupil: Napoleon III.

Teacher: What war did Napoleon I wage?

Pupil: The wars against Prussia one hundred years ago.

Teacher: What wars did Napoleon III conduct?

Pupil: The Franco-Prussian War in 1871.

Teacher: Have the French and Germans gotten along well together?

Pupil: No, they have had many wars with one another.

Teacher: Yes. Now we must study and find out more about this country, because we may have trouble in the future with them: The chief rivers of France are the Loire, the Rhone, the Garonne, the Meas, the Mosel, and the Seine. Repeat that.
Pupil: The chief rivers of France are the Loire, the Rhone, the...
Teacher: Garonne.
Pupil: ... the Garonne, and the...
Teacher: Seine (giving it the French pronunciation).
Pupil: ... the Seine, the Maas, and the Mosel.
Teacher: All together (pointing to the rivers).
Pupil: The chief rivers of France are the Rhone, the Loire, the Garonne, the Seine, the Maas, and the Mosel.
Teacher: What mountains are here in the South of France?
Pupil: The Pyrenees.
Teacher: On the east of France are the Alps, the Jura, the Argonne, the Sevahnes. The Sevahnes stretch up as far as the Mosel. Repeat that.
Pupil: The mountains in eastern France are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, the Argonne, and the Sevahnes.
Teacher: Repeat that once more. These mountains in here are the Vosges.
Pupil: The mountains in eastern France are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, the Argonne, the Vosges, and the Sevahnes.
Teacher: Where are the lowlands of France? (No reply.) The lowland plain of France reaches from the Pyrenees to Belgium. Repeat that.
Pupil: The lowland plain of France reaches from the Pyrenees to Belgium.
Teacher: Repeat that again.
Pupil: The lowland plain of France reaches from the Pyrenees to Belgium.
Teacher: There is another lowland (valley) along the Rhone.
The song "Deutschland, Deutschland, uber alles" was then sung, presumably because the boys were getting a little sleepy.
Teacher: What is our Fatherland?
Pupil: Germany is our Fatherland.
Teacher: Who is our kaiser?
Pupil: William II is our kaiser.
Teacher: Whatever we call him?
Pupil: We call him the Landgravine.
Teacher: What country are we studying to-day?
Pupil: We are studying France.
Teacher: What border of Germany is France?
Pupil: France is the western border of Germany.
Teacher: What is the capital of France?
Pupil: Paris is the capital of France.
Teacher: What is the best train for Paris? (No reply.) The best train for Paris passes through Hanover, Cologne, and Brussels. Repeat that.
Pupil: The best train for Paris runs from Berlin through Hanover, Cologne, and Brussels. (It was repeated again.)
Teacher: The best water route from Berlin to Paris is down the Elbe to Hamburg, then through the North Sea and the English Channel to Havre, and then by rail to Paris. Or one may go by way of Boulogne instead of Havre. Give me the boundaries of France.
Pupil: The boundaries of France on the west are the Atlantic Ocean and the Bay of Biscay; the southern boundaries, the Mediterranean Sea and the Pyrenees; the eastern boundaries are the Alps, the Swiss Jura, the Argonnean Wald; Belgium and the English Channel are the northern boundaries.
Teacher: Give me the chief rivers of France.
Pupil: The chief rivers of France are the Rhone, the Garonne, the Loire, the Seine, the Moselle, and the Meuse.
Teacher: Repeat that. (Calling another pupil.)
Pupil: The chief rivers of France are the Rhone, the Garonne, the Loire, the Seine, the Moselle, and the Meuse.
Teacher: What are the chief mountains of France?
Pupil: The mountains of France are the Alps, the Jura, the Voges, the Argonne, and the Sereannes. (Repeated by another pupil.)
Teacher: Give me the lowlands of France.
Pupil: The chief lowland of France reaches from the Pyrenees to Belgium. The other plain is along the Rhone.
Teacher: If we take a look at the general shape of France, what form do we find it to have?
Pupil: It is quadrilateral.
Teacher: Yes. There are two peninsulas. Normandy. Say that.
Pupil: Normandy.
Teacher: And Brittany. Pronounce that.
Pupil: Brittany.
Teacher: These peninsulas used to reach out and join England to the continent, but the North Sea broke through. What was the result?
Pupil: England was then an island.
Teacher: What lands used to be joined?
Pupil: England and France used to be joined.
Teacher: What divided these countries?
Pupil: The North Sea broke through and separated them by the English Channel.
Teacher: What body of water separates England and France?
Pupil: The English Channel (Armnel Kanal).
Teacher: Why is it called the Armnel Kanal?
Pupil: Because it has the shape of a coat sleeve.
Teacher: The narrowest part of the channel is at Dover Straits. There is the narrowest part of the channel?
Pupil: The narrowest part of the channel is called the Straits of Dover.
Teacher: What are the chief peninsulas of France?
Pupil: The chief peninsulas of France are Brittany and Normandy.
Teacher: What have we talked about to-day?
Pupil: We have talked about France.
Teacher: What was the name of the early inhabitants of France?
Pupil: The Franks.
Teacher: Who was their king?
Pupil: His name was Charles the Great.
Pupil: The boundaries of France are the Atlantic Ocean and the Bay of . . .
- Biscay on the west, the Pyrenees, the Mediterranean, and the Gulf of
  Lyon are the southern boundaries; and France is bounded on the east by
  the Alps, the Swiss Jura, the Argonne, the Vosges; and on the north
  by Belgium and the English Channel.

Teacher: Name the chief rivers of France.

Pupil: The chief rivers of France are the Rhone, the Garonne, the Loire,
  the Seine, the Maas, and the Mosel.

Teacher: Give the name of the mountains in France.

Pupil: The Alps, the Jura, the Vosges, the Argonne, and the Savennes.

Teacher: Where do we find the Savennes?

Pupil: The Savennes extend from the Pyrenees to the Mosel.

Teacher: Where are the lowland plains of France?

Pupil: The great lowland plain of France is in the western part of the
  country and extends from the Pyrenees to Belgium.

Teacher: Give the names of the chief peninsulas of France.

Pupil: The chief peninsulas of France are Brittany and Normandy.

Teacher: Repeat that together.

Pupil: The chief peninsulas of France are Brittany and Normandy.

Teacher: Why is the channel called the Argel Kanal?

Pupil: It is called the Argel Kanal because it has the shape of a sleeve.

Teacher: What did we study about before vacation?

Pupil: We studied about the Balkan countries.

Teacher: What are the Balkan countries (pointing at a map)?

Pupil: The Balkan states are Turkey, Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, Bosnia,
  Montenegro, Albania, Herzegovina, and Greece.

Teacher: Repeat that, some one else. (It was repeated again.)

Teacher: Who is the new prince of Albania?

Pupil: Prince William of Hied.

Teacher: Yes, he is a German prince. What is the capital of Albania?

Pupil: The capital of Albania is Durrazo.
Teacher: What is the capital of Turkey?

Pupil: Constantinople.

Teacher: Give me the route by train from Berlin to Constantinople.

Pupil: The train passes through Dresden, Prague, Vienna, Belgrade, Sofia, Adrianople, and Constantinople, and the name of the train is the Oriental Express.

Teacher: How do you go to Constantinople by water?

Pupil: One may go to Trieste by train and then by boat through the Adriatic Sea, the Aegean Sea, the Dardanelles, the Sea of Marmora, and then the Bosphorus.

Teacher: What other water route is there?

Pupil: One may start from Hamburg down the Elbe, through the North Sea, the English Channel, the Atlantic Ocean, the Straits of Gibraltar, the Mediterranean Sea, the Aegean Sea, the Dardanelles, the Sea of Marmora, and the Bosphorus.

Teacher: Tell me what you know of Constantinople.

Pupil: The churches have no bells and instead of spires they have minarets. They are called mosques.

Teacher: How are the faithful called to prayer?

Pupil: A priest calls the people from the minaret.

Teacher: Constantinople lies on the water. Of what meaning is that?

Pupil: It is a great commercial city.

Teacher: Yes. Its harbor is one of the best in the world. What is the capital of Greece?

Pupil: Athens is the capital of Greece.

Teacher: What is the seaport of Athens?

Pupil: It is Piraeus.

Teacher: Who is the queen of Greece? (No answer.) She is the sister of

Pharaoh.
I think it can be stated as almost an historical truism, said Mr. Willkie, that the greatest civilisations of history have been the best educated civilisations. And when I speak of education in this sense I do not have in mind what so many claim as education, namely, special training to do particular jobs. Clearly in a technological age like ours, a great deal of training is necessary. Some of us must learn how to be mechanics, some how to be architects, or chemists. Some will have a special aptitude for medicine. And a great many will have -- or think they have -- a mysterious talent inducing them to undertake the practice of law.

But none of these specialties constitutes true education. They are training for skills by which men live. I am thinking, rather, of what we call the liberal arts. I am speaking of education for its own sake: to know for the sheer joy of understanding; to speculate, to analyze, to compare, and to imagine.

.......

The destruction of the tradition of the liberal arts, at this crisis in our history, when freedom is more than ever at stake, would mean just that. It would be a crime, comparable, in my opinion, with the burning of the books by the Nazis. And it would have approximately the same results. Burn your books -- or, what amounts to the same thing, neglect your books -- and you will lose freedom, as surely as if you were to invite Hitler and his henchmen to rule over you.
In the middle of 1942, the war activities of youth in high schools were brought to a focus by the organization of the High School Victory Corps. Official responsibility for the Federal Government in developing this organization was delegated to the U.S. Office of Education. The plan in general was approved by a National Policy Committee consisting of representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the Department of Commerce, the U.S. Office of Education Wartime Commission, and the Civilian Aeronautics Administration. The plan was endorsed by Paul V. McNutt, Chairman, War Manpower Commission; Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy; and Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce.

A national pattern, rather than a national organization, was recommended for the Victory Corps, which was "basically an educational plan to promote instruction and training for useful
pursuits and services critically needed in wartime." The purpose of the plan was defined as follows:

We are engaged in a war for survival. This is a total war—a war of armies and navies, a war of factories and farms, a war of homes and schools. Education has an indispensable part to play in total war. Schools must help to teach individuals the issues at stake; to train them for their vital parts in the total war effort; to guide them into conscious personal relationship to the struggle.

Students in the Nation's 18,000 secondary schools are eager to do their part for victory. To utilize more fully this eagerness to serve, to organize it into effective action, to channel it into areas of increasingly critical need, the National Policy Committee recommends the organization of a Victory Corps in every American high school, large or small, public or private.

The Policy Committee urges the organization of the Victory Corps as a high school youth sector in the all-out effort of our total war, a sector manned by youth who freely volunteer for present service appropriate to their experience and maturity, and who earnestly seek preparation for greater opportunities in the service which lies ahead.14

The two objectives of the wartime programs of the high schools to which the Victory Corps was related were as follows:

(1) The training of youth for that war service that will come after they leave school; and (2) the active participation of youth in the community's war effort while they are yet in school. The first seems closer to what goes on in school classrooms and shops; the second to the out-of-school activities of students. The Victory Corps organization takes account of both.17

To give a list of the activities included in the Victory Corps program would be to repeat the activities presented earlier in the account of the preinduction training program. All students were eligible to membership, provided they participated in a school physical fitness program appropriate to their abilities and needs in the light of their probable contribution to the nation's war effort. They were required to be pursuing studies of prob-

17. Ibid., p. 5.
able immediate and future usefulness to the war effort and to
be participants in at least one wartime activity or service.18

The Victory Corps was designed as much for promoting and
maintaining the morale of youth as it was to provide training.
The wearing of insignia, a simple uniform (a white shirt with
dark trousers for boys and a white waist and dark skirt for girls),
initiation ceremonies with rituals of induction into membership,
participation in parades and other community ceremonies—all
these were elements in developing consciousness of participation
in the war effort. To link youth and adult in this effort the for­
mation of a Victory Corps Advisory Committee in each com­
munity was recommended. In January, 1943, Captain Eddie
Rickenbacker became chairman of the Victory Corps Policy
Committee.

The Victory Corps was organized in six divisions, each with
its own insignia: general membership, production service divi­
sion, community service division, land service division, air service
division, and sea service division. In addition to the specialized
work of each division, members participated not only in the com­
munity activities listed earlier but also in selling war savings
stamps and bonds, in salvage campaigns, and in collecting waste
paper. Perhaps an added inducement to activities of an extra­
curricular and community nature was the fact that credits could
be obtained for participation. This was recommended by those
responsible for the organization:

College entrance requirements, as well as requirements for grad­
aduation from high school, need adjustment in wartime. The substitu­
tion of war service, war production, and other forms of partici­
pating work experience in critically needed occupations for class
attendance may be encouraged, at least during the period of the
war emergency, without lasting damage to the student’s education.
State and regional accrediting associations must adjust their require­
ments. A campaign of community education to break down the

18. This was defined as “air warden, fire watcher, or other civilian
defense activity; U.S.O. volunteer activities; Red Cross services; scale
model airplane building; participation in health services, such as malaria
control; farm aid, or other part-time employment to meet man power
shortages; school-home-community services, such as salvage campaigns,
care of small children of working mothers, gardening, book collection,
etc.”—(Ibid., p. 15.)
existing prejudices in favor of the strictly academic college preparatory types of high school course is also required. Naturally such a campaign will require the vigorous leadership of the professional educators.19

The preinduction training program, the Victory Corps program, and the funds available for the promotion of vocational training all combined to produce a new emphasis in the high school curriculum. This was not accidental but was deliberately designed. Thus it was urged that “The High Schools Should Prepare Youth for War Production and Essential Community Services” for the following reasons:

A realistic appraisal of our need for trained manpower, both in the armed forces and in war production, makes it evident that the high school can’t go on doing business as usual. High school youth are impelled by patriotic considerations to point their training to preparation for war work, to tasks requiring skill of hand and strength of body, coupled with intelligence and devotion. The 18,000 high schools of the Nation with their 6,500,000 students should speedily undertake the adaptation of their curricula and of their organizations to train youth (and adults, also) to do their part in the victory effort.20

It is difficult to estimate the contributions of the Victory Corps. The organization and its plans received a great deal of publicity for a year or so, but no general report to indicate the extent to which it was adopted by the high schools or its effectiveness was published.
During the past two decades American education has been increasingly influenced by a psychology that is essentially mechanistic and a philosophy that, in its effects, is essentially opportunistic. The present essay and that which follows will attempt to prove, first, that a much more liberal psychological basis than mechanism provides, and an equally valid basis, can be made available for educational theory and practice; and secondly, that this psychological basis will justify a virile idealism in place of the weak opportunism that now prevails. A working hypothesis will be sought in the implications of emergent evolution when this new familiar hypothesis is used as a basis for interpreting the facts of mental life.

The hypothesis of the continuity of culture is of basic significance to those institutions of society the business of which is to see to it that the gains made from generation to generation are not lost to posterity. This is not to say that the preservation of the actual material products is the important thing (except in the case of written records); rather the important thing is the art or skill or knowledge that creates the material product.

The social heritage here implied has two parts: (1) the material heritage of implement, utensil, machine, or any artifact or improvement wrought by Man and conserved over one or more generations for the use of Man; and (2) the spiritual heritage of tradition, custom, standard, ideal, knowledge, and skill.

So long as the pedagogical doctrine of interest meant the following of the lines of least resistance, its failure as an educational principle was absolutely certain. Always to obey the dictates of interest, in this sense of the term, would mean the instant arrest of all progress. But if the interest means the desire for a satisfaction of acquired needs, the case is somewhat different. The child is no longer at the mercy of the strongest stimulus; sustained attention directed toward a remote end has become possible. But the point never to be forgotten is this: acquired interests are developed only under the stress of active attention. Always there must be some inhibition of natural tendencies at the outset. The passion for change, the insidious and often overwhelming desire to do something else must be strenuously repressed.

... One vital necessity of education, therefore, is to develop in the immature child needs that will demand the acquisition of experiences that will be beneficial in mature life.
Certain it is [he wrote in *Educational Values*] that the present tendencies in our schools toward ease and comfort and the lines of least resistance confirm rather than counteract the operation of that Zeitgeist which reflects so perfectly the moral decadence that comes with prosperity — the letting loose the grip that our forefathers, who lived under sterner and harsher conditions, had upon the ideals of self-denial and self-sacrifice.

What is needed, now that we have got away from the lock step, now that we are happily emancipated from the meaningless thralldom of mechanical repetition and the worship of drill for its own sake — what is needed now is not less drill, but better drill. And this should be the net result of the recent reforms in elementary education. In our first enthusiasm, we threw away the spelling book, poked fun at the multiplication tables, decried basal reading, and relieved ourselves of much wit and sarcasm at the expense of formal grammar. But now we are swinging back to the adequate recognition of the true purpose of drill. And in the wake of this newer conception, we are learning that its drudgery may be lightened and its efficiency heightened by the introduction of a richer content that shall provide a greater variety in the repetitions, insure an adequate motive for effort, and relieve the dead monotony that frequently rendered the older methods so futile. I look forward to the time when to be an efficient drillmaster in this newer sense of the term will be to have reached one of the pinnacles of professional skill.
In short, the net effect of these rationalized justifications of relaxed standards has been to open the paths of least resistance. The influence can even be traced in the changes that have taken place in our educational vocabulary. Practically every term suggestive of strength and vigor and rigor has been replaced by a weaker term. Certain words are seldom mentioned in our professional discussions except as objects of opprobrium—such words, for example, as discipline, thoroughness, and system.

The educational practitioner and the educational administrator, in my judgment, have not been primarily responsible for these weakening tendencies. The spirit of the times has worked increasingly in this direction, and educational theory, in a very emphatic fashion, has compounded this influence.

The extent to which these softening influences have gone is most clearly seen in the increasing vogue of what I shall call the Freedom theory of education. In its popular form, this theory deifies individual freedom, not only as an end of education, but also as the primary and most effective means to this end. Learning activities must not be imposed; they must always take their cue from the immediate desires and purposes of the learner. The continuance of the learning process must be justified at each step by the learner's own satisfaction with its results; as the street phrase has it, he must get a "kick" out of each learning experience. Imposed tasks and prescribed programs of study not only violate the inherent right of the learner to make free choices, but are themselves either futile or negative as educational means. Just now the favorite theme is the "creative impulse." By the simple legerdemain of "taking off the lid," it seems, one will be able to conjure creative products out of a vacuum.

My own objection to Progressivism is that, in spite of many salutary virtues, it is at base a weak theory. It lacks virility not in the sense that it is feminine but rather in the sense that it is effeminate. It is my contention that its virtues and worthy contributions to educational progress can be preserved without committing American education to its weaknesses and its shortcomings, especially at a stage of social evolution when education among the few remaining democratic nations needs most emphatically to be fused through and through with a virile and dynamic idealism.
The flabbiness and superficiality of American education are due to the lack of adequately prepared teachers, not only in elementary schools but on the secondary and higher levels as well — a condition almost inevitable in view of the rapid growth of the high schools and colleges. The larger problem is: Can schools and colleges level up instead of down? Can we realize the praiseworthy democratic ideal of equal educational opportunity for all without committing the American people to a standardized-institutionalized-mediocritiy? Can we maintain secondary schools that are quite unselective and higher institutions far less selective than those of other countries and still compete with other countries in the development of talent that will be competent to the higher realms of intellectual activity? Finally, throughout the range of school and college life can we make the education of all an effective stimulus to intellectual and volitional growth upon the part of all?

What we need in education is something definite to tie to. If this something be accurate and exact, so much the better; if it cannot be accurate and exact, let it approach this ideal as closely as possible, but in any case let it be definite. If we have a definite notion of what we are trying to accomplish, and if we realize that this notion is subject at all times to the changes that later discoveries may necessitate, we shall at least have a chance to make some degree of progress and yet escape the danger that is incident to hasty generalization.18

But the finished product of the teacher’s art must be more than a reading-writing-ciphering automaton. It must represent a highly complex mechanism of civilized habits, delicately adjusted to respond effectively to the innumerable stimuli of an increasingly complex social life. It must represent a storehouse of organized race-experience, conserved against the time when knowledge shall be needed in the constructive solution of new and untried problems. It must represent the initiative that is competent to adapt means to ends in the solution of such problems. And, beyond all this, it must represent ideals — those intangible forces that can lift a race in a single century through a greater distance than it has traversed in all preceding ages. Every teacher who comes in contact with the plastic material that we designate as childhood and youth can add a touch to this creative process — can influence definitely, tangibly, unerringly, the type of manhood and womanhood that is to dominate the succeeding generation.18
But what is education for if it is not to preserve midst the chaos and confusion of troublous times the great truths that the race has wrung from its experience? . . . Is it not the specific task of education to represent in each generation the human experiences that have been tried and tested and found to work — to represent these in the face of opposition if need be — to be faithful to the trusteeship of the most priceless legacy that the past has left to the present and to the future?

A clear and primary duty of organized education at the present time is to recognize the fundamental changes that are already taking place, and to search diligently for means of counteracting their dangers. Let us repeat that an educational theory to meet these needs must be strong, virile, and positive, not feeble, effeminate, and vague. The theories that have increasingly dominated American education during the past generation are at basis distinctly of the latter type. The Essentialists have recognized and increasingly recognize the contributions of real value that these theories have made to educational practice. They believe, however, that these positive elements can be preserved in an educational theory which finds its basis in the necessary dependence of the immature upon the mature for guidance, instruction, and discipline. This dependence is inherent in human nature. "What has been ordained among the prehistoric protozoa," said Huxley, "cannot be altered by act of Parliament" — nor, we may add, by the wishful thinking of educational theorists, however sincere their motives. "Authoritarianism" is an ugly word. But when those who detest it carry their laudable rebellion against certain of its implications so far as to reject the authority of plain facts, their arguments, while well adapted perhaps to the generation of heat, become lamentably lacking in light.
What follows are the key characteristics of an Essentialist rationale.

An emphasis on effort. Learning valuable skills and knowledge requires the expenditure of time and effort. Many of the permanent and persistent interests of adult life have resulted from efforts that initially may not have been interesting or appealing to the learner. While the child’s interest should not be ignored, all learning should not be based on the child’s limited range of experience. The Essentialist position argues that there are many things to learn that, while they may not be of immediate interest to the learner, can become both valuable and permanently interesting at a later time in a person’s life.

An emphasis on discipline. To advance the attitude that a person has absolute freedom to do as he or she pleases, without regard to personal and social consequences, is to invite moral and social anarchy. “Doing your own thing” is an insufficient justification in education. Nor is it possible for children to create and live in their own reality as many romantic child-centered educators have suggested since the time of Rousseau. Genuine and lasting freedom is won and preserved by the systematic discipline of learning what needs to be learned for survival in a civilized society.

An emphasis on the accumulated knowledge of the human race. By sustained inquiry, scientific investigation, and literary and artistic achievement, the human race has created a cultural heritage that is one generation’s legacy to the next. So that the cultural heritage can be transmitted efficiently, it has been organized into units of subject matter, that can be taught at age-appropriate levels. As a cultural agency, the school’s primary task is to transmit the cultural heritage to the young so that they may share and participate in it. For the Essentialist, the transmission of the cultural heritage must be done systematically and deliberately rather than incidentally or haphazardly.

An emphasis on teacher-initiated learning. The human infant is long dependent on adult care. Children have the right to expect that adults will provide the guidance and control they need to grow and develop. Society has the right to expect that teachers possess basic skills and knowledge and have the professional competence to transmit that knowledge by systematic instruction.
An emphasis on logical organization of subject matter. In elementary schools, learners need to master the basic skills of reading, writing, and computation. These fundamental skills have generative power in that they are the foundation for learning other skills and for learning organized bodies of knowledge. Instruction in these important skills should be systematic and sequential.

The accumulated experience of the human race is vast and complex. For instructional purposes, it is best organized into subject matter disciplines that are arranged either logically or chronologically. Each subject matter has its own pattern of organization and the curriculum should reflect these patterns.

Although learning by activities, projects, and discovery methods may be appropriate at various times in a child's school experience, it is always necessary that care be given to organizing the curriculum according to a systematic structure and sequence.

An emphasis on long-range goals. While it is true that society has experienced profound social change, it is equally true that the human race has abiding interests and concerns of a perennial nature. The school's educational program should not be based on what appears to be immediately relevant and popular at the moment. Fashions and styles may change, but the essentials of a good education are permanent.

As individuals grow from childhood to maturity, their interests will change. While these changing interests can be significant, it is of paramount importance that the long-range needs of human beings and of society be recognized in the education of a person.
APPENDIX - XVII
A CREED OF DEMOCRACY

We believe in and will endeavor to make a democracy which
1—extends into every realm of human association;
2—respects the personality of every individual, whatever his
   origin or present status;
3—insures to all a sense of security;
4—protects the weak and cares for the needy that they may
   maintain their self-respect;
5—develops in all a sense of belongingness;
6—protects every individual against exploitation by special
   privilege or power;
7—believes in the improvability of all men;
8—has for its social aim the maximum development of each
   individual;
9—assumes that the maximum development possible to each
   individual is for the best interest of all;
10—provides an opportunity for each and every individual to
    make the best of such natural gifts as he has and encourages
    him to do so;
11—furnishes an environment in which every individual can be
    and is stimulated to exert himself to develop his own unique
    personality, limited only by the similar rights of others;
12—assumes that adults are capable of being influenced by reason;
13—appeals to reason rather than force to secure its ends;
14—permits no armed force that is not under public control;
15—implies that a person becomes free and effective by exer-
    cising self-restraint rather than by having restraint imposed
    upon him by external authority;
16—imposes only such regulation as is judged by society to be
    necessary for safeguarding the rights of others;
17—assumes that all persons have equal rights to life, liberty, and
    the pursuit of happiness;
18—guarantees that rights and opportunities accorded to one
    shall be accorded to all;
19—insures standards of living in which every individual can
retain his own self-respect and unabashed make his peculiar
collection to the society in which he lives;
20—does not tolerate an enduring social stratification based on
birth, race, religion, or wealth, inherited or otherwise ac-
quired;
21—recognizes a desire on the part of people to govern themselves
and a willingness to assume responsibility for doing so;
22—holds that government derives its powers solely from the
consent of the governed;
23—tests the validity of government by its effort and success in
promoting the welfare of human beings;
24—lays on individuals an obligation to share actively and with
informed intelligence in formulating general public policies;
25—requires that the responsibilities and activities of citizenship
be generally held to be among the highest duties of man;
26—holds that men deserve no better government than they exert
themselves to obtain;
27—believes that the decisions concerning public policies made by
the pooled judgment of the maximum number of interested
and informed individuals are in the long run the wisest;
28—weights all votes equally;
29—has faith that an individual grows best and most by actively
and intelligently exercising his right to share in making
decisions on public policy;
30—permits, encourages, and facilitates access to information
necessary to the making of wise decisions on public policies;
31—provides free education from the beginnings of formal
schooling as long as it may be profitable to society for each
industrious individual to continue;
32—attempts a general diffusion among the people of the ideals,
knowledge, standards of conduct, and spirit of fair play
which promote a sense of equality;
33—permits the unhampered expression of everyone’s opinions on
public policy;
34—guarantees the right of free expression of opinions on all
matters, subject to reasonable libel laws;
implies that all who are bound by decisions of broad public policy should have an opportunity to share in making them; 
demands that minorities live in accord with the decisions of the majority, but accords the right to agitate peacefully for the change of such decisions; 
exercises tolerance to others without sacrificing the strength of conviction favoring different notions and practices; 
accepts representative government as an economy necessitated by the size of the population; 
delegates responsibility to individuals chosen by the people for their peculiar competence in defined areas of action, but retains the right to withdraw this authority; 
develops a steadily increasing sense of obligation to a constantly enlarging social group; 
induces a willingness to sacrifice personal comforts for the recognized general welfare; 
stimulates a hope of constant betterment and provides means which the ambitious and earnest may use; 
encourages constant reappraisal of things as they are and stimulates a hope that leads to action for their betterment; 
uses peaceful means for promoting and bringing about change; 
holds that the fundamental civil liberties may not be impaired even by majorities; 
permits unrestrained association and assembly for the promotion of public welfare by peaceful means; 
recognizes and protects the right of individuals to associate themselves for the promotion of their own interests in any ways that are not incompatible with the general welfare; 
grants the right to labor at work of one's own choosing, provided it does not interfere with the interests of society; 
guarantees the right to enjoy the fruits of one's honest labor and to use them without molestation after paying a part proportionate to wealth or income to the cost of necessary government and general welfare; 
encourages individual initiative and private enterprise in so far as they are compatible with the public weal;
51—maintains human rights to be more important than property rights;
52—so regulates the natural resources of the country as to preserve them for the widest use for the welfare of all the people;
53—insures freedom of movement;
54—guarantees a legal assumption of innocence until proof of guilt, definite charges before arrest and detention, and open and speedy trial before a jury of peers, with protection of rights by the court and by competent counsel;
55—guarantees freedom from persecution by those in authority;
56—provides that no individual be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law;
57—permits worship according to the dictates of one's conscience;
58—separates state and church;
59—provides such security, freedom, opportunity, and justice for all its members that they will be qualified and ready, if circumstances require, to sacrifice in defense of its way of life;
60—renews its strength by continued education as to its meanings and purposes.
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THE DECREES OF MAY 3RD, 1923

The President of the French Republic

Having regard to the report of the Minister of Public Instruction and of the Fine Arts,

Having regard to the law of February 27, 1880, Article 5, and the law of March 28, 1882,

And after the report from Higher Council of Public Instruction, issues the following Decree:

SECTION I

Art. 1. Secondary instruction comprises a course of study covering seven years. It follows a course of elementary education which was established by Article 1 of the law of March 28, 1882.

Art. 2. All pupils follow the same course of study during the first four years.

Besides the other subjects required of all pupils alike, Latin is required during these first four years (sixth, fifth, fourth and third classes) and Greek during two years (fourth and third classes).

Art. 3. In the second and first classes the pupils have a choice between classical and modern-language instruction.

On the classical side Latin is continued as a required study and Greek as an elective. Pupils who succeed in passing the examinations in advanced Greek will be rewarded with special advantages in their candidature for the baccalauréat and in being received for that degree, the terms of these advantages to be stated in the decree on the baccalauréat system. The hours set apart for Greek in the daily time-table are divided between French and the required modern foreign languages in the case of those who do not continue Greek.

On the modern-language side Latin and Greek are replaced by a more fully developed study of French and by a second modern foreign language.
ART. 4. From the sixth class to the end of the first, the programmes and time-tables in science are the same for all pupils.

ART. 5. The "philosophy class" and the "mathematics class" are open to pupils on passing out of the first class, no matter what their previous elective choice may have been.

ART. 6. The requirements for the *baccalauréat* are the only standard for the secondary schools.

Every candidate, on applying for admission to the first part of the *baccalauréat* examination, must produce a certificate for the early common classical studies and show that he has passed a special examination, consisting merely of a written test in Latin and one in Greek, taken two years before the *baccalauréat* examination.

A ministerial decree will give further details in regard to this examination, which all pupils will be obliged to take under the same conditions of anonymity in the correcting of papers, and will decide also in regard to those exceptional cases in which this interval of two years may be reduced.

**SECTION II**

ART. 7. Public secondary education is open only to pupils who give evidence that they have received sufficient instruction to enable them to pursue the studies of the class they wish to enter.

A ministerial decree will determine for every class the terms of this evidence.

Pupils who have passed the first part of the studies covered by the certificate of primary studies will be acceptable for the sixth class, and those who have passed the second part will be acceptable for the fifth class.

ART. 8. A ministerial decree will determine the time-tables and programmes for the public secondary schools.

ART. 9. The present decree will be applicable, beginning on October 1, 1923, to pupils who shall enter the sixth class, except in what affects the terms of admission referred to in Article 7.

ART. 10. Further decrees will determine the new system of scholarships in the secondary schools and also the ways and means for adapting the new plan of studies to the secondary education of girls.
Art. 11. The decree of May 31, 1902, concerning the plan of secondary education is abrogated, except in so far as it affects pupils who are at the present time pursuing secondary-school studies.

Art. 12. To the Minister of Public Instruction and of the Fine Arts is committed the execution of this decree.

Paris, May 3, 1923

A. Millerand

By the President of the Republic:

The Minister of Public Instruction and of the Fine Arts,

Léon Bérard
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Deare Mr. POLLACK,

To answer to your letter, I confirm to you the date of
Professor Isaac Leon KANDEL nomination of the Legion of
Honor.

He was made "chevalier" the 12 August 1937.
Unfortunately, I cannot to say you why the French government
honored Professor KANDEL.

I have not another details regarding the nomination of
Professor Isaac Leon KANDEL.

Sincerely,

Mademoiselle Claude JACIN
Documentaliste au Musée
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