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Preface

The central purpose of this dissertation is to assay the possibility of implementing Robert Ulich's theory of international education. In this effort, Ulich's theory of international education will be described and analyzed in separate chapters dealing with the curriculum, methodology, teachers, and the American school tradition. Brief analyses of the various segments of Ulich's theory will be offered at the conclusion of each chapter, but extensive review of his ideas will be reserved for the final chapter.

Throughout this dissertation, the writer has been concerned with the immediately practicable features of Ulich's concepts, in order to determine the feasibility of Ulich's ideas as a rationale for the organization of international education. Consequently, extended study of Ulich's philosophy of education has been deliberately avoided. That kind of study, in the writer's opinion, would necessitate a separate research effort of considerable length and would be essentially peripheral to the purpose of this paper.

Though Robert Ulich has produced a prodigious number of books and articles and though he has manifested an interest in international education for some time, only a few of Ulich's writings relate directly to the topic of "education for mankind". Ulich's Crisis and Hope in American Education (1951), Philosophy of Education (1961), Education and the Idea of Mankind (1964), and Education in Western Culture (1965) proved to be particularly helpful as sources of information. Helpful, too, was the writer's personal interview with
Ulich before the Professor Emeritus left Harvard University to retire permanently in Europe.

The single study dealing with the thought of Robert Ulich, contained in Dissertation Abstracts published by University Microfilms of Ann Arbor, Michigan, was written by Myron R. Kirsch and was entitled, "A Philosophic Analysis of Intellectual Freedom in American Public High Schools Based Upon Certain Educational Viewpoints of Robert Ulich and John Dewey". It was judged to have no bearing on this dissertation. No other extended, significant reference to Ulich's works were discovered in the educational literature consulted. Consequently, the analysis of Ulich's ideas contained in this dissertation will be exclusively those of the writer.
CHAPTER ONE

ROBERT Ulich: AN INTRODUCTION

Robert Ulich was born on April 21, 1890 in the village of Riedermuhl bei Lam, Bavaria, Germany. On his father's side of the family, Ulich's forbears frequently were connected with the Protestant pulpit or the teacher's podium. His father and grandfather, both businessmen, were unlike most male Ulichs in that neither had university training. On his mother's side, Ulich was descended from Catholic dissenters, "'Erasmians'", who fled their native Spain and took refuge at the French Huguenot settlement at Nantes to escape the Inquisition.1

Ulich spent his early childhood at Lam, which was entirely surrounded by the Bavarian Forest. Here, in "the silent grandeur of the Bayrische Wald," Ulich believed, he acquired his "philosophic pantheism".2 Previous to his entering school, Ulich's family migrated eastward to Bischofswerda, a town on the Saxon-Bohemian border, where Ulich's father owned a half-interest in a glass factory. There, "At the customary age of six [he was] broken in...to elementary school."3 Some three years later, he entered the Humanistisches Gymnasium at nearby Bautzen. Due to subsequent relocations of his family,

2 Ibid., p. 414.
3 Ibid., p. 415.
Ulich also attended Gymnasien at Leipzig and Dresden. Throughout his secondary education, he concentrated on linguistic studies, i.e., Latin, Greek, French, and Hebrew. Of these, Greek was his favorite subject. This traditional linguistic training, Ulich later recalled, "gave me perspective and provided me with some insight into the depth, the beauty, and the failure of the human situation."  

Originally intending to study theology at the university level, Ulich altered his plans after reading Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* in his eighth year at the Gymnasium. This celebrated classic on religious tolerance had made the young student conclude that there may be infinitely more greatness of mind in a Jew or in a follower of Islam than in a Christian. At approximately the same time, Ulich continued, I read the book on Buddhism by the Englishman Rhys Davids. And when I bought some books on the history of Christianity, I discovered its missionary complex as a consequence of its claim to superiority, its alliance with insidious political powers, its hatred against free minds, and its persecution mania even within its own ranks. Evidently, every organization that claims to be absolute and thus to control the passage of man to the holy invites the devil of totalitarianism.

Disenchanted with the claims of Christian dogma, Ulich turned to the study of philosophy when he entered the University of Freiburg in 1909. Though philosophy remained his "prevailing interest", Ulich "saw so many answers toward knowledge in the fields of higher learning that it took considerable time before he knew which to go."  

Thus, before he completed his doctoral thesis on "the rather obscure German poet, C. F. Scherenberg", he had trod several academic avenues at Neuchatel, Munich, Berlin, and Leipzig, where he finally took his degree in 1915. Taking advantage of the German system which

---

4 Ibid., p. 416. 
5 Ibid., p. 417. 
6 Ibid., p. 418.
allowed free transfer to various schools, Ulich had attended these universities "in order to listen personally to a professor whose books had attracted [my] interest...."  

At the university level, Ulich specialized in the study of philosophy, German language and literature, history, and Latin. Before his graduation, he successfully completed an examination required for certification as a secondary school teacher. But, he recalled, "I never attended a course in 'Padagogik', which is probably the reason that I later became interested in education." 8

Soon after completion of his studies at Leipzig, Ulich was invited to become a fellow at the Institute of Culture and Comparative History (Institut für Kultur und Universalgeschichte). Evidently unsympathetic to Germany's participation in World War I 9, he accepted the appointment and remained with the Institute from 1915 to 1916. This organization was apparently founded to conduct studies in comparative history, religion and anthropology, but its operations were brought to nil by the war. Nevertheless, Ulich accomplished something while connected with the Institute: he prepared a translation of Carmina Burana, Vagabond Songs from the Latin Poetry of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century (Carmina Burana, Vagantenlieder aus der lateinischen Dichtung des zwölften und dreizehnten Jahrhunderts), later published in book form in 1927.

---

7 Ibid. 

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid., p. 419. Ulich's personal aversion to war seemed deeply ingrained, and for good reason: he told the writer that Europe's armed conflicts had brought many personal sorrows to him, including the loss of his son in north Africa during World War Two. Interview with Robert Ulich, Harvard University, November 9, 1970.
In response to an increasingly acute shortage of teachers during the War, Ulich left the Institute in 1916 to teach German literature and Latin at the Thomas School (die Thomas Schule) in Leipzig. Though he felt that he had taught German literature competently, Ulich's attempt to teach ten-year-olds Latin "was an unforgivable sin". He implied that he simply had no patience for the grueling routine of drilling young pupils in the rudiments of Latin grammar. Furthermore, he feared "spending his life at an institution such as the Thomas Schule with teachers who enjoyed the glory of a long tradition without adding anything to it. Also, Ulich continued I had become deeply critical about the value of mere erudition in human culture. Too many of the learned in academia had dipped into a lot of scholarly books, but had not read in the book of life. When compared with my parents, who had not studied, their immaturity was patent." Consequently, after only one year at the Thomas Gymnasium, and with mixed feelings about his performance as a teacher of the very young, Ulich "gladly accepted an opportunity to work at one of the middle-sized metal plants in the industrial center of Berlin." This decision was shortly to lead Ulich back into education as a career. But his concept of education was to undergo a major and fateful metamorphosis.

Though Ulich was not unfamiliar with the lives of German workingmen—he was exposed to them at his father's glass factory—his experience at the Berlin metal works opened his eyes to the trying circumstances of their lives, circumstances made all the worse by the exigencies of the War. He witnessed the workers' disheartening attempts to subsist on meagre wages, to be productive.

11 Ibid., pp. 420-421.
12 Ibid., p. 421.
in the face of shortages of materials, and to continue working despite the lack of holidays and vacations. In addition to their personal hardships, the workers were aware that the war effort was going badly. They naturally were attracted to leftist and revolutionary schemes that grew rife as Germany's fate darkened. But those who were outspokenly critical of the government or the war Ulich noted, were identified by "government spies" and were precipitously "despatched to the most perilous places at the war front." 13

Ulich felt moved by the workers' plight. He increasingly became convinced that

There was some truth in the claim of Karl Marx that the worker has no fatherland \(\text{i.e.},\) has little or no stake in his country's wealth. Indeed, a large part of the \(\text{German}\) population lived under humiliating conditions and could well believe that they were exploited by the unholy trinity of state, church, and money. 14

"But", Ulich insisted, "just as I never became a Kantian or a Hegelian \(\text{though he was attracted to their thought}\), likewise I never became a Marxist." Ulich found Marxists shallow and Marxism too dogmatic:

The typical Socialist meetings disappointed me. The orators used Marxian slogans, especially that of the 'class struggle', without penetrating deeper into the thought of Marx. It never dawned on them that he, as all mortals, was influenced by his time and environment. I was especially disturbed by the fatalistic character of his materialistic determinism, which was in striking contrast to the evangelism of his \text{Communist Manifesto} and his utopian image of the classless society. 15

\[\text{13 Ibid.}\]
\[\text{14 Ibid.}\]
\[\text{15 Ibid., pp. 421-422.}\]
Ulich was disturbed by the life the laborers led and by their doubled hardships stemming from the War. He was equally disturbed, however, by their mis-spent efforts to alleviate their condition by uncritical application of Marxian thought. But what to do? How were the workers to improve their lot without falling victim to the chimeric promises of simplistic revolutionary "remedies" and sterile socialist slogans? They were to do so through a radically new kind of education, replied the former student and one-time teacher.

"In Berlin," Ulich mused, "I began to change my whole conception of education. What society needed--so I now began to understand--was a form of total re-education or reformation of the social body in its entirety." Just what content this "form of total re-education" was to feature or what configuration the reformed social body was to assume apparently was not perfectly clear to Ulich at this point. Yet, he remained convinced that the lot of the laborer, and, indeed, of all mankind, would be improved if only such a system of education, or re-education, could be established.

Though he had not determined the specific details of such education and reformation, Ulich was quite unequivocal about one major aspect: total re-education and social reformation could not be accomplished solely through the agency of the school. For evidently in considering what kind of education was called for by his conclusions, Ulich was led to ask

What forces do really educate us? I would answer, the family and schools, to a degree, but in addition there are also the traditions which form our judgements and prejudices; the communal environments;

16 Ibid., p. 421.
the people with whom, under whom, and above whom we have to work; our loves, hopes, and disappointments and infinitely more. In comparison with the magnitude of these surrounding powers, how narrow our typical concepts of education seemed to me then in Berlin...."17

Ulich's experiences at the Berlin metal works had sensitized him to social ills attendant upon certain economic arrangements and war. More important, however, was the fact that this episode had turned him again toward the profession of education, and that it had persuaded him that the alleviation of social ills was somehow inextricably connected with what man learned. Having arrived at this conclusion, Ulich in 1917 readily accepted an offer from Walter Hoffman, the director of Leipzig public libraries, to assist in establishing a program of adult education sponsored by that city's municipal government. Here was Ulich's opportunity to implement that type of education—at least on the adult level—which he perceived was necessary while in Berlin.

Ulich remained with Hoffman and the Leipzig libraries' adult instruction enterprise for three years. His work in Leipzig apparently attracted the attention of certain Saxon educational officials, for, in 1921, he was invited to assume the directorship of that province's newly formed adult education program, organized under the auspices of the Saxon Ministry of Instruction. This offer, too, Ulich accepted.

As director of this program, Ulich felt that he "succeeded in changing Saxon adult education from a rather conventional and somewhat charitable enterprise into a truly educational movement that attracted not only the middle classes, but also workers whom [he] particularly wishes to reach."18

17 Ibid., pp. 422-423.  
18 Ibid., p. 425.
These years spent in adult educational efforts, Ulich later reminisced, were "one of the happiest parts of my professional work." Though they were rewarding, they must have been personally disturbing as well. For as a member of the Saxon officialdom, Ulich witnessed firsthand the backstage machinations of contending political groups maneuvering for advantage in the governmental maelstrom of Germany during the '20s.

In 1923, the Saxon Educational Ministry's counsellor in charge of higher education retired, and Ulich was asked to succeed him. At the age of thirty-three, Ulich assumed control of "university affairs and professional appointments for all the institutions of higher education in Saxony." Ulich was to hold the position of counsellor for higher learning for some ten years. As such, his greatest concern was a partly successful attempt to improve the academic training of elementary school teachers: he desired to secure university status for the courses they had to undergo. Traditionally, elementary school teachers were prepared in normal schools or teachers seminaries, whose programs lacked the depth and prestige of university work. Ulich's efforts were hampered by various ministry officials who saw no need for change.

During the last half of his service as counsellor, Ulich was afforded a chance to return to the classroom: he was appointed a professor of philosophy at Dresden Institute and taught part-time there until he left Germany in 1933. Ulich's own political education was continued and intensified as Saxon

---

19 Interview with Robert Ulich.

counsellor for higher education. For in this position he observed the first stirrings and the spread of anti-semitism that was to culminate at Dachau and Buchenwald. From the beginning, Ulich set himself against the ethnic insanity that led Saxony to repudiate her own native-born Lessing for speaking well of the Jews in Nathan the Wise.\(^{21}\) As counsellor, on several occasions, Ulich succeeded in persuading "Social Democratic or Democratic ministers to appoint Jewish or leftist scholars rejected by some faculty out of mere prejudice." Needless to say, these actions did not endear Ulich to the National Socialists when they assumed full authority in Germany in 1933.

As 1930 approached, Ulich recalled, he became increasingly interested in the subject of comparative education. By this time, he had apparently made the acquaintance of Isaac Kandel, who was even then the eminent scholar in that field. The two must have developed more than a casual knowledge of each other's work, for through the good offices of Kandel and Abraham Flexner, Ulich was invited to lecture for a few months in the United States during 1930. Ulich accepted the offer.

When he returned to Germany in the fall of the same year, it was with the awareness that the Nazis had won a signal victory in the recent elections. A marked man for his openly liberal political and racial views, Ulich recalled that after his return his "freedom of action became increasingly limited."\(^{23}\) And, "I felt," he continued, "that I could be more useful if I devoted myself full time to my professorship and to writing."\(^{24}\) But no phase of educational

\(^{21}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp.} 429-430.\)
\(^{22}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p.} 426.\)
\(^{23}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p.} 429.\)
\(^{24}\text{Ibid.}\)
work, neither administrative nor academic, was to avoid the impending political showdown, as Ulich was to learn: more and more, after 1930, the nationalistic nonsense of the Nazis began to creep into and to achieve official sanction in the schools of Saxony. Soon Nazi agitators commenced their successful disruptions of university classes and affairs. When at last in 1933 Hitler and his national Socialists achieved full power, and

When the Nazi flag was hoisted on government buildings, I went to the Nazi educational minister, who had just arrived. Without waiting for what I wanted to say, he told me that he had already signed the dismissal of racially and politically undesirable professors. "Well," I said, "I just wanted to make sure that I am among them." 25

During subsequent days, most of Ulich's political protégés were clapped into prison. Ulich felt that he himself would have met the same fate, had it not been for the influence of his wife, Elsa Brandstrom, daughter of the Swedish general and ambassador to Russia, Edward Brandstrom. Even so, Ulich's house was placed under official surveillance and his students were shadowed by Nazi police.

It was in this unnerving context in the fall of 1933 that Ulich received an invitation from the dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Education, Henry W. Holmes, to lecture at the university for a year. Ulich seized this chance to flee Germany. He and his wife arrived in the United States in January, 1934. This was a fateful decision, for Ulich would not again resume permanent residence on the continent until the fall of 1970. In addition, he was to spend the rest of his professional life—as a teacher—at Harvard's Graduate School of Education, from which he would retire in 1960 as James B. Conant.

25 Ibid., p. 432.
Professor of Education, Emeritus.

Hired initially as an assistant professor on the basis of a university grant, Ulich was soon made a permanent member of the School of Education's staff and was promoted eventually to a full professorship. His first few years at the university were rather difficult, he later recalled. He was not very fluent in English, and to complicate things, Ulich frequently found his strong humanistic background in basic conflict with the entrenched and highly popular views of the ubiquitous "Deweyites", who seemed to dominate the thought of the School of Education.

There were numerous instances in which Ulich would find himself embroiled with the advocates of progressivism. But the doctrine of the Deweyites at which Ulich would take particular umbrage involved their apparent inference that the immediate, material world and its concerns were paramount in life and education, and, indeed, were all that there really was to existence. Though he agreed that the faith in the empirical process was a valuable and necessary addition to the Western educational tradition, Ulich refused to "make a new dogma out of empiricism, 'instrumentalism', or whatever the 'isms' were." 26 Specifically, Ulich argued, man's empirical capacity, as every other human capacity, and, indeed, man and his entire world, were sustained by a power and a transcendent reality greater than man, his capacities, and physical existence combined. Thus, though he could accede to Dewey's assertion that traditional ideas ought to be empirically scrutinized from time to time, Ulich insisted

---

26 Ibid., p. 433.
that the most important question remained:

How can man be empirical, how can he invent and use instruments,... and how can he experiment within a systematic sequence of ideas and with some hope of success? My own answer was only be trans­
cending his subjective self towards a greater self; only because he lives, physically as well as mentally, within a self-directing whole which he can intuit only...as..."God". Man does not invent his own logic, just as he does not invent himself.27

In their exaggerated and excessive advocacy of empirical ends and means in education, Ulich contended, Dewey and the Pragmatists ignored the central fact of existence, i.e., all of reality is undergirded by a transcendental entity. In doing so, Ulich continued, they tended to exalt the study of the scientific method almost"to the exclusion of older subjects that provided man with some insight into the transcendental world, e.g., religion and the humanities. Despite its intellectual closemindedness and its academic lop-
sidedness, always anathema to the catholic mind of Ulich, the thought of Dewey was overwhelmingly popular among American educators.

Rather quickly, Ulich recalled, "I discovered that the one-sided admira-
tion of John Dewey was partly due to the lack of historical knowledge on the part of educators. It seemed to many of them that his Democracy and Education (1916) was the only treatise on education worthy of reading."28 To counter this fatal omission, which had led to a widespread cultural and spiritual myopia among American teachers, Ulich began to compose a series of books specifically designed to illustrate the inerradicable connection among education, culture, and transcendent values. Thus, his History of Educational

27Ibid. 28Ibid., p. 435.
Thought was penned to demonstrate that great educational theorists were also "great thinkers and often courageous social reformers."29 Most of them, Ulich believed, harbored "a profoundly mystical trend,"30 for they conceived of education, not simply as an uncritical transfer of ideas. Rather, they defined education as "...a continual process of the re-examination, transmission, and re-formation of human values, and, most of all, a process of inspiration."31 Ulich edited his *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom* for the same purpose, and to apprise Western readers of the educational and philosophic sagacity of the Orient. Most recently, he published *A History of Religious Education* (1970) to remind teachers of the predominantly religious origins of Western educational practices and traditions.

In his opposition to the Pragmatists' heavy emphasis on the practical and the immediate, and in his championing of certain older educational traditions and practices, Ulich stood consistently among the lonely critics of Dewey and his followers, long before their ranks were swelled after the Second World War. And long before the topic of international education appeared in books and professional periodicals during the 1960s, Ulich had begun to formulate ideas about the deliberate use of formal instruction to serve the interests of all of humanity rather than merely those of one or another national or ethnic segment of mankind. Thus, as early as 1935, Ulich spoke of using education "in the

29 Ibid.  
30 Ibid.  
31 Ibid.
affectionate endeavor to help, to strengthen, to foster the human race."  
Some five years later, he argued that education had a responsibility to mankind as a whole, as well as to the individual nations it served.  
Recall, too, that previously as a young man in Berlin during the Great War, Ulich had divined that the resolution of human problems was somehow intimately involved with education.

When asked, in an interview with this writer, at what point he became consciously interested in international education, Ulich replied that he did not know. He did recall, however, that at quite an early age he was increasingly aware of the fundamental unity of and similarity among human beings and their ways of life and the fact that no single culture possessed a monopoly on human wisdom. As an adolescent, he remembered being struck by the profundity and eminent reasonableness of the thought of men from other cultures who had lived and written in times long past. His introduction to Nathan the Wise was an example of this occurrence.

Ulich's initial exposure to religion worked to reinforce this mature open-mindedness unusual for his age. As a young student at Bautzen, he reminisced, "It greatly impressed me that the nave of the local Cathedral...built in

---


the sixteenth century, was divided by a magnificent fence, with the Catholics... preaching and praying on the one side and Protestants on the other."\(^3\) The fence, he thought, did not obscure the essential unity of belief among Catholics and Protestants. To him, it was merely a material manifestation of all those petty distinctions that had pointlessly set Christian against Christian since Luther. What counted was not the distinctions, but the sometimes ludicrously ignored unity of Christendom.

The intrinsic oneness of Christian culture seemed apparent to Ulich again at his confirmation. Baptised a Catholic but raised a Protestant, Ulich was amused by the ecclesiastical commotion he caused when it came time for his confirmation. For no less than a high Protestant churchman and a Catholic bishop had to decide in which church Ulich finally was to be established. After some debate, Ulich recalled, the two genially concluded that what mattered most was the Christian faith of the individual, not the particular church in which he expressed this faith. And though he was confirmed a Protestant, Ulich never forgot this very personal lesson in Christian brotherhood and harmony, nor was the bishop's truly catholic view lost upon him.

As a very young man, then, Ulich had acquired an intellectual, cultural, and religious openmindedness, which, after all, may not have been odd for an academically inclined descendent of Protestant and Catholic dissenters. By the time he left Berlin, he had also acquired a faith in the power of education to

resolve society's ills. In the years following his immigration to America, Ulich would weave these acquisitions into a broad theory of instruction designed to generate the kind of intellectual, cultural, and spiritual openness which his background and experiences had bestowed upon him.

It is now time to examine this broad theory of instruction, that is, Robert Ulich's concept of international education.
CHAPTER TWO

EDUCATION AND THE IDEA OF MANKIND

What, according to Robert Ulich, is international education, or to use his own phrase, "education for mankind"? Any attempt to locate a simple response to this essential question among Ulich's myriad writings is to invite unrelieved frustration. For though he has written copiously on the subject, Ulich nowhere has provided his reader with an exact, explicit, and extended definition of international education or education for mankind. Detailed definitions, it seemed, were a rarity for Ulich. Even his sympathetic biographer, Messerli, owned that to those insisting on an exacting verbal precision "...Ulich's writings...seemed murky and vague. With some justification, his critics chided him for the ambiguity and evanescent quality of his terms..."\(^1\)

Ulich's avoidance of straightforward statements about the nature of the various topics that crowd the pages of his books was deliberate, however, for he maintained that while "Man has to use words in order to formulate and communicate ideas, ...words never symbolize fully the total concreteness of their objects; they give only a shadow of the richness of reality."\(^2\)

\(^1\)Messerli, NSSE 71st Yearbook, Part II (Proper citation will be completed later.)

Moreover,

Some cultural activities are so widely and deeply diffused into the wholeness of human life that they defy all attempts at ambiguous definitions. Who can say exactly what "politics" is, where "business" begins and ends, or where "religion" plays its role? In like manner, who can mark where the boundaries of "education" lie?  

Definitions, then, cannot be trusted, nor can certain broad areas of human activity be easily circumscribed and catagorized. Apparently, the topic of international education, as well as that of education in general, was an example of such activity. Nevertheless, some description of the topic of this research is in order, and, fortunately, Ulich did provide the writer with one.

According to Ulich, education for mankind, or international education, is an instructional effort intended to develop "an appreciation of different national and cultural activities in terms of politics, religion, and other expressions of human productivity." It is education consciously conducted to evoke a sense of human unity, or "unia", among peoples. It is that directed toward creating "a readiness to accept differences among all men, and a readiness to encourage and be happy in these differences, while at the same time developing a capacity to see the amazing similarity among men."

---

3 Ibid., p. xi.
4 Interview with Robert Ulich, Harvard University, November 9, 1970.
5 Ibid.
This definition appeared to be consonant with certain aspects of Ulich's overall educational philosophy, particularly in reference to his views on the role of education vis-a-vis man and civilization. The word "appeared" must be emphasized here, for again Ulich's pronouncements about man, civilization, and education were frequently attended by the same kind of indeterminateness that seemed to be the hallmark of his thinking. Thus, according to Ulich, man was a mystery whom even scientific psychology would fail to explain. 6 "The human being," Ulich argued, "is not describable in any total and definite manner...", for, "...that which is nearest to him--his self--is...the most evasive and inscrutable" facet of his being. 7 The "creative center of his ego," Ulich maintained, "stays within a realm of cosmic forces which are beyond our ordinary categories of thought, our discursive logic, and the grasp of our conceptual language." 8

Nevertheless, certain assertions can be made about the nature of man. Among the most significant of these is that man's life is no mere "biological datum", for it is sustained by "cosmic or metaphysical forces [which, once more,] we are unable to explain...scientifically." 9 Man, in other words, is a transcendental as well as a physical phenomenon.

7 Ulich, Philosophy of Education, p. 70. 8 Ibid., p. 69.
9 Ibid., pp. 4 and 7.
Furthermore, Ulich maintained, man "develops according to certain laws of human growth...which he cannot change arbitrarily...."\(^\text{10}\) One of the principle laws which directs human development is the dictum that man cannot become fully human without acquiring a capacity for "transcendence". Transcendence, or "self-transcendence"--Ulich seemed to use the terms interchangably--is man's ability to reach "beyond his given physical and mental situations toward wider areas of life and mind";\(^\text{11}\) it is the extension of the personality beyond itself";\(^\text{12}\) it is, quite simply, man's faculty to vicariously participate in the lives, thoughts, and emotions of others through the power of his imagination and the medium of his empathy. Without this facility, man must remain less than human, for man:

can develop into his own form only if, together with cultivation of his own personality, he constantly transcends his empirical isolation and tries to understand the whole of the components upon which he and his civilization ultimately depend.\(^\text{13}\)

And whenever man transcends himself, i.e., whenever he "tries to understand the whole of the components upon which he and his civilization ultimately depend," he inevitably comes to the realization that he is inextricably part of a vast but totally interrelated reality, for "behind every person is...his society,


\(^\text{13}\) Ulich, Philosophy of Education, p. 220.
his nation, and its history, mankind, and finally the universe."\(^{14}\)

Thus, man becomes man only when he deliberately attempts to breach his isolation by linking his consciousness to that of other men and by attempting to grasp the overarching truths of existence, the greatest of which has to do with the total interrelatedness and unity of reality. Furthermore, the sense of unity with other men and with all of existence constitutes the essence of humanness. Indeed, he who would isolate himself is mad: "The hermit, the solitary, the misanthrope are...possessed. They \(\underline{\text{represent}}\) a neurotic situation...."\(^{15}\)

Now, as each human being is inseperably part of all others, so too are whole cultures and civilizations part of one another: "The greatest in the past of every great nation continues to live in every other nation that participates in the cultural enterprise of the race."\(^{16}\) Despite all its divisions, "...despite all national wars and suspicions, humanity is a whole..."\(^{17}\) And as each human being must strive to be self-transcendent, so too must every civilization: "...the transcendental character...is an indispensable prerequisite of civilization", for "...cultural greatness and attractiveness have never come from ingrowth. The more we learn about the glory of ancient Greece, the more we become aware of the mixture of influences that it received from older cultures...."\(^{18}\) Every major accomplishment of

\(^{14}\)Ulich, Education and the Idea of Mankind, p. 23.

\(^{15}\)Ulich, Philosophy of Education, p. 150.


\(^{17}\)Ibid.
Western culture, Ulich argued, was the product of the stimulation from "foreign ideas."¹⁹ In brief, as with man who does not become fully human without breaching his isolation from other men and reality, whole cultures and civilizations will remain stunted and sterile, unless they open themselves to the life, thought, and influences of other peoples. Indeed, Ulich concluded, the very "...survival of a civilization depends on its capacity to combine courageous interest in new movements...in thought...with a respect for...tradition."²⁰

Without the capacity for self-transcendence, then, neither individual men nor entire civilizations can mature, or, in the latter case, survive. And without education, neither man nor civilization can acquire self-transcendence, for the very essence of education is the cultivation of this quality. Education, explained Ulich, is the:

widening of man's intellectual horizon, in order to lead him deeper into his own self, and this not merely for the purpose of developing his individuality—which, when leading to isolation may even lead to catastrophe—but for the purpose of helping him to discover the unity of his own striving with the strivings, hopes, and ideals, and also the loneliness, the sins, sufferings and the aggressive tendencies of all mankind.²¹

So integral was the development of transcendence to the process of education that Ulich warned, "The schools must protest against all forces...which hinder man's self-transcendence or his power to reach into ever widening spheres of

¹⁹ Ulich, Philosophy of Education, p. 98.

²⁰ Ulich, Crisis and Hope in American Education, p. 159.

²¹ Ulich, Education and the Idea of Mankind, p. xvi.
thought and action."\(^{22}\)

Education, then, our contemporary assertions to the contrary, is not simply "information-gathering" nor merely transfer of knowledge, for such "will inform, but not form a person."\(^{23}\) In fact, the directionless accumulation of data can work to destroy what little sense of inner unity and self-direction students yet possess.\(^{24}\) Nor is education the preparation of overly specialized professionals or the process of Philistine political indoctrination of the young.\(^{25}\)

No, the essence of education has nothing to do with aimless ingestion of facts; rather, it has everything to do with transcendence, or the linking of the individual with the larger realities of humanity and all of existence. Its purpose is not to produce narrow professionals or thoughtless political automatons, but "to make man humane—that is, to tune his mind and soul in such a way that he becomes eager to draw into his development all that makes his and his fellowman's life rich and creative, and so capable of truth, love, and justice...."\(^{26}\)

Thus, in Ulich's thought, education in general and international education in particular have much in common. Both are designed to develop in man a sense

\(^{22}\)Ulich, *Philosophy of Education*, p. 158.


\(^{24}\)Ulich, *Education in Western Culture*, Chapter Eight.

\(^{25}\)Ulich, *Philosophy of Education*, p. 27.

\(^{26}\)Ibid., p. 89.
of genuine openness toward others, and both are intended to evoke in man a
sense of unity with humanity. What, then, distinguishes the two? Apparently
this: whereas education in general should terminate with a sense of self-
enrichment, the product of a new awareness of one's relation to other men and
all of reality, and in action of an undefined nature, international education
should end in something more specific: it should create an "ever-widening
sense of humane responsibility and... an active moral commitment to the
common tasks of mankind." In addition, then, to cultural openness, and a
sense of human unity, international education must develop in students a desire
to actively participate in the resolution of problems which confront all men.

Now, exactly how is this to be done? That is, how are the goals of
cultural openness, a sense of human unity, and a "commitment to the tasks of
mankind" to be achieved? In short, how, according to Ulich, is international
education to be conducted?

When asked this question, Ulich replied that his suggestions for the
improvement of American secondary education, contained in his Crisis and Hope
in American Education, should serve as the organizational, curricular, and

27 In contrasting the theoretical with the active life, Ulich observed that
"...all wise men have emphasized as requisite for inner maturity not only a
vision of the transcendent, a persevering mind, and the seeing of relation­ships. They have also laid stress on the continual interchange between learn­ing and action... or the vita contemplativa and the vita activa." Ulich,

28 Ulich, Philosophy of Education, pp. 142-143.
methodological basis for the conduct of his concept of international education. Careful reading of Crisis and Hope convinced this writer that Ulich's third chapter, entitled "The School of the Future", was the particular section of the book to which he alluded. In this chapter, Ulich attempted to deal with one of the fundamental problems of American education, i.e., that arising from our need for schools which combine "the ideal of equality with the ideal of quality." For unless the American school were egalitarian, that is, genuinely equal and open to all, it would serve only to intensify social divisions among the populace and so undermine democracy. And unless it strove for academic excellence at the same time, the quality of our national culture would decline.

But how can the American school be at once excellent and open to all? How can it maintain standards required for cultural progress without exacerbating social cleavages based upon intellectual and vocational differences among students? How can it, in short, achieve what Ulich termed "unity in diversity"?

American education can have both excellence and equality, Ulich argued, if it would alter its primary emphasis from that of developing intellectual and vocational abilities to that of developing a strong, viable, and democratic sense of community among students. While it ought not to abandon altogether its traditional academic objectives, American education should strive first to build a strong feeling of unity, a genuine desire to co-operate, and a sense

---

29 Interview with Robert Ulich.
30 Ulich, Crisis and Hope in American Education, p. 47.
of mutual responsibility among its pupils. In this manner, both the cohesive and intellectual-vocational needs of our society will be met, and American education will preserve and strengthen our culture and our democracy.

Now, how exactly is this democratic sense of community, or, in Ulich's words, "communality", to be developed by the school? This desired sense of community is to be evoked through what Ulich called "emotional education." For when Ulich asked, "Which are the spheres where human beings, despite all their individual inequalities, can share the experience of communality...?", he straightaway answered that they are those which involve "our physical activities, natural appetites, and emotions." It is in these three areas of "human experience, Ulich maintained, that the degree of sharing, and consequently also of community in education, reaches far beyond adolescence and the boundaries of individual cultures...." And of these three functions which all human beings share and which produce the sense of community among men, it is apparently the emotions which are the most significant. For it has been through essentially affective or emotional appeals that literary geniuses, religious prophets, as well as dictators and demagogues, have moved and moulded masses of men.

Academic education alone, then, can never serve as the framework upon which the fabric of a democratic society is to be woven. Rather, such is accomplished only through schooling which is essentially emotional. For:

---

31 Ibid., p. 49.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid., pp. 49-50.
if difference in social status and difference in intellectual quality come together and there is no overarching dynamic above all these divisive factors, then a school may be a breeding place for the high-handedness and snobbery of some and the resentment of the rest. And then we have not democratic education but induction into class-mindedness.\textsuperscript{34}

In short, "without any connecting emotional link...the school community splits,"\textsuperscript{35} and so too will the society the school is intended to serve.

"Of course," Ulich conceded, "a school should try to unite young people by means of intellectual learning as much as possible. But you soon discover that beyond a relatively low level of academic achievement the differences in intelligence and aptitude will block your desire for unification."\textsuperscript{36}

Consequently,

\textit{though recognizing that there is a common field of experience...in certain basic intellectual pursuits, we must attempt to solve the dilemma between unity and diversity by using as the common core of education the activities primarily fitted to cultivate the emotions or the affective life.}\textsuperscript{37}

Now, what are these "activities fitted to cultivate the emotions or the affective life" which will bring unity into the diversity within American education and society?

The essence of Ulich's plan for emotional education combined what can be called experiential learning with elements of traditional academic and vocational training. Instruction was to take place in several buildings as well as in fields and shops. The physical center of the learning complex, and,

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., p. 25.\textsuperscript{35}Ibid.\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 223.\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p. 68.
indeed, the hub of Ulich's entire scheme, was to be the largest campus structure, called the "Community House."

In the Community House, "...all members of the school community assemble for their common activities." And:

Since the uniting element of our new education lies in the emotional sphere, this building would be the sanctuary for the cultivation of all those experiences and attitudes which enable both teachers and pupils to realize not only their oneness with their fellow men and all humanity, but also the relationship between man and the cosmos.

"With this in mind," Ulich continued, "there will be built into the Community House a chapel...[for]...rest and contemplation...where a young person can go in order to be alone." Here, "...he [can]...feel the profound comfort that can unite man with humanity and the universe." Though the chapel was not to be the exclusive domain of one sect or another, Ulich left no doubt that it was to be used, for those who feared "that the minds of the young may be contaminated by contact with a community [which] believes in the universality of religious experience [should]...have...separate schools."

Finally, "There will be great poetry recited in the chapel and great music will be heard with the participation of the school choir and the school orchestra."

---

38 Ibid., p. 70.
40 Ibid.
42 Ibid., p. 71.
44 Ibid.

39 Ibid.
41 Ibid., pp. 70-71.
43 Ibid.

"Besides the chapel," Ulich went on, "the Community House harbors the art gallery, the music hall, and the general library." The art collections will contain "not only reproductions of the best paintings and etchings, but also originals loaned from the museums of town and state." The music hall will feature performances "not fitted for the chapel." It will also house recordings of the great masterworks.

"In winter the music hall may also serve as the domicile for the teacher of eurythmics and his pupils." And "The teacher of eurythmics will cooperate with the teacher in drama," in order to blend both arts as they were in ancient Greece, thereby extending the sense of community among the students as they engage in these modes of human expression.

"Near the Community House will be the gymnasium and the surrounding athletic fields, for they have an important part to play in the basic emotional education of the young." Physical education, Ulich explained, should not center on simply exercising the muscles; nor should the fields serve only "...as the occasional meeting ground for teachers and students--all shouting...the old school tie." "Rightly understood, physical discipline is
a part of education toward harmony and self-respect": it should develop "poise and balance" and a respect for the body, the consequence of correctly conceiving it as a worthy instrument of the mind. 53

With sport understood in this way, there is no break between the "spiritual" and the "physical" in education. Then the whole group of activities, from the Community House with its chapel to the gymnasium and its play fields, would provide the area of basic emotional education in which all unite irrespective of their scholastic differences. There all should find safe foundation and constant help for the development of character and personality. 54

Though the "whole group of activities" from the Community House to the Gymnasium obviously constituted the heart of Ulich's scheme for emotional education, academic concerns were not at all to be ignored. Intellectual and vocational instruction, too, were important: first, as a means to develop human talent, and, then, as a means to develop a sense of human unity. But whereas no distinctions were to be made among the participants in the activities at the Community House or on the playing fields--for the purpose of these activities was to bring all the students together--clear differentiations were to mark the students' academic education.

Such separation, or "tracking", was necessary and natural, Ulich maintained, for though men are very similar but not quite equal in terms of their emotional attributes, 55 they are "incurably different in the sphere of the intellect." 56

53 Ibid., pp. 73-75.  
54 Ibid., p. 75.  
55 Ibid., pp. 49-50.  
56 Ibid., p. 59.
Thus, when one surveys a typical population, he can discern five more or less distinct "groups" of people. The first two of these groups, Ulich implied, are rather small in number, but they are readily distinguished by their interest in "intellectual activities." For them abstractions are neither impractical nor difficult to grasp: rather, theories constitute for them "a higher reality, as they were for Plato." Among the first two groups, those of the first "...prefer to deal with the humanities and social problems, whereas those of the second are fascinated by mathematics and the natural sciences."

Of the third group of talents, let us call them the "executive group", it is difficult to give an exact definition, as they represent a more complex psychological picture than the primarily theoretical groups, and the scale of their activities covers a wider area in the occupational life of a nation, from the political and organizational leaders down to the business clerk. Some of this group may intellectually be equal to the young humanists and scientists. But instead of being attracted by theoretical problems, they are anxious to apply knowledge to practical tasks. They like to organize, to master situations and human relations, or to acquire wealth and influence...

There is next "...a fourth group of people, whose talent lies in their skill as artisans. Though not primarily intellectual, they are not at all without highly valuable talent", for among them are skilled specialists, craftsmen, and artists. Moreover, many of this group "are capable of understanding even difficult problems, so long as these come out of a concrete situation."
Fifth and finally, there are those who have not been blessed with any highly differentiated talent. They are "average", or even a little below average. They are fully as useful and as good citizens as members of the other groups; as a matter of fact, they keep the wheels of civilization going. 62

Now, on the basis of these "natural" and essentially inerradicable intellectual distinctions among individuals, academic and vocational instruction was to take on different forms and was to be conducted in separate buildings. Thus, "Around the Community House we have the halls... for the various groups of pupils divided according to their specific interests." 63

First of all, "There is the hall for the budding humanists," for whom "We do not prescribe a stiff pattern of curriculum as their program may vary according to the locality...." 64 But though the humanist curriculum might vary from place, its core was to be composed of literary and historic studies. Its object, in addition to preparing "the future interpreters of the great humanist tradition", was apparently to induce the student to "identify" with great authors, to enter fully into the meaning, essence, and "spirit" of their works. 65 For "Only when we try to reason and act as the great men would exhort us to do if they could now talk with us, can they become our companions" 66 and presumably influence our lives.

In order to enter fully into the spirit of the writings, i.e., "in order to come closer to the mind of an author and his people", the students "will... go through the labor of learning some of the original languages" and will study original sources of knowledge. 67 They "...will learn that interpretation of

---

64 *Ibid.*, pp. 75-75.
great documents is not just translating, but an imaginative art" which involves "not only reconstruction of words, but also re-formation of ideas, or transposition of things past into living attitudes and deeds."68

With this approach as the guiding principle in the organization of the humanities, i.e., emphasis upon grasping meanings through study of original sources in their original languages,

...all the other subjects will group themselves around the humanities easily and organically. History for instance will not be a lifeless enumeration of data, but an intercourse with the great thinkers and doers of earlier ages; it will be delivered from the original documents and not be narrated in the customary textbook fashion.69

Finally, the young humanists will be taught mathematics and the sciences, "not so much with the intention of making mathematicians and scientists, but with the purpose of rounding out knowledge..." so as to provide them with another, i.e., quantitative, method for understanding reality.70

"With the same regard for a well-rounded aspect of the world, the students who concentrate on mathematics and science will not receive merely 'professional' i.e., scientifically theoretical training."71 They will not be driven "...to...the study of mathematics and the sciences so far that no time remains for a broad human development."72 Every attempt will be made to breach "...the attitude of scientific isolationism as it emerged during the nineteenth century and to reincorporate the exact and applied disciplines into a broader cultural and philosophical framework."73 Thus, the scientists,

68 Ibid.
70 Ibid.
72 Ibid., p. 78.
69 Ibid., p. 77.
71 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
too, will be introduced to that "fundamental wisdom about man's relation to himself, his fellow men, and God...expressed in the millennium before and during the end of antiquity..."  

They, too, in other words, will study the humanities as well as science and mathematics.

The education of the "executives", in a way, will be broader and more complex than that of the two groups of theorists. For, in addition to mastering "the means and techniques of organization, business and management, they will also examine the human goals which they have to serve", i.e., they will join the scientists in the study of the humanities and social sciences. Moreover, so as to acquire "a sense of good manual workmanship they will be sent frequently over to the fourth division of our ideal school where they will meet the young artisans." The "doers," then, more than any other group, must combine theory with practice, knowledge with skill, and a sense of community with an ability to get things done.

The instructional unit of the fourth group, the "artisans", will be one of the largest buildings on campus, as it will contain workshops as well as classrooms. "These workshops, however, will not only be filled with the noise of tools and machines; they will in their own manner provide a wide humanistically minded education." Technical skills and ideas will be taught with reference to their larger implications: "Therefore the teachers in the artists' and artisans' department must seize every opportunity to point out the general problem inherent in a particular, practical task."

74 Ibid., p. 77. 
75 Ibid., p. 80. 
76 Ibid., p. 81. 
77 Ibid. 
78 Ibid., pp. 82-83.
Avoiding the "thin atmosphere of abstractions", instructors in the artisans' hall will nevertheless take every occasion to link concrete technical problems with the perennial problems of all men. In this way, just as the executives' and scientists' views would be expanded through humanistic studies, the Weltanschauung of the artisans would be widened allowing them to "transcend their subjective situations and increase their sense of community with mankind.

Hence we will use manual work not only as a value in its own right, but also as a center from which to move freely, yet systematically, into the sciences of both man and nature, especially in so far as they help the student to understand the interrelationship between his work and the culture of mankind.79

The education of the fifth and last group posed special problems, Ulich observed, for boys and girls of this segment of the population are even less moved by "verbal forms" of learning than are the artisans. Moreover, their intellectual, emotional, and spiritual lives are most threatened by the deadening realities of our industrial-technical economy: they are most exposed to the drab environment of congested industrial areas; and they are most frequently subject to the spectre of joblessness.80

Thus, Ulich was moved to comment, "There is something insoluble in the problem of educating the unskilled worker, because there is something insoluble in his human situation," i.e., the almost inescapable fact that so much of his life will be spent in monotonous work and dull surroundings which tend to numb the mind and senses. Nevertheless, the education of "the workers" deserves as much attention as that given to the other groups described above.

---

79 Ibid., p. 83.  
80 Ibid., pp. 83-84.
Consequently, "Just as much as the other boys and girls they will participate in the emotional education going on in the Community House." But in accordance with their talents and calling, their academic instruction will center upon:

the fundamentals of citizenship and husbandry. They will not suffer from the feeling that the knowledge extended to them is theoretical knowledge thinned and delivered in homopathic doses; theirs will be strong and useful food, though simple.

They will have workshops for their semi-skilled work, where they shall aid the artisans in the construction of useful products. They will assist in the upkeep of the school buildings. They will work the school farm, taking care of its livestock and ploughing its fields. They may periodically leave the campus to join in community and national conservation projects. And "The girls who are interested in household arts will act as the housemothers of the community." Finally,

The whole division will be responsible for the roads, lawns, and flowers of the campus, and they will be the commanders of the squad when the young highbrows of the humanist and scientific groups come to work with them.

For there will be one rule in our school of the future: that every physically capable pupil will have to spend some hours of every week in useful practical work, partly in the workshops, partly on the farm and in the gardens. In the great effort to unite the individual members of the school into one community, and also to unite the various capacities in each individual into one harmonious whole, the Community House and the gymnasium on the one hand, and the workshops, the farm and the gardens on the other, will be equally important. They will be like pillars holding the two ends of a bridge.

81 Ibid., p. 84. 82 Ibid. 83 Ibid., pp. 84-85. 84 Ibid., p. 85. 85 Ibid.
This completed Ulich's prescriptions for the education of the five great groups of students, from theorists to workers. Ulich had a few more remarks, however, for the conduct and location of "the School of the Future". Since "No institution, no movement, no idea, and no sentiment in the world can live long on itself... the new school will have to have contact with the outer world in order to keep alive."86 The School of the Future "will therefore... attempt... to become the center of cultural activities for the entire community."87 All "exhibits, concerts, and addresses given in the school will be open to the parents and the other inhabitants of the town...."88 Every effort will be made to maximize contact among teachers, parents, and townsmen.89

At the same time— if possible in combination with the junior or the community college—the school will be the center for adult education, of a type which is more than vocational and more than a nice and harmless pastime. It will rather be education that helps the adult to clarify his own personal, social, and political problems in stimulating contact with other adults.90

Finally, the School of the Future should be built "at the outskirts of the city or town, for it will cover a large area" and will incorporate elementary as well as secondary instructional levels.91 And by locating the school in its own "special and independent area to which children of the most varied parts of the city would flock, education would no longer have to fight the dividing

---

86 Ibid., p. 86.  
87 Ibid.  
88 Ibid.  
89 Ibid., pp. 86-87.  
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91 Ibid., pp. 87-88.
effects of social grouping...." the inevitable product of racial and economic segregation within the city. Large cities, Ulich concluded, would have to develop several such school sites, while sparsely settled areas would have to consolidate their resources and construct one central facility.

Such, then, is Ulich's scheme for emotional education. Such also was his scheme for the implementation of his theory of international education. For, as indicated previously, Ulich specified that his suggestions contained in Crisis and Hope for the improvement of American education were to serve as the organizational, curricular, and methodological framework for the conduct of international education as well. At this point, the reader is in possession of the main elements of Ulich's theory of international education. It remains but to note a few more central considerations germane to this theory and then to integrate all the elements into a concise and articulated statement of the whole.

International education, according to Ulich, is education designed to develop an appreciation of and acceptance of different world cultures; it is that intended to evoke a sense of the unity of humanity and a commitment to its common tasks. By this definition, international education inevitably involves both academic and affective learning. It incorporates academic learning for "appreciation" of a culture cannot occur without some knowledge of the culture. It incorporates affective learning for acceptance of, unity with, and commitment to others cannot occur without some sort of emotional preparation.

Because it includes both academic and affective learning, and because it must use the school not only as a means to transfer knowledge but as a means to

\[92\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 87.}\]  \[93\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 88.}\]
create and extend human ties within society, international education is similar
to education in a democracy. And, like education in a democracy, Ulich main-
tained, international education can achieve its ends through "emotional
education", i.e., the use of education to bring into being a deep sense of
"community". This sense of communality, i.e., a genuine openness toward, union
with, and responsibility for others, was to be generated by a combination of
common experiential and academic-vocational learning based on the activities
associated with the "Community House" and the various instructional halls
described earlier. Once this sense of communality breathed among the members
of the school community, it was to be extended, in ever-widening circles, to
the immediately local or town community and finally to the entire family of
man. And, presumably, once this openness toward, unity with, and
responsibility for others had been extended to all of mankind the goals of
international education would have been achieved.

In brief, then, Robert Ulich's theory of international education becomes
the following: international education is the attempt to use formal schooling
to develop and appreciation and acceptance of foreign cultures, a sense of
unity with humanity, and a commitment to its tasks by evoking an internationally
extendable sense of openness toward, oneness with, and responsibility for
others through a certain scheme of experiential and academic-vocational
instruction.

Now, it may be argued that Ulich's theory is more complex than this. For
he asserted that, like education in general, international education must first
generate a feeling of self-transcendence before it can evoke a "sense of
humanity" or the sense of international communality desired:
the sense of humanity can enter into a person's conscience only if he feels in his mind and heart a tendency to reach outward and upward and if he adds to the sense of the immediate the mental dimension of width as well as breadth.95

But, whether or not the phenomenon of self-transcendence actually precedes the development of the sense of communality, the fundamental problem of Ulich's theory of international education remains the same. That problem is composed of the following questions: Do those organizational, curricular, and methodological prescriptions outlined in Ulich's scheme for emotional education ultimately lead to and evoke a genuine sense of cultural openness, unity with others, and responsibility for them capable of being extended to all men? Do they, in fact, produce appreciation and acceptance of foreign cultures and peoples? Do they bring into being sincere feelings of brotherhood and an active concern for the welfare of all mankind?

Whether or not the feeling of transcendence occurs prior to the appearance of communality seems to be essentially a philosophical problem, in the opinion of this writer, and as such incidental to the central pedagogical issue which is, again, does Ulich's scheme for international (or emotional) education actually end in the cultural appreciation and openness, human unity, and commitment desired? The answers to this question will constitute the themes of the remaining chapters of this study.

---

CHAPTER THREE

CURRICULUM FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Robert Ulich's theory of international education has been described as the attempt to use formal instruction to develop an openness toward and an appreciation of foreign cultures while evoking a feeling of unity with humanity and a commitment to its welfare. Such was to be achieved by a system of instruction that called into being a deep sense of communality and a genuine sense of self-transcendence, which, in turn, would lead to the openness, appreciation, unity, and commitment desired. Before proceeding any further, it would be useful to note some distinctions between the concepts of communality and self-transcendence, since, apparently, Ulich perceived some important differences in these two key terms.

According to Ulich, the sense of communality arises out of the sharing of certain basic human functions, i.e., those involving physical activities, natural appetites, and emotions.¹ Though these functions cannot be totally divorced from the operation of the intellect, they must be considered

¹ Supra, Chapter Two, p. 6.
essentially physiological in nature. The sense of self-transcendence, on the other hand, appeared to be a largely intellectual or cognitive phenomenon, for it involves "...an amazing process of selecting and ordering the continual influx of impressions." It is, at base, a reaching out into "wider areas of life and mind". "For the person who thinks," said Ulich, "relates himself to the other objects in the world; he extends, as it were, his mental antennae outside of himself into a universe which is not his own though he is a part of it."

But while the sense of communality may be said to be physiologically derived and the sense of self-transcendence intellectually or cognitively derived, both concepts have to do with the uniting of man to man: the former on a physical or material plane and the latter on a mental plane. Both involve the extension of the human individual beyond himself, in the one instance as a physical entity and in the other as an intellectual entity.

---

2 The arousal of appetites and emotions among humans would seem to presuppose some kind of low level mental activity or perception. But the action of the intellect here would appear to be minimal, when compared to the activity of abstract thinking.


5 Ulich, *The Human Career*, p. 101. Perhaps self-transcendence cannot be called a totally cognitive phenomenon, for the profoundest kind of unity with creation would seem to require a sort of intuitive, inexpressible awareness that is more felt than intellectually understood. We are, as Ulich has so often observed, a unity that cannot be easily dissected into mutually exclusive segments labeled "purely physical" or "purely mental".
Thus, the concepts of communality and self-transcendence are at once related to and distinct from each other. So too are the remainder of Ulich's objectives for international education. The ultimate ends of his scheme, i.e., cultural openness and appreciation of foreign cultures, a feeling of human unity, and commitment to mankind, are different individually; yet they are similar in that their realization must be preceded by the creation of communality and transcendence.

Ulich's theory of education for mankind, then, has different kinds of and different levels of objectives. There are first the remote or ultimate ends of openness, appreciation, unity, and commitment. And there are the immediate objectives of communality and transcendence. There are also affective objectives, in that Ulich's plan calls for the creation of communality and openness, unity, and commitment, all of which at base seem to be emotional in nature. And there are finally content or subject matter objectives, in that his scheme requires appreciation of foreign cultures and self-transcendence, both of which appear to involve knowledge of people and situations beyond the individual consciousness.

Now, how does Ulich, in terms of the curriculum, propose to reach all these various objectives? His answer to this question will constitute the basic theme of this chapter.

Asked which were the studies peculiarly fitted for the conduct of education for mankind, Ulich replied that there were none. There was no rigid hierarchy of subjects, he maintained, uniquely appropriate for a curriculum of international education.\(^6\) What mattered, Ulich explained, was not the subjects

\(^6\)Interview with Robert Ulich, Harvard University, November 9, 1970.
themselves, but rather the "spirit" in which subjects were taught: no study of itself, automatically, would lead to the realization of the goals of international education, nor, presumably, to either communality or transcendence. However, he added, any discipline, properly taught, was capable of illustrating "transcendent thought" and, conceivably, was capable of evoking a "sense of humanity" as well.

Now though there were no absolutes as to what may or may not be included in the curriculum for international education, there were, Ulich admitted, certain studies (and learning activities) which appeared to be "more explicit than others" in expressing the spirit of humanity. Which were these? From his exclusive references to Crisis and Hope, it may be safely inferred that those learning activities and studies most explicit in expressing the spirit of humanity, and therefore most apropos for the curriculum of international education, were those discussed by Ulich in reference to emotional education.

The curriculum for emotional education, the reader will recall, combined certain kinds of experiential and academic-vocational learning. On the experiential level, it called for bringing the entire school community together in the Community House, in order to share in religious experiences, poetry readings, and musical performances. Ulich indicated also that art exhibitions and dramatic presentations were to involve as many people as possible. Physical education and sports, too, were intended to draw students and teachers together. Finally, everyone was to spend some time joining in "useful, practical work" in the school workshops or on the campus grounds, farm, and gardens.

7 Ibid. 8 Ibid. 9 Ibid.
The main object of all this experiential learning, again, was to unite all the members of the school population, "irrespective of their scholastic differences", into a harmoniously integrated community. It was designed to develop among the students a genuine openness toward each other, a feeling of unity with each other, and a willingness to work for each other's welfare. It was intended, in short, to create communality. Thus, the first of Ulich's immediate objectives in his scheme for international education, i.e., the sense of communality, was to be achieved through the experiential learning activities associated with the Community House, athletics, and the all-school work projects.

But what of the second immediate objective, self-transcendence? As noted above, in contradistinction to communality, self-transcendence is fundamentally an intellectual or cognitive phenomenon. As such, it requires knowledge for its realization. This knowledge, evidently, was to be provided by the academic-vocational learning phase of Ulich's scheme for emotional education.

A re-examination of the academic-vocational provisions of his plan revealed Ulich's pronounced bias in favor of the humanities. The education of the first group of theoreticians, it will be remembered, was to center upon humanistic studies. That of the scientists and the executives, too, was to feature the humanities as well as quantitative and managerial studies. Even the instruction of the artisans was to occur in a "humanistically minded" manner. Indeed, Ulich's apparent prepossession regarding the humanities extended to the experiential phase of his instructional program: much of the common activities to be conducted within the Community House involve humanistic subjects, i.e., music, art, and drama.
Why, it may be asked, should Ulich rely so heavily on the humanities in order to cultivate self-transcendence? And why did he evidently consider them more explicit than other disciplines in expressing the spirit of humanity? The answers to these questions were contained in Ulich's conception of the nature and potential of the humanities. Study of the humanities, explained Ulich, can help to lead

man out of his isolation into the agora, where peoples meet and exchange ideas. \[ They can induce him to wander through foreign lands and project himself into their works of art and thought, into the motives and decisions of their statesmen, into the graces of their peace, and the heroism and shame of their wars. \[ Finally, they can assist him to live more sympathetically with...others....\]

More than any other studies, then, literature and languages, history and philosophy, the fine arts and the social sciences, can, according to Ulich, lead the student beyond the narrow confines of his own consciousness into wider areas of life and mind. With their peculiar ability to project the individual's awareness into the lives, thoughts, and deeds of other men, the humanities, more

\[Ulich, \text{Education and the Idea of Mankind}, p. 273.\]

\[Ulich has explicitly defined the humanities as including history, philosophy, and the fine arts (Ibid., p. 253). That literature and languages fall into the category of the humanities was implicit in Ulich's heavy emphasis upon these studies in the education of the "young humanists" as outlined above. That the social sciences also were to be so categorized seemed evident in Ulich's lament that the humanities and the social sciences, since the Nineteenth Century, have become increasingly separated from each other (Ibid., pp. 262-264). In so much esteem did Ulich apparently hold the social sciences that he asserted they had the potential to "accomplish more than the older, one-sided classical schools...." Robert Ulich, \textit{Fundamentals of Democratic Education} (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1970), p. 209.\]
than any other curricular element, can create the sense of self-transcendence and a deeper understanding of the spirit of humanity and the soul of man.

But if the humanities were to be the academic means to self-transcendence and a sense of humanity, what would lead to the same ends in the realm of vocational education? Emphasis upon handicrafts and manual arts, Ulich seemed to reply. For by "moving closer to nature" through work with one's hands, we move closer to the "universal creativeness" undergirding all of existence. And, presumably, as one moves closer to the creative center of reality, he moves out of his own crowded consciousness into wider areas of being. Vocational education, in other words, was not intended to consist of merely teaching students to operate tools and run machines. Rather, it was to be conducted in a manner which encouraged creativity and artistry in respect to working with material things. Thus, what the humanities were to accomplish for those pursuing academic studies, i.e., transcendence, handicrafts and manual arts were to accomplish for those engaged in vocational education.

Such, then, was Ulich's curriculum for international education. It featured certain experiential learning activities, apparently designed to evoke a sense of communality and thereby to realize the ultimate affective goals of international education as defined by Ulich, which were again an openness toward other, a feeling of unity with them, and commitment to their welfare. It featured, as well, a humanistically oriented academic curriculum and a

12 Interview with Robert Ulich.

13 This conclusion seemed justified on the basis of Ulich's desire to use manual training "as a center from which to move... into... the study of man and nature...." Robert Ulich, Crisis and Hope in American Education (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), p. 83.
creatively oriented vocational curriculum evidently intended to provide the knowledge required for an appreciation of foreign cultures and the self-transcendence necessary for any genuine intercultural openness, unity, and commitment.

Now, what may be said of Robert Ulich's curriculum for international education? First of all, it must be observed that Ulich's curricular proposals are nothing new; they are as old as classical Greek education. The deliberate mixing of students in common instructional activities in order to evoke certain feelings, attitudes, and values, e.g., a sense of belongingness and loyalty, was a common feature of Spartan education. The use of essentially humanistic studies to accomplish the same ends was typical of Athenian education, which relied upon Homeric poetry and song to instill desired affective qualities among the young.\(^1^4\) For that matter, Ulich's entire concept of using schooling for the promotion of international understanding is also nothing novel. Erasmus and Comenius long before Ulich had advocated as much.\(^1^5\)

There were, in other words, historical precedents for both Ulich's curricular prescriptions and his overall theory of international education as well. There also were precedents for his ideas in the realm of educational philosophy. Ulich's curriculum, with its heavy humanistic orientation,
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appeared to be very similar to certain Idealistic conceptions about what should be taught and why. According to Kneller, the Idealist believes that the school curriculum "should widen the child's understanding of the universe and of man himself. Hence, it should pay greater attention to such subjects as history, philosophy, the fine arts, and religion, which tend to be neglected in the contemporary school." 16 Ulich, too, favored these subjects as a means to understanding reality outside of the individual consciousness, i.e., as a means to self-transcendence.

There were other parallels between Ulich's educational thought and that of the Idealists. J. Donald Butler's observation that "What the school wants as its products are people who are at home in the world as a whole" 17 seemed to be merely another way of saying that what education should produce is an openness toward and appreciation of foreign cultures and peoples. These qualities, it will be recalled, were two major objectives of Ulich's plan for international education. Finally, Ulich's persistent concern for human unity seemed faintly reminiscent of the Idealists' near obsession with philosophic integration, oneness, and coherence in their metaphysics and epistemology. 18

Robert Ulich's theory of and curriculum for international education, in short, seemed to reflect a great deal of the Idealists' philosophy of education.


18 Ibid., pp. 48-52 and 67-73.
And, like much of the thinking of the Idealists, in the opinion of this writer, Ulich's curricular prescriptions featured an annoying inexactness and lack of clarity, particularly in the realm of educational objectives. For despite his explanations, Ulich frequently left this writer perplexed over the exact meaning of his key terms. Precisely what, for instance, is "transcendence"? What does it mean to "reach out into wider areas of life and mind"? What, specifically, is meant by "appreciation of foreign cultures"? Or "communality"? Or "commitment"?

Furthermore, even if these objectives were satisfactorily defined—which they were not—how does one verify that they have been realized? That is, how, exactly does one measure the achievement of transcendence, appreciation, communality, or commitment? At base, most of Ulich's objectives for international education are attitudinal: openness toward others, unity with them, and commitment to their welfare are essentially attitudes or feelings to be instilled by Ulich's instructional scheme. And attitude development is one of the most notoriously difficult of all educational objectives to either achieve or measure. 19

The questions raised above are very serious and basic questions, for unless curricular objectives are clearly defined and measurable, no educational

---

enterprise would ever be able to ascertain whether or not it had achieved its purposes. To this writer, Ulich has not answered those questions in an entirely acceptable manner. His curriculum for international education, therefore, suffered initially from two critical shortcomings: it lacks complete clarity in terms of its objectives; and its objectives, even if clarified, may be impossible to quantify.

There remain, however, even more serious flaws than these, for they lie at the very heart of Ulich's curricular theory. The objectives of Ulich's scheme for international education were to be achieved by a combination of experiential and academic-vocational learning. To develop an appreciation of foreign cultures, openness, and so on, students were to share in common activities and were to be exposed to an essentially humanistic academic-vocational array of studies.

Now, although there seems to be some promise of opening students emotionally to each other, of breaking down prejudices among each other, and, in general, of developing a more constructive and cohesive attitude in regard to each other through what is called "intergroup education," the mixing of

---


21 There are a number of studies which seem to establish that intergroup education, i.e., education of racially or socially mixed classes designed to break down prejudice, actually is effective. See, for instance, Lloyd and Elaine Cook, Intergroup Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954) or Hilda Taba, Elizabeth Hall Brady, and John T. Robinson, Intergroup Education in Public Schools (Washington: American Council on Education, 1952).
racially, socially and culturally different students may actually increase rather than lessen divisions among them. According to Allport, "It has sometimes been held that merely by assembling people without regard for race, color, religious or national origin, we can thereby...develop friendly attitudes. The case is not so simple." The fact is, Allport maintained, "Such evidence as we have clearly indicates that such contact does not dispel prejudice; it seems more likely to increase it."

As Ulich has previously admitted, then, mere mixing of students will not automatically produce openness, unity, and commitment among them. "True acquaintance", however, as opposed to "casual contact" does seem to lessen prejudice. But, it may be asked, how far is the school required to go in developing "true acquaintences" among students? Is this not more properly the function of the community or the church?

If mere mixing of students cannot of itself end in openness, unity, and commitment, can academic instruction achieve these ends? It would appear that it cannot:

Even though we have little basis for saying so, we continue to assume that the liberal arts make people more liberal, and that the humanities make people more humane. Most of the available evidence (which is not conclusive) indicates that at the college level very little change in the values of students can be noted. Studies at the elementary and secondary levels also are not optimistic.

---

23 Ibid., p. 251.
24 Ibid., p. 252.
Thus, neither those experiential nor academic learning activities specified by Ulich can guarantee the realization of those attitudinal outcomes which can be summarized as the sense of communality. In light of this fact, the problem of whether or not his plan for academic and vocational education produces the phenomenon of self-transcendence becomes an inconsequential one. For while Ulich's curriculum for international education may actually produce a reaching out mentally to others, it very well may be incapable of producing a commensurate emotional extension on the part of the individual. And without the latter, there can be no possibility of fully achieving the ends of education for mankind.

However, even if his curricular prescriptions did evoke a sense of communality within the school community, the following question would remain: can that sense of openness, unity, and commitment in fact be extended to those beyond the campus grounds? Or will it, like the love professed for all men by so many "religious" people, wither in the face of human realities?

For all its alleged concern for the emotional education of students, Ulich's ideal curriculum proved to be fundamentally an academic one: its emphasis on the humanities has already been noted at length. As such, Ulich's curriculum for international education remains one which would be more apropos for and attractive to a relatively few in our highly technical and practical-minded culture. Ulich's heavy reliance upon languages, literature, history, and so on, in his instructional scheme reflected more of his own educational background and experience than a thorough awareness of what might prove viable as a program of studies in industrial, commercial America.

Furthermore, Ulich has prescribed a curriculum for the secondary and higher
levels of instruction, rather than one applicable at every rung of the educational ladder: the study of fine arts, philosophy, and foreign languages seem inappropriate in the primary grades. Thus, his curricular prescriptions for international education are incomplete.

They are incomplete in another sense, too. It will be remembered that Ulich indicated that the Community House was to serve as the site for the sharing of "common activities" among the entire school community. Which were these activities? Ulich listed but a few: they involved the chapel and musical, artistic, and dramatic presentations. He might have also indicated that the Community House could serve as the common dining hall, where all might share their meals, and that each week the cuisine featured would be that of a different culture. He might have also indicated that the religious, musical, artistic, dramatic, and sport and play activities, in which all were to take part, did not necessarily have to be drawn from the Western or Occidental traditions, i.e., those activities might be inspired by an Eastern or Oriental culture. In this fashion, students would be exposed to the life-ways of other lands in a natural, i.e., physiological and recreational manner.

A few final observations remain. They have to do with the education, of the two last groups of students described in Ulich's scheme for emotional education, the artisans and the workers. Both of these groups were to receive instruction commensurate with their interests and talents. Such dictated, apparently, that their instruction would mainly involve learning manual skills and handicrafts; these talents also were to be the means by which members of the two groups were to achieve self-transcendence.

It must be asked, in all seriousness, how the making of a table or chair,
or the acquisition of the ability to make them, will bring the student into contact with wider areas of life and mind. It must be asked, also, whether or not Ulich expected too much of the young, intellectual "highbrows", for he wanted them to place themselves willingly under the direction of "squad leaders" drawn from among the workers and then to police the campus grounds. The experience of the Russian and Chinese Communists, who have tried to send young university students back to the farm or into the factory for a year of manual labor, should have given Ulich second thoughts about this idea. Nevertheless, it appears to be a sound concept: many modern students probably do not get enough contact with the physical realities of the fundamental modes of production.

Most, if not all, of the preceding comments about Ulich's curriculum for international education have been of a negatively critical nature. Is there not any strongly positive assessment that can be made of Ulich's ideas? The answer is yes. For despite the lack of empirical proof that Ulich's curricular proposals can accomplish his stated ends, he has nevertheless chosen the most logical means to realize his objectives. If indeed appreciation of foreign cultures, openness to foreign peoples, feelings of unity with them, and commitment to their welfare can be achieved through some kind of formal education, then, logically, such is most likely to occur through an instructional program like that outlined above. That is to say, the ends of international education, i.e., appreciation, openness, etc., are more likely to be achieved by bringing all kinds of students together and by exposing them to each other and to the humanities than they are by teaching students mathematics in total isolation from each other.
Furthermore, for all its faults, Ulich's curriculum for international education possessed a most significant quality frequently absent from other, but less ambitious, instructional proposals. His plan featured a full range of studies and learning activities, from the humanities to the sciences, from commercial subjects to vocational training, and from physical education to religious development, without loss of inner unity and cohesion. In theory, at least, Ulich succeeded in outlining a most comprehensive yet thoroughly integrated curriculum, which, at every phase and level, did not lose sight of its overall aims, i.e., greater human unity and intercultural understanding. This was no mean achievement. And it attested to the sweep of Ulich's vision, to his practical and profound grasp of the function and possibilities of various studies, and to the consistency of his concern for harmony in life, thought, and education.

But despite these strengths, Ulich's curriculum for international education suffered from several debilitating flaws: the ambiguity and immeasurability of its objectives; and its humanistic bias and its incompleteness all worked to sap the promise of Ulich's plan. Consequently, the potential success of Ulich's theory of education for mankind, if it hangs upon the strength and promise of his curricular concepts, is not at all bright.

However, Ulich argued initially that it was not so much the curriculum but the "spirit" in which teaching occurred that mattered in the international educational enterprise. In other words, in the realm of education for mankind,

---

26 See Taba, *Curriculum Development*, pp. 298-301, for an explanation of the importance of integration and unity in curriculum planning.
teaching methods were superior in importance to any program of studies. In light of the serious shortcomings of Ulich's curriculum, this assertion took on additional importance.

It is time now to examine Ulich's teaching methodology for international education.
CHAPTER FOUR

A METHODOLOGY FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

The previous chapter concluded with the observation that Ulich considered teaching methods a more important consideration than curricular provisions in education for mankind.¹ But when he was asked to describe the ideal methodology for international education, Ulich informed this writer that no particular manner of instruction was superior to any other. Any method of teaching, he explained, was appropriate for international education so long as it was at once suitable for the subject matter and the age, experience and capacity of the learner; conducive to bringing the student closer to the creative center of the universe, i.e., capable of encouraging in him a sense of self-transcendence; and effective in illustrating to him how the knowledge or skill acquired could be utilized or applied in resolving the tasks of mankind.² Thus, as in the case of the curriculum, in which Ulich argued that no single subject could be considered as exclusively appropriate for international education, no single teaching method, he insisted, was peculiarly suited for

¹This was no novel position for Ulich, since he asserted as much before: "...it should be clear that it will be the spirit in which an experience is had or a subject is taught which decides about its value for mankind." Robert Ulich, Philosophy of Education (New York: American Book Company, 1961), p. 144.

²Interview with Robert Ulich, Harvard University, November 9, 1970.
education for mankind.

It should be recalled, however, that in spite of his assertion that no one study could be considered uniquely valuable to international education, Ulich nevertheless placed heavy emphasis upon the humanities in the curriculum. Likewise, though he said that one teaching method was as potentially effective as another, it seemed clear from a number of remarks contained in three of his key books, i.e., Crisis and Hope, In American Education, Philosophy of Education, and Education and the Idea of Mankind, that Ulich considered certain modes of instruction significantly more effective than others in the international educational enterprise. Now, which were these? What, in other words, was Ulich's preferred methodology for international education?

A review of Ulich's scheme for emotional education, described previously, yielded several statements and implied principles concerning methods of teaching. These, it may safely be assumed, constituted an initial listing of Ulich's ideal teaching methods in education for mankind. That most frequently mentioned or implied involved the concept of unity, both within the school community and within the program of studies. Ulich, it will be remembered, consistently called for bringing students and teachers together in common activities and for uniting them with the community at large. He also called for the integration of the various curricular units; e.g., he suggested that the teachers of drama and eurythmics combine their activities and that the programs of both the scientists and the executives include the humanities as well as quantitative and managerial studies. Thus, two key principles in Ulich's methodology for international education were: (1) in whatever subject area or at whatever instructional level, maximize student participation in the learning activity; and (2) on every occasion, attempt to fuse and co-ordinate instruction among the disciplines.
A second salient feature of Ulich's plan for emotional education involved the humanities. Ulich's preoccupation with these studies was manifested throughout his scheme. When he did not specify that the humanities were to be featured in the curriculum, as in the program for the artisans, he urged that teaching be conducted in a "humanistic" manner. Thus, a third, but largely un-stated, principle of Ulich's teaching technique for international education was that at every opportunity, the human or humane functions of knowledge were to be emphasized.

Beyond these general and largely implied methodological maxims, Ulich provided only a few guides for the conduct of teaching, and most of these had to do with the humanities. He suggested, the reader will recall, that the humanities student be led to "identify" with great authors by entering into the "spirit" of their masterpieces. He stressed the teaching of meanings and ideas, not mere words, in the study of original documents. Concerning the instruction of the young scientists, executives, and workers, Ulich said little or nothing about method. He did specify, however, that abstractions were to be avoided in teaching the artisans; and every chance should be utilized to illustrate general principles in a particular task.

In his Philosophy of Education and Education and the Idea of Mankind, Ulich reiterated some of his instructional principles and introduced several new principles. Unfortunately, like so much of his writing, most of the new and heretofore unmentioned principles were rather obscure.

As in Crisis and Hope, Ulich, in both texts, again noted the importance of
teaching meanings and intent over mere subject matter.\(^3\) In *Mankind*, as in this writer's interview with him, Ulich once more stressed tailoring teaching to the maturity of the student:

The school must not intentionally split the minds of the young from those of the old. It must not talk about topics beyond the comprehension of the pupils. It must adjust the goals and the methods of teaching to the mental capacity of the learner.\(^4\)

In *Philosophy*, he counseled that teaching machines need not be shunned in the international educational effort, since they could be used to free the teacher for more personal contact with the student. "But," Ulich warned,

if certain "practical-minded" school administrators and school boards use the teaching machines for pushing the teacher aside to save salaries, enormous harm will be done. For only the personal relationship between the learner and the educator can provide that interchange of ideas, that warmth of confidence, and that understanding of error and praise of achievement—in other words, that atmosphere of humaneness—in which free men can develop.\(^5\)

Here, regretably, Ulich's lucidity concerning teaching methods for international education largely ended. What remained were only vague intimations and veiled allusions about instructional techniques. He intimated that the use of examples had their place in education for mankind, for he observed that "More so than with so many spiritually worn-out adults, the compassion of
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youth can be aroused by a few great examples that reach into the heart of humanity." Drawing of comparisons, too, were apparently important, for Ulich implied that they can result in a "healthy relativism, which should prevent us from idolizing ourselves and our nation...." The Harvard historian and admirer of Hegel also seemed to advocate a dialectical rather than an empirical approach to classroom teaching, for he contended that "Only a dialectical form of thinking that sees the ambivalence and polarity in even the most virtuous preachments can help us to act wisely." Thus, Ulich would apparently begin classroom instruction by contrasting maxims and principles rather than by conducting research and observation. Finally, he appeared to call once more for self-transcendence in international education: "Everyone who works on himself opens the door to humanity, and whoever cares for humanity enters deeper into the self...."

Such, it would seem, was Ulich's complete teaching methodology for international education. Before commenting on its merits, it would be helpful to summarize his remarks on instructional techniques noted so far. In order of their citation, Ulich's methodological principles for international education were:

7 Ibid., p. 23.
9 Ibid., p. 33.
1) maximize student-teacher participation in learning activities;
2) fuse and co-ordinate instruction among the disciplines;
3) emphasize the human and humane uses of knowledge;
4) encourage students to identify with authors studied;
5) stress meanings and ideas rather than mere facts and empty content;
6) illustrate general principles from particular problems;
7) tailor instruction to the maturity of learners;
8) utilize teaching aids, but not to the detriment of personal student-teacher contact;
9) use great examples in teaching;
10) make comparisons;
11) employ dialectic over empirical thought; and
12) lead the student to "work on himself".

Now, what may be said of Robert Ulich's methodology for international education? First of all, it must be observed that Ulich's methodology is incomplete, if the term is defined as a detailed description of teacher behavior in the classroom. What Ulich provided under the name of methodology was not an explicit exposition of instruction for international education; rather, he has merely listed a random series of very general guidelines for teaching.

For example, Ulich did not inform his reader exactly how to maximize student participation in learning activities. Nor did he specify how to encourage students to identify with authors studied nor how to employ dialectic thinking. He simply urged the teacher to maximize such participation, encourage such identification, and employ such thinking. It must be concluded, therefore, that Ulich's "methods" for international education were at base mere directives rather than clear directions for the conduct of education for mankind. They were not so much explanations of teaching procedures as they were earnest but essentially cloudy exportations. Though much of Ulich's writings seemed to fall into the category of earnest exhortation, hortatory maxims are out of place here; for a thoroughly adequate methodology for teaching must be quite explicit and specific regarding teacher behavior and student activities in the classroom.
Like his curriculum for international education, discussed in Chapter Three, Ulich's instructional principles were not without their historical and philosophical precedents. His advice about employing examples and dialectic thought was reminiscent of Plato's admonitions contained in The Republic. The great Greek sage, also, had urged that students be exposed only to edifying examples of human existence in literature and poetry, and he also felt that the dialectic was the highest form of thought.¹⁰

As in the case of his curriculum, Ulich's list of teaching "techniques" reflected a good deal of Idealistic thinking. His keen interest in illustrating the unity of knowledge paralleled that of the typical Idealist, of whom, said Kneller, "...knowledge is not fragmented but unified, since reality, which knowledge reflects, is itself a whole."¹¹ Ulich's endorsement of the use of examples, comparisons, and the dialectic in teaching also corresponded to Idealistic views regarding teaching procedures.¹² Finally, Ulich's assertion that no single manner of instruction eclipsed all others in the realm of education for mankind appeared to harmonize with Butler's belief that "...idealists are likely to insist that they are creators and determiners of method, not devotees of some one method."¹³


¹³Ibid., p. 117. Emphasis added.
Perhaps because of his apparent Idealistic bent, Ulich's remarks about teaching methods displayed on occasion the same annoying inexactness that was so much in evidence in his curricular scheme. Though his lapses of clarity were not quite so frequent as before, Ulich again succeeded in perplexing this writer over terminology. What, for instance, the writer wondered did it mean "to identify with an author"? What exactly did one do when he "worked on himself"? Ulich did not explain.

Like his curriculum for international education, Ulich's "methodology" appeared incomplete and one-sided. Most of his dozen instructional directives seemed suited for an academic and secondary rather than a vocational and primary type of education. His emphasis upon ideas, general principles, comparisons, and dialectic reasoning appeared most appropriate for a highly academic--and specifically linguistic--instructional program designed for mature minds. His acknowledgement of the need to tailor instruction to the level of the pupil and of the need to avoid abstractions with some students notwithstanding, Ulich's teaching procedures seemed apropos only for that kind of curriculum he championed in the previous chapter, i.e., one which heavily favored academic and humanistic studies. Once again, then, Ulich's prescriptions for international education reflected more of his own personal academic background and humanistic predilections than a consistent awareness of the full range of academic needs and realities in technical-and-practical-minded America.

To ignore such sizable segments of American education as the elementary and vocational elements constituted a major flaw in Ulich's methodological proposals. But the greatest weakness of Ulich's teaching techniques for inter-
national education involved the basic presumption that they were capable of realizing the ends of education for mankind.

Although nowhere did he say as much, it seemed apparent that Ulich's instructional principles were intended to reach specific objectives of international education. It may be safely assumed that Ulich's urgings to maximize student-teacher involvement in learning activities and to use comparisons resulting in a "healthy relativism" were designed to achieve a certain level of cultural openness. It may be assumed that his emphasis upon illustrating the unity of knowledge and general principles inherent in particular problems was directed toward convincing the student of the unity of all reality. It may be assumed that Ulich's concern for citing the human and humane use of knowledge was aimed at evoking a sense of responsibility for and commitment to others. Finally, it may be assumed that his endorsement of identification with great men and of "working on oneself" was intended to realize transcendence.

Assuming that these were, indeed, the intentions behind Ulich's "methodology" for international education, it must be asked, as it was in the previous chapter, Can these instructional provisions actually achieve the ends of education for mankind? That is, can student-teacher contact and drawing of comparisons increase cultural openness? Can emphasis on the unity of knowledge and general principles or truths lead to feelings of unity with reality? Can illustrations of the humane uses of knowledge produce commitment to others? And can identification with great men and great causes, as well as "working on oneself" evoke transcendence?

In reference to the first question, it has already been observed that
increased exposure to others can actually lessen cultural openness.  And exposure to facts, with which one could make comparisons, can lead to the closing of minds as well as to the opening of them. In reference to the second question, it may be argued here that what is at issue is the classic problem of knowledge transfer, i.e., can the perception of the unity of knowledge lead to the perception that all reality is one? An educational psychologist with but the slightest leaning toward behaviorism would respond in the negative. In reference to the third query, it has been noted already that humane learning does not necessarily make one more humane. Logically, it may be maintained that emphasis upon the humane uses of knowledge may also fail to make one more humane or committed to the welfare of others. Finally, "identification" with great men or authors--whatever that means--and "working on oneself" whatever that means--may in fact produce transcendence--whatever that means. But so long as Ulich's "methodology" cannot guarantee the development of communality, i.e., cultural openness, a sense of oneness, and commitment, the most fundamental affective objectives of international education may

14 Supra, Chapter Three, p. 7.


16 See, for instance, J. Charles Jones, who concluded that though some transfer of learning is certainly possible, "Clearly, our ability to control the complicated forces affecting transfer is sharply limited. In most cases, transfer is largely a matter of guesswork and chance." J. Charles Jones, Learning (Chicago: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967), p. 144.

17 Supra, Chapter Three, pp. 7-8.
remain beyond the grasp of Ulich's scheme of education for mankind. And the problem of whether or not Ulich's instructional prescriptions can evoke transcendence, as in the case of his curricular prescriptions, becomes academic and peripheral. For, as noted previously, transcendence without communality is, as far as the ends of education for mankind are concerned, a sterile achievement.

Like his curriculum for international education, Ulich's methodological maxims were seriously flawed. They evinced the same vagueness, incompleteness, and humanistic bias which his curricular suggestions revealed. As in the case of his program of studies, Ulich's teaching techniques well may be incapable of reaching the ends of education for mankind. His instructional theories were neither novel nor up to date: certain suggestions were as old as classical Greek education; and Ulich ignored such long-established instructional approaches to attitude change as role-playing. Indeed, Ulich's "methodology" was no methodology at all; his prescriptions for teaching in education for mankind were merely a motley collection of general guidelines.

So far, the assessment of Ulich's methodology for international education has been highly negative. There are, however, a few positive observations that can be made in its defense. The first is that Ulich's instructional principles seemed quite consistent with the overall thrust of his ideal curriculum for international education described in the preceding chapter. It was concluded in that chapter that Ulich's program of studies manifested a distinct humanistic bias. And, as noted earlier in this chapter, Ulich's instructional suggestions seemed most fitted for a highly verbal or linguistic kind of education. Furthermore, Ulich's teaching methods, like his curriculum, appeared more appropos for secondary rather than primary school children.
Secondly, as with his curriculum, Ulich has identified the most logically promising instructional procedures, their lack of empirical verification notwithstanding. That is to say, despite Ulich's failure to provide positive proof that they can achieve the ends of international education, his methods for teaching—in the opinion of this writer—appeared to be the most logical choices among all the possible approaches to classroom instruction. Thus, openness to other people and other cultures, it seemed, would more likely follow schooling which maximized personal contacts and the making of cultural comparisons than that which taught students in total isolation from each other and which kept them in ignorance of life styles other than their own. Perception of the unity of reality and of mankind, it appeared, would more likely flow from instruction which consistently illustrated unity and cohesion than that which displayed only chaos and confusion. Commitment and responsibility for others, it seemed, would more likely be the result of education which emphasized the human uses of knowledge than that which offered facts and concepts totally divorced from their implications for the life of man. Finally, the phenomenon of transcendence, would more likely be the product of teaching which induced the student to reach beyond his consciousness into that of other men and of humanity than that which augmented and abetted the psychic isolation of the individual.

Ulich's methodology, then, like his curriculum for international education, featured a few modest strengths. But they were not sufficient to offset the goodly number of their serious flaws. Again, the most significant of these was Ulich's failure to empirically demonstrate the ability of his methods to achieve his stated ends of international education. In fairness to Ulich it must be
remembered, however, that the Professor Emiritus adamantly maintained that there was no unique methodology for international education nor constellation of teaching techniques peculiarly fitted to its purposes. Thus, despite all his allusions to and rare straightforward statements about an international educational methodology and despite the extended analysis of the same provided in this chapter, Ulich could still logically insist that he actually had proposed no methodology for international educational at all. Therefore, he might add, the criticism of him, which filled the previous five pages of this chapter, was both invalid and pointless, for it was directed at something which did not exist, i.e., Ulich's explicit methodology for international education.

Nevertheless, the following observations may be derived from the preceding discussion. While Ulich seemed to imply that the shortcomings of his curriculum for international education could be remedied by his prescriptions for teaching methods, his methods proved inferior in merit and promise to his program of studies, which at least reflected an inner unity and coherence. While he insisted that teaching techniques were more important than any curriculum in international education, Ulich failed to identify these techniques. Indeed, he maintained, that there were none.

If any single conclusion can be drawn from this examination of Ulich's work, it is that the key to Ulich's scheme for international education and its potential success involve the role of the teacher. If, as Ulich has said, method is superior to curriculum in the realm of education for mankind, and if one method can be as effective as any other in reaching the ends of international education, then, the accomplishment of these ends must be attributed to the skill of the teacher who employs the methods used in the classroom.
Moreover, no method of teaching can be more effective or efficient in attaining any educational objectives than the teacher employing it.

It is necessary at this point to examine Ulich's thoughts on the role of the teacher in education for mankind. Such will constitute the theme of the next chapter.
In the last chapter, it was concluded that the teacher appeared to be the key to the success or failure of Ulich's scheme for international education. Ulich himself confirmed this interpretation. When asked about the role of the instructor in education for mankind, Ulich insisted that the teacher was "indispensable".¹ He must possess, Ulich maintained, all those virtues at which international education was aimed.² That is, the teacher himself must be open to and appreciative of foreign cultures and peoples; he must have a sense of the unity of all men; and he must be actively committed to the resolution of the tasks of mankind.

Specifically, Ulich said, the teacher in international education must manifest a "sense of proportion or of what is important" regarding life, and, presumably the interests of humanity.³ He should be able to empathize with people, and he should have a firm grasp of sound educational psychology and good classroom management techniques.⁴ Above all, Ulich emphasized, he must

---

¹Interview with Robert Ulich, Harvard University, November 9, 1970.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
"believe in and have a sense of universality" or of the essential oneness of things.\(^5\)

How was such a teacher to be trained, this writer asked? How was he to acquire the traits and abilities necessary for a teacher in international education? Through the very system outlined earlier and referred to as "emotional education", Ulich replied. The teacher for international education would be prepared for his role by undergoing the same kind of affective and academic instruction which he would later conduct and supervise.\(^6\)

These remarks about the nature and role of the teacher in international education, though typically brief, were unusually direct and pointed for Ulich. They did not, however, exhaust the Harvard professor's comments on the topic. In *Crisis and Hope in American Education*, Ulich identified several "fundamental postulates on which to build the education of the teacher".\(^7\) These may also be considered to be postulates for the preparation of the international education teacher, since Ulich consistently referred to this text as that containing his ideas on the implementation of education for mankind.

The first of these postulates required that the teacher be not only a competent scholar, but that he should have love for his pupils and society as well. Secondly, he must be an inspired and inspiring individual, who can serve as a model for and guide to a better life. Lastly, he should have at least one area of academic specialization, and he should be a master at the art of

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Ibid.

Elsewhere Ulich noted other qualities of the ideal instructor. Since the teacher rather than the administrator or the supervisor was the "pillar of the school system", said Ulich, only those "with self-respect should teach....". So important was the character of the teacher that, Ulich argued, personality should take precedence over pedagogical preparation in recruitment of those who were to conduct the classrooms of the nation. The effective teacher, he continued, combined "technical skill" with a "humanistic quality". Perhaps reflecting memories of the McCarthy era, Ulich warned that the teacher was to be "...a citizen of such loyalty that even the most suspicious investigating committee could find no fault in him." Finally, though he need not himself be a creative individual, the teacher should possess or acquire "a sense of the creative process". That is, he should be able to appreciate and understand the process of creating works of literature and art, though he himself may not be capable of artistic creation.

In his chapter entitled "Education and the Concept of Mankind" in "Philosophy of Education, Ulich said surprisingly little about the ideal teacher for international education. He noted only that by teaching merely "subject matter" the teacher can "often kill the spirit of transcendence in young and adult", and that the instructor must serve as the pupil's "guide".

---

8 Ibid., pp. 123-132.
9 Ibid., pp. 6 and 123.
10 Ibid., p. 135.
11 Ibid., p. 123.
12 Ibid., p. 120.
13 Ibid., p. 135.
rather than his "pedant".  

In his Education and the Idea of Mankind, Ulich was slightly more expansive. He once again called for teachers who combined scholarliness with a power for inspiration. Then, he asserted that teachers in international education must develop a sense of proportion, or a capacity to see the relationship of their specialty to the whole of human knowledge. They must develop an ability to link their truth with the truths that others know, if their knowledge were to be beneficial to the international education enterprise.  

Lastly, Ulich argued that the effective teacher in international education, like the students he instructs, must identify with the material he teaches, for only in this manner can he lead his charges into a sense of unity with all mankind: 

...through teaching competently and devotedly,—i.e., through identifying himself with his topic as a gathering point of significant ideas—he transcends the limits of mere "subject matter" toward meaningful and universal concepts. And through doing this he evokes in his pupils a sense of personal participation in the enterprise of civilization.  

The above characteristics of Ulich's ideal teacher for international education appeared to involve both professional and personal traits. Among what seemed to be essentially professional qualifications were the teacher’s grasp 

---


16 Ibid., p. xvi.
of sound instructional psychology and classroom management; his competence as a scholar and as an academic specialist; his breadth of knowledge and his humanistic quality; his technical skill and his adeptness at conveying ideas; his love for his pupils and his appropriateness as a guide and life-model for them; and, finally, his ability to identify with his subject as a gathering point for significant ideas.

Among what appeared to be essentially personal qualifications were the teacher's capacity for empathy and his openness to other cultures and peoples; his commitment to the welfare of others; his inspiration and his ability to inspire others; his breadth of view or sense of proportion; his loyalty to and love for his society; his respect for himself and his sense of the creative process; and, above all, his belief in and feeling for the oneness of all reality and mankind.

It should be recalled here that, according to Ulich, all these professional characteristics and personal traits were to be produced in the ideal teacher by the same instructional system discussed earlier as "emotional education." That is, Ulich's scheme for international education was to develop both students and teachers manifesting the ends and ideals of education for mankind. And, it should also be recalled that the ideal teacher was to be the key to an catalyst for the realization of all the objectives of education for mankind.

Now, what may be said of Robert Ulich's thoughts about the teacher and international education? First of all, it must be observed that Ulich's remarks on the topic were unusually frank and clear: his description of the ideal teacher for international education was cast in remarkably unambiguous terms.
But though his straightforwardness was new, his ideas about the ideal teacher for international education—like those pertaining to the ideal curriculum and methodology—were not without historical or philosophic precedent. Ulich's call for instructors who combined a love for pupils with a capacity for inspiration and an appropriateness as a life-model echoed that of Quintilian's some eighteen centuries ago. His insistence that the teacher possess both scholarliness and breadth of knowledge paralleled Thomas Elyot's requirements for tutors listed in The Governor. And his concern for the teacher's sense of the unity of reality was reminiscent of Froebel's obsession with that concept in education.

Furthermore, Ulich's ideas again reflected a strong Idealist influence. His belief that the teacher should have a firm understanding of his pupils, technical skill, and a facility for conveying ideas mirrored perfectly certain Idealist tenets pertaining to the ideal teacher. Indeed, Ulich's fundamental argument about the indispensableness of the instructor seemed little more than a repetition of Butler's assertion that, to the Idealist, "...the teacher is


18 Rusk, pp. 59 and 62.


more the key to the educative process than any other element comprising it." 21

But despite their apparent lack of novelty, Ulich's thoughts on the
teacher in education for mankind appeared—from a logical standpoint, at least
—fundamentally sound. That is to say, in order to induce among his students
openness to foreign cultures and people and commitment to solving the problems
of humanity, logically, the teacher himself should be genuinely open to others
and committed to their welfare. And he could readily demonstrate these traits
by manifesting a love for his pupils. Logically, to help his students
appreciate and understand foreign cultures, the teacher himself should be a
knowledgable man, perhaps even scholarly; and he should be adept at conveying
what he knows. Logically, to convince his students of the oneness of humanity,
the teacher himself should believe in this concept and demonstrate his belief
by manifesting a love for his and all societies. Logically, to serve as an
agent for transcendence, the teacher himself must be able to reach beyond mere
subject matter into wider areas of life and mind; and, to serve as a gathering
point for significant ideas, he must have both depth and breadth of knowledge.
Finally, to avoid having his ideas rejected on the suspicion that he represents
some sort of dangerous internationalism or political subversion, the teacher's
loyalty should be beyond question. 22

21 Ibid., p. 98.

22 It was clear, however, that Ulich did not want a blindly loyal, political
automaton at the head of the classroom. For in any clash between the interests
and values of humanity and those of the local or national political community,
the teacher in international education would certainly be expected to champion
the former: "It is perhaps the central defect of the modern teacher that he has
become far too much of his community's obedient servant, dominated by school
boards and afraid of the frowning of a town Samurai. A good teacher has the
right to consider himself the trustee of the community and even more, as the
Ulich's delineation of the ideal teacher for international education was not only logically acceptable, but, based on certain long-standing psychological findings, it appeared to be empirically sound as well. There is considerable evidence which indicates that the acceptance or rejection of ideas and information, and the changing of people's attitudes, depends to a significant degree upon the "creditability" or believableness of the person disseminating the information or advocating the attitudinal change. Moreover, "... Creditability is a function of perceived expertness and perceived trustworthiness." 23

Now, it may be argued that Ulich's scheme for international education basically involves information, or appreciation of foreign cultures based upon knowledge of them; and that his scheme involves attitudes as well, since it is aimed at encouraging openness and acceptance of foreign peoples and cultures, feelings of unity with them, and commitment to their welfare. Furthermore, based on the evidence cited above, to develop such appreciation, i.e., to facilitate acceptance of knowledge pertaining to foreign cultures, and to develop the desired attitudes, i.e., acceptance, feelings of unity, and commitment, the teacher must possess "creditability".


24 Ibid.
But Ulich's ideal instructor for international education would possess creditability for, at Ulich's insistence, he would combine knowledge, scholarliness, and professional competence (or simply expertness) with empathy, loyalty, and love (or simply trustworthiness). Thus, Ulich's description of the best teacher in education for mankind corresponded to that of the most effective agent for attitudinal change and dissemination of information and ideas.

If Ulich's description of the ideal instructor seemed to be both logically and empirically sound, so also did his apparent assumption that the teacher was the key to the entire international educational enterprise. For, implied in the evident importance of the creditability of the individual who champions certain ideas or attitudes was the fact that that individual himself was important. That is, if the teacher's creditability was significant in international education, then, logically, the teacher himself must be significant.

But there is empirical evidence which seems to establish that the teacher is far more than "significant" in education for mankind: he appeared to be, as Ulich seemed to imply, the key to the entire effort. In Values and Teaching, Raths, Harmin, and Simon noted the recent, dramatic decline in the influence of the family, the community, and the church on the formation of values and beliefs among the young. In this contemporary value-vacuum, they argued, the classroom teacher has the opportunity to be the crucial factor in value

---

formation. Since Ulich's scheme is essentially an attempt to engender and encourage certain attitudes and values, and since the teacher now has the rare and increasingly less challenged opportunity to influence affective behavior, it follows that the instructor is indeed the key to education for mankind.

Moreover, there is additional evidence to the effect that, within racially mixed learning and social situations, an esteemed authority figure, e.g., a teacher, is the most significant factor influencing the modification of racial feelings. It should be recalled here that Ulich advocated the mixing of students from different social and ethnic backgrounds in order to positively influence their attitudes toward each other and toward others of different cultural origins. In any such attempt to develop racial or cultural openness, based on the findings just cited, the teacher would be the key to the success or failure of the project. Thus, again, empirical evidence seemed to corroborate Ulich's ideas about the teacher for international education, and again his ideas seemed both logically and scientifically sound.

But if both Ulich's assertions about the teacher in education for mankind and his assumption concerning the centrality of his role were sound and acceptable, there remained two other fundamental suppositions of Ulich's which seemed highly questionable, if not highly unsound. The first of these concerned Ulich's conviction that the ideal teacher for international education


could be produced or trained by the very same instructional system which that teacher later was to conduct. It has already been observed that Ulich's scheme for international education may be incapable of developing students who have cultural appreciation and openness, feelings of unity with others, and commitment to their welfare. How, it must be asked, can Ulich expect the same scheme to produce teachers who possess not only these qualities but all the others required of the ideal instructor as well?

Perhaps, under the best of circumstances, Ulich's curriculum and "methodology" for international education could provide teachers who manifested a certain scholarliness and humanistic orientation, as well as a breadth of knowledge and an ability to convey ideas, since his scheme seemed to feature an intellectual and broadly humanistic bias. But can his scheme also create teachers who have self-respect, a capacity for becoming a gathering point for significant ideas, and the power to inspire? Can it, at the very least, develop teachers who love their pupils and the rest of mankind? It has been observed that humane learning does not necessarily make one more humane; nor does exposure to others make one more open to, unified with, or committed to them. How, then, can Ulich's scheme for international education, as a

---

28 For further proof of this assessment, there is the following statement of Sawrey and Telford: "We have practically nothing but conjecture and opinion as to the influence of reading [e.g., of reading humanistic literature] by itself on the shaping of character and personality." James M. Sawrey and Charles W. Telford, Educational Psychology (2nd ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), p. 401. And there is yet another observation from Allport to the effect that vicarious exposure to strange cultures and ethnically different people through books, movies, and drama may be more effective than other means, e.g., direct personal contact, in the attempt to modify cultural or racial fears and prejudices. Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958), p. 453.
minimal requirement, guarantee the provision of teachers filled with genuine love for their pupils and society?

The answer is, of course, that it cannot. Nor can it guarantee the realization of any of those qualities identified as essential for the ideal teacher in education for mankind. Indeed, to hope that any strategy for teacher-training can produce the kind of instructor desired by Ulich may be totally idle: educational literature, since the early 1960's, has been replete with frequently caustic indictments of existing teacher-training programs which have failed to provide instructors of much more modest professional dimensions than those envisioned by Ulich as indispensable to international education.²⁹

Perhaps, after all, William Kane was right: excellent teachers are born, not made; and there exists a natural "aristocracy" of teaching talent which serves to distinguish good from bad instructors. Moreover, this talent is in-born and therefore unalterable, the busy efforts of all the normal schools and their equivalents notwithstanding.³⁰ If Kane were correct, and in the opinion


³⁰"From Vittorino de Feltre and Vives down to 'Mark Hopkins on one end of a log', all the great teachers have known that teaching is an art, that the success or failure of almost any method in schools depends upon the personal gifts and acquirements of the teacher himself. That fact demonstrates the essential aristocracy of education, the class distinctions in teacher as well as in pupil set by the Creator." W. Kane, S.J., An Essay Toward a History of Education (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1935), p. 444.
of this writer he was, the procurement of Ulich's ideal instructor would be more a matter of discovery than training. That is, Ulich's ideal instructor for international education would more likely be identified from among the existing and potential population of teachers than they would be the product of his teacher-training plan. It is quite likely, therefore, that Ulich's preferred teachers would remain forever in short supply. Thus, once again there is serious doubt as to whether the Harvard professor's theory of international education could be implemented, at least on a popular scale.

But even if Ulich's system of instruction were capable of providing a sufficient quantity of qualified teachers for international education to staff the nation's schools, could these teachers in turn actually achieve the ends of education for mankind within every pupil in their charge? This question concerns the second of Ulich's dubious assumptions, i.e., the effectiveness of the teacher in reaching the ends of international education.

It is to be doubted that Ulich's ideal instructors would meet with success in every pupil. For even the best of teachers can be confounded by intractable students or by forces outside the classroom and beyond the teacher's control. Ulich himself conceded as much when he observed that the sense of humanity may be totally lacking in some individuals and will always be foreign to them as long as they are selfish and self-centered, and again when he noted that some

31 The sense of "...mankind cannot mean anything to people of complete self-immanence or of narrow group-thinking except the sum-total of human creatures, to be befriended or exploited at will." Ulich, Philosophy of Education, p. 143.
parents will not countenance the tampering with their children's values by the teacher. Thus, though the teacher for international education may be adequately trained and trained in sufficient numbers, still the objectives of education for mankind may remain unattainable, because of important instructional factors beyond the teacher's control.

What, then, may be said in conclusion about Ulich's ideas concerning the teacher in international education? First, it may be said that, unlike much of his earlier comments on curriculum and methodology for international education, Ulich's remarks proved to be amazingly frank and straightforward. And, unlike his theories about academic subjects and how to teach them, much of his thinking about the ideal teacher in education for mankind appeared to be both logically and empirically valid.

But like his ideas on curriculum and methods, Ulich's arguments concerning the ideal teacher were not without serious faults. Though his description of the perfect teacher and his assumption about the centrality of his role can be accepted, Ulich's belief that such a teacher can be produced by his system of instruction—or any system of instruction—and his apparent conviction that such a teacher can always achieve the ends of international education in his students, cannot be accepted. Ulich's ideal teacher would be a rare blend of thorough professional competence and outstanding personal character. In the opinion of this writer neither Ulich's system nor any existing system for teacher training could guarantee the production of this kind of instructor.

32Ulich, Education and the Idea of Mankind, p. 25.
And even if that caliber of teacher could be produced, there is no assurance that he could evoke in all his students the kind of openness, unity, and commitment Ulich desired. Thus, after all, the teacher may not be able to compensate for the shortcomings of Ulich's curriculum and instructional methods for international education; and, again, Ulich's theory of education for mankind may prove unworkable.

Yet, if it is assumed that Ulich's ideal teacher can be trained according to his beliefs, and if it is assumed that such a teacher can indeed realize the ends of education for mankind within his students, there remains the question of whether or not the American school tradition would pose any problem in the attempt to achieve these ends. That question will constitute the theme of the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

EDUCATION FOR MANKIND AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

Chapter Five concluded by noting that even if Ulich's ideal teacher for international education could be adequately prepared, and even if that teacher could achieve the ends of international education among his pupils, Ulich's scheme would still have to contend with the realities of American education in order to be operable within this country. That is, to prove feasible within the context of American schooling, Ulich's theory of education for mankind would have to prove minimally compatible with certain features of American educational organization, practices, and traditions. But which are these features and what are the realities with which Ulich's ideas would have to contend?

As it has been described in the four previous chapters, Ulich's conception of international education in a number of instances would touch upon aspects of American schooling. First, there is the category of overall instructional objectives. Ulich desired that international education contribute to an openness toward and acceptance of foreign cultures and peoples, a sincere feeling of unity with all men, and an active commitment to their welfare. Though the aims of American education are manifold, and though they vary from school to school, level to level, and state to state, they may be summarized as an attempt to develop individualistic and competitive, economically efficient and
politically loyal members of the state.¹

Thus, while Ulich's instructional aims for international education emphasized supranational concerns and loyalties, those of America emphasized individual, economic, and national ones. While Ulich's objectives stressed openness toward all men, unity with them, and commitment to the resolution of their problems, America's stressed individualism, commercial competitiveness, and national rather than worldwide unity and commitment. While Ulich would have marketable skills developed by his system of schooling turned toward the benefit of all mankind, America seemingly would have those developed in her classrooms used only for individual and national purposes. In terms of educational objectives, then, Ulich's focus was societal, global, and humanitarian, while that of America was individual, national, and commercial.

Secondly, there is the category of curriculum. To achieve his overall objectives, Ulich prescribed a curriculum which combined experiential episodes with elements of traditional learning, i.e., the humanities, the sciences, commerce and industrial arts. His plan featured the deliberate integration of students in the manifold activities of the Community House, playing fields, and the all-school work projects. It included exposure to both academic and vocational instruction in the various learning halls as well. As noted earlier in Chapter Three, Ulich's curricular concepts manifested a marked bias in favor of the humanities and secondary and higher education. This humanistic bias, however, also provided his program of studies with a certain unity, consistency,

Because of the plethora of study patterns and programs, it is as difficult to generalize about the American curriculum as it was to summarize American educational objectives. Nevertheless, it may be safely said that, like Ulich's ideal instructional program for international education, the American curriculum combines both experiential with elements of traditional learning. That is, in addition to strictly academic subjects, the American curriculum seems to provide amply for experiential learning activities as assemblies, dramatic presentations, exhibitions, dances, bazaars, sporting events, field trips, and so on. And like Ulich's experiential curricular elements, these American learning activities appear to be designed mainly to further students' social or emotional education.

The American curriculum, too, like Ulich's instructional paradigm, is characterized by the "tracking" or categorizing of students according to their interests, abilities, and achievements. And, again, like Ulich's plan, the American program of studies offers a wide array of subjects and activities designed to appeal to a broad spectrum of student interests and abilities.

Here, however, the similarities between Ulich's suggestions and American curricular practices ended. For unlike Ulich's pattern of subject offerings, American instructional patterns do not appear to evince a humanistic bias. Literature, languages, history, and the arts do not seem to dominate the systems of studies in American schools. Rather, science and technical subjects, commercial and practical skills appear to be the main pedagogical fare, especially at the secondary and higher levels of instruction.

Neither does the American curriculum evince the unity, coherence, and
direction of Ulich's plan. The proliferation of course offerings, apparently
the response to the myriad student interests and needs, has obliterated the
simpler, less complicated, but more readily perceived curricular patterns of
earlier days. Again, this fact seems especially true of American education
above the elementary level.

It is difficult to determine whether or not the curricula of American
secondary and higher schools receive more attention than that of the elementary
school. It would seem, however, that they do not. For the bulk of recent
attempts at curricular revision, spawned in the wake of Sputnik's flight, seem
to involve the lower and middle levels of American education rather than the
college and university levels.

Next, there is the category of teaching methodology. Ulich, the reader
will recall, espoused no specific methodology as uniquely apropos for inter-
national education. Any mode of instruction, he said, was appropriate as long
as it was suited to the subject taught and the learner's capacities, conducive
to encouraging transcendence, and helpful in illustrating how the knowledge
learned or skill acquired would be of use in assisting mankind. Ulich's

\[2\] The multiplication of course offerings in American schools began as early
as the nineteenth century, but the real dissolution of the curriculum began
with Dewey, Hofstadter contended. For it was Dewey who argued, and apparently
successfully, that one subject was as educationally as good or as desirable as

With the "equalizing" of academic subjects, no one study or group of
studies appeared dominant. All were of equal importance, which is to say that
there was no longer any pattern or design in the American curriculum.
preferred methods of instruction were little more than a random listing of exhortations and directives, seemingly suitable only for his humanistically oriented curriculum. Indeed, in terms of specific teacher behavior, Ulich's "methodology" was not methodology at all. Like his ideal curriculum, Ulich's suggestions for the conduct of classroom instruction appeared most appropriate for post-elementary education. Unlike his curricular proposals, however, Ulich's favored teaching techniques evinced little unity or coherence.

As with the objectives and the curriculum of American education, it is no simple task to describe what can be accurately labeled "an American methodology" for instructional practices and procedures in the nation's schools are as varied as the nation's curricula. Nevertheless, some relatively valid generalizations can be made about American teaching techniques in contrast with Ulich's methodology for international education. The first of these generalizations is that from the American methodological viewpoint, Ulich's assertions to the contrary, one mode of instruction is not as good as any other. Current traditions and practices regarding teaching strategies in this country would seem to imply that only those methods which prove to be scientifically, i.e., psychologically, sound are "good". It should not be surprising, then, to conclude that American methodology in recent times has tended to be based upon scientific and empirical data rather than on traditional and "time-honored" concepts drawn from humanistic or pre-twentieth century literature. Contrariwise, much of Ulich's methodology appeared to be derived from the latter source i.e., humanistic and pre-1900 writings.

Unlike Ulich's prescriptions for teaching, American methodology is committed--since Dewey's era, at least--to a child-centered rather than subject-
centered approach to instruction. That is, American pedagogical techniques take their cue from the learner's nature and needs. Ulich's methodology on the other hand seemed to be geared more to the subject matter, i.e., highly intellectual and humanistic studies, for it concerned itself mainly with the teaching of ideas and concepts rather than skills. Ulich's call for teaching tailored to the characteristics of the student appeared to be merely perfunctory in light of his academic, non-developmental methodology and pedagogical orientation.

Also unlike Ulich's prescriptions, American methodology appears to be aimed at developing empirical approaches to problems and habits of free-ranging inquiry. Modern American teaching techniques encourage students to sharpen their observational and conjectural powers, and even their skepticism. The traditional concept that there is but one "right" answer, and that this answer by and large must come from a recognized or hallowed authority, are implicitly rejected by the new methodologies. Ulich, however, championed methods which appeared to be aimed at developing deductive and convergent thinking patterns rather than inductive and divergent ones: use of examples, comparisons, and dialectic thought seem more apropos for evoking a highly rationalistic rather than an empirical approach to problems. Moreover, Ulich's desire for students to "identify" with an author or authority seemed diametrically opposed to the thrust of the new methods which encourage the questioning of authority.

Yet another difference between Ulich's views on teaching procedures and American instructional techniques involves the use of teaching machines and

---

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 360.
mechanical educational devices. Whereas Ulich seemed wary about the use of these media, and warned that they should not be used as cheap surrogates for a live classroom teacher, American education seemingly would welcome them as economical and efficient substitutes for the teacher.

Finally, unlike Ulich's instructional suggestions, American methodology does not seem to take the form of vague exhortations. Rather, it tends to be very specific and exact regarding descriptions of teacher behavior designed to facilitate learning. Indeed, American methodology often appears psychologically behavioristic in its precision.

So far it would appear that Ulich's and American concepts about teaching methods were consistently contradictory. But this is not the case. For when Ulich voiced the need for maximum pupil-teacher interaction in the classroom and for the teaching of ideas rather than empty content, he appeared to be squarely within the stream of current American methodological theory. However, Ulich's instructional prescriptions seemed more at odds with American thinking on the subject than they appear consonant with it.

A fourth category is that which concerns the teacher. To achieve the ends of international education, Ulich called for an instructor who manifested all the qualities that education for mankind was to develop, i.e., cultural openness, a sense of unity with all men, and a commitment to their welfare. In addition, this ideal instructor was to have a good grasp of sound educational psychology and classroom management techniques, an academic specialty, an inspired and inspiring manner, and so on.

The teacher for international education, Ulich insisted, was to be the prime mover in the learning process. And he was to be the product of the very
same kind of instruction which he would later conduct with his pupils.

As with the categories of the curriculum and teaching methodology, there are both similarities and differences between Ulich's ideal teacher for international education and that which appears to be the preferred American instructor. Like Ulich's ideal, the American exemplar teacher is expected to manifest an ability to deal with children, convey ideas to them, and efficiently operate a classroom. He is expected to combine a love for his pupils with a capacity to inspire them. Furthermore, he is expected to possess an academic specialty and a character worthy of serving as a life model for his students. Finally, he must prove to be a citizen whose political loyalty and patriotism are beyond question. In many localities, this last requirement is equal in importance to the teacher's professional competence: the ubiquitousness of loyalty oaths for teachers and the seriousness with which they are taken attest to the significance of educators' political orthodoxy in the "land of the free."

But unlike Ulich's ideal, the American teacher may not always be expected to evince a genuine cultural openness. Certainly, he would not be required to do so in a deliberately racially segregated school. Nor is he always expected to manifest a sense of human unity or an active commitment to the interests of all mankind. Indeed, to do so may earn for him the suspicion that he is callous to the claims of his country's national interest. And he may be labeled as a dangerous, or at least politically unreliable, "internationalist."

Neither is the American teacher required to be a broadly educated humanist: the overemphasis upon teacher-training courses and the neglect of liberal arts studies, which seems to be endemic to the nation's normal schools, indicate that American teachers are expected to be pedagogical technicians
rather than well-rounded educators. And because he lacks the depth and breadth of learning which Ulich would require of his ideal, the American teacher only with difficulty could act as a "gathering point for significant ideas".

In the classroom, though he is to be in all respects an emuable person, the American educator is not expected to stamp his students indelibly with his own peculiar personality and views. Unlike Ulich's instructor, the American teacher is to be merely a guide, or just a "resource", rather than the towering and dominant source of knowledge, truth, and direction that the Professor Emeritus would have his teacher to be.

In short, the preferred American educator, more often than not, is a thoroughly but narrowly trained technician, a child psychologist rather than a scholar, and a politically "safe" or neutral instructional specialist with an essentially parochial cultural point of view. In contrast, Ulich's teacher for international education would be a richly educated humanist, who blended technical competence with a wealth of knowledge, a culturally catholic view, and an active commitment to all men rather than to one country.

There is yet a fifth and final category of miscellaneous, but noteworthy, considerations which involve both Ulich's prescriptions for international education and American instructional practices and traditions. Within this last category there is first the fact that while Ulich's scheme of education for mankind exhibits a distinctly intellectual flavor and orientation, American education, in Richard Hofstadter's estimation, is essentially anti-intellectual.

narrowly utilitarian, and shallow.\(^5\)

Secondly, there is the fact that though Ulich's plan for international education can hardly be called sectarian, it nevertheless was aimed at encouraging transcendent and "universal religious experience". Thus, while Ulich's educational enterprise featured a consciously spiritual aspect, American education adamantly opposes the introduction of religious thought and teachings into the schoolroom.\(^6\)

Thirdly, there is the fact that while Ulich's scheme called for centrally located, racially and socially integrated school buildings, American education remains marked by consistent attempts to maintain segregated instruction through the "neighborhood school" concept and opposition to busing of students. Once more, then, the realities of American education, in this case its anti-intellectualism, opposition to transcendent teachings, and de facto segregation of students, are arrayed against rather than with Ulich's prescriptions for international education. These facts would seem to cast doubt on the possibilities of implementing Ulich's ideas within the American educational

\(^5\)Hofstadter, pp. 300-301 and 306-307.

\(^6\)Though it may be argued that there is both a religious and transcendent strain of some strength and duration in the American school tradition, it seems that both these elements are far from dominant today. Since the public school achieved ascendency over the sectarian school in the latter half of the nineteenth century, American education has been essentially secular rather than religiously oriented. And, according to one authority, transcendentalism in education, largely fathered by Emerson, has not been a force in American formal instruction since John Dewey's student days. Curti, pp. 501-502.
context.

But is such doubt really warranted? Are there no major elements of American educational realities with which Ulich's ideas are consonant and through which his ideas may be sustained? The answer to the last question would seem to be "yes". For while Ulich's specific overall instructional objectives seemed to run counter to those which were apparently America's, his general objective of "communality" seemed to be compatible with a central feature of American education. Since the early part of the nineteenth century, one of the major functions of American education has been to create a community out of the disparate immigrant groups that came to our shores and entered school. Like Ulich's scheme, then, American education has attempted to use the school to bring people together and to teach them to live in harmony with each other. It must be admitted, however, that while Ulich's plan has in mind the creation of an international community, America's efforts have been restricted to forging a national community.

Thus, again, it can be argued that Ulich's concepts concerning international education are inconsistent with American school practices, organization, and traditions. It can be argued that, though there are instances of compatibility regarding the curriculum, methods of teaching, and the role of the teacher, the differences--particularly in the realm of overall objectives--far outweigh areas of harmony between Ulich's scheme and the realities of American education.

Does this mean that because of its serious shortcomings detailed in previous chapters and because of its apparent incompatibility with major features of American education, Ulich's scheme for international education must
be abandoned as practically inoperable? The answer to this key question will constitute the theme of the next and final chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

CAN EDUCATION FOR MANKIND WORK?

The purpose of this dissertation, as stated in the Preface, was to determine the feasibility of Robert Ulich's theory of international education. The purpose of this final chapter is to assess that feasibility against the background of the previous chapters' analyses of Ulich's ideas and in the light of other authorities' concepts about international education.

Ulich's theory of international education or education for mankind has been described as a formal instructional effort designed to develop an appreciation of and openness toward foreign cultures, a sense of unity with humanity, and an active commitment to its welfare. This instructional effort, Ulich advised, was to take the form of "emotional education". Emotional education, according to Ulich, was that intended to evoke a sense of "communality" or a feeling of belongingness or oneness among students. It was that meant to create also a sense of "self-transcendence" or intellectual participation in the lives and thoughts of others. This type of instruction was to be conducted according to Ulich's methodological prescriptions by teachers who already had passed through the system of international education.

Now it must be asked, Is Ulich's theory of education for mankind feasible, i.e., can it be implemented and will it achieve its stated ends? In the opinion of this writer, it is entirely possible to implement Ulich's scheme.
That is, it would not be impossible to construct schools according to Ulich's design and to operate them according to his plan. However, it is also the belief of this writer that such schools and such education, in all probability, would fail to achieve fully those fundamental affective ends of cultural openness, human unity, and commitment to the interests of mankind.

Ulich's proposed schools and education well may be capable of achieving a degree of cultural appreciation and transcendence, i.e., an intellectual understanding of, or at least an acquaintance with, foreign cultures. For appreciation of foreign cultures and self-transcendence, as noted previously, require knowledge of people, their lives, and their thoughts. And Ulich's scheme of international education, with its heavy emphasis on studies which deal with man and his works, would appear to furnish such knowledge in abundance. But, again, in the opinion of this writer, such schools and such education would probably fail to develop the sense of communality essential to the ultimate realization of the ends of education for mankind.

This pessimistic assessment appeared entirely justified in light of the following facts. Though Ulich's ideas about the conduct of international education in a number of instances seemed to possess a certain amount of logical validity, Ulich failed entirely to offer any empirical proof that his ideas could in fact achieve his stated ends. He provided no empirical evidence, for instance, that either identification with great authors, emphasis upon meanings rather than mere information, use of the dialectic, or the skilled efforts of his ideal teacher could actually evoke the kind of cultural openness, human unity, or commitment desired.

Indeed, the bulk of the empirical data which bore directly or indirectly
upon Ulich's concepts, seemed to establish that Ulich's suggestions--particularly in reference to the curriculum--would prove to be counter-productive, despite their apparent logical plausibility. Thus, while it appeared logical to bring different kinds of students together in integrated educational settings in order to achieve within them a cultural openness and a sense of unity, long-standing empirical evidence indicated that such experiences were as likely to increase cultural prejudices and social cleavages as they were likely to decrease these prejudices and cleavages. While it seemed logical to expose students to a humanistically oriented curriculum for the same purposes, very recent findings seemed to hint that the humanities may be inferior to other studies in their ability to reduce cultural prejudice and social misunderstanding. And while it appeared logical to provide students with information about foreign peoples, so that they might make cultural comparisons and achieve a fuller understanding of these peoples, empirical data suggested that such information could lead to the closing of minds as well as to the opening of them. Will Ulich's scheme achieve its stated ends? Can education for mankind work? On the basis of the empirical evidence cited immediately above, and on the basis of Ulich's failure to provide concrete proof which would establish

1In an attempt to discover prospective teachers' attitudes toward foreign nations, one researcher has concluded that college students majoring in English, a humanities subject, were more hostile toward foreign countries than those majoring in mathematics. See Patrick Ferguson, "International Hostility: A Study of the Attitudes of Students Preparing to Teach in the Secondary School" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; State University of New York at Buffalo, 1970).
the validity of his ideas, the writer was forced to conclude, "No, education for mankind, as outlined by Ulich, in all probability will not work nor will it fully achieve its objectives."

This is not to say that Ulich's theory of international education absolutely cannot work or achieve its ends. For educators since classical Grecian times have advocated aspects of Ulich's scheme, e.g., the study of literature, poetry, and music, in order to create a sense of communal unity and commitment. And the brief but brilliant glory of Athens and Sparta attested to the success of such efforts.²

Nevertheless, it appeared highly unlikely against the background of previous chapters' analyses that Ulich's plan for international education, as he described it, could fully achieve the internationally extendable sense of communality he desired. Specifically, in the view of this writer, neither Ulich's curriculum, nor his methodology, nor his ideal teacher, either singly or in combination, can guarantee the creation of those affective qualities described as cultural openness, a sense of human unity, and commitment to the welfare of mankind.

Does this mean that Ulich's vision of creating one world through education must be abandoned? The writer thinks not, for there are certain changes which can be made in Ulich's scheme, changes which appear to improve the

²Of course, other factors than the Greeks' educational system contributed to their communal solidarity. Their family life, their government, and even their forms of amusements, e.g., their games and dramas, certainly must have played a part in cementing Greek society together.
possibility of realizing the ends of education for mankind. Now, what are these alterations that can be made upon Ulich's apparently inadequate plan?

The first series of changes concern the curriculum for international education. Recall that Ulich was faulted for his apparent conviction that communality could be created merely by mixing students in common learning activities and by exposing them to humanistically oriented studies. Instead of simply bringing masses of students together in the hope of generating openness, unity, and commitment among them, small groups of culturally or socially disparate students should be formed under the guidance of teachers thoroughly skilled in group dynamics and completely knowledgable in terms of human behavior. In a small group context and under the direction of skilled teachers, real friendships would have a chance to form. And the development of real friendships, Allport argued, constituted the most reliable means to reduce prejudices, suspicion, and hostilities among socially or culturally different individuals.

In reference to academic subjects, instead of the humanities, the study of man, his nature, and his works should constitute the core of the curriculum. And the study of man, his nature, and his works should be undertaken by utilizing "comparative courses", e.g., comparative culture, comparative religion, comparative government, comparative literature and so on. At the elementary educational levels, young students might undertake studies in comparative family organization, comparative play activities, comparative myths, rhyms, and stories, or comparative pet-keeping practices. Care should

---

3 Supra, Chapter Three, p. 37.
be taken so as to avoid invidious and derogatory comparisons, for such would lead to cultural chauvinism and arrogance rather than to the openness and understanding desired. Care should also be taken to give eastern or non-western cultures, religions, governments, etc., as much attention—or even more attention—as that expended on western cultures, religions, and so on. By so doing, the student will be given a truly world-wide picture of man, and with this picture, perhaps, will come a fuller understanding of human unity.

The second series of changes involves the methodology for international education. It will be remembered that Ulich was criticized for failing to provide a detailed description of teaching activities designed to achieve his instructional ends. Instead of offering merely a random list of general guidelines for the conduct of education for mankind, Ulich might have suggested the use of role-playing or "divergent thinking" in the effort to achieve cultural openness and understanding. These two teaching techniques have been recognized for their ability to acquaint students with different thought and value patterns.

Instead of his collection of very broad and rather indefinite suggestions for the conduct of class, the Harvard professor might have noted that the teacher could utilize foreign radio and television broadcasts in the classroom.

---

4 The teaching technique called "divergent questioning" utilized classroom questions designed to encourage new thought patterns which can result in increased insights, appreciations, and changed attitudes. See James E. Weigand (ed.), Developing Teacher Competencies (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), pp. 96-97.
In the near future, perhaps there could be the possibility of direct and instantaneous contact between classrooms on different continents through the use of satellite TV transmittors. Language differences would be no problem if messages sent between classrooms were immediately translated, as are speeches in the General Assembly in the United Nations.

For the present, Ulich might have mentioned that the teacher could employ foreign-made films, film strips, phonograph records, tapes, and textbooks in the classroom. These instructional aids whenever possible should be foreign-made rather than domestically produced for this reason: with the use of foreign-made films, tapes and texts, the student would be exposed to materials dealing with topics seen from another culture's point of view. By viewing familiar and foreign topics from a different perspective, the student might be led more easily to examine critically his views and understand those of others.

To encourage openness toward others and feelings of personal unity with them, Ulich might also have suggested students attempt to contact each other directly by letter or even by transoceanic telephone. Toward this same end, he might have suggested that students within the same school, but with different cultural or social backgrounds, spend several days with each other in one another's homes.

He might have suggested that students and teachers be sent abroad in massive exchange programs, or that summer camps in foreign countries be developed for students and teachers alike. He might have suggested, too, that students tour inner-city areas within their home towns, in order to see first-hand and within their native environs the problems that beset men around the globe, problems as poverty, over-crowded facilities, industrial pollution, exhausted
educational and cultural resources, disease, and so on. By so doing, the school may be able to arouse feelings of empathy within students, and, perhaps, a commitment to do something about these problems as well.5

Finally, instead of his frequently vague instructional prescriptions, Ulich might have suggested that foreign food be served in the school cafeteria, foreign music be used as background music in study halls, and foreign games be taught on the playgrounds. With continuing exposure to different aspects of different cultures, in this case, food, music, and recreation, students may begin to open themselves to the enjoyment of and ultimately to the understanding of different ways of life.

The third and final series of alterations of Ulich's scheme for international education involves the training of the teacher. Recall that the writer took issue with Ulich's assertion that his system of emotional education could produce the kind of teacher required for international education. Instead of passing the prospective teacher for international education through what Ulich has described as his system of education for mankind, the potential instructor should receive a special kind of training. In addition to thorough preparation in his academic specialty and in methods and psychology of teaching, the instructor should be emersed in cross-cultural and comparative studies. His

strictly professional training should include extensive work in comparative education, group dynamics, and counselling. In addition, the future teacher in international education should be required to spend at least one year in study abroad.

Ideally, the instructor in education for mankind should be drawn from returning Peace Corps and Vista volunteers or their equivalents. Whenever possible, he should be recruited from among foreign nations, so that every school staff has at least one teacher with a significantly different background. And whenever possible, the school's foreign staff member should join with native-born staff members to form an international or interracial teaching team. In this manner, students may be shown that members of different cultures can work together in practical pursuits.

Finally, in every instance, the prospective teacher for international education must be selected from individuals outstanding in their capacity for human understanding and for their sincere willingness to aid their fellowman. With such teachers as models, students can be more readily convinced of the need for and reward of commitment to mankind.

The preceding alterations suggested for the improvement of Ulich's plan of international education, like the plan itself, lack empirical verification. And like Ulich's plan, the changes suggested cannot guarantee the realization among students of cultural openness, a sense of unity, and commitment to the resolution of the common tasks of mankind. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the writer, these changes would markedly improve the possibility of realizing the ends of international education as Ulich outlined them. And they appeared absolutely necessary if Ulich's scheme for international education were to work at all.
Can Ulich's scheme for international education or education for mankind work: No, the writer concluded, Ulich's concept of international education would probably prove unworkable and unable to achieve its ends, unless it were extensively revised along the lines suggested above. This does not mean, however, that Ulich's ideas were totally devoid of value nor that they were completely unsound.

Ulich's views were sound regarding his assumption that education could and should contribute to furthering international unity and co-operation. And Ulich was correct in assuming that any such educational effort, directed at extending world unity and understanding, must concentrate on the affective development of students rather than solely on their intellectual development.

Ulich was right in asserting that those studies and activities, especially productive in generating and furthering human understanding, ought to constitute the core of education for mankind. He was correct also in maintaining that any method of teaching, so long as it suited the nature of the subject, the learner, and the instructor and so long as it proved conducive to reaching the ends of international education, was proper in the attempt to educate for mankind. Finally, Ulich was entirely justified in his assertion that the teacher constituted the key to the success of international education and in his belief that the community must endorse and become involved in the international educational enterprise, if that enterprise were not to fail.

Ulich's concept of education for mankind has value as an explicit statement about the nature and objectives of international education. To define and
delineate this new educational field is no mean accomplishment, as Butts has observed. Ulich's plan has value as well-argued attempt to re-instate the humanities as an integral part of the modern curriculum. As such it represents a much needed effort to humanize the overly specialized, overly technical, and overly commercial syllabus of modern education.

Ulich's scheme for international education, regarding the curriculum at least, was an excellent example of an unusually comprehensive, integrated, and unified plan for post-elementary education. His suggestions regarding the Community House offered a means to American education whereby it might reintroduce ethical and transcendental values to students without offending parents' religious sensibilities nor the advocates of strict separation of church and school: who could seriously object to a non-denominational center used for music recitals and art exhibits as well as for contemplation? Finally, Ulich's ideas have value as a vigorous, modern defense of Idealist principles, though Ulich might object to the writer's labeling him an advocate of this philosophic view. 7

---


7 Ulich's views on curriculum, methodology, and the teacher, plus his constant references to a transcendental reality, convinced the writer that the Harvard professor belonged to this particular philosophic school. Several authorities have also interpreted Ulich's writings as those of an Idealist. See Charles J. Brauner and Hubert W. Burns, Problems in Education and Philosophy (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965) and Frederick Mayer, Philosophy of Education for Our Time (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1958).
But though certain features of his scheme for international education have value and are undoubtedly instructionally sound, Ulich's plan, in the opinion of this writer, remained fundamentally questionable at best. All the virtues of Ulich's concept of education for mankind did not seem sufficient to compensate for its elemental weakness, i.e., its apparent inadequacy to reach its objectives without basic revision, particularly in reference to Ulich's proposed curriculum and teaching methods.

Nor was this elemental weakness the writer's only objection to Ulich's scheme for international education. As noted previously, Ulich's ideas frequently suffered from an annoying vagueness and lack of clarity. His curriculum and methodology appeared suited more to the intellectual elite of an academically oriented secondary school than to the full spectrum of students in today's schools. He failed totally to provide any suggestions for measuring the success of his theories; indeed, since his objectives were mainly affective in nature, there may be no reliable way to ascertain the effectiveness of his plan.

In a number of instances, Ulich's theory of education for mankind ran counter to fundamental aspects of the American educational tradition. This fact alone could easily prevent Ulich's system of instruction from reaching its objectives, were it otherwise capable of doing so.

Finally, Ulich may be mistaken about his assumption concerning the equality of human emotion: there may be as much variation regarding individual men's ability to feel and respond to emotional education as there apparently is regarding their ability to think and respond to intellectual education. Thus, a system of international education based on emotional
education may flounder as readily as systems of intellectual education.

This last objection is merely another way of saying that, in the view of this writer, Ulich's scheme of education for mankind probably cannot achieve the level of cultural openness, sense of unity, and commitment Ulich desired. His plan may well be capable of generating a degree of cultural appreciation and transcendence, or intellectual participation in the lives of others. But unless it generated a sincere feeling of communality as well, Ulich's vision of one world through education will remain an unrealizable dream. For Ulich was correct when he implied that the stuff out of which human unity is spun must be drawn from man's emotions rather than from his mind.

Ulich's theory of international education, without far-reaching modifications, appeared unlikely to reach its objectives. Yet, as argued above, Ulich's vision of building one world through education need not be abandoned; nor were his ideas completely devoid of merit. However, the virtues of Ulich's scheme were judged insufficient to compensate for its fundamental fault, i.e., its projected inability to achieve its affective ends.

But, one may contend, Ulich's life itself may be advanced as living proof of the workability of his theory of international education. For what Ulich has proposed as education for mankind, at least in regard to the curriculum, appeared to be little more than the type of education he himself underwent as a youth, i.e., a humanistic kind of schooling. Thus, it may be argued, if that form of instruction could produce a Robert Ulich, a humane, internationally minded and productive man, why could it not just as well produce other men like him?

The answer to this question is, of course, that Ulich is just one example
of the merit of this type of education. The same humanistic education which Ulich enjoyed did not prevent other learned men in his native Germany from championing Fascism after the First World War. Moreover, factors other than Ulich's education moulded his mind and character. Ulich himself identified some of these as his early religious experiences and his brief but moving exposure to the lives of German industrial workers. Even the Bavarian forest seemed to play a part in the formation of his views.

All this is simply to say that any educational plan, however well-conceived and however blessed with sensitive and intelligent students, must ultimately contend with historical and social forces outside of the classroom for the minds, loyalties, and convictions of the learners. Ulich was not at all unaware of this fact, when he noted that unreasoning nationalism may be one of the most important factors influencing the success of international education. 8

But though factors beyond the control of the school may determine its final success, education for mankind must be attempted: the world grows smaller each year, while its problems grow larger and more frightening. In the years ahead, whether or not mankind is prepared for the fact, we will all grow increasingly closer to each other, economically and physically as well.

Men must be taught to grow closer to each other psychically and spiritually, too, if a final nuclear cataclysm is to be avoided. Though his scheme for international education appeared highly unlikely to achieve the

8Interview with Robert Ulich, Harvard University, November 9, 1970.
level of psychic and spiritual closeness required, yet Ulich's plan, properly revised, may prove helpful in reaching these ends. In any case, it is imperative that some scheme to further international understanding, co-operation, and peace through education be devised and implemented. Like Ulich's theory, any plan for international education cannot guarantee the creation of cultural openness, human unity nor world-wide co-operation and peace. But the facts of Robert Ulich's life and work attest to the power of education to help produce the kind of man the world so desperately needs.
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