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The roots of contemporary American education are imbedded in the historical development of the United States. From the 18th century onward into modern times, political statesmen have recognized the relationship of an intelligent citizenry to an effective form of democratic government. The philosophic thrust for education has been enmeshed in our political structure but it has been the educational statesmen who have had to translate into actuality the hopes and ideals of the American public school system.

Henry Clinton Morrison (1871-1945) was one of these men. The pattern of his educational career fitted him to play the role of an educational statesman. As a high school principal (1895-1899), city superintendent of schools (1899-1904), state superintendent of public instruction (1904-1917), director of the laboratory schools of the University of Chicago (1919-1928), professor of education (1928-1937), lecturer, author, and emeritus professor (1937-1945), he had the opportunity to view the panorama of the educational enterprise over a period of time and from a variety of significant perspectives.

The half-century during which Morrison was active in the field of education (1895-1945) was one of tremendous social and educational ferment and change. The rapid social changes were reflected in the educational structure.
In the midst of the educational and social change Henry Morrison reflected on the problems facing education in his era, witnessed the tremendous changes taking place in the social and political life of America and argued that only a "valid theory of education based on scientific principles" could bring some order and rationality to bear on these problems and serve as a guide for future action.

A basic assumption of this dissertation is that Henry C. Morrison had a conception of society and of the education that prepared one to function in that society. This study will attempt to identify and to analyze his conception of society and to relate his idea of education to preparation for life in the social order.

Each era of history faces problems that are peculiar to that era in some respects and yet have aspects that are timeless. Several problem areas which posed questions of concern to Morrison throughout his educational career were as follows:

1. What is education?
2. What is the nature of the learning process?
3. What contribution can learning theory, administrative organization and structure, curriculum theory, and methods make in providing equal educational opportunity for all children?
4. Are all children educable to the same degree?
5. Is there a difference between education and schooling?
6. Are there distinctions between primary, secondary, and higher education?

7. How can the educational system be organized and articulated as a continuous one from nursery school through the university?

8. What is the role of state supported education in a democratic society?

9. How does one reconcile state responsibility for education with local control?

The problems raised by Morrison's questions still challenge us today. This dissertation will seek to identify and interpret Morrison's response to the questions.

The aim of this study is to identify, discuss, and appraise the educational and social theories of Henry C. Morrison in light of his educational publications and activities. The evolution of these ideas will be traced. Special attention will be focused on the socio-economic forces which prompted his continuous search for an educational theory of adjustment and adaptation, a basic essentialist curriculum, and an orderly, scientific method of instruction leading to mastery.

This study will attempt to assess the contributions which Henry C. Morrison's ideas have made to education in general, tracing the changes which he effected in the areas of educational theory, curriculum, and method during his lifetime. Indications will be made of contributions which could conceivably be effective at present if attention were redirected to his concepts and line of reasoning.
An analysis of the educational ideas of Henry C. Morrison requires a basic understanding of the terminology employed to express those ideas. Bent on developing a theory of education based on scientific principles, Morrison was consistent in defining and redefining his terms in each of his publications to avoid confusion or misinterpretation and to provide continuity in his developing theories.

In one of his early works, Morrison stated:

It is impossible to think accurately and coherently, unless we have the appropriate language forms, or some other concrete symbols such as those which mathematics employs in which to do our thinking. Scientific or systematic thinking further requires words which are always used in exactly the same meaning.1

Every science rests heavily on its terminology, or on the system it employs for the sake of achieving not only unmistakable meaning but also convenience in discourse itself.

The whole field which is commonly called education is singularly uncertain in the words which are used. Words of critical importance are not only used with no exact meaning, but their meaning varies in accordance with the philosophy, education, and experience of the user. And so at the outset it is necessary to state the working terminology and to define the fundamental meanings as expressed by Morrison throughout his professional presentations in the

course of his educational career.

A re-emphasis of the importance of clarity and consistency in educational terminology was made by Morrison in his final major work:

If those who govern our Public Instruction, those who administer it, and those who operate it in the schoolroom are to be governed by reason and not by fads or fancies of the day, they must be familiar with a terminology in which the substance of valid thought can be framed for intercourse among themselves.²

According to Morrison, the principal marks of a good terminology are:

1. That the terms must be definitive and not merely descriptive.
2. That each term must have exact denotation and not merely vague connotation.
3. That the terms must define structures, functions, processes and objectives which have real existence and are not merely notions.
4. That words used as terms shall be employed in their correct meaning.³

Therefore, a review of the significant terms used by Morrison in his discourse is presented and developed in a logical order.

Throughout his professional research, experimentation, and writing, Morrison sought to answer the question, "What is Education?"

³Ibid., p. 116.
The conclusion of his studies was in substance that education is nothing else than taking on the arts and sciences and moral attitudes which make up the fabric of civilization. Education is not erudition, or information, or enlightenment, or mental training, or development of individual personalities, or a process of generating a new and better civilization.

Education is an organic natural process which is common in the broadest sense to much of the whole animal kingdom. It is a matter of an individual learning how to get on in the world. It takes place in all creatures which exist in a changeable environment.

In his attempt to formulate a defensible theory of education, Morrison turned to the theory of evolution, in general, and to the doctrine of emergent evolution in particular. He saw evolution as a process of producing organisms which are capable of adjusting to a continuously broader and more complex environment. In the quantitative process of producing more organisms, two basic qualitative changes occurred. The first was life itself, during which the process caused variations in the species, biological transmission of this variation, and survival. The second qualitative change was the appearance of personality where the process of evolution shifted to learning and the transmission of learning through cultural accumulation.

\[4\] Morrison, Basic Principles, pp. 364-66.
With the appearance of personality, human society could develop. The function of education was to enable the individual to adjust to that society by adaptation, that is to say by inner personal changes in the direction of adjustment to society.

Learning how to get on in the world is adjustment. And so Morrison speaks of the adjustment theory of education as contrasted with the eruditional theory or with theories which hold that education is a matter of organic development and training of the faculties. It ought to be borne in mind that the adjustment theory does not mean that the individual has to learn every adjustment he has to make. According to Morrison:

Both in the race and in the individual the prize is not adjustment but "adaptability", that is, the capacity to meet a very wide range of adjustments as the need arises. Hence, it has been said. . . "we do not learn what to do, but rather become the kind of people who will know what to do".5

Man alone is capable of reacting upon and modifying his environment. Adaptability implies a minimum of native adjustments and a maximum of dependence on individual learnings.

It follows that as the individual learns from the experiences of his life he is always becoming something, in some way different from what he was before learning took place. The result is what Morrison calls personality,

---

and every genuine learning product is an accretion to personality. Personality is the sum total of what an individual has come to be by learning the cultural products of social evolution.6 According to Morrison, an individual can be defined at any period of his life as what he has come to be, first by the process of physical growth, and second by the process of learning.7

Education, then, is the development of the individual by the process of learning as distinguished from physical growth. Learning is becoming and the product is a new birth in the individual, a changed point of view, a new taste or set of values, a new inward ability. Thus every step in the development process for which Morrison uses the term education is a piece of learning, or a learning product.

The process of education itself is in fact what parents and school people are most concerned about. According to Morrison: "It is the means whereby civilization is transmitted from one generation to another".8

Morrison distinguishes between learnings which are essential to all men and women, and those further learnings

6Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 38.
7Ibid.
8Ibid., p. 28.
through which individuals grow in the capacity of rendering special services to society. These are categorized as General Education, Liberal Education, Professional Education, and Training.

The term general education is used by Morrison to signify that growth, the need of which is common to all mankind; that education that is non-professional and non-specialized. By liberal education he referred to the course of instruction which free men might follow and which was related to the liberal arts. In another sense, Morrison stated that all true education is liberal, in that it leads to the kind of personality which knows what to do instead of having to be told what to do.

Professional education has distinguishing marks that set it apart. The distinguishing marks are first, in the principle that the practitioner has come into independent command of the underlying arts and sciences of the profession; and second, that he has become the kind of person who can apply them with honor and intelligence. The high status accorded a profession may be gleaned from Morrison's definition.

A profession, a learned profession, is a calling whose activities constitute a series of problems to be solved. It is, of necessity, based on a body of principles clearly understood and susceptible of being used in the solving of problems as they arise. It constantly relies on the scientific method.9

In general, training takes place when humans are told what to do and when they and lower animals are habituated through practice in certain desirable acts or even attitudes. Thus, according to Morrison, most preparation for carrying on industrial processes are of necessity training and not education. Training makes no direct contribution to educational growth.\(^{10}\)

Within his analysis of the process of educating, Morrison defines several terms which will be repeated throughout this study. A brief review of these terms follows.

Instruction is the process by which education is brought under positive and systematic control and guidance. It is, in principle, a deliberate process which belongs to the school and is intended to see that education is adequate, normal and right.

Upbringing is distinguished from instruction in that it belongs to the family, which also purports to guide and direct the normal and right education of the child. Upbringing is the guidance and instruction, less systematic than in the schools, that goes on in the home under the guidance and control of parents.

Teaching is that intimate contact between a more mature personality and a less mature one which is designed to foster the education of the less mature with a sense of responsibility for progress in learning.

\(^{10}\)Morrison, *American Schools*, p. 34.
The school is an institution, a community of pupils and teachers. In its instructional purpose, it is an enterprise. The school becomes marked off from the family at the point at which instruction begins, and instruction has for its content the universal institutions. That is what makes the schools social.11

The child within the educational setting of the school can be distinguished at three separate stages of his educational development: pupil, student, educationally mature person. These stages are correlated with Morrison's organizational structure of the school system.

Pupillage is a recognized status both in law and social structure. The youth of society are said to be, "in statu pupillari", when they are within and under the direction of the school. The pupil is a member of a school, who in the nature of the situation must be "under tutors or governors".12 The pupil becomes a student when he has passed out of his pupillage and is qualified to pursue his studies, independently of tutors, or in our use of terms, teachers.

The pupils' educational status does not change until he is truly in possession of the capacity to read the printed word, to express in writing ideas which he knows are his own ideas, and is in control of the number system which is utilized in the culture in which he lives. Thus armed with these primary cultural tools, the pupil's

11Ibid., p. 125.
12Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 48.
educational status has in fact changed. When the pupil is thoroughly in possession of the primary learnings, he is certainly in a new period and if the first is primary, then the next is the secondary period.

The next distinct difference is seen when in the process of intellectual maturation, the pupil has reached the point at which he can and does identify his own problems, find his own material, and control his own time; when he has learned to utilize his teacher as he does the library, the laboratory or the consultant; when he has discovered the purposes of further enlightenment.

For him the period of general education is at an end and the period of true specialized or scholarly or professional study has begun. He is out of the secondary period and in the university.13

It is assumed by Morrison at this point that the pupil has moved forward and reached the stage of educational maturity. Educational maturity signifies that the individual has reached a stage at which he is capable of directing widely his own further learning.

Educational status then is a matter of nodal points in personal development and not of age or physiological development.14

Primary status is not at an end until the individual is secure in all four essential unit learnings; reading and handwriting, number concepts, principles of morals, and volitional learnings.


14Morrison, American Schools, p. 177.
A further reinforcement of this idea of individual change and not the passage of time as advancement in age was stated by Morrison:

Time is not of the essence. Learning acquired is the substance of the school. The time required is merely a circumstance. Maturity is of the essence. The age of emergence is not of the essence.\(^\text{15}\)

Following upon the definitions of the stages of intellectual maturing which the child passes through as he participates in the schooling provided him in the institutional setting, it is important to relate these stages of growth to the specific institutions designated to encourage growth and development from one stage to another.

According to Morrison the child's general education began the day he was born and would end the day he died. It was a continuing and continuous process. His schooling, on the other hand, might last for a limited period of time depending on an individual's ability, achievement and aspirations. A person moved from educational immaturity to educational maturity. He passed from the status of a pupil, to that of a student, to that of an educationally mature person.

The mature young person has become the kind of person who will know what to do, or will know how to find out and who can be trusted to do right.\(^\text{16}\)

The progress was one beginning with a state of dependence

\(^{15}\)Ibid., p. 187.

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 12.
on others moving to a state of independence, individual initiative and effort in utilizing the skills and resources available to him. Thus Morrison recognized only two "schools", the Common School and the University, which would provide for the educational maturation of the young.

Morrison's conception of the Common School will be treated in some detail in a later chapter. The following statement will provide an introduction to his analysis of the Common School:

The school as a universal institution is the Common School. It exists not primarily for the behalf of individuals but for the transmission of civilization and, in that sense, for the benefit of the community.17

One of the primary attributes of the Common School is that it implies the instruction of the whole rising generation up to educational maturity. The characteristics of the old Common School as listed by Morrison were

1. It was meant to be used by everybody.
2. The subject matter suited to Public Instruction could be provided all the way up to the educational maturity of the pupil.
3. It was a continuous school.
4. It was terminal and not preparatory.18

The concept of the continuous school, its demise and resurgence, caused serious concern to Morrison as an educator and an administrator. The pressures of society's new demands for education in the late 19th and early 20th centuries resulted

17 Ibid., p. 8.
18 Ibid., p. 48.
in the development of separate educational institutions; elementary schools, secondary schools, Junior High Schools, and Junior Colleges. These separate entities emerged to meet the increasing numbers of pupils enrolled in schools and newly identified needs. The end product was discontinuity in the educational system. Morrison spoke out forcefully against this distortion of the system and of the meaning of education itself:

Discontinuity is a state of affairs in the structure of a school system in which there has come to exist several schools in a hierarchy of progress, each of these schools being more or less like a thing in itself rather than a functional part of a system.

Our whole discontinuous school system, and the graded school notions which it has generated, has produced a picture of what would be good organization for industrial production - but scarcely an organization capable of transmitting civilization and generating education.19

Since he identified two separate stages of educational development in the child, pupil to student, Morrison also provided for two school periods to parallel this growth, primary school and secondary school. However, he envisioned them as two steps along the educational continuum leading to educational maturity and independent learning, the province of the scholars in the universities, not as separate and unrelated entities. He said:

The Primary School is properly the name for an educational status, as well as the name for an integral division of the Common school. It is not a part of the elementary school. It is not a certain number of grades. It is not passing so many years.20

19 Ibid., p. 100.

20 Ibid., p. 178.
For Morrison, the critical difference between Primary School and Secondary School was in principle that the pure didactics of the former yielded to the semi-independence involved in learning to study, and in learning by study that characterized the latter. Systematic teaching came to include the supervision of study and perhaps even more, the organization of the material for study. Morrison recognized the University as the second educational institution. He defined it by listing its attributes.

A University is:

- a company of scholars, some of them professors, some of them students devoted to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and to the pursuit of the learned professions.
- a company of educationally mature persons confined to the pursuit of scholarly and scientific subject matter.
- a company of students who are self-dependent in their academic pursuits, under the guidance and cooperation of men who profess advanced knowledge of the subjects pursued.
- conceived in the spirit of independent search for knowledge and reinterpretation of knowledge.
- consisting of several faculties composed of learned men who are capable of guiding advanced study, of interpreting its results, and of competently lecturing on subject matter not yet available in published form.21

The pupil, after completing the process of intellectual and educational maturing, was ready to move into this phase of his independent study and continued growth.

To summarize Morrison’s position on this matter of continuous schools the following comment is appropriate.

"The Common School and the University are the backbone of any natural system of education."22

21Ibid., p. 21.
22Ibid., p. 31.
In contrast, the criticism he hurls at the discontinuous school system of the 1940's is significant:

The disastrous final result has been the universal establishment of an inverted ideology in which the securing of credits, graduation from school, and the attainment of a degree are put in the place of education, until only a pitifully small proportion of the graduates of schools and colleges is composed of even partially educated people.23

The quality of education, Morrison felt, depended on the content of education and the manner in which it was presented. Thus he defined curriculum:

Curriculum is in its nature constant and universal. It is in substance an outline of the fabric of civilization, as the latter subsists in its universal and major institutions.24

He moves to the next unit within the curriculum to the program of studies which is referred to as a list of courses properly organized in learning units intended to be pursued by pupils and presumed to be the best method of attaining the objectives established by the curriculum. And a course was defined as a limited functional element in the program of studies. Morrison devoted an entire book to the presentation and explanation of his concept of the curriculum.25

The teaching procedure recommended by Morrison was the direct method of teaching which resulted in mastery.

---

23 Ibid., p. 112.
24 Ibid., p. 187.
25 Morrison, Curriculum.
According to Morrison:

"When a student has fully acquired a piece of learning he has mastered it. Mastery means completeness. Whenever the adaptation in the individual which corresponds to a given product in learning has taken place, the individual has arrived at the mastery level for that particular product."  

On this topic Morrison wrote his first and most popular major book in 1926, *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School*. This work will serve as a source of specific insight in the analysis of Morrison's theory of method to be discussed in depth later.

Having compiled a list of basic terms which will be encountered and further developed throughout this study, we now turn to the method to be employed in the analysis of the educational ideas and theories developed by Morrison during his professional life and activities.

The research used in this dissertation will follow the historical method. That is, relevant primary and secondary sources will be identified, examined, and evidence from them will be used to develop the dissertation. The method will be primarily documentary and will be non-empirical. While the study will rely primarily on Henry C. Morrison's published works—books, reports, and articles—unpublished manuscript sources will be used to amplify these printed materials when they are available.

The purposes of this study will be pursued through

---

analysis of the following major sources.

1. For the biographical sketch, the Dictionary of American Biography, Who's Who in Education, newspapers, and periodicals will be perused.

2. For the general background and substance of Henry Morrison's educational ideas, his books, articles, essays, and addresses will be studied and analyzed.

3. For the germination of his educational thinking in the early years of his educational career, his Reports as superintendent of public instruction in the state of New Hampshire from 1904-1916 will be utilized.

4. For his activity at the University of Chicago from 1919-1945, a variety of sources will be studied.
   a. The printed reports of Morrison as contained in the President's Reports to the University.
   b. Articles in the University Record.
   c. Reports on file in the Laboratory School Records Office.
   d. Unpublished doctoral dissertations relating to the history, organization and experimentation in the Laboratory Schools at the University of Chicago during Morrison's era.

5. A review of the history of education references will be made to provide the background information regarding the milieu in which Morrison functioned during his educational career (1895-1945) and by which he was affected in the evolution of his educational ideas.
This study will be documentary, utilizing the historical method in identifying and analyzing primary materials as the sources of evidence for Morrison's educational ideas and their application to school and society. The materials to be utilized in this research will consist of primary and secondary sources. Relevant primary sources will be identified and analyzed. These materials will include books, reports, journal articles, and unpublished manuscripts and letters, where available.

A critical analysis of the primary sources will be made to extract the basic tenets of Morrison's educational and social theories, and the implications in their application to the concept and function of education, to curriculum development, and to educational methodology.

Secondary sources will be reviewed and synthesized to provide historical and social background information, cultural perspective, and the total frame of reference within which Morrison worked. Additional analysis will be pursued to assess the response of the public in general, and of those in the field of education in particular, to the views, criticisms, recommendations, proposals, theories and plans of Henry C. Morrison.

A review of the literature regarding Henry C. Morrison revealed a wealth of material, both primary and secondary source material, pertaining to his educational contributions. From 1924 through 1943, Professor Morrison published eight books and one collection of addresses and essays which ranged from teaching technique, school finance, the evolving
common school, basic principles in education, the curriculum, and the American school system. The concepts developed in these major works grew out of the professional experiences in which Morrison was involved at the time of their writing.

An analysis of Morrison's major works requires a review in logical order rather than chronological order.

Morrison so states in the Introduction to his final work.

For about twenty years past, I have been attempting to bring some sort of intellectual order into our activities in Public Instruction, utilizing as well as I could the methods which are common to all the sciences and especially to the social sciences. In so doing I have sought to cover the disciplines which seem to be fundamental to our whole valid conception of the American public school system and its operations.

Three volumes have preceded the present publication. The four are, in logical order although not in order of appearance, Basic Principles in Education, The Curriculum of the Common School, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, and finally American Schools: A Critical Study of Our American School System.27

This study then will deal with the logical development of Morrison's concept of education and society, his conception of the American educational system, of the curriculum, and of educational methodology as they became crystallized during his educational career over half a century encompassing many and varied activities. Other major primary source material which will provide further insight and amplification of Morrison's educational conceptions include his Reports while he was Superintendent of Public Instruction in New Hampshire, surveys which he conducted of the St. Louis Public Schools in 1917, and his articles in the Thirteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the study of Education in 1914

27Morrison, American Schools, p. vi.
and the Thirtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education in 1931.

The professional journals contain many articles written by Morrison regularly from 1908 through 1937 and a few appear in 1943 and 1944. The topics presented cover the range of his varied educational interests and activities and reaffirm the principles enunciated in his major publications; the interrelationship between education and society, the necessity for a continuous school system, the importance of a basic curriculum, and the significance of a teaching method which leads to mastery.

Secondary source materials were found in numerous periodical and journal articles in the literature of professional education. These printed materials contain commentaries on Morrison's major educational publications which propose his basic theory of education, curriculum, school organization, finance, method, and unit plan. Several experimental studies were discovered which were designed to test the effectiveness of specific aspects of Morrison's unit method and method of direct teaching for mastery. The available materials will provide a source of reference regarding the reaction of the education public to Morrison during his educational career and will provide a sound basis for arriving at some conclusions regarding the impact of Morrison during and after his lifetime.

The intent of the proposed study will focus primarily on the educational and social ideas of Henry Clinton Morrison which evolved throughout his educational career, including his theory and purpose of education, his concept of a relevant
curriculum, and his statement of an educational method based on scientific principles. This study proposes to investigate Morrison's concepts of society and education and the inter-relationships between the two in the preparation of youth to participate in the social order.

As to the importance of this study, one can only view this within one's own frame of reference, shared by many as even a cursory review of "reform" literature reveals. This writer views American education and society in a state of flux, in great need of redefinition, reorganization, and redirection.

In every age of history, thoughtful men have viewed the problems facing education at that time as crucial. Today, as always, we need the insights and reflections of intelligent men to assist in attempts at solutions to the basic problems facing education and society. These insights can come from the thoughtful contemplation of these problems by men from past eras. It is hoped that this study of the educational ideas of Henry C. Morrison will make a small contribution to our understanding of some of the problems facing education today.

Perhaps the most difficult phase of the study will be in interpreting the implications of Morrison's educational and social ideas and practices in light of current problems confronting American education in its present socio-economic context. Documentation of Henry C. Morrison's relevance as an educational counter-critic in the 1970's will prove to be a task. It is not, however, an impossible or an unwarranted task.
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CHAPTER I

HENRY CLINTON MORRISON: A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

A man's activities in his life are the result of the kind of man he has become, the social setting in which he has lived, and the task in life which he has set out to do. These three components, the man, the setting, and the job form the fabric and basic pattern of man's professional life, especially a man such as Henry Clinton Morrison.

On the occasion of Morrison's death in Chicago on March 19, 1945, many educators acknowledged that "one of the last of a generation of sturdy and colorful leaders in public education had died," 1 and that "America had lost one of its great educators." 2 Henry Clinton Morrison, the man, was thought of as a sturdy person, as sturdy as the rocks of his native state of Maine. He lived and worked according to his principles and was seldom swayed by passions or emotions.

Morrison, according to several fellow educators, believed in principles and ideas and could always be counted on to stand up strongly for what he believed. He never cared for personal popularity nor was he a follower of the crowd. According to Harry A. Brown, Morrison was:

---

1 Arthur B. Moehlman, "Henry Clinton Morrison: Master Teacher," The Nation's Schools, XXV (June, 1945), 19.

Perfectly certain of his country's mission and of his own place in the general plan, he stood firmly against all diverting pressures or persons. His influence on public education was deep and will be felt for many years to come.

The long and productive life of Henry Clinton Morrison began on October 7, 1871 in Oldtown, Maine, a rugged fishing and lumber town. Here Morrison spent his early childhood up to the time he entered Dartmouth College in 1891. As a youth he worked in the lumber camps and shared in the rough and tumble interaction of the men. Oldtown was a rough and rowdy settlement, and it was here that Morrison first saw the lawlessness and lack of virtue characteristic of a town with poor educational facilities, a sight which he was to observe on numerous occasions during his professional career; one which concerned him deeply.

Morrison's parents, John and Mary Louise (Ham) Morrison, ran a general merchandise store in the town with but meager success. They raised Henry in a home permeated by the "so-called" traditional values such as honesty is its own reward, hard work breeds success, virtuous and frugal living is its own reward, and responsibility to law and order is our own lot. Gradually, Henry Morrison became convinced that the greatest threat to his way of living was an unintelligent and lawless citizenry. Since organized religion could not

3 Ibid.
or would not attack the problem, the schools, Morrison believed, could and should. Very early in his life Morrison had identified the goal of his life; the use of public education to develop an intelligent citizenry that could triumph in the struggle for existence and the survival of society.

Morrison's family was not financially successful enough to send him to college. However, he had done so well in his preparatory work for college that the local banker and the selectmen of the town raised a purse of $1,000 to send him to school. During the summer before college, he often "held" school to supplement the family income, but the thousand dollars was sufficient to cover his expenses in college.

When he entered Dartmouth College in 1891, there were three possible courses of study which he could follow: a classical course, a Latin-Scientific course, or a Scientific course. Of the three, Morrison followed the Classical course which concentrated on Greek, Latin, Mathematics, English and foreign language. He took a heavy concentration in philosophy. The only course he had resembling one in pedagogy was during his senior year when Philosophy I dealt with elementary psychology. He was an

---


excellent student, receiving special honors in German, philosophy, and astronomy, and receiving cash prizes for English composition and German.

At Dartmouth, Morrison was influenced by James Fairbanks Colby, Professor of Law and Political Science and Instructor in History. In dedicating a book to him in 1937, Morrison acknowledged that it was in his classroom many years ago that he came to see that "a good American is not a product of racial inheritance but a moral and intellectual achievement."6 The Bachelor of Arts Degree was conferred on Henry Clinton Morrison on June 26, 1895. He was one of two students to be graduated magna cum laude.7

Dartmouth marked the end of Morrison's formal education although he later received an honorary M.S. degree in 1906, and an L.H.D. degree in 1931 from the University of New Hampshire. On June 10, 1914, the University of Maine awarded him a special diploma, an appropriate hood, and the LL.D. degree.8

After graduation from Dartmouth College in 1895, Morrison began a teaching and administrative career in the public schools of New Hampshire and Connecticut. Here he served successively as teacher, high school principal, school superintendent and, for fourteen years, as state

---


8Ibid.
superintendent. In 1917, he became assistant secretary of
the Connecticut Board of Education.

In 1902, Morrison was married to Marion Locke. In
the years to come, three boys, Robert, Hugh and John were
born to round out the Morrison family.9

It was during his service in New England that Henry
Clinton Morrison developed his simple and homely philosophy
of American public education as something that grows vitally
from the soil and that needs to be kept clear of non-democratic
influences. He often decried the acceptance of the German
elementary school during the 1830's as well as the general
influence of German scholarship on American advanced education.10

The reputation of Morrison was so outstanding in 1919
that, at the age of forty-eight, he was called to serve as
professor of education and director of the laboratory schools
at the University of Chicago. According to Brown:

Henry Clinton Morrison rose to prominence and gained
national recognition through his services to education
in New Hampshire. Dr. Judd had been greatly impressed
with Dr. Morrison's leadership in New Hampshire and had
sought to interest him in a university position.11

At the University of Chicago, Dr. Morrison taught,
wrote, and lectured extensively for eighteen years until in

9 Leaders in Education (New York: Science Press, 1948),
p. 730.

10 Henry C. Morrison, The Evolving Common School
(Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933),
p. 9.

11 Brown, "Morrison's Contributions to Education",
pp. 380-81.
1937, he reached the age of retirement and became professor emeritus. Retirement from active teaching in 1937 made little difference in his life or routine. He merely continued the development of an idea that had been in his mind for many years, an exposition of what he called the American common school. Two important books were published during his retirement and at the time of his death he was working on another volume, *Our University Foundation.*

For relaxation during his later years of retirement, Morrison began to take up gardening. He never had been a man who enjoyed hobbies or knew how to relax. It was difficult to begin at that age but he did develop a love for gardening and spent hours puttering with his flowers. On March 19, 1945, Morrison was in his garden on Blackstone Avenue. There he suffered a heart attack and by nightfall he had died. The obituary for Morrison which appeared in *School and Society* contained these brief words:

Henry Clinton Morrison, Professor Emeritus of Education, University of Chicago. Succumbed to heart attack while working in his garden, March 19, 1945 at the age of seventy-three.

Throughout his life, Morrison was imbued with the deep sense of civic and moral responsibility to society that an educated man had to exhibit if our society was to perpetuate itself. Morrison tried to exemplify in his own

---


life the concept of the educated man as he conceived it to be. "An educated man was one who took on the arts and sciences and moral attitudes which make up the fabric of civilization."14 "An educated man displayed what the French express so well... savoir faire."15

Henry Clinton Morrison, the man, appeared to be a difficult person for his colleagues to know and understand. He evoked intense and often contradictory feelings from those who worked with him. To some he was a charismatic figure, the kindest man they had ever met, the greatest teacher they had ever had. To others, he was a martinet, a task-master, an idealistic reformer who thought it was his task in life to upset an otherwise smoothly functioning organization.

Morrison was an imposing looking man whose walk and carriage gave him the appearance of being an Old Testament prophet and of being much taller than he actually was. He was tall, at least six feet tall, and his bushy hair, his gray mustache, his deep set eyes, his stern expression, his brusque manner, his habit of looking over you not at you, his impatience with small talk, his lack of urbanity, and his awkward gait all combined to make him more feared than loved, more respected than admired. But the gruff exterior concealed a shy, kind, sensitive personality within.16


Henry Clinton Morrison was strict, firm, demanding, uncompromising, idealistic, and authoritarian. These were characteristics born out of intense visionary dedication to teaching, to education, and to moral and citizenship training. He was committed to a cause, and like many other idealistic reformers, he let nothing, rank, status, job or personalities, stand in his way.

"I have been a product of my times,"17 Henry Morrison said and his times encompassed a number of significant struggles within the field of education. The American high school had barely attained legal status and was in the process of developing into an integral part of the American public school system. The whole concept of professional supervision of schools was in its infancy and the role of superintendent was not clearly defined in American society. Given time, both of these institutions could have developed in a much more regular progression but at the turn of the century there was no time for relaxed development into maturity.

From 1900 on, the enrollment of the high school increased tremendously year by year. For several decades, the enrollment doubled. For the first time in our history, the labor of children was not essential for economic growth. So the children went to school. The growing numbers of pupils called for an increased number of teachers and both required schools in which to be housed. Qualified teachers could not

boards, which had difficulty supervising elementary schools, now ran into unexpected problems in trying to operate the new high schools. Too many students, not enough teachers, incompetent supervision, willing but unqualified board members were but a few of the educational problems to be solved.

Henry Clinton Morrison, who had experienced these conditions at first hand, was disturbed by them and he set about to solve them with all the vigor he could muster. The conditions of the times of his educational career demanded reform and Morrison spent his professional life in responding to these demands. The setting in which a person grows and matures affects him and directs him personally and professionally.

The academic career of Morrison ranged from activities as teacher, principal, city superintendent, state superintendent, director of the laboratory schools to university professor. As he moved from one level of professional performance to another, he was always a teacher.

First of all, Morrison was committed to teachers and teaching. He considered himself a teacher and a schoolmaster, not an educator, not a professor, not a scientist, not an administrator, but a teacher.

I am sure that at bottom I am temperamentally a teacher and a schoolmaster. Anyhow, I began teaching when I was seventeen years old and have never done anything else, not even in the twenty years when I was city and state superintendent. At least other duties have been incidental to teaching. I have never really desired to do anything else. 18

18 Morrison, "What I Have Been Driving At," p.3.
Morrison himself narrates his activities after graduation from Dartmouth. "I began after college days as a high school teacher holding classes in Latin, mathematics, history, physics, and chemistry, and managing what now would be called a consolidated school." The school which he managed at Milford, New Hampshire had fallen on bad days. Its student body was dominated by several oversized bullies whose curricular activities consisted of terrorizing timid school teachers. Morrison's early life and experiences in the lumber camps at Oldtown had prepared him to meet his first "educational challenge." It was not long before Henry Morrison had literally whipped the school into shape.

As a result of the reputation which he earned for conducting a well disciplined school at Milford, Morrison was appointed city superintendent of schools in Portsmouth, New Hampshire in 1899. At this time only thirty-one percent of all school districts in New Hampshire boasted of "professional supervision." The Portsmouth appointment was quite a promotion for a young man of twenty-eight.

During Morrison's tenure in Portsmouth, three significant events occurred which were to shape his future activities. In October, 1901, when Morrison was Vice-
President of the New Hampshire State Teachers' Association, he shared the same speaking platform with Colonel Francis Parker. Parker spoke on "Education into Citizenship" and "Artist or Artisan, Which?". Only several months prior to this, Colonel Parker's Elementary School of the Chicago Institute had become affiliated with the University of Chicago to form the School of Education. Little did Morrison realize at that time that eighteen years later he would be in charge of the school that Colonel Parker had brought to the University of Chicago.

The second event occurred in 1902 when Morrison was elected President of the New Hampshire State Teachers' Association. It was this organization which was later to bring Morrison in close contact with Charles Hubbard Judd. Judd's observations of Morrison's ability led him to offer Morrison a position at the University of Chicago seventeen years later.

In 1904, the third significant event occurred when Morrison was appointed Commissioner of Public Instruction for the State of New Hampshire.

I was commissioned by Governor Bachelder October 25, 1904, and at once assumed those duties of the office which none but the superintendent can perform.


During his tenure as State Superintendent (1904-1917), "the duties of the office which none but the superintendent can perform" increased in number and complexity and in the fulfillment of these duties Morrison remained essentially a teacher, a teacher of all concerned with education.

At the beginning in New Hampshire, Morrison saw universal and better supervision as the key to the highest success of the educational program. He, therefore, proposed legislation to form unions of rural towns and to place professional superintendents in charge of all schools. He initiated a vigorous program of in-service training of superintendents which was one of the most successful enterprises of its kind ever undertaken in this country at that time. Supervision of schools rose to a high level of effectiveness in New Hampshire during his administration.24

As State School Superintendent, Dr. Morrison taught the people of his state by informing them of educational problems. He taught his superintendents to act as educational statesmen and as school reformers. In meetings and conferences, he met the people fact to face. In language they could understand, he explained the meaning of schools and the value of education to children. He always emphasized good citizenship as the ultimate aim of schools. No group was too small and no section of the state too far away when a call came to talk to the people. He was in constant demand in this area of activity.

Morrison was a unique state chief educational officer in that he spent nearly all his time out in the field, where he encouraged his superintendents to strive for better teaching in the classrooms. During the years of his tenure, notable advancements were made in teaching practices. Innovations such as a functional approach to the teaching of Latin, and an intrinsic approach to beginning reading represented progressive developments in education that in those years were far in advance of their time.\textsuperscript{25}

Shortly after he became state superintendent, Morrison developed a system of institutes. Harry A. Brown, deputy state commissioner in New Hampshire under Morrison, described these institutes:

These were not inspirational in a maudlin sense; they were educational conferences devoted to the serious discussion of better teaching practices, better supervision, and better school organization. Throughout the school year Dr. Morrison lectured twice at some institute for teachers every Friday and took with him several other instructors. The whole purpose was inservice teacher-education. He held a two-week institute for superintendents in the summer at which strong unit-courses in educational psychology, teaching, supervision, and administration were given. Another one-week institute for superintendents was held in the winter vacation, devoted to the advanced professional study of school problems. These institutes were intensive in character and held morning, and afternoon and also evening sessions. The evening meetings often continued far into the night in the form of small-group discussions. Outside educators of national standing were brought in for short courses, and superintendents who had done outstanding things in their schools also acted as instructors. In the last few years of his term of service, members of the augmented staff of the state education department served as instructors.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 381.

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 382.
In addition to the activities noted, Morrison conducted teachers' examinations, approved all schools within the state, served on the State Medical Board, and supervised attendance and child labor laws. He also wrote book-sized educational reports to the Governor each year which furnish excellent and comprehensive source materials for the status of education in the 1900's.

During the summer of 1905 Morrison taught college classes for the first time by lecturing on administration at Dartmouth. Two years later, 1907, he published his first article in a major journal, the *Journal of Education*.

The following year he was elected President of the American Institute of Instruction, an organization that had been formed in Boston in 1830.

The ties which Morrison had established with the University of Chicago began to develop during this period. In 1911, Charles Judd, who was then Director of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, spoke at the fifty-eighth meeting of the New Hampshire State Teachers Association, on the topics, "The Scientific Study of Education", and "Practical and Theoretical Education." These talks had an effect on Morrison and when the opportunity was to present itself, Morrison knew exactly where he wanted to continue.

---


his work, his search for a theory of education based on scientific principles.

The following summer, Judd invited Morrison to be a guest instructor for the summer session at the University of Chicago. Four years later, 1916, when Judd was appointed director of a survey to evaluate the schools of St. Louis, Missouri, he engaged Morrison as a specialist to investigate the attendance department and the general organization of the system.29 By 1919, when the position of director of the Laboratory Schools of the University of Chicago became vacant, Judd was well acquainted with Morrison's accomplishments and administrative skills.

Prior to going to the University of Chicago, Morrison made a significant change which broadened his educational experiences still further. He resigned his position in New Hampshire in November, 1917, and moved to the neighboring state of Connecticut to become the assistant secretary of the State Board of Education. He remained in Connecticut for only two years. In 1919, he was offered a position at the University of Chicago by Charles H. Judd, then Dean of the School of Education and head of the Department of Education.30 On July 1, 1919, Henry Clinton Morrison became Professor of School Administration and Superintendent of the


which he held until the end of the school term in 1928.

The year 1919 marked the end of a definite era in the educational life and career of Henry Morrison. Up to that time, he had been grappling with the significant educational problems of his day. Travelling throughout New Hampshire, he saw at first hand the negative effects of incompetent teaching; the dire consequences of ignorant decisions by illiterate board members; the dulling drabness of rote learning, lesson learning, ground-to-be-covered, time-to-be-spent methods of teaching; the tremendous inequality of educational opportunity open to children. He witnessed the confusion created by discontinuous systems of schools; he saw district after district facing financial ruin; he saw the results of incompetent supervision by administrators; he saw districts without any supervision at all. He was faced with these problems and was groping for tentative solutions to them.

Morrison was deeply conscious of the problems facing education and he knew that they had to be solved. And so he began taking steps to experiment with solutions to these problems. By the time he arrived in Chicago, he had tentative ideas about how subjects should be structured and taught, and how districts should be organized, governed, and financed. All the time he had been in New Hampshire and Connecticut,

---

he was enthusiastically aware that some of his contemporaries cherished the same views and concerns and were building up university laboratories and departments of education to attack these problems. He wanted to be a part of that movement.

Harry A. Brown's comment on Morrison's reaction to the position offered him at the University of Chicago reveals Morrison's dedication to his task as an educator and a teacher and Brown's respect for the man and the educator.

Morrison saw the opportunity that awaited him in the possibility of combining university teaching with the development of an elementary and a secondary school where he could exemplify his ideas under laboratory conditions. His New Hampshire experience was excellent preparation for the new venture, for he had already made extensive use of an entire state as a laboratory for experimental development of progressive practices in education based upon sound scientific principles, as far as they were known at that time.

He did not, however, stop at what had been proved; he did not attempt to prove what ought to be by measuring what is; he formulated basic principles and with creative intuition he developed new methods and tested their results with such instruments as were then available.

The period up to 1919 was the period in which Morrison saw the problems of education at first hand and began to search for tentative solutions. From 1919 to 1928 he formulated the theoretical background for approaching these problems, tested out tentative solutions under laboratory school conditions, and carried on a vast amount of experimentation.

---


33Brown, "Morrison's Contributions to Education," p. 381.
Morrison's experimental and scientific attitude earned him recognition and created the opportunity for him to devote the best period of his life to the research and teaching of educational theory and to experimentation in his laboratory schools. The publication of the results of his constant search for a better way to teach and organize had to wait until Morrison could be relieved of his many administrative duties and could concentrate fully on his teaching, research, and writing. This occurred in 1928 when he resigned as director of the laboratory schools.

Despite the burden of his administrative duties as director of the laboratory schools, Morrison found time to write and publish two major works during this period. In 1921, the American Council on Education established an Educational Finance Inquiry Commission to conduct a "series of intensive studies of the costs and revenues of public school systems in as many of the states as time and funds would permit." Morrison served on the National commission, and together with Nelson B. Henry, Floyd W. Reeves, and George W. Willett, formed the staff for an intensive study of Illinois. Their report, written primarily by Morrison, was entitled, The Financing of Public Schools in the State of Illinois. Morrison's work on this study developed

34 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
In him a deeper interest in finance which resulted in the publication in 1930 of *School Revenue*, 37 and the *Management of School Money* 38 in 1932.

Morrison's major work of this era of his early writing was *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School*, published in 1926. 39 This book created an immediate sensation in educational circles in this country and abroad and marked the arrival of Morrison as an educational figure to be considered in the days to come. He was invited to speak all over the country to explain his "system". Students crowded into his courses at the university. George Willett has described the effect of these courses:

Principals and superintendents urged teachers to take courses with Professor Morrison. The results were startling. Those who had taught for years and years revolutionized their procedures. Daily recitations either disappeared or occurred occasionally as functional parts of procedures looking to general understanding of large units of work. Pupils made the classroom a laboratory where work was actually done; teachers eliminated much of their drudgery in the correction of short papers at home; red ink ceased to flow uselessly over reams upon reams of student papers; new courses of study developed. Teachers who had never aspired to authorship essayed to publish text-books usable in accord with this new interpretation of secondary education. Induction into the technique of research became the lot of all youngsters. Mary Jones was stimulated to do her best irrespective of Jane Smith's ability or exertion. Individual initiative was fostered among youth in that each could choose for himself the supplementary projects into which he would venture. The mere "parrot work" of


The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School was the result of a long period of thinking and planning that stretched back into the New England days. When Morrison arrived at the University he had mimeographed some of the material which was contained in the book. In fact, portions of the book had been published in mimeographed form by the Edwards Press of Ann Arbor, Michigan in 1924.41

In the Laboratory Schools of the University of Chicago he tested many of the ideas contained in the mimeographed material, expanded on them, revised the material, and published it in book form. Morrison describes the developmental phases of this work in its preface.

The volume is the product of a study of teaching as it is found in schools and in undergraduate colleges, and of the literature bearing upon the subject, extending over a period of about twenty-five years. The study has been largely experimental: first, in the schools of a New England city; then at different points under differing conditions, and in varying fragmentary forms in a state system of public schools; and finally, much more systematically, for six years in the Laboratory Schools of the University of Chicago.42

According to Harry Brown, "Dr. Morrison's most popular book has been his Practice of Teaching." In it he saw two major units in the educational system and he recognized them as social institutions. They were School and University.


42 Morrison, Practice of Teaching, pp. v-vi.
Brown stated that "This is a great conception; and it may well be the basis for the complete rebuilding of education in America and the world in the postwar period." Brown's prediction was Morrison's dream, a dream which was never realized.

During the time Morrison was busy administering the Laboratory Schools and writing, he was not immune from the occupational demands of the professional life. . . interminable meetings, innumerable lectures, and detailed reports. He served on numerous University of Chicago committees exploring such areas as "Economy of Time in Education", Reorganization of the College Program, and "The Role and Development of the Junior College". His lectures took him all across the country. In School and Commonwealth, he published some of his speeches and the contents give evidence of his peripatetic wanderings. A radio speech in Chicago; an address at the University of Pennsylvania; a lecture to the Science and Mathematics Association in St. Louis; a talk to the Progressive Education Association in San Diego; an address to the Baltimore County Teachers; a speech at Columbia, South Carolina; a convocation address at the University of Pennsylvania and another at the University of the State of New York; a lecture to the American Council of Education in Washington, D.C.; more speeches at the University of Toledo. . . all proving the point he was want to make when he said, ". . . a teacher is bound always to be lecturing his friends, and I plead guilty to that as one of my numerous faults.""\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{43}Brown, "Morrison's Contributions to Education," p.382.

\textsuperscript{44}Morrison, "What I Have Been Driving At," p.3.
At the end of the school term in 1928, Morrison was relieved of his administrative duties as director of the Laboratory Schools at his request. He was transferred to the Department of Education. Thus relieved of the administrative duties and assigned to a reasonable teaching load, Morrison could devote more time to writing and book after book began to appear.

During the years after 1928 Morrison produced and had published the following books: *School Revenue* in 1930; *The Management of School Money* in 1932; *The Evolving Common School* in 1933; *Basic Principles in Education* in 1934; and *School and Commonwealth* in 1937. All of these were written while he was still serving full time as a University professor.

Upon his retirement from the University in 1937, Morrison received the gift of "free time". This he used to pursue his writing and to continue the development of an idea that had been in his mind for many years, an exposition of what he called the American Common School. The first of this series, *The Evolving Common School*, had appeared in 1933 and was followed by *Basic Principles in Education* in 1934, *The Curriculum of the Common School* in 1940 and his final work *American Schools: A Critical Analysis of Our School System*, which was published in 1943. At the time of his death in 1945, he was working on *Our University Foundation*. 

---
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According to Moehlman, a number of educationists considered his last work, *American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System* to be his most important contribution. Since it is the practice of the teaching profession, particularly in administration, to center its praise on the activist rather than on the retired specialist, Morrison's recent works, in terms of circulation, did not receive the same attention as did his earlier books.

In addition to his major books, Morrison made a number of surveys of school finance and participated in several surveys of school systems. His six biennial reports in New Hampshire while he was state superintendent were "book-size educational documents of rare penetration and educational vision." Their uniqueness lay in the fact that they were honest appraisals of education in the state. "They pointed out faults and unsolved problems as well as excellencies." Following the appearance of his first article in the *Journal of Education* in 1907, Morrison became a regular contributor to the major educational journals, submitting articles on topics which ranged from "Vocational Training and Industrial Education" in 1908, "The School and Defense", "The Readjustment of Our Fundamental Schools", "Sincerity in the Present Situation" to "Thumbs Down on Federal Equali-

---

46 Moehlman, "Morrison: Master Teacher,"
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zation" in 1944. His articles could be found in such journals as Educational Review, The School Review, Educational Administration and Supervision, Journal of Education, Educational Record, and The Nation's Schools to mention but a few which indicate the level of his journalistic publications. 50

Over the years Henry Clinton Morrison gradually became a man with a purpose, a man with a mission to perform, an impassioned idealist. He became a committed man, a dedicated man. He had a task to perform and a commitment that furnished the impetus for him to keep going.

First, Morrison was committed to teachers and to teaching as evidenced by his entire life's work and by many statements made throughout his career.

It was in his preface to The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School that he acknowledged the importance of teaching most succinctly when he said, "... [the message] in this book is addressed... especially to the executive and staff officers of schools who realize that teaching is by far the most important activity which they have to administer." 51

Second, Morrison was committed to an idea: "That [idea] was and always has been the notion that character and intelligence broadly diffused amongst the population is the only possible basis for the welfare of people in society and that the only instrument useful for that end is universal education of the rising generation. I have preached [this] to hundreds of audiences for perhaps thirty-five years and I suppose I have never conducted a course without it or written a book." 52

50 Education Index

51 Morrison, Practice of Teaching, p.v.

52 Morrison, "What I Have Been Driving At."
Third, he was committed to a process, a plan, a method of approach. In the past we have confused "what education ought to be" with what it is, he said.

We find running through the years a long succession of enterprises based upon what founders would have. I suppose that Benjamin Franklin in his academy at Philadelphia was in a way the great precursor of that whole way of looking at the problem. . . . We find it in the absurdities of numerous scattered colleges founded and administered by men who were convinced that they—and they alone had—it must have been by revelation—the recipe for what education ought to be!53

To gather the material for the formulation of a theory of education which would deal with the "is" in contrast to the "ought" grew to be the lifelong task of Henry Morrison.

As Morrison surveyed the educational enterprise in its entirety and pondered over the role of the school in society, he gradually developed a set of principles which were basic to his system of thinking. Fundamentally, these basic principles were as follows:

1. Institutions of society have a logical role to play in the universe and the institutions cannot depart very widely from that role if they are to accomplish the purpose for which they were intended.

2. There are basic principles which can be arrived at scientifically which account for the presence and purposes of institutions.

3. These principles must be understood if we are to control the direction of these institutions.

4. Schools are such an institution. Thus, there are basic principles which can be arrived at scientifically which account for the presence and purposes of schools.54

If one is to arrive at the basic principles underlying schools as one institution in society by scientific principle,

53Morrison, American Schools, p.v.

54Morrison, Basic Principles.
if one is to escape the dangers involved in the "ought" approach, then one must formulate a theory of education which will explain the nature of the educational experience and its purpose, Morrison suggested. Once such a theory of education has been formulated, there is a basis for the projection of other theories such as the following:

1. A theory of the curriculum. What is the valid content of education?

2. A theory of instruction which is composed of a theory of teaching and a theory of discipline. How are the content and the experiences of the child so arranged that the desirable learnings will most certainly and economically arise?

3. A theory of organization. What is the way in which an individual school or a system of schools is organized so as to make possible the attainment of the purposes of education?

Morrison wrote four basic books during his professional career to develop his theories. These books in logical order rather than in the order of their appearance were:

Basic Principles in Education
The Curriculum of the Common School
The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School
American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System

The questions to which Morrison sought answers were:

What is education? What is the content of education? How is this content organized and taught? How is this whole process organized?

Two years before his death in 1945, Morrison summarized the efforts of his life, as a man, as a teacher, as an educator

55 Ibid., p. 45.
in the preface of his final work.

For about twenty years past, I have been attempting to bring some sort of intellectual order into our activities in Public Instruction, utilizing as well as I could the methods which are common to all the sciences and especially to the social sciences. In so doing, I have thought to cover the disciplines which seem to be fundamental to our whole valid conception of the American public school and its operation.\footnote{Morrison, \textit{American Schools}, p. vi.}

Henry Clinton Morrison lived a long and full life, 1871-1945. His educational career spanned half a century, 1895-1945. His career included positions at all levels of educational activity and involvement. His writings ranged across the entire spectrum of the educational field posing answers to the why, how, what, when, and where questions plaguing educators during the difficult developmental period of American public education.

A review of the life, the academic career, and the writings of this man would prompt one to repeat the words of Arthur Moehlman.

Henry Clinton Morrison represented one of the last of a generation of sturdy and colorful leaders in public education. His influence on public education was deep and will be felt for many years to come.\footnote{Moehlman, "Morrison: Master Teacher".}

Henry C. Morrison had a conception of society and of the education that prepared one to function in that society. Morrison's conceptions of society and education, and the inter-relationships of these concepts will be reviewed as his social and educational theories are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II

MORRISON'S GENERAL SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL THEORY

Henry C. Morrison had a definite conception of society and of the education which prepared an individual to function in that society. This chapter presents a review and analysis of Morrison's conception of society and education, and of the interrelationships which existed between the two in the preparation of youth to function effectively in the social order. For Henry C. Morrison, education was the transmission of the arts, sciences and moral values which constituted the fabric of civilization. Through the educational processes, the immature individual learned to adjust to the conditions and requirements of the society in which he lived. Morrison stated:

Education is a process of adjustment by adaptation—that is to say, adjustment by inner personal changes, each of them in the direction of adjustment; that right education is a process of becoming civilized; that civilization or the art of living together in the presence of natural law is inherent in the institutional products of evolution; that right personal adaptations must be the elements of civilization.¹

Education, according to Morrison had an inner logic all its own and this inner logic was based on the doctrine of evolution, which he considered to be "the most important generalization of modern times, probably the most revealing of all times."² For Morrison, evolution explained the nature

²Ibid., p. 60.
of organic life, the nature of the human being, and the
nenature of the society in which that human being lived.
Evolution was the law of nature. "Whatever is has come to
be what it is because it had to, circumstances being what
they were and what they perhaps still are." 3 Things are
as they are by nature and it was Morrison's task to dis-
cover the laws governing nature and follow them, to find
out "why what works does work and why what does not work
does not." 4

A brief sketch of the process of evolution will be
of value as it relates to Morrison's social and educational
theories. In the evolutionary process, three principles
are basic: variations in animal life of the same organic
forms, inheritance and survival of adaptations or variations,
and adjustment to the environment for survival. 5 Variations
somehow occur in a species causing that form of animal life
to become better fitted to survive in a changing environment.
Favorable variations accumulate, unfavorable ones disappear,
and the favorable adaptations are passed on to succeeding
generations. Organisms that survive in the long run are
those best fit to survive. Favorable variations enable
organisms to make "adjustment to the environment in the
broadest sense on peril of extinction or at least misery
to self and others." 6

3Ibid., p. 62.
4Ibid., p. 8.
5Ibid., p. 63.
6Ibid., p. 66.
The process by which a variation occurred and was transmitted by heredity to enable the organism to better survive was called by Morrison "adaptation"; the result was "adjustment." \(^7\) Man, as an animal had undergone physical adaptation. "The sum total of our adaptations \(^8\) what we are, physically speaking." His body had become physically adjusted to the environment. To this point, man was no different from any other zoological creature.

But a fundamental break occurred in the evolutionary process. Man as an animal developed into "homo sapiens" by virtue of four distinctive characteristics which differentiated him from other creatures. According to Morrison:

Finally \(^9\) there appeared "homo sapiens" standing erect, possessed of a peculiar fore paw, capable of articulate utterance, and endowed with a brain and sense organs altogether in a class by themselves. The vocal organs rendered man capable of speech and "upon this supreme adaptation rests the possibility of language, of thought, of culture, of civilization. More than that, it closes one chapter in evolution and opens another, for it makes possible the beginning of social evolution and personality."\(^{10}\) The course of evolution had taken a new direction and a significant dimension had been added.

This new direction and dimension enabled education to develop. Man could communicate. He could pass on his

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 67.
\(^8\)Ibid.
\(^9\)Ibid., pp. 75-76.
\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 76.
culture to the next generation. Man was capable of assimilating and learning that culture. Man could develop as a person. He could now be defined in a sense other than physical. Just as the sum total of our adaptation was what we are, physically speaking, so the sum total of our learnings, or personal adaptations, defined us personally. Man could develop a personality through communication with others. Man could learn.

With these four characteristics man's adaptive range was infinitely expanded. Man alone in the whole realm of animal activity had the adaptive capacity to adjust to any environment which he had thus far encountered. "Quantitative developments [had] led to conditions under which a qualitative change became possible." Moreover, man could react upon and modify his environment. He could develop a culture. He was now a social being and society could evolve. He could develop a civilization. Morrison summarizes this change as follows:

Now what organic evolution is to the race, civilization is to society and education—that is, development through learning—is to the individual. Fundamentally, the process is the same; the evolution of personality on the one hand and that of civilization on the other are, taken together, a continuation of organic evolution. They are evolution in a new phase. The process may be different, for whereas organic evolution is limited to variation, inheritance, and survival, the evolution of personality and indirectly that of civilization can be brought under control and the process greatly expedited.12

Man now became more or less capable of controlling his own destiny but progress in that regard was slow and painful

11 Ibid., p. 92.
12 Ibid., p. 82.
until man developed effective means of accumulating wise behavior patterns and learned to transmit these patterns by ways other than "the hazardous and wasteful method of tradition." Morrison stated:

The race has been here a long time; and it has been obliged to learn a great deal, practically all of it in the direction of co-operation in getting along together and in utilizing the forces and resources of nature. Thus has civilization, or the art of living together, been built up.

Morrison's concept of society was basic to the development of his educational theory. Both theories of society and education were essentially based on the doctrine of evolution as Morrison envisioned it. Morrison's discussion of the development of the concept of society began with a definition of society that was developed by the sociologist Albion Small:

Society is that phase of the conditions of human life which consists of inevitable action and reaction between many individuals. It is also living together in mutual relationships.

So, Morrison elaborated, society is, first of all, the name for a form of existence. Just as man is conditioned by laws of gravity, electricity and chemistry, and by the structure and physiology of his own body, in the same sense is he conditioned by the inescapable circumstance of

13 Ibid., p. 83.
living in social relations with other human beings. Second, living together in mutual relationships means that social relationships are established. Morrison believed that the words "society" and "social" were frequently misused. He defined society concisely and comprehensively:

"When individuals live in communication with one another, whether it be in the same community or in different communities or in no community at all, under common estimates of the world of common experience and under common expectations of what each will do under certain sets of circumstances, then there is a social order, a society, and the society acts as a going concern, much as a business enterprise is said to be a going concern." 16

Common estimates and common expectations, Morrison asserted, constitute organized society. The society is an organism, not a physical organism but a social organism. Such a society or social order is in the order of nature. Finally, Morrison notes, that society is not self-conscious or a self-conscious being. Society requires nothing, decrees nothing, decides nothing, invents nothing. Individuals invent, governments decree, courts decide, circumstances as well as powerful men or the law sometimes require, but not society or societies. At its base, society rests on the individuals that comprise it.

Having defined society, Morrison moved to study its structure. He asked, "Can we then find characteristic sets of common estimates and common expectations, or rather relationships in which the latter inhere?" 17 The answer was,

17 Ibid., p. 10.
"Yes, in the broadest sense four of them: folkways, mores, customs, and institutions."¹⁸

"A folkway is a form of common expectation."¹⁹ There are thousands of folkways. The origin of the great folkways is obscure and lost in antiquity. People did things in a certain way that met their needs, and the folkway thus established was transmitted by tradition. Each folkway is the product of "the action and reaction between many individuals."²⁰ Whatever modifies folkways modifies society, for better or for worse.

A mores is the attitude characteristic of a given population. It may be said, for example, that good taste and approved behavior are based in the local mores of this community or in its civic decency. So, "common estimates are mainly in the mores."²¹ The estimates may be grossly wrong in fact, but they are estimates just the same; they are a part of the structure of that society.

While some sociological writers have stated that mores tend to govern, Morrison did not wholly agree with that position. He stated that the statement was partially correct since common expectations and estimates do determine conduct to some degree. But mores determine conduct in the socially minded, the ethical alone. There is nothing positive

¹⁸ Ibid.
¹⁹ Ibid., p. 11.
²⁰ Small, General Sociology, p. 405.
²¹ Morrison, Curriculum, p. 11.
about folkways and mores by which the community can govern its irresponsible members. Morrison then traced the logical development of customs and law:

So, instead of the mores acting as a compelling code of conduct, the juristic and political approaches tell us that positive control is in the customs out of which civil law has evolved. 22

Customs referred to the way in which things were done, human interactions were handled, and the social order and discourse were maintained. A large part of positive control comes from custom. Although Morrison referred to custom as "primitive law", when custom merged into law, he did not intend to limit custom to proto-law alone. For example, when a person asks about making a social visit, he is not concerned about a statute or a moral obligation. Rather, he raises an ethical question. Custom tends to dictate the answer.

The Institution is the fourth member of the elementary structure of ordered relationships between individuals as discussed by Morrison. When a particular element in the folkways or the mores, or a particular custom, becomes so important in experience that other elements in folkways and mores or a whole group of customs cluster around it and become integrated, then an Institution is born and civilization is launched. There are many such institutions; universal, national, and local, major and constituent, temporary and established.

22 Ibid., p. 12.
When an institution such as Language or Number appears everywhere or nearly everywhere in advancing societies and when it is seen rationally that it is in principle a part of the method by which people live together in harmony and cooperation, then it can be concluded that it is a universal institution. Those individuals who possess a universal institution are better off than those who lack it. Morrison arrived at what he called a serviceable definition of a universal institution:

A universal institution is a system of popular usages or beliefs which originating in human nature, in the common sense and experience of mankind, has survived as a useful form of harmony and cooperation, has become organized, extended, and refined in the course of social evolution, and is, finally, capable of being rationally comprehended as a necessary element in the structure of all advancing societies.23

Institutions then, continued Morrison, "are the great culture carriers, the depositories of social heritage, the media of its operation and perpetuation."24 Without them, there would be no enduring products of the intercourse and interstimulation of individuals and groups. All institutions in their nature are social, not physical or biological.

In his concluding remarks regarding society, Morrison commented on leadership, which "in dynamic social existence is as important as structure."25 He stated that societies or social orders do not become effective spontaneously. Like other organisms, they depend upon "head" dominance which is

23Ibid., p. 14.
25Ibid.
found in the leadership of individuals. Vital leadership is that process of leadership and coordination by an individual which is required for the effective functioning of a community, an enterprise, or an organism. According to Morrison, whatever the organization, it will not function without head dominance of some kind. Leadership is determined by mores. He is the leader whom the common people will follow. Leaders are not appointed or elected, they arise.

The principle of leadership is important in Morrison's theory of the school. For centuries men have seen that the quality of leadership in the community depends upon the rate and extent to which civilization is bred into the mores. Modern despots recognize the leadership principle when they use their school systems for propaganda purposes. Morrison develops the leadership principle further:

Nor is political leadership the only form. The community gets the kind of literature and music and painting which the content of the mores justifies. We get the kind of Government, especially in democracies, which the standard of conscience and political intelligence in the mores requires.26

While it is in no sense the function of the schools to educate for leadership, it is their business to educate the kind of followers who will follow the best leadership in the field. The common schools were not intended to train individuals for leadership positions or to produce an aristocracy of intellectually elite. The primary purpose of the Common School was to train the whole rising generation up to the point of educational maturity. At this point leaders would emerge,

26 Ibid., p. 15.
and the educated man, the wise, virtuous, law-abiding citizen would be capable of making an intelligent choice to follow that leadership which would be in the best interest of society and the common good.

Social organization cannot be readily understood except as a part of culture. "Culture", according to Morrison, "comprises inherited artifacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, habits, and values." Often, the common meaning of culture carries the notion of pursuit of higher arts and sciences, the tastes and graces of a highly civilized life. These represent cultural acquisitions at a high level of civilization. In that sense, they are parts of the body of the "Higher Culture."

The characteristic which distinguishes man from the subhuman species is that he is organically capable of enshrining culture in the cultural products which he leaves behind him. When men shaped stones roughly to serve as pounding instruments, they began to create a new environment which was different from the natural environment. Morrison asserts that "the law of adjustment is inexorable."

People did not emerge into a highly institutionalized society, and come in contact with the cultural environment which that kind of society makes inevitable, without finding that the new environment requires adjustment to itself on pain of some kind of extinction, just as did the old environments.

Writers often mistake culture for civilization and the reverse. Morrison restates the definition of civilization

---

27 Ibid.
28 Ibid., p. 16.
Civilization has been aptly called the art of living together. In light of all we know regarding the genesis of society and the history of social evolution, and having due regard to the etymology of terms, I do not believe there is any better definition stated in simple form.29

Civilization has been evolving since an early period in prehistory. Morrison states that there can only be one civilization on this planet, since human nature is the same everywhere, and in the great cosmic laws the environment is the same. A civilized individual is much the same person the world over regardless of time and place, race or nationality; but the number of such individuals in a given population may vary. It should be recognized that Morrison emphasized the role of universal, cosmic laws in shaping human society and institutions. His view is in sharp contrast to the cultural relativism that influenced many of the educational theorists who were inclined to Pragmatism.

Civilization has been defined as an art, and an art implies a technique and a structure. According to Morrison, the structure of civilization is the universal institutions which have to be the final element in social structure. It would follow then that a civilized individual at any stage of the world's development is the person who possesses the universal institutions available in his time.

Proceeding a step further, Morrison asserts that civilization has content and effect as well as structure.

29Ibid., p. 17.
He suggests that one can specify the observable measure in communities, ancient and modern, of the extent to which civilization is present in their social structures.

The terms of the measure, in Morrison's words, would be as follows:

1. Justice is most evenly, promptly, and effectively administered.

2. The national defense against the external enemy and the internal criminal is most adequately provided for.

3. The perils of the geographical and biological environments are most effectively warded off.

4. Mental and bodily health in the population is at the maximum.

5. The natural resources are most effectively conserved.

6. The distribution of wealth is at the maximum consistent with the maximum total production.30

Such a test, according to Morrison, would be good, for it would presume that much of the whole institutional fabric of civilization was so extensively bred in the mores as to be dominant in individual and group culture.

Throughout his work Morrison raised questions that guided his study and research. At this point in his review of society, its origins, development, structure, content, and effect, Morrison posed another leading question. "What assurance have we that the world as we know it, and especially the social world, is anything else than a meaningless flux of changing circumstances and ever changing adjustment?"31

30Ibid., p. 18.
31Ibid.
The search for an answer led him into such disciplines as history, philosophy, law, the physical and biological sciences and ultimately, the social sciences. For Morrison, the sociologist has to choose between believing that there is no such thing as a logic in normal ways of living together or believing that a discoverable logic exists. In his reading of sociologists, jurists, economists, and political thinkers, Morrison found a search for normality in human relationships. These writings revealed the belief that the reality of normality rests on the same terms on which the biologist rests his assumptions, namely, the assertion that normal social conditions are defined by what they have come to be. At this point Morrison stated, "Hence we turn to Evolution as the method by which normality is sought and in common use "normality" is about equivalent to "rightness." 32

The notion that there has been evolution in the scheme of things, unfolding from one state into another state, is at least as old as the Greeks. But it remained for the biologists and the sociologists in the nineteenth century to unravel the method and processes of evolution. Morrison relied on Herbert Spencer's summary of evolution as a method of social thinking to guide his own thinking. As Spencer stated:

Whatever is common to men's minds in all stages must be deeper down in thought than whatever is peculiar to men's minds in higher stages; and if the later product admits of being reached by modification and

32 Ibid., p. 19.
expansion of the earlier product, the implication is that it has been so reached. 33

And again:

It has come to be a maxim of science that in the causes still at work, are to be identified the causes which, similarly at work during past times, have produced the state of things now existing. 34

Morrison felt that man would be intellectually helpless in a world of living things if he could not rest securely upon the faith that life is the same wherever it is found, that it is at bottom no different in the lower forms than it is among humans, however it may differ from species to species in its manifestations. He stated that "Biology justifies our faith." 35

Morrison also felt man would be similarly helpless in his attempts to understand society, if he had not faith that human nature, in its common sense reactions, its passions, and in its bodily controls, has always been what it now is, despite the infinite variety of its manifestations among individuals. Morrison states, "The anthropological record justifies our faith." 36 Herein are the causes still at work in the presence of the same physical and biological forces. We do not react to all experiences in the same way in which the savage reacts, but the difference is mainly, if not entirely, due to what we have learned with our human nature

34 Ibid., p. 327.
35 Morrison, Curriculum, p. 20.
36 Ibid.
that he had not learned. The differences are cultural in their nature and not organic. Mentality does not evolve, or at best evolves after the slow methods of organic evolution; ideas do evolve, and they evolve rapidly because the method is learning.

The process of social evolution which began with man's ability to speak, to communicate his thoughts, and to learn provided the impetus for the evolution of society, universal institutions, culture and civilization. Man's natural desire to transmit these social learnings to the next generation added to the continuous advance in the levels of civilization through the process of education. Through the process of social evolution man, throughout the ages common in his basic human nature and affected by the same cosmic forces, evolved universal institutions which aided him in his adaptation, adjustment and ultimate control of the environmental forces to his own advantage. In so doing, he was able to rise above the level of the savages, who also coped with their environment utilizing the primitive institutions available to them at that time. Thus the universal institutions which evolved served as culture carriers, the depositories of social heritage, and the media of society's operation and perpetuation. These universal institutions, which were the products of social evolution, carried forward Intelligence, the capacity to see the world understandingly and to react to it rationally; Conscience, the sense of obligation without regard to the subject of obligation; and Taste, the sense of the appropriate.
Morrison moved from the process of evolution to the content of social evolution. "Perhaps," he postulates, the pursuit of happiness would be considered by most people to be the appropriate driving force in the evolution of civilization. 37 Morrison, however, discards that possibility because he said he had never seen a definition of happiness which was dynamic enough in connotation to be a driving force in anything but the endless pursuit of pleasure.

In the whole story of social evolution, Morrison sees man's efforts to escape from the difficult and undesirable as the explanation for most of the institutional development. Morrison said:

Escape from the pangs of hunger, from the attacks of ravenous beasts, from the raids of only less ravenous men, from disease, from the fear of the unknown, from the dread of destruction wrought by the elements, from the arbitrary power of capricious men and women, and not least, from the domination by the specialist—all these seem to me typical of what has chiefly forced mankind to learn all it could, all the way from the best way to kill a bear to the best way to avoid being devoured by destructive taxation. 38

The principles of evolution thus give us the only scientific approach to the tests of validity and normality. Since the beginning of history, adjustment to current circumstances has been the test of survival, in a larger sense adjustment to current circumstance evolving into creatures and cultures capable of effecting adjustment to any circum-

37 Ibid., p. 22.
38 Ibid.
linger on in the human organism and in the social structure as well, particularly in its civil and political dimensions.

Generally, organic evolution is protected from retrogression or lingering maladaptations because the method of transmission is biological heredity and regressive progeny tend to be eliminated. In social evolution, however, the method of transmission is by upbringing and instruction, and a great deal of regression can take place in a single generation and will take place if the home and the school fail.

In the continuation of his analysis of society, culture, and civilization Morrison poses another question: "Has civilization ceased evolving?" His response is that civilization changes but slowly and then for the most part in the development of the universal institutions; but, he states, the institutions themselves are in constant evolution. That process itself creates no problems, but the rapid consequent expansion of the cultural environment does make social problems. According to Morrison, it would be difficult to find an absolutely new major institution which has emerged out of nothing since recorded history began, but that gives us no assurance that the art of living together, civilization, will not in due season give us something new and more effective. Morrison elaborates on this possibility:

but whatever the future millenniums may hold in store, we may be well assured of this, that the civilization of the future will evolve out of experience found in the civilization of the present and that there can be no progress at all, but rather regression, except in so far as civilization as we know it is more and more bred into the mores through effective instruction of all the children of all the people. 40

If civilization is the art of community existence and of conquest of the environment, and if the universal institutions are the fabric of the art, then it follows that the content of the instruction leading to the general education of the nonspecialized person must be constituted of the universal institutions which are good in all advancing societies.

In the course of the evolutionary development of man, when the human organism was capable of developing a personality, learning became inevitable. The next step was the transmission of this learning from generation to generation. This could be done informally within the family and was referred to as "upbringing". It could also be done more formally by schools. If done by the schools, the transmission of learning was called "instruction". Thus, the school, as a formal agency of instruction, was an integral part of the evolutionary process and was rooted in the nature of humanity itself. Morrison commented on this point of civilization and education as the process of transmission:

40 Ibid., p. 25.
Civilization, or the art of living together has been built up. Whether we like it or not, it is the only civilization there is. The difficulty is that children do not inherit it in the germ plasm; they have to learn it..."That they [the children] will become will depend very much on the families and public schools or today."

For Morrison, there were several ways by which the learnings of one generation had been handed down and added to by succeeding generations. One was the family school which was the most significant, universal, and effective school. The family school existed in the informal experiences and relationships between the parents and children in the home and in the milieu in which they functioned. This type of school preceded the availability of the formal school. The control and guidance of the children in the development of right attitudes, appreciations, and moral values was the responsibility of the parent. This was the process of upbringing which continued until formal schooling became available and provided an extension of the learnings acquired in the family setting, the family school. The foundations of personality were of necessity laid in the primary affective relations within the home and in the imitative responses of young children to parental conduct and emotional patterns. In fact, this type of schooling was so important that in the face of an effective family life, the public primary school is at best a poor and halting agency.

41Morrison, School and Commonwealth, p. 7.
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Another school was the private school which existed primarily to expand the family school and to further the group interest and aspirations of the families from which it admits children. The private schools were independently owned and operated enterprises, funded by Church groups or subsidized by philanthropic organizations or men. These schools developed, because no others were available, to meet the interests and needs of specific groups; religious, economic and social groups. The organization and objectives of the private schools were directly related to the supporting group which financed the educational enterprise. Parents desired their children to become acceptable members of their social group and if possible to rise into higher and higher levels of social prestige. The distinguishing feature of a private school was that it existed primarily for individual benefit rather than for a social and public purpose. As long as the family school, with or without its extension in private schools, was able to fulfill its function, people were unlikely to respond to the call for public schools of any description.

The third type of school was the public school which arises in the evolutionary process whenever a public purpose in the schooling of the younger generation becomes active within an organized group or in the government of the State or the Church. Thus in its nature and in its purposes.
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the public school represents a collective response to the
principle of transmission of culture which underlies all
societal evolution and it likewise represents the polar
opposite of laissez-faire in the conduct of human affairs. 48

In the United States, by law, all state schools were
public schools, but not all public schools were state schools.
The confusion arose because many of our public schools had
perverted their original intent and had developed into schools
with a private function. They existed primarily to develop
the individual potential of each individual child no matter
where this might lead. Originally, however, schools existed
in the "interest of the defense of the commonwealths from
the menace of an ignorant citizenry." 49 They were not
private enterprises maintained by individuals or communities
but were integral parts of the "machinery of Government under
popular sovereignty." 50 They had existed for the perpetu-
ation and protection of the commonwealth. If there were
franchised voters, these voters had to have the means of
acquiring knowledge regarding public affairs. An educated
electorate is a safe electorate, safe to themselves and

48 Ibid., p. 12.

49 Henry C. Morrison, American Schools: A Critical
Study of Our School System (Chicago: The University of
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safe to society in general.  

So had run the argument all the way back to the political philosophy on which Massachusetts Bay was founded, Morrison asserted. The basic laws upon which our system of State schools was founded and which declared the essential purpose of the State school were the Massachusetts Acts of 1642 and 1647. The principles on which these acts rested were three-fold:

1. The universal education of youth is essential to the well being of the state.

2. The obligation to furnish this education rests primarily upon the parent.

3. The state has a right to enforce this obligation.

And so, the state program of studies in 1642 first proclaimed that there was "no safety in letting children grow up ignorant." Morrison spent considerable effort in documenting this basic thesis from early legislative acts, pronouncements of national leaders, state constitutions, and judicial decisions. Winthrop, Endicott, Penn, Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison... all concluded that the "major purpose of a public school system [was] the defense of society against the menace of ignorance and self-will." Article III of the Northwest Ordinance con-

51 Morrison, School Revenue, p. 15.
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rirmed this view. The state constitutions followed the
same reasoning. All recognized the civic purpose of public
education. For Morrison, the boldest and most exact procla-
mation of the essential civic purpose of the school was
contained in the preamble to the Illinois Act of 1825 which
reads as follows:

To enjoy our rights and liberties we must understand
them; their security and protection ought to be the first
object of a free people; and it is a well-established
fact that no nation has ever continued long in the
enjoyment of civil and political freedom which was not
both virtuous and enlightened; and believing that the
advancement of literature always has been and ever will
be the means of developing more fully the rights of man,
that the mind of every citizen in a republic is the com-
mon property of society, and constitutes the basis of its
strength and happiness; it is therefore considered the
peculiar duty of a free government, like ours, to en-
courage and extend the improvement and cultivation of
the intellectual energies of the whole.

But, said Morrison, from the 1820's on through the
Civil War and up to the present time, the schools began to
develop along lines that perverted the original intent of
developing an intelligent citizenry.

The change in the original purpose began to take form
in the Jacksonian era. During this time, more attention was
paid to what individuals desired than to the civic purpose
of the schools, and many of our public schools expanded
into private schools where the desires of the individual
tend to obscure the necessities of the State as an organized
self-governing society. The rights of individuals were
stressed; responsibilities as citizens were glossed over.

Morrison, American Schools, p. 78.
Gradually, many schools developed into vocational-preparation institutions, into preparatory institutions for college, and into institutions devoted to the development of the potential of each individual.

Only legislative enactment and judicial decisions forced the "issue back to the fundamental Puritan conception" and this was not wholly successful. Compulsory attendance laws and the unique character of tax-supported schools "point unmistakably to the principle that in the collective political thought of our people public schools are a part of the defenses of the commonwealth." First, all children had to be in school, and second, all people had to pay for these schools. Morrison presented his case thus:

It is repugnant to the whole spirit of our institutions to do for the citizen what he ought to do for himself, even though his individual benefit is also the benefit of society. Thus, the public health is safeguarded and health officers are paid, but the State does not pay the individual's medical bills. Water supply is essential to the well-being of the community, but the city charges water rates. Postal facilities are required, but we pay postage. Even the highway system, long a communistic enterprise, is returning to the equivalent of the original turnpike system through gasoline taxes and automobile license fees. In even so fundamental a matter as justice, courts are provided, but litigants are expected to pay their own lawyers. In fact the State school is the one instance in which the police power is exerted and the bill is paid for all out of the public purse. The reason is to be found in the principle that beyond the public health, or the physical requirements of community life, or the need of communication, none of the American states dare trust the critical nature of the enlightenment of future citizens to the chance of individual support. The several states tolerate other public schools, private schools, or even in some instances the family school.
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throughout childhood, but only on condition that these are rendering the essential service which the state require.58

Thus, Morrison was content to tolerate other public schools, private schools, and even family schools throughout childhood but it was to the State Common School that he looked as the only possible guarantee that effective citizenship would develop and that learning would not be "buried in the grave of our fathers."59 And he made it very clear that the State Common Schools existed;

...for the purpose of training pupils into good and efficient citizenship and for nothing else. The advantage of the pupils is not even incidental; it is inherent. To become a good citizen is to become educated; to become educated, in any true sense, is to be a good citizen—not only morally sound but intellectually sound.60

It was true that Morrison looked upon the family as an integral partner in the education of the child, but the stakes were too high to permit the family to have absolute control. The very existence of organized society demanded that the State guarantee the purposes and support the schools for citizens. Morrison sums up his inquiry on the social evolution of man, society, culture and civilization:

Truth to tell, every child born into the world begins about where his most remote ancestors began. He inherits not a fragment of either civilization or culture.

58Ibid., pp. 79-80.
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so far as we can make out. If he eventually becomes civilized, he does so by learning what the older generation teaches him. In his maturity he may add something to civilization which he can teach his children in turn. Thus civilization is reproduced, or goes backward, or collapses, in proportion to the effectiveness of the family and the school.\textsuperscript{61}

The basic dilemma which confronted Morrison when he relied on the notion of natural evolutionary development of social institutions can be noted. If Morrison argues, the natural evolutionary process is not interfered with, institutions will normally and naturally adapt to changing conditions and changing environment and be constantly in a state of perfect adjustment. But there is another strand in the process of adaptation. An educated man will adjust to society as it is. Yet, the purpose of his adjustment is to enable man to control and affect the environment; in other words, an educated man will have to interfere with the normal, natural, evolutionary process. An educated man is a man who knows what to do. If man does nothing, he merely accepts an environment and, hence, is controlled by that environment and he is not educated. If he acts, he is interfering with the environment and a maladaptation is bound to occur. Thus, Morrison leaves little choice to the individual. If he acts, he interferes and causes maladaptation; if he does not act, he is not fulfilling the basic purpose of education: to know what to do and thus control and affect the environment.

Morrison weaves his way out of this dilemma by \textsuperscript{61 I bid., p. 116.}
insisting that he wants man to act and interfere with the environment but only in the right manner, for the right purposes, and with the right organization. The right purpose he derived from the record of social evolution. In this instance, the right purpose for schools is the civic purpose: to develop effective, moral, virtuous, and law-abiding citizens.

The social evolution and civilizational movement which Henry C. Morrison recognizes has shown definite progress. In personality development, man has expanded tremendously, essentially because of the broadening scope of civilized social institutions and technological advances. Morrison would deny that in the course of the last hundred years any changes have occurred in science which markedly alter the direction of man's thinking. There has been a gradual extension along all lines of thought, but the fundamentals have always and will always remain the same. At present, generalized lay thinking lags behind the scientific, political, and economic advances which followed in the wake of the Industrial Revolution. This but denotes the problem for contemporary educational statesmanship.

The long ages of man's climb to civilization have witnessed many types of social experimentation of which the best in institutions and in moral standards and ideals have come down to us. The truly civilized and cultured person, nurtured on these inheritances, is, in essence, the same everywhere and at all times.

The aim of the school is the initiating of individual
publis into the richness of our physical, social, and
spiritual inheritance. The production of a citizenry so
initiated would guarantee intelligent choice of leaders
and thoughtful followership by the public. It is the task
of a science of education.

The art of civilized living is found in the universal
institutions that man has created in the process of control­
ing his environment. The general aspects or essentials of
education should then deal with those institutions that have
advanced civilized life in all human societies. Morrison
pursued a theory of education based on scientific principles
supported by the theory of evolution and the essential nature
of universal institutions.

As we move from Morrison's theory of society into his
type of education, several aspects of the evolutionary
process must be reconsidered and applied to the nature of
man, the nature of society, and the process of educating
man to live effectively as a contributing member of the
society.

Man had two aspects: the physical aspect, which was
common to all living things and which was limited to var­
iation, inheritance, and survival, Morrison called the
quantitative difference; the psychical aspect, dealing
with the evolution of personality and indirectly, the
evolution of civilization, he called the qualitative dif­
ference. These differences were significant. Morrison
drew the implications of these differences:
1. Whereas man shares with animals adaptive organs that enable him both to adjust to the environment and to learn by experience, man differs from animals in that his experience may be vicarious and not direct. His language enables man to generate, transmit, and perpetuate complex ideas.

2. Whereas an animal's adaptive capacity is determined by and limited by the excellence of the adaptive mechanism itself, man's adaptive capacity depends far more on personality, the product of learning, than on either mind or brain.\(^\text{62}\)

3. Whereas man shares with animals the fact that behavior can be interpreted on physical grounds, man differs from animals in that man's total behavior must be interpreted on physical grounds plus personal grounds.\(^\text{63}\)

4. Whereas human and animal behavior may be explained on the basis of tropism, chain-reflex associationism, conditioned response, and trial and error, man differs from animals in that he alone has conscious control over these processes and can direct them. In so doing, man undergoes an adaptive change.\(^\text{64}\)

5. Man alone can reflect; man alone can have constructive imagination. Man alone, on the basis of what he has learned, can think his way through complicated situations.\(^\text{65}\)

Thus, man cannot be reduced to physical terms and physical processes alone. There is an appropriate psychical aspect to the adaptive organism also. From the best evidence available from the psychologists, and physiologists, Morrison summarized his findings:

The organism is a unity which presents two aspects; two sets of phenomena appear one of which we call physical, and the other psychical; . . . . the connection

\(^{62}\)Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 91.

\(^{63}\)Ibid., pp. 116-120.

\(^{64}\)Ibid., p. 102.

\(^{65}\)Ibid., p. 103.
between the two is still an enigma; and finally, . . . we do not know that there is any intellectual necessity for finding a dynamic connection between the two. . . . Behavior may be recognizably physical in origin and yet exhibit psychical phenomena; or it may be psychical in origin and reveal physical reactions. 66

Morrison first turned his attention to the physical phenomena or what he called the physiological aspect of the adaptive organism of man. He carefully differentiates between the adaptive organism itself, the adaptive process, and the adaptive product or the result of the process. Man's sense organs, brain, and the nervous system make up the adaptive organism, he maintained. The adaptive processes are the processes of stimulation, integration, motor response, and chemical reinforcement. 67 Stimulation refers to the response of the organism to influences coming both from the external world and from within the organism. Motor response is locomotion or the ability to move about. The complex nervous system aided by glandular secretions, integrates the organism and enables it to act as a unit.

From the whole body of evidence which he studied, Morrison drew up a set of inferences which he believed followed logically from the data. 68

1. The function of the brain and the nervous system as a whole is to relate the organism to the external world and to coordinate bodily activities.

2. The nervous system and the body as a whole constitute an organism through which experience occurs.

66 Ibid., p. 115.
67 Ibid., pp. 123-129.
68 Ibid., pp. 131-153.
3. Learning products are the outcomes or results of the adaptive process. Learning products are not neural patterns or bonds except in those cases where behavior is expressed in sensory-motor products.

4. Learning products inhere in the self and constitute modification and extension of self. Personality has developed.

5. Self cannot be understood as inhering in the organism in either its physical or psychical aspect, nor can personal learnings or personality. These are realities, in fact they constitute fundamental reality of existence.

6. Self, personal learnings, personality or mind are not material objects having shape and substance; yet they are real. One sees their manifestations in the behavior of human beings.

7. Education which appears as a process of personal development in the individual does not inhere in the brain even though the brain makes this development possible. The brain does not become educated.

Turning his attention to the psychological aspect of man's nature, Morrison relied heavily on the concepts in the behavioral sciences that had developed by this time, 1934. He became thoroughly acquainted with the work of such psychologists as G. Stanley Hall and William H. Kilpatrick who were dealing with learning theory. With them, he repudiated the old notion of faculty psychology, which educated the mind, the brain, the emotions, and the temperament. With them he discarded the notion of neural bonds and neural pathways, and stimulus-response associationism. He became familiar with the work of W. Kohler and his contributions to insightful learning. He was acquainted

69 Ibid., pp. 153-156.

with the work of John Dewey and George M. Reid as they had developed the concept of "mind" and "self" in the individual. Morrison wrote frequently about the concept of homeostasis, how the individual operates in a state of equilibrium and once that equilibrium is disturbed, seeks to regain it.

From a wide variety of evidential material, Morrison attempted to validate his conception of the role that education had to play in the evolutionary process. Man was human because of his peculiar adaptive capacity which made possible human behavior and enabled him to behave in a variety of ways. Man could make a variety of adaptive responses to basic needs or appetites, and it was the function of education to train him to make the right adaptive responses. The correct adaptive responses enabled civilization to be continued from generation to generation and these correct responses could result in adaptive changes which not only enabled the individual to adjust to society but which could be learned and thus transmitted to another generation.

The personal or psychical aspect of man's adaptive organism greatly increased the scope of man's learning. On the one hand, he could act on the basis of tropistic, instinctive, or impulsive behavior. On the other hand, he could act on the basis of reflection, intelligence, and understanding. In the former case, the behavior was unlearned; in the latter case, the behavior was learned.

In the area of learned behavior, the schools had a significant responsibility. It was their task to "provide pupils with experience out of which learning can be built
[and upon which] rational behavior [could] be founded and further provide them with 1) the systems of reasoning which organized science expounds and 2) the critique of valid reasoning which is contained in grammar and logic.\textsuperscript{71}

Learned behavior involved the use of intelligent and rational behavior to be able to generalize, to see the relationship between cause and effect, and then to transmit these generalizations and insights. This was the prime function of teaching in the schools; to transmit these basic generalizations.

Morrison then dealt with the nature of man's adaptive organism. He felt that man's adaptive organism was propelled into action by organic drives which he referred to as appetites. Morrison explained the role of appetite in the evolutionary scheme:

The ground plan of evolution can be said to be the perpetuation of the species. Two factors are involved, preservation of the individual until he or she can take part in procreation and thereafter nurture the young, and a guaranty that the individuals of the two sexes will thus take part. Here is perhaps the fundamental condition of Nature takes no chances. Out of this condition arise certain organic drives...\textsuperscript{72}

The basic appetites which Morrison isolated were:

1. Hunger and thirst
2. Sex
3. Physical growth
4. Avoidance of pain
5. Curiosity or the drive to find out about the unaccustomed, the novel

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid., pp. 172-173.

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid., p. 175.
The development of assertion of self, mainly in the direction of egoistic behavior.\textsuperscript{73}

Here again Morrison was concerned with the role that education must play in the curbing of these appetites. All of men's appetites, without education, "tend to run wild. . . . Hunger is checked by satiety, sex by organic periodicity and the necessity of agreement between two individuals, bodily exercise by exhaustion; but there is no natural restraint on egoism."\textsuperscript{74}

Morrison reiterated his concern:

Self-appetite is by far the most influential factor in the process of education. It is not too much to say that it is the chief factor with which the schoolmaster has to reckon in formulating and laying out the course of instruction and the statesman in formulating and administering programs of social betterment.\textsuperscript{75}

The function of education, then, was to blunt the appetite, or alter its direction. Education provided the appetite with personally and socially constructive objects or activities of satisfaction. Calling this process of adjustment sublimation, Morrison asserted:

I take it that the heart of education is learning how the world is put together and being willing to be governed accordingly. The philosophers tell us that the biggest thing in the good life is sloughing off egoism by sublimating it into self-constraint, and self-denial, and self-respect.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., pp. 174-181.
\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., p. 180.
\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., p. 181.
\textsuperscript{76}Morrison, \textit{School and Commonwealth}, p. 7.
The egoism of the child became the altruism of maturity. In fact, sublimation was one of the criteria for a mature civilized person. The appetites had been sublimated to higher levels of action. Morrison said, "Hunger has been refined; sex appeal appears as a romantic regard and feeling of sanctity; self appears as ambition, widespread interest, patriotism, and self-respect." 77

Other facets of man's adaptive organism were in the realm of temperament and affect or feelings. Feelings or affect arose from the desires of appetite, especially those clustering about self. They formed the basis for personality growth since personality was, in fact, a matter of affective adjustment. 78 It was in this area that Morrison leaned heavily on the concept of homeostasis or equilibrium. 79 At any given time, the organism was in a relative state of equilibrium. When an appetitivative urge appeared, there was a feeling of discomfort which upset the equilibrium. If unhappy feelings resulted from this basic drive, the organism resorted to sublimation of the basic drive to re-establish equilibrium. Sublimation, for Morrison, would be an appropriate adaptive response to this urge. It was part of the function of education to teach pupils correct adaptive responses to these basic urges and thus reduce

77Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 183.
78 Ibid., p. 190.
79 Ibid., pp. 191-197.
emotional stress. Unless the individual were able to sublimate the appetitive urge, conflict would develop. Continued conflict would cause the "personality to become so unbalanced" that the individual would be in a state of "more or less chronic disequilibrium" and might become "merely a morbid patient in a sanitarium."\(^{80}\)

Another facet in the psychological functioning of the adaptive organism was in the area of mental processes like attention, perception, memory, recall, imagination, judgement, and reasoning. These were all part of the essential adaptive processes which the peculiar nature of man's original adaptive organism made possible. All of these processes were in the realm of the consciousness of man and enabled man to adjust better to the external environment and thus be able to control the environment.

All of these adaptive processes could not be trained or educated. Morrison pointed out the relationship of education to this whole process:

Attention is not educated, but developing personality makes attention possible in situations in which it otherwise would not occur. Perception is not educated, but accumulating experience determines the character of percepts. Memory and recall are not educated, but, as personality develops, the memory system expands in content and becomes organized so that efficient recall becomes more and more possible. Imagination is not educated, but imagination, like the other mental processes, not only makes education possible, but as personality develops the scope of imagination is broadened. The conceptual process in its several phases is not educated, but more and more concepts accrue, and

\(^{80}\)Ibid., p. 193.
that is perhaps the heart of the process of becoming the kind of person who knows what to do. Organic thinking capacity is never educated, but the individual can learn to think logically. Speech and symbolic capacity in general are not educated, but language, graphic representation, mathematics, are learned, and being learned they marvelously extend the application of symbolic capacity.81

Thus far, Morrison has asserted that man, because he was both a physiological and a psychological organism, could exhibit behavior on an intelligent and rational basis and could curb and sublimate his appetites. This was all learned behavior and as a person learned he developed a personality. At any stage in an individual's development, then, his personality was the "resultant of the sum learning to date."82

Each time an individual mastered a learning it became an accretion to personality. Each accretion which led to adjustment in society broadened the personality until the time the individual became the kind of person who knew what to do and what was good for him if he wanted to become adjusted to the laws of Nature governing social conduct. In educational terms, he then became mature and could order his own learning.83

Personality, for Morrison, did not mean charm, temperament, individuality, or character. It meant personal behavior. Reflex, tropism, impulse, conditioned response

81 Ibd., p. 217.
82 Ibd., p. 229.
83 Ibd., p. 373.
were all forms of organic behavior and were not dependent upon what has been learned, on intelligence or reason, or ideals or volitions. Personal behavior, on the other hand, was determined by what the individual has learned and has become as a person. Personality was dependent upon the accumulated social learnings of the race and upon the degree to which the school and other agencies were effective in transmitting these learnings to the person. The function of the home and the school was to see that the right structural elements of personality took form and that during infancy and early childhood there was a minimum chance for maladaptations and perverse learnings to become structural.

A normal child born into society will have experience, Morrison said. Education of some sort is bound to occur because the child is an organism capable of learning. He does learn. Some of these learnings are personal adaptations; they enable him to survive in the world. Some learnings are maladaptations; they lead to elimination of the individual. Some are perverse; they lead to the impairment of civilized order in society. Morrison asked, "What guaranty do we have that the education will produce right adaptation?" For Morrison, the answer to that would depend upon the family, the school, the state, and all institutions of social control.

84 Ibid., p. 238.
85 Ibid., p. 241.
other questions were raised by Morrison on this subject. "What constituted right personality? What were the structural elements of this right personality?" To answer these questions Morrison developed a diagrammatic scheme to illustrate the basic structural elements that comprised the right personality. From the birth line of the child to the end of infancy, the child was engaged in a series of structural adaptations, which, if mastered, would provide the child with an "adequate basis for the development of an integrated civilized personality."

Among these were the establishment of obedience, the establishment of family affection, walking, talking, avoidance of danger, thrift (more in the sense of budgeting of time than of money), and care for one's own bodily needs.

It is interesting to note that it was at this stage in his theory that Morrison introduced the notion of different types of learning which were to play a crucial part in his practice of teaching. He also introduced the concept of arts, tastes, and volitions which were to become part of the curriculum of the common school. Obedience, for example, was a learning of the appreciation type and walking was a type of neuro-muscular learning; talking, a type of language learning; self-dependence, a type of volitional learning.

86 Ibid.
87 Ibid., p. 253.
In the pre-school period, the basic personal adaptations, or learning products, were the arts, tastes, and volitions. Taste and volition were based on preference which had its genesis in obedience. All the arts, tastes, and volitions, as well as all the basic adaptations had to be taught. They had evolved because man lived in society with his fellow man; they were not innate, and once acquired, they formed a basis for the right personality which would enable a person to adjust in society. Their early acquisition was crucial for the school since "neglect of infantile learnings will in most instances inevitably incline the scales in the direction of ultimate educational failure, beyond the capacity of most schools, as schools now are, or foster homes, to repair." 88

Upon these basic adaptations, right personality or personal behavior was grounded. The period of upbringing in the family was joined by the period of formal instruction in the school in developing right personality. The civilized personality, according to Morrison, was composed of three basic components; the volitional and symbolic learnings, as language, graphic representation, and mathematics; moral values, which are cultivated tastes and ideals; and intelligence, which arises out of insights and which are largely the products of learning in the field of the sciences.

88 Ibid., p. 258.
The volitional structure was characterized by a feeling of "I can," "it is worthwhile to do what I can," and "I prefer to do so despite the effort involved." The thought structure was composed of reading and written discourse, which could produce spurious learnings or valid learnings. Learning was spurious if it degenerated into word-calling without meaning.\textsuperscript{89} Taken together, the volitional and thought structure were the "central axis of personality, the core of internal adjustment and the center of integration, the heart of the civilized self."\textsuperscript{90}

Value attitudes or appreciations formed the second thread of personality. Significant in this area were such learnings as concern for the well being of others, sense of fair play or elementary justice, property right, decent concern for the opposite sex, and fidelity to promises. These according to Morrison, were all products of social evolution and were "of universal validity because they furnish the only possible measure of social intercourse."\textsuperscript{91} In the same category were appreciations which Morrison referred to as "cultivated tastes or appreciations in the presence of the beautiful, the good, and the true."\textsuperscript{92}

These cultivated tastes were "indefeasible parts of the

\textsuperscript{89}Morrison, \textit{School Revenue}, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{90}Morrison, \textit{Basic Principles}, pp. 271-272.
\textsuperscript{91}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 274.
\textsuperscript{92}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 277.
The parts were indefeasible in the sense that they could not be nullified or voided. In large part, they defined personality.

The third basic element in right personality was the Intelligence structure. If we are to adjust to an orderly universe and thus be able to control it, Morrison argued, we have to learn the laws of Nature governing that universe and obey them. We have to learn how the world is put together. We have to understand the meaning of cause and effect.94

All three elements of right personality bore an important relation to education: they constituted the content of the curriculum of general education which was the responsibility of the school. Morrison summarized as follows:

In so far as upbringing and instruction succeed in producing an individual who meets the test of all the evolutionary processes which defines what any form of life must be, they do so only by building a personality whose structure is the essential institutions which have evolved during the long process of social experimentation. The individual becomes educated by becoming civilized, and he becomes civilized by learning to obey rightful authority, by learning to regard the rights and needs of others, by learning to read, write, and cipher, by learning the elements of the arts and sciences, the moral, and volitional religious attitudes which make up the fabric of civilization.95

Morrison did not conceive of these basic elements in personality as being discrete items. He suggested that to produce a well rounded personality required an integration

93 Ibid., p. 279.
94 Ibid., pp. 281-286.
95 Ibid., pp. 289-290.
process of these various structures and a balance among them. This integration process was inevitable if the organism was to survive. Some sort of personality was bound to appear as long as the individual lived in society. But the right personality developed only if a balance was reached or there was equilibrium between the volitional structure and the rational structure. Unless there was a balance, the personality never developed into maturity. The adaptive responses never quite resulted in adaptive changes. A spurious personality developed.

Since all the aspects of personality structure were learned, an individual reached maturity when he could be trusted to guide his own further development. He now placed the "right valuation on his relation to his self to other selves." He had learned to sublimate his basic appetites. He had become adjusted to the external world. For Morrison, the impelling drive toward this integration of personality was inherent in man's nature. Man was an integral part of society itself and he was what he had come to be through the process of variation, heredity, and survival. If he did not adjust to society, he disintegrated in personality and he broke down a bit of civilization when he failed.

The theory of evolution as Morrison interpreted it set the fundamental problem for the school and for education. Morrison summarized the matter in a series of

96 Ibid., p. 305.
It seems to follow that education itself is a process of adjustment by adaptation—that is to say, adjustment by inner personal changes each of them in the direction of adjustment; that right education is a process of becoming civilized; that civilization or the art of living together in the presence of natural law is inherent in the institutional products of social evolution; that right personal adaptations must be the elements of civilization.97

Such was education defined in terms of adjustment for Morrison. The adjustment theory was the only defensible theory of education. According to Morrison, education was adjustment. Education was not synonomous with erudition, or information or knowledge. Knowledge was only one of the sources of education, not education itself. Morrison's theory changed the statement, "Education is not preparation for life, but life itself." His would read, "Education is the preparation, at least in childhood and youth, for right living in adult life."98 In fact, Morrison claimed that any theories which began with "education for" this, that or the other, so popular in teachers' convention addresses, are usually illustrations of mysticism and not valid theories.

Nor was education, for Morrison, the unfoldment of individual potentiality.99 Breeding was the only method of developing better adaptive capacity. But the psychological aspect of personality had to be learned by all children.

97_Ibid._, p. 366.
98_Ibid._, p. 346.
All were members of society. All had to adjust to an ordered universe governed by natural law. Children may vary in adaptive capacity and strength of their basic appetites but each individual had to have common learning to get on in the world.

Morrison similarly rejected the notion that education was a matter of habit formation, or of forming associational bonds, or of the establishment of neural pathways, or of the building up of conditioned responses. Likewise he rejected the notion of mental discipline and faculty psychology which was prevalent in his day.

For Morrison, the theory of evolution was the most "revealing" and insightful generalization that had ever been developed in the history of man's intellectual and rational progress. For him it explained the nature of all organic life, the nature of the human individual, and the nature of the society in which that human individual lived. The laws governing the evolutionary process were relatively few in number. Variations occurred in living creatures. Some variations developed which enabled living creatures to continue to exist; other variations developed which caused living creatures to perish. Creatures who survived were adapted to the environment; those that perished were mal-

100 Ibid., p. 354.
101 Ibid., p. 356.
adapted. The process and adaptation, the goal was adjustment.

The next step for Morrison was to distinguish man (homo sapiens) from other living organisms. The evolutionary process now became more refined. Somehow, in the long evolutionary process a fundamental break occurred and man became a more refined organism capable of speech and endowed with a brain and sense organsisms altogether in a class by themselves. Man had both a physiological nature which he shared with animals and also a psychological nature which differentiated him from other animals. He could communicate ways of behavior and thinking that he had developed. He could transmit these ways of behaving and thinking from generation to generation. He could develop a personality. Cultural products could accrue and be transmitted to others. Heredity alone was not sufficient for man. A means had to be developed to hand down ways of behaving and thinking which were not transmitted through the biological stream.

The final step for Morrison was to make the analogy that the evolutionary process which had produced animals and which had produced man as a human being capable of developing personality also governed and determined the growth and direction of society and social institution. For Morrison, the same laws governing the development of man governed the manner in which men lived together in groups in society. Thus society had to adapt to the laws of nature also or face extinction. Man had to ferret out
the laws of nature governing society and then adapt his ways of behaving to these laws in a harmonious relation. For man and the institutions of society which developed, the same inexorable law of "adjust or perish" prevailed.

Into this general pattern, Morrison had to fit the school pupil and he had to find a rationale for the control of both pupil and school by the society. For the pupil, the point was reached when vocal organs evolved to the point where man could communicate the ways of behaving and thinking that he had developed. Man evolved a personality. He now could communicate with others more effectively and transmit this knowledge from generation to generation. The formal school came into being when society had evolved to the point where life had become so complex and differentiated that the parent could no longer effectively transmit the values, ideas, ideals, volitions, and tastes that had developed in the society. The formal school was to assume major responsibility for the transmission of these vital ingredients of civilization.

Morrison had no doubt that the pupil was capable of learning anything that the formal school could teach. But what was the formal school to teach? One had to analyze the mores, folkways, customs, and institutions which society developed to perpetuate itself. An understanding of these institutions was mandatory for man to adjust to life in that society and survive in the struggle for existence. A study of the basic institutions, thus, formed the subject-matter of the school.
By analyzing the subject-matter of the school, one could isolate the structure of each subject. By analyzing the way the pupil learned, one could determine the best method for enabling the pupil to learn. By putting structure of subject-matter and nature of the learning process together, one developed theory of teaching. By studying the societies in which formal instruction had not occurred and seeing how they had disintegrated or did not survive, one could see the necessity of right education for the perpetuation of the society. Hence followed the need of society itself to operate and finance these schools.

Finally, some learnings such as reading, handwriting, mathematical computation, and socialization were basic to living in society and were more significant than other learnings. These learnings were necessary as basic tools so that the individual could acquire further learnings. Here was the organizational basis for the primary school. The further refinement of these basic learnings—Morrison refers to these as adaptations—in addition to learning about the institutions that make up the fabric of society were delegated to the secondary school. Together, the primary school and the secondary school formed the Common School which was the school that Morrison believed the civil state should operate, control, and finance if it wanted to provide for the self-perpetuation and survival of society.

Thus, an understanding of Morrison's basic theory of
education is important if we are to understand and appreciate the other facets of the educational process with which we will be dealing. In the succeeding chapter we will explore his conception of American education and the American educational system.
CHAPTER III

MORRISON'S CONCEPTION OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Henry C. Morrison had a definite conception of society and of the education which prepared an individual to function in that society. It was on the basis of these conceptions that Morrison developed his plan of school organization, internal and external organization. This chapter presents Morrison's analysis of the historical origins and development of the American public school system, the emergence of discontinuities within the educational system, and his plan for a State supported and controlled Common School system designed to educate all the members of the rising generation up to the point of educational maturity. In the various branches of engineering, in medicine, in law, and in the crafts, man generally recognizes that principles exist which must be followed in order to arrive at useful and intelligible results. Schools are often taken for granted since most individuals have attended school somewhere and at some time. And yet it is likely that very few people realize that schools have a logical place in the universe and that they cannot depart very widely from their role if they are to accomplish anything in particular. In order to attain the objectives for which schools were established, Morrison affirmed the need for basic scientific principles upon which the process of education must be based.
In this chapter, we will deal with the abstract idea of a "school" as the name for a universal institution, part of the order of wholesome life in any possible society. The concept of the school as an agency to provide for the transmission of the cultural heritage to the next generation has a logical place in the social nature of man and society. The school as a universal institution is as significant to the perpetuation of society as are the organic growth and adjustment of man, and the cultural products he produces significant to his physical adjustment to the environment and his improved control over environmental forces. Mechanism and health have reason behind them, and so has the school. Unless these primary forms of existence are used correctly, deleterious consequences will follow. The establishment and conduct of schools, if not guided by sound principles, is a meaningless undertaking, scarcely more than the establishment of a traditional nursery on a large scale.

In endeavoring to get at and understand the scientific principle underlying education, the principle of adjustment, one has to study five fundamental intellectual disciplines: 1) the Theory of Society, 2) the Theory of Education, 3) the School Structure and School System, 4) the Curriculum, or the valid content of Education, and 5) the Principles of Pedagogy, or the nature of the learning products and the valid methods of attaining them. That is the scope of this study as it relates to Morrison's theories and interpretation.
A review of the theories of society and education as interpreted in the previous chapter will provide an orientation to the study of the school structure and school system as it evolved in the United States and was recorded, interpreted, and evaluated by Morrison.

The human infant is peculiar among animals in that he has to learn all that he will ever be or be able to do, Morrison stated. Moreover, beyond any other creature, the human adult under civilization is dependent on his kind, so that he can in no sense achieve his destiny outside of society. Since the child is devoid of instincts and has to learn, infancy is the point at which society appears in the universe, and becomes a comprehensive logic parallel with Nature. Living under social conditions means that ways of living together begin to evolve, and in general, these ways are called folkways, mores, customs, and institutions.¹ Nobody ever invented society anymore than anybody invented Nature. Both of them had to be. They arose out of the necessities of living together, and they are still social necessities in civilized existence. All this signifies upbringing of children in the family and, beyond that, instruction in the school. But there is no upbringing and no instruction except as ways of living

together are transmitted. From the earliest times the school as an institution has existed because boys and girls had to be provided with something that would guide their minds when they had passed beyond parental and scholastic tutelage and guide their acts when they were beyond the reach of the law. That something must be what is right in itself rather than what is decreed by authority or inculcated by propaganda. In short, what is transmitted must be the elements of civilization in the arts and sciences and moral attitudes which constitute civilized existence.

For Morrison, the school of necessity applied to all individuals, not only in the United States but in all nations. Otherwise there would be no adjustment of folkways, mores, and customs to the primary universal condition of happy living which is civilized society as a going concern. Morrison stated:

Ignorance and primitivism are more fundamental menaces to humanity than disease. The mores, which in the end govern everything, even in absolutisms, arise out of the persons of all - in slave times even out of the persons of slaves - and there is always and everywhere a tendency for the immature generation to regress to the lowest cultural level to be found in the surrounding population, unless the youth are prevented from so doing by competent upbringing and instruction.  

According to Morrison, it followed that the school as a universal institution was the Common School. It existed

---

not primarily for the benefit of individuals but for the transmission of civilization, and in that sense, for the benefit of the community.

The individual benefits in proportion as he himself becomes civilized and in proportion as the community in which he lives becomes more civilized and more capable of defending him in his rights, of saving him from the attacks of criminals, and of protecting him from the consequences of economic collapse. A community becomes more civilized in proportion as it contains more civilized persons.3

The school, asserted Morrison, had as its subject the common man - not common man in the demagogic sense but all of us in our nonspecialized, personal character, the citizen as distinguished from the professional man, the craftsman, the businessman, the learned man. The common man remained the subject of the school until he reached educational maturity. As the individual developed personally by learning things which were essential to his adjustment in the world, he sooner or later tended to reach the age at which he was competent to direct his further learning. Adaptability had become established in him as a social being. He was fit to be trusted as a safe citizen. His common school education was complete. The major elements of personal maturity were present in this man; social or ethical maturity, volitional maturity, and intellectual maturity. "But," stated Morrison, "intellectual maturity is something rarely achieved by age twenty-one or any other age. The schools are not adequate to the purpose in either curriculum, structure, system or

3Ibid., p.9.
Morrison's views of the American school system and its educational product were developed early in his life. These views evolved throughout his educational career and were crystallized in American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System, his final work published in 1943. In the Introduction to this book, Morrison's words convey his dissatisfaction with the schools, the school system and the mode of its development:

Very well, why not proceed at once to the subject? That is the way most things have been done in our country in the "do it now" spirit. It is especially the way, as we shall abundantly see, in which our whole existing system of schools has been developing ever since the time of Horace Mann. It all has to be done over again in much the same guesswork fashion, perhaps after years of futility.

He goes further in his criticism.

It is simple enough to proceed at once with our great subject and perhaps arrive at satisfying conclusions, in a similar unbalanced and ignorant manner, unless we first of all come to see that nobody can possibly understand the school structure and school system except he see both in their inevitable and normal logical relationship to the whole effort of public enlightenment and, indeed, to the whole process of the conservation and transmission of civilization itself.

Thus Morrison launched his critical study of the American school system. Basic to the study of the system is his understanding of the Common School which he defines by listing its two main attributes:

---

4Ibid., p. 11.
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One of the primary attributes of the Common School is that it implies the instruction of the whole generation rising up to educational maturity, as the latter is in terms of the cultural organization of society at any particular period in the world's history and in any particular national community. The other principal attribute of the Common School is that it is meant to furnish instruction in the fundamentals of civilization, that which concerns the common man as distinguished from the specialist, up to the point of educational maturity.

Morrison states that this was what the school system, unorganized though it was, attempted to do in the colonial and early national periods of American history. His study of the American school system returns to its origins and traces from them the course of its development. Morrison states that this approach is useful in three ways:

First, to understand the existing situation in which we now find ourselves.
Second, to estimate how far the existing system may be composed of elements which are adaptations to conditions which have long ceased to exist.
Third, to judge what phases of development were misconceptions, in other words, where development went wrong.

It is well to recall that American school reformers have seldom been distinguished for their critical capacity. They have been prone to adopt "plans". The consequence is that our school system has with difficulty developed into an institution; most of the development for a century past has been through invention, often very shallow invention, or some kind of incautious borrowing. "Prudent retreat is often the way to ultimate victory; salutary reaction the way

---

8 Ibid., pp. 44-45.
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to realistic progress, asserted Morrison.

In tracing the origins and development of the common school and the school system which evolved, Morrison began with the old American common school as it could often be found in the villages and countryside of a century and a half ago and later. At that time well over ninety percent of the population dwelt in rural communities. Morrison's review began with New England and chiefly Massachusetts, where he believed the structure of contemporary American schools had originated. It was there that the most fateful digression from the normal line of development occurred.\footnote{Ibid.}

During the early Colonial and National periods, Morrison felt that it would have been difficult to state or to prove that any universal kind of school had existed at that time. Compulsory schooling laws were unheard of. Superintendents of Public Instruction and State Boards of Education did not exist. There was no teacher-training and instruction was by tradition rather than by course of study. However, Morrison was certain of one thing:

All the way westward from the New England states, through upper New York, and into the new settlements in Ohio, there was what many of these people and their forebears had been feeling for a century and a half, namely, a love of and respect for learning and a missionary zeal for the establishment of schools.\footnote{Ibid., p. 48.}

In addition, there was the forthright reassertion of the civil purpose and necessity of public instruction in the

\footnote{Ibid.}
northwest Ordinance and later in the uncompromising declaration of the preamble to the first school legislation in Illinois. Many Americans of the early nineteenth century were imbued with the value of education, but they had to combat an opposition which doubted the use of education and public enlightenment and denied that the body politic needed schools. They had to get their own and other people's children taught the "common English branches, they were what all must learn in the existing society and culture." \(^1\)

This they did, but it must have been done in an exceedingly casual way at times, and at other times such schools as were kept up must have been hard to distinguish from ecclesiastical proselytism. Still, asserted Morrison, it was not difficult to distinguish a conventional set-up which was on the whole more common than any other kind.

"It was the school which tended to be found wherever Calvinistic and Lutheran principles in Church and Commonwealth existed." \(^2\)

The structure of the old common school, in Morrison's mind, was so simple and obvious that common sense should have been likely to lead men in that direction in the further development of schools and a school system. "It had


Morrison elaborates on these characteristics:

In the first place it was common school throughout in the sense that it was meant to be used by everybody.16

The discontinuous elementary-high school pattern that gradually replaced the old school was never meant to be used by everybody throughout and was not common school in that sense until well after 1900. Morrison continued:

In the second place, it was common school in that subject matter suited to public instruction (that is subject matter that met the common need) could be provided all the way up to pupil maturity. In the third place, it was continuous school.17

Pupils did not transfer into another school every year or half-year or two years. The old common school had little resemblance to the elementary school of today. In principle, pupils of all ages were gathered in a single room. They were advanced in accordance with the attainment of proficiency in subject matter and with personal growth, in general. They were advanced in terms of learning acquired and not in terms of satisfactory performance on tasks supposed to lead to learning. Morrison concluded with the final characteristic:

In the fourth place, the old common school was terminal and not preparatory, that is to say there was no presumption that a pupil who had finished would be going on into another school where his standing would depend upon what he had done in the common school.18

15 Ibid., p. 52.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 Ibid., p. 53.
A pupil might leave the common school after a few years and enter an academy, but his admission would depend upon the estimate of his qualifications made by the academy authorities and not upon what he had already done in the common school. There were no public high schools until 1821, and not a great many for fifty years afterward. There was no such relationship between common school and high school as now exists between the elementary school and the high school. Morrison concludes, "In the best illustrations, the old common school was assumed to be parallel to high school, and not infrequently that was the case."19 Thus was the old common school in structure and purpose explained by Morrison. It was a normal response to the schooling of citizens in countries possessed of institutions. "It was the mother lode to which our school as an institution can be traced back."20

Morrison concluded that the contemporary American school system bore little resemblance to the old common school.

The lack of similarity exists because:

1. of the incorporation of an "elementary school" so-called derived from sources which were entirely foreign to our national institutions.

2. of the survival of a misunderstood English school in our traditional high schools and colleges.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., p. 54.
3. of the evolution out of an original and justifiable school organization of a purely mechanical formalism based chiefly upon the ideology and sometimes phraseology of industrial enterprises.

4. and finally, of the universal confusion between School and University, and between common school and various technical schools. 21

In spite of the positive aspects and advantages of the old common school, Morrison did not recommend that they could or should be copied today. To do so would be to copy an adaptation to a bygone set of social conditions. What Morrison does say is:

That in its essential structure it [the common school] was the type of what all schools must be if they are intended to accomplish the essential purpose of the School as an institution and not some other purpose. 22

Here, according to Morrison was a normal institutional beginning, originating in common sense, experience, and felt need of mankind, and inherently capable of comprehension and rational development. A prediction was made by Morrison:

If our structure [the common school system] had been allowed to develop in its own genius under intelligent guidance, in the end it might well have become the model primary-secondary set up for the democracies doing for them in both commons and leadership the democratic equivalent of what the double German system did for autocracy. 23

The secondary phase of the common school evolved as the result of social conditions and social changes. High schools in the United States date from the foundation of the Boston English High School in 1821. Prior to 1821,

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid., p. 55.
23 Ibid., p. 56.
private schools called "academies" developed in the middle of the eighteenth century. These two, the academy and the high school taken together make a very significant chapter in the evolution of the American school structure. Morrison traces their origins and developments as they relate to the American school system.

All the way back to the middle of the eighteenth century there were private schools called "academies" scattered over the country, until by 1850 one could be found in every group of two or three townships all over the Northern states as far west as the country had become settled, and southward through the middle Atlantic states, and into the South at least as far as Charleston, where one of the most famous academies was located. The old academy appeared because something of the sort was what people who had cultural aspirations for their children believed would be a good way to attain the latter. It was not college preparatory, because in the minds of its constituents it was a substitute for college as colleges were then. The academy was terminal; when the student had finished, his general education was supposedly complete.

The academies, according to Morrison's interpretation, were true institutional developments and not mere scholastic devices. They were the natural way to get something done which was desired and which was beyond what were esteemed
to be the common branches. They were not borrowed ready made and then subject matter crammed into them." The academy was essentially a feature of a populous and prosperous countryside, and when that came to an end, the academies went too. Morrison stated that the academy was much like the common school in its structural conception. It dealt in substance rather than in form. Morrison detailed the similarities:

It [the academy] seldom had any formal requirements for admission beyond good character, the three R's and little more. Admission was rather on scrutiny of each individual case. The curriculum followed that of the common school branches above primary and went beyond.25

The pioneer of the Public High School movement is generally identified as the Boston English High School, which began class work in 1821. Morrison detailed the reasons for the establishment of that high school.

The academies were in full swing, going to college was not to become folkway for nearly another century, and the Latin School was believed to belong to a by gone day. But the academies were residential as well as local, and they charged fees for tuition. People in Boston felt that there should be some school in their own town which would meet the needs of the "mercantile and mechanical classes".26

In the beginning the Boston school did not bear the designation "high school"; it was called English Classical. Morrison observed the differences between the academy and the English Classical School. The academies:

24 Ibid., p. 58.
25 Ibid., p. 60.
26 Ibid., p. 62.
1. might receive children at a relatively early age
2. received pupils from different sorts of communities
3. placed emphasis on the pupils themselves regardless of their scholastic origins
4. were well equipped with better teachers
5. carried pupils farther than most common schools could
6. kept them on to a later age

There was no reason to think of the academy as "high"; it was merely another version of the old common school. The Boston English Classical, and those patterned after it Morrison continued:

1. were parts of local systems in which there were lower classified schools through which it was assumed that pupils would pass before going on to upper school.

2. In the largest cities there would not be more than one or two of these terminal members [upper schools] in the classified chain.

Thus it became a folkway to refer to these upper schools as "high schools".

Two streams of development can be noted in the lineage of the high schools which became common after the Civil War and gave rise to the unwieldy and chaotic city high schools of the present day. As Morrison traced this development, he asserted that this was one of the points at which the evolution of our school structure went wrong. One of the

---


lines of development which is most often noted was that in which a high school was established by formal vote of a school district and placed under a separate high school board. Most often that was the only thing which could be done, for no one sub-township district was large enough either to bear the cost or to furnish a sufficiency of pupils; a union district or a high school district had to be established. Sometimes, special high school districts were established by special acts of legislatures without reference to existing town and district boundaries. In all such cases the public would consider the high schools set up in this way as things in themselves, discontinuous with the lower schools apart from them.

The second line of development of the high school was much different than the first. These high schools were set up as the fourth in a system of classification in which the others were primary, intermediate, and grammar. Sometimes a different chain of school titles came to be the same thing in the end. These schools were established by school boards with or without the express sanction of the district; they had the same governing boards as the rest of the school system. They were not things in themselves in any other sense than were primary, intermediate, and grammar schools. The whole system that resulted from this mode of development was in reality the old village common school conveniently classified so as to take care of a
About the turn of the nineteenth century, circumstances came to suggest that there must be some working definition of High School, and the definitions were worked out by people who had scant understanding of what a definition is or what it implies. The only recognized definition at the time was "the school which comes next after an elementary school of eight grades"; and that was no definition at all. Morrison recounts his own difficulties while Superintendent of Public Instruction in trying to arrive at a definition of the High School:

The reason why I could not myself formulate a definition as the statute directed — and apparently the authors of the current definition were in the same case — lay in the fact that there was nothing to define; in logical principle, there was then and is now no such thing as high school other than by descriptive circumstance. There is a building set apart, teachers who draw pay as high school teachers, pupils who are described as belonging to high school, and so on; but there is nothing in either social or educational function which in its nature marks off what we call high school from any other school — it is part of a school system and nothing more.30

Morrison recounts further his own professional experience:

All the other State Superintendents had to act much as I had acted in New Hampshire. We thereby helped forward the process of setting up arbitrary definitions — which we were compelled by the several statutes to do — and thereby furthered the process of derationalizing the school system, which taken up and pushed further by others, has led to a condition in which ideational chaos in school structure is the background and guaranty of educational chaos.31


30Morrison, American Schools, pp. 67-68.

31Ibid., p. 68.
By the year 1900 the American common school had disappeared in most if not all of the larger places through the spread of the Volkschule elementary. It still remained in the classified local school system of the smaller towns. Soon after 1900 arbitrary definition of the High School as a thing in itself completed the process of destruction. There then followed the universalizing of the graded elementary school, even in one room country schools.

With all its faults and handicaps, the structure, as described by Morrison, was the normal institutional structure of the school. It disappeared because the society which made it easily possible disappeared, and, instead of developing it to meet social changes, the Germanophiles and to some extent the Anglophiles substituted something which bore no normal relation to anything in any existing society. Morrison felt that the High School might have been the means of rapidly adapting our own American school to the necessities of an industrial society but he stated:

First, the old New England particularist obsessions insisted on setting up High School as a thing-in-itself, with strong leanings toward the English Public School; and second, a group of reformers who had been to Europe, but who knew little of the genius of the American system, extolled the merits of the Prussian Volkschule and led to the adoption of that pattern as our nondescript elementary school.32

32 Ibid., p. 62.
Within a few years following the disappearance of the common school, three movements became established, all of which, if properly understood and guided, were leading the structure of our schools back toward the structure of the native common school. The three movements were the Rural Consolidated School, the Junior High School, and the Junior College. Morrison stated that none of the three had been fully understood by those most influential in their development. The result was that in the Rural Consolidated School the graded ideology of the Volksschule elementary gained full control. Both of the others developed into schools in themselves. Morrison decries the consequences saying, "The gross result has come to be a wholly discontinuous school system."33

Morrison traced the emergence of the Junior High School and the Junior College as they developed, both structural adaptations forced by the circumstances of social change. In the decade 1890-1900, there began an upward expansion of school enrollment which was destined to dominate the policies of the entire educational system for the next generation. Pupils began to flow into the four year high school in great numbers, and they came more from the less cultivated homes. Two immediate effects were apparent. First, the high schools passed into a state of chronic crowding, requiring new buildings every few

33 Ibid., p. 71.
years. Second, pupil mortality in the first years of high school became excessive. In public high schools sensitive to popular desires the adjustment tended to take the form of lowering standards.

A structural readjustment was recommended and this took the name of "junior High School," although there was nothing junior about it. The move was originally a purely practical device to meet a current situation. Morrison recounts his own professional knowledge and experience in the development of the Junior High School.

Now I point out that the junior high school was at best makeshift in the days when my generation of young schoolmasters were setting it up. The Report of the Committee of Ten had foreshadowed something of the sort in 1893. Sometimes it was an interval of two years, sometimes three, sometimes of only one, between two different kinds of schools.34

Morrison felt that the Junior High School was well calculated to serve a useful end until such time as the whole system could be reorganized to meet the needs of the common man in an economic structure of society which was making that possible, for perhaps the first time in human history. This movement appeared to be a good instance of the way in which society becomes readjusted when people do the next thing. "It was more or less a blundering way back to the normal American school structure through the classified school."35

34 Ibid., p. 97.
35 Ibid., p. 98.
Unfortunately, according to Morrison's view, the Junior High School emerged at a time when "mysticism in educational theory was beginning to become fashionable and when a jargon had already been evolved." The speculative theorists more or less captured the movement and created a thing which was veritally a catch-all of the extant fads. In the course of their operations, they succeeded in diverting the movement from its normal end and made it the most consistently thing-in-itself in the entire discontinuous system. Moreover, the graded school system of ideas had become so firmly rooted, that the question was not: "How can this new move make the needed adjustments most economically and effectively?" It was rather: "How many years shall be devoted to this junior high school?" And so, Morrison concludes, "another element had been added to the sadly discontinuous system and another station had been inserted in the production line." Here was another place where the developing school structure went wrong.

Like the Junior High School, the Junior College was a structural adaptation forced by social circumstances in the direction of the American common school. In a similar fashion the natural development of the Junior College was aborted by misguided educators and the prevailing theme of

---
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educational separatism. The origin of the Junior College movement was an adjustment by means of which certain college work of secondary character was placed where it belonged namely, in the secondary school.39

President Harper at the University of Chicago entered into an understanding with the authorities of Joliet High School in Illinois. The terms of the agreement were in substance that the High School should extend its course to include the misplaced two years in college and that the University should admit graduates, otherwise qualified, to its junior year. According to Morrison, the only reason for the Chicago - Joliet agreement was in the principle that the first two years of the existing Science-Arts College, elsewhere as well as at Chicago, were and are secondary, common school, in content, in method, and in meaning. Harper's arrangement with the Joliet Township High School was no new thing, except perhaps for the fact that a university took the initiative. President Harper was seeking for reasonable alternatives to set in motion forces which would keep school children where they belonged, in the common school until educational maturity, and reserve the University for mature men and women.40

When the practice of adding to the work of the high school courses which had become misplaced in college, and


40 Morrison, American Schools, p. 25.
of extending the age of graduation two years in the hope of gaining maturity became common, very few were satisfied to merely extend the high school. Instead, the junior college had to be a thing-in-itself, a separate organization under a dean. The work was no different in fundamental educational conception from the rest of the high school work, but Morrison stated:

It seemed preposterous to make the boys and girls what they were, in fact, namely immature pupils not yet in possession of General Education: they must be "college students," and to many of them that meant license to defy the statutes and shatter the whole code of good manners. 41

Here, then, was a further step in discontinuity, an expensive annex to a local high school, or else a separate facility, instead of a series of courses assimilated to the existing high school work. Whereas the rational intention behind the whole movement was merely to exclude from the University something that was no part of any College in the University but was decidedly part of the common school. The result was another addition to the discontinuous school system.

Morrison reaffirms his position that the School is complete in itself. On every count, legal and educational, he considers the School to be complete in itself. It is not a collection of schools in a series. It does not lead to the University, nor to anything else save the attainment

41 Ibid., p. 99.
of General Education at educational maturity. He states, "the moment a university sets up entrance requirements in subject matter, at that moment it becomes a school and ceases to be a University. It can retain University status only by resolutely refusing to accept the immature as matriculants." 42

Although the University does not fall within the scope of the common school in Morrison's interpretation, it seems advisable at this point that the University, its definition, role, function and development be reviewed. Morrison affirms this position:

There is no possibility of arriving at a comprehensive understanding of the school without also understanding the University in its essential social function and in the organization which makes the accomplishment of that function possible.

Moreover, in our own country, schools and universities are so tangled up in their administration that the universities are in the main schools, and schools are largely dependent in their administration on the policy of the universities. 43

In distinguishing the School from the University Morrison stated:

The school uses culture for the purpose of generating Intelligence, Conscience, and Taste, under discipline. The University engages in the pursuit of culture for its own sake in quest of Philosophy, either general or professional. 44

The function of the University is the interpretation of Nature, the accumulation of wisdom, the conservation and application of the customs, the cure of disease through

42 Ibid., p. 16.
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research, and more of the like. The form changes from age to age, and the content expands beyond all knowledge, but the substance remains the same. Without that function being well and truly performed, Civilization soon withers and then disappears out of the mores and society as a going concern disintegrates. According to Morrison this is something very different from the School and more fundamental in social meaning.\textsuperscript{45}

Morrison then traced the origins of the University. While it is true that no universities existed in the ancient world which were similar in form to those foundations with which we are familiar, it remains nonetheless true that the University function was carried on in Babylon and ancient China, in Greece and in other centers in the Hellenic and Roman worlds. It appeared as studies in rhetoric, mathematics, ethics, metaphysics, and logic. Grown men from all over the Mediterranean Basin resorted to Athens and Alexandria because they were interested and desired to spend time in study. What they studied was called Philosophy and out of that pursuit has descended our College of Arts and Sciences.

But it was left to the early Middle Ages for the emergence of the incorporated institution. It was "universitas" the name for a corporation in the Roman law. In the twelfth century the organized university as we know it was launched. All our universities are truly the heirs and

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 18.
successors of Paris and Bologna. Morrison stated that the essential structure of the true University held good, with a few adaptive variations, down to the collapse of universities in the twentieth century under the impact of worldwide materialism and hedonism and of totalitarian absolutism.\textsuperscript{46}

The terms in the original structure are still valid and are significant to the discussion of the American Universities. The central term "university" came to be defined as "an incorporated company of masters and students."\textsuperscript{47} It had nothing to do with universe or universal. It was not a school or body of pupils under discipline.

The parallel term "college" meant then, as it still fundamentally means today a body of men set apart to perform some special function in Church or State. The academic meaning of College was that of a particular company of masters and students working in some particular field, in most instances what we should call a profession.\textsuperscript{48} The academic meaning of "faculty" is not teaching staff, but rather a body of masters or professors devoted to some particular pursuit. The old faculties included Philosophy, Law, Theology, and Medicine.

Morrison arrived at a descriptive definition of the true University by listing its attributes:

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. 19.


\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
1. A university is a company of scholars, devoted to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

2. It is a company of educationally mature persons.

3. It is confined to the pursuit of scholarly and scientific subject matter.

4. Students are self-dependent in their academic pursuits.

5. The University is conceived in the spirit of independent search for knowledge and reinterpretation of knowledge.

6. The several faculties of the University are composed of learned men.

This descriptive listing of attributes, Morrison stated, distinguished the true University from the School and also the true University from that which is called University in America. According to Morrison:

There are no American Universities. What goes under the name with us, or else under the name of College, is, in varying proportion of ingredients, a combination of graded school, trade school, daily journal of professorial opinion about life, amusement club for adolescents, propagandist forum, public entertainment park, employment agency, matrimonial agency, and University proper.

This stringent indictment, Morrison felt, could be justified by information in the daily newspaper, in the common knowledge of all who directly or indirectly have to deal with the institutions and by many noted publications on the subject.

Proceeding with his negative assessment of the

49 Morrison, American Schools, p. 21.
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American University, Morrison recognizes that in the aggregate a great deal of University work was taking place in the higher cultural foundations of the United States, but nowhere in companies of scholars organized for this purpose. He stated that there were indubitable masters in many fields on faculties, and many of the matriculates are truly students, but there is nowhere an incorporated body of such and nothing else. Morrison again makes an ominous prediction:

So long as this condition prevails in our national economy, there can be no common school, and any wisdom which creeps into the conduct of our national affairs will arrive there by accident.  

A specific descriptive listing of the deficiencies of the American Universities was presented by Morrison which paralleled his descriptive listing of the attributes of the true University. Morrison stated:

1. The student body is nowhere a company of educationally mature men, or men and women, and is nowhere in fact professed to be.

2. Our higher institutions, even the best and most distinguished of them, are by no means confined to the pursuit of scholarly subject matter.

3. Study is not self-dependent under guidance and cooperation.

4. Nor is the American University conceived in the spirit of research.

5. Some of the faculties are composed of learned men, and there are learned men on most faculties. It is a pity they have to be wasted on children.  

51 Ibid.
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Scholars, men of affairs, and university executives seventy years ago recognized the defects in our higher institutions of learning, although the defects of those days were nothing like those which have since appeared. Some of the executives were men of great capacity, discernment, and aggressive activity. Notable in the early days were Charles W. Eliot and Daniel C. Gilman, but they had many contemporaries who were only a little less vigorous. Somewhat later appeared others among whom William R. Harper at Chicago and Woodrow Wilson at Princeton were conspicuous.

Eliot at Harvard devoted himself to the building of competent professional colleges and to opening up the Science-Arts College to true University work.

Gilman had the opportunity of launching a new university, and the result was Johns Hopkins in its best period. Later on, Wilson attempted to turn the Science-Arts College at Princeton into an enterprise possessed of University aspirations on the principles, largely of Oxford, as Oxford was then.\footnote{Fredrick Rudolph, \textit{The American College and University} (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).}

Morrison felt that neither Eliot, Gilman, nor Wilson seemed to have been aware of the crux of the whole matter, namely that the so-called "undergraduates" were still school children and that they could not be lifted out of that status by mere presidential decree promulgated at an early meeting of the Freshman class. Harper at Chicago did see the crux.
He turned this way and that in efforts to set in motion forces which would keep school children where they belong and reserve the University for mature men and women.

Morrison concluded that there is a definite need for fewer and better colleges and universities, and many more and better technological schools. He asserted:

Indeed, if an adequate common school system were erected, and the amusement-resort conception of universities were abolished, few would desire to go beyond the Common School, unless it be into the kind of training offered in good technological institutes.\(^{54}\)

Truly in Morrison's view, "the Common School and the University were the backbone of any natural system of education."\(^{55}\)

However the American public school system evolved into a discontinuous series of schools which existed as things in themselves.

Morrison's use of the term "discontinuity" referred to a state of affairs in the structure of a school system in which there have come to exist several schools in an hierarchy of progress, each of the schools being a "thing-in-itself" rather than a functional part of a system. He was specific in developing the full meaning of this concept.

The difference between primary school and secondary is functional because it is a difference in the nature of things. In the primary school, pupils cannot learn by studying books, because they do not have the primary tools

\(^{54}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 30.}\)

\(^{55}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 31.}\)
or study. They cannot read or write or work with numbers. They can learn, but not by studying. In the secondary school, they can use the tools acquired in the primary for study purposes. There is a functional difference between primary and secondary school which was ordained by nature and logic and not by the school board. Such discontinuity as there is, is normal and harmless.\(^{56}\)

However, in the long period stretching from the end of the primary to the attainment of educational maturity, there is no functional difference in instruction which is throughout the same in concept. It is all a matter of using cultural material for disciplinary purposes with pupils who are not yet mature. Any breaking up of that period into separate schools introduces discontinuity, but it does not necessarily break with the Common School principle of subject matter learning.\(^{57}\)

A resume of the historical development of the American school system reveals that the old common school was not discontinuous for the reason that it recognized no formal division points within itself, and for the further reason that it implied neither an earlier nor a later school. Likewise, the old academy was not discontinuous, because it did not admit its pupils on the completion of an earlier school but rather took them on evidence of learning acquired, whatever its source, and because it did not imply a later

\(^{56}\)Ibid., p. 86.

\(^{57}\)Ibid.
school. When the academies became college preparatory, they became discontinuous, and the College ceased to be a part of the University and became part of a school system.

When the Boston English High was established, it became part of a discontinuous system because it presumed an earlier school, post-primary as preparatory. The high schools which were established as was the Boston English High were, like it, discontinuous from the beginning, since their very inception made them schools in themselves. The high schools which followed the other line of descent as parts of a classified system were in a system which was in form discontinuous, but, so long as pupils were advanced in terms of learning acquired, the system was not in substance discontinuous. Morrison said, "Let any kind of form be set up and adhered to and the form will always tend to be separated in men's minds from the substance. Hence, unless the form is in itself valid and right, substance will always tend to be lost." 58

The climax of the discontinuity, prior to 1900, came in the Eight-grade Elementary, the Americanized Volkschule. Here then were eight distinct schools, and the pupils moved into an upper grade when they had maintained satisfactory performance on assigned tasks in the next lower grade. In time, promotion by half years came in, and then there were sixteen distinct schools below high school. "In truth, the eight grade school never worked well save by default of

58 Ibid., p. 87.
By the time when the recent critical period came in, about 1890, many weaknesses were noted, all of them inherent in the structure and its consequences. Perhaps the first in order was the dissatisfaction in the product of the eight grades which led to nine grades and sometimes ten grades. Then came a long series of troubles and their amendments which can be grouped together under the name "laggards in our schools." In general, human nature is so constituted that it perversely declines to slide through a machine as inorganic material can be made to do. Consequently, failure to make the grade occurred and pupils were not promoted. Many devices were invented to solve the problem, but like the old ninth and tenth grade solution, none of them got at the heart of the matter. Among the devices, Morrison lists the fast and slow sections, the so-called "double track," and semi-annual promotions. Finally the I.Q. came in and sorted out human nature into sections of pupils who were born capable of promotion, others who were partially capable, and still others who were not capable at all. In Morrison's words, "The eight grade school was assumed to be eternal verity and human beings to be relative to that perverted institution."

So by the year 1900, or soon after, the American school system had become an involved discontinuity between the Elementary and High, and within the eight grade system.
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of the Elementary. Morrison stated:

The immediate consequences may be generalized as being a progressive substitution of getting through school for the acquisition of learning in school.61

The purpose of our educational system in the beginning was Education of the masses. That was long ago transformed into mass production in Education, parallel to industrial mass production. Morrison said:

Our whole discontinuous school system, and the graded school notions which it has generated, has produced a picture of what would be, I suppose, good organization for industrial production - but scarcely an organization capable of transmitting Civilization and generating Education.62

Morrison goes on to criticize the product of the educational system. The efficient industrial organization is based on the fact that it deals with material things which change little if at all while they are in the process of manufacture. Ultimately, a fabricated product emerges which must make good for the purpose it was designed to serve. The same thing can be done in the schools and school system, provided the formal machinery works well, but there will not be an educational result. This can be gotten by with partly because "getting by" has been the chief product of the system and partly because the public seldom questions effectively that which it has no reason to understand. The school product is seldom submitted to any pragmatic test in such form that the public knows it

61 Ibid., p. 89.
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is being submitted; the industrial product is always being submitted to the most exacting of pragmatic tests: if the bridge will not stand up or the machine will not run, something is definitely wrong somewhere.63

A look at the social, economic, and political status of the American public in the 1940's caused Morrison great concern. He felt that the absence of a well educated citizenry was detrimental to the effective functioning of a democratic society. Morrison cited several examples indicating his concerns. The commercial and industrial system breaks down from the sheer lack of a popular understanding of its operations. Political corruption continues on a bankrupting scale on the excuse that it is not good politics to save money. Citizens fight for democracy and yet there is little understanding of the concept of democracy or of democratic procedures. Advertisers and other promoters deal with a population which they claim is about twelve years of age in its collective cultural capacity. That is a serious indictment of the products of our educational system.

At this time in the 1940's with sixty to seventy percent of the children of appropriate ages in high school and with attendance at college becoming the usual rather than the uncommon thing, one would think that the process of selection would have singled out the obviously unfit and have left among the students in our colleges and universities at least the approximately educated. Morrison presents his observations of the graduate students with whom he has
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dealt over a period of eighteen years.

As a class, they have no conception that this is an orderly universe in which effect follows cause, consequent follows antecedent. They have little conception of logical coherence as opposed to sentimentality, prejudice, and expediency. They can be convinced of "truth" or what they suppose to be truth, through what they call "eloquent appeal" but never through demonstration. Opinion with them is founded on predilection...They cannot learn from following an argument....They seldom read anything beyond the current newspapers and magazines and popular books. They never read fundamental material in any field, not even their own field...It is inconceivable to most of them that anybody can know anything for which he has not taken a course and received credit. That seems to me the culminating tragedy of the whole graded school ideology.64

Morrison asserts that these people about whom he speaks are not mentally inferior; they have brains enough. They are often unusually bright, but they do not know much and are in no shape to learn more. "They are the logical product of the system through which they have passed. They have never in their lives encountered such a thing as intellectual discipline."65

In spite of the significant deficiencies in the educational products of the school system, Morrison does attribute several positive accomplishments to the functioning of the public school system in the United States. The very fact that there has been for three hundred years a common school system in America has undoubtedly brought about an accomplishment of significant value. Morrison lists these positive results:

64 Ibid., pp. 104-106.
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1. There has been erected some measure of a common culture, in institutions, in language, and in traditions.

2. A great population has learned in the schools to read in a common vernacular.

3. There has been inculcated a widespread primary intelligence about matters of health.

4. A large part of our remarkable national talent in things mechanical is probably the fruit of the teaching of the physical sciences in the high schools over two generations.66

Morrison goes on to say that this literacy and trained intelligence which resulted is only primary in character. It is reading that follows current events that has a direct appeal to the passions but not reading which interprets and explains. "It is in the main an intelligence which sees "What" and "How" but stops very soon after crossing the boundaries of "Why"."67

According to Morrison, "It would be hard to find instances which better exemplify the truth of the saying that Man proposes and God disposes than in the development of our present [school] system."68 In putting the matter in other than religious terms, Morrison holds that when human beings begin to plan in social matters and to make adjustments which are believed to meet empirical needs, they very rarely are competent in planning for future development. Ordinarily progress has always been a matter of muddling
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through, that is, unguided social evolution. The process works slowly toward the universally valid and right, but it does so at the cost of infinite waste and sometimes suffering. "The evolutionary principle is another matter, for it yields to us about all the positive intelligence we can find anywhere in the amelioration of society and indeed personality."\(^{69}\) Thus Morrison reaffirms his basic belief in the doctrine of evolution.

In order to illuminate the present condition in the American public school system, it is necessary to return to the origins of the tendencies which have produced the present conditions. In Morrison's view, things went wrong at the following points:

1. Maybe with the establishment of the classified system, although that was mild compared with other forms of mischief.

2. The introduction of the independent high school

3. The adoption and final establishment of the structural form of the Volkschule in our Elementary School, so called.

4. The inauguration and development of the elective system.

5. The perversion of the Junior High School.

6. The misconception and perversion of the Junior College.

7. The elaboration of a system of credits for time spent in successful performance to take the place of evidence of accruing educational values.\(^{70}\)

\(^{69}\)Ibid.

\(^{70}\)Ibid., p. 112.
The disastrous final result has been the universal establishment of an inverted ideology in which the securing of credits, the graduation from schools, and the attainment of degrees are put in the place of Education, until only a pitifully small proportion of the graduates of schools and colleges is composed of even partially educated people. As early as 1933 Morrison decried this loss of the true meaning of Education, saying:

Discontinuity and stereotyping began to come in, on the one hand, when the schools [the academies] had stuck an elementary school in underneath, and on the other hand, when they themselves had become preparatory. The process was no doubt hastened and furthered by the assimilation of the American common school to the structural pattern of the Prussian Volkschule. Be that as it may, by the turn of the new century the process had become complete and you could write the table of educational denominate numbers: eight years make one elementary education; fifteen Carnegie units make one secondary education; one hundred twenty semester hours or thirty-six majors make one college education - only you are not educated until they give you a degree.71

The phenomena before us can be explained as the consequences of unheeded changes in American society which have taken place during a generation past, and of structural maladaptations in the school system which did not become apparent until an increasing load and an increasing discontent brought them to light. In discussing the deficiencies in the administrative structure of the school system, Morrison commented:

A tradition which commits the government of our national enterprise in public instruction to 150,000 different school boards could hardly do otherwise than hamper

sound progress in adaptation to social requirements in general, and especially to economic conditions.72

And thus Morrison arrives at a survey and analysis of the school system, or the organization, support and control of schools under which it is presumed that they will be able to achieve the institutional purpose of the School in Society. His study is not concerned with the educational system as a whole including universities and technological institutes. It is primarily concerned with Public Instruction within the Common Schools.

If the School were not institutional but rather on the analogy of a farm or business enterprise or the private practice of a profession, there would need be no organized system or systems of schools at all. Each school would be an enterprise in itself, of interest and concern only to the parent who might furnish the children. Schools might be regulated in the statutes, as the trades and professions and commerce are regulated, but nothing further. This notion is quite inconsistent with the institution of free schools which exist in State school systems in each of the states. The schools have operated for over three hundred years on the principle, namely, that the school is institutional in its nature, that schools are maintained not primarily in the interest of the parents and their children but rather in the interest of the defense of the commonwealths from the menace of an ignorant
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citizenry. Instead of being private enterprises either severally or communally maintained, they are part of the machinery of government under popular sovereignty. So our courts have reasoned whenever the legal and constitutional bases of public tax supported schools have been the issue.\(^7^3\)

Nevertheless, Morrison states, "through negligence and ignorance of public affairs, most of the State systems we have belong to a state of society which came to an end in the Eastern states well over a century ago and everywhere on the disappearance of frontier conditions sixty years ago or more."\(^7^4\)

The cell of the political, instructional, and fiscal organism which is the American type of State school system is called the "School District", larger or smaller. "Nobody can understand the school system or comprehend its obsolete character without some clear notions of this peculiar legal and political institution.", Morrison said.\(^7^5\)

The school district system means that the great function of Public Instruction is conducted and in the main supported by more than a hundred and fifty thousand independent political units scattered through the nation, each of them conducted by a school board of one sort or another. By them teachers and school officers are employed, curriculums sanctioned or prescribed, money raised, supplies and equipment purchased,

\(^7^3\)Henry C. Morrison, \textit{School Revenue} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1930), Chapter IV.

\(^7^4\)Morrison, \textit{American Schools}, p. 256.

\(^7^5\)\textit{Ibid.}.
and pupils governed and graded. These districts are established for varied purposes. The fundamental unit, however, is one established to support and administer a local school system. There are also other kinds of school districts, all of them independent and each of them with a governing board of its own; high school districts, supervisory districts, districts for vocational schooling, for the employment of school nurses, and many others.

As is his usual procedure, Morrison again traces origins to determine progress, problems and areas of concern which were overlooked in the process of evolution and development. Morrison pointed out that our school system is in most respects an evolution out of New England and chiefly Massachusetts origins. There, he feels, is undoubtedly where the school district idea came from, not only the general concept itself, but the added variation in the sub-township district. The history of the school district system of support and government illustrates what often happens in social evolution. According to Morrison:

A form corresponding to valid and useful substance appears in the customs because the substance responds to the requirements of social circumstance in a given age. This form persists and becomes institutionalized, in this case by taking on political and legal concepts. In the course of years the substantial meaning disappears in a new set of circumstances, but the form remains, and it is in the form that we do our thinking. Thought inevitably goes wrong when it rests on no valid substance. . . . Indeed, we might say that the style of our system is "late New England Colonial." 76

76 Ibid., pp. 257-258.
A recollection of the development of the schools in the Northeastern states in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries leaves no doubt as to the principles upon which action was taken. Schools were social in their meaning and were presumed to be at the heart of the free commonwealths which were growing up. The Colonial legislatures required that schools be maintained, and Massachusetts sanctioned the use of general taxation for the support of what the Colonial government required. But there was no sign that the Colonial government would itself assume the burden and responsibility. Maintenance of schools was a burden laid upon the towns; that was the kind of government that was developing. It fitted the circumstances of the times.

There was good geographical reason for the policy of local control and support throughout the Colonial and well over into the National period, while the State sanctified the form in the building up of a sort of school jurisprudence covering the legal nature of the school district, pupillary status, teachers' contracts, and civil rights and obligations with respect to schools and attendance. A form of system was set up which was well suited to the circumstances; and today most of the essentials of that system are still in existence. "So the form persists, long years after the circumstances which produced it disappeared.\textsuperscript{77}\textsuperscript{77}" said Morrison.

\textsuperscript{77}Ibid., p. 258.

What has generally proved to be the most serious
obstacle to progress in Public Instruction is the sub-
township district, which owed its origins to social con-
ditions which did not appear until the last quarter of
the eighteenth century. These social conditions exhibited
the patternless character of our national and local com-
munities. Farmers moved out and settled on cleared land,
remote from the old village community. If they were to
have schooling at all, a school had to be established within
walking distance for the children, and the formal political
pattern already established meant that the school must be
supported and controlled by this group of farmers. Thus
there came to be constituted organized school districts
about each of the schoolhouses. The latter would be one
room buildings, housing in conception what was a continuous
school. These new units of organization were called "sub-
township" districts because there were typically many of
them in each township. They constituted what was known
as the "district system" par excellence, but they were no
more truly that than were systems founded on the township,
city, or county.

"Perhaps," conjectured Morrison, "There was no other
device which could have carried the elements of Civilization,
as Civilization in the country then was, into the backwoods
and beyond frontiers, not only in New England but westward,
so long as the task of conquering a continent for civili-
zation remained."78
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However, that task was completed by the end of the nineteenth century, but the subtownship district and the special districts for high schools and the like still remain in many of the States, including the largest. Once more, substance had disappeared and form had remained. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century that the subtownship district began to be abolished in the states which had it, in favor of the town system and later, the county system; that is to say that the townships or in some cases the counties were made single districts. Morrison concluded, "That eliminated the most troublesome symptom of the disease but did not cure the disease itself, which is in the school district concept." 79

Morrison has suggested that the political concept behind local school control is perhaps more important than the visible school district itself. Since it is part of the American system of local government, Morrison states the concept needs to be clarified since it is common to confuse local government with the concepts of municipal self-government and state sovereignty which have little to do with it. Morrison deals first with State Sovereignty, then municipal self government, and finally with local government.

State Sovereignty, a fundamental fact and principle of the American Federal Republic, means that certain sovereign
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powers are specifically committed to the Federal Government and others reserved to the several states. We thus have a Federal Government and Government in the separate states in a dual sovereignty, as some of our lives and activities are regulated by one of the sovereigns and the rest by the other. That is all the Government we have. Town, city, and county governments are creatures of the states. State Government is not a form of local government, it is Commonwealth Government.

Local self-government, on the other hand, refers to the principle that matters which concern a given local community, and in their nature do not concern any other community, are left to the incorporated municipality to provide for and administer. That is Municipal Government proper, and it is the same thing when it is carried out by a township, an incorporated village, or a county, as it is when it is operated by a chartered city. Illustrations of Municipal Government are found in the maintenance of fire departments, streets and sewers, public parks, and enactments of ordinances to govern existence within the municipality as such.

Local Government means the commitment of affairs which are admittedly Civil in their nature and not Municipal, that is to say, which are of the state and affect everybody in the state and often in other states as well,

---
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to the several counties and/or municipalities. These are State affairs locally administered by locally chosen officers. Examples in most States are the prevention and punishment of crime as distinguished from misdemeanors, the care of the public health, the maintenance of courts for the trial of both civil and criminal cases, the registering of deeds, the probating of wills, and especially the maintenance of Public Instruction. 82

Morrison relates the significance of the foregoing concepts to the evolution and continuation of the local school district and the concept of local control of education. All the foregoing Local Government, not local self-government but Government locally conducted has been part of our theory of Government, itself. It is tradition handed down from other days, other conditions, and another kind of society. Some of it comes down to us from Medieval England and indeed from Anglo-Saxon England. In our country, the tradition goes back to frontier days, isolated communities, poor transportation, and limited communication, and then there was reason for it. However, it is more likely, Morrison asserts, that other grounds were the main motive, or at least would have been motive if there had been no good geographical reasons. 83

Here again, Morrison states, "is particularism in all public affairs as well as in those of the schools,
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and out of particularist interests and attitudes came intense suspicion of any kind of central Government. "84

Keeping Government "in the hands of the people" meant not Commonwealth democracy but rather keeping it in their own hands and those of their neighbors. There may be something admirable about that, for it at least meant a willingness to assume the responsibilities of Government. However Morrison also took a less positive view when he said:

More cynically, one may suspect that it [the desire to keep Government in the hands of the people] arose out of an overweening love of having one's fingers in every pie.

So long as conditions persisted in which tradition originated, and so long as the population was mainly British in origin, it worked fairly well, or at least not ill, and more than one chapter might be written showing how it did contribute to the secure foundations of the Republic. 85

But once more, content changed and substance was lost. The form has lasted over to a day in which it is easier to get to the State Capital than it used to be to get to the county seat, and in which, so far from desiring to have a finger in every pie, most Americans are unwilling to have a finger in any pie other than their own business. Everyone desires honest and competent Government but cannot devote a large part of their lives to doing the governing themselves. Moreover, the population has ceased to be mainly English with racial talent for self-government, and
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the body politic has come to be made up in large part of peoples who in their former homelands hardly conceived of such a thing as their own participation in Government. Morrison states, "The obsolete form becomes a gift of grace to the machine politician, because it provides him with an abundance of offices with which to gratify his henchmen."86 Morrison concludes:

The school district is simply an extreme and special case of Local Government, and the subtownship district is an ultra-extreme case.87

Any good text on School Law deals with the subject of the school district as a quasi-corporation.

An incorporated city or town sometimes embraces by legislative provision two distinct corporations, as, for example, the municipal and the school corporation existing within the same territory. It is in such cases a distinct corporation for school purposes. . . . More generally, however, school districts are organized under the general law of the State, and fall within the class of corporations known as quasi-corporations. . . . It [the school district] is but an instrumentality of the State, and the State incorporates it that it may the more effectively discharge its appointed duties.88

This corporate character has important consequences in the whole popular conception of the School and in the manner in which schools are carried on. Morrison lists three major consequences:

---
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1. In the first place, let the legal theory be what it may, the corporate character of the school district makes the school as an enterprise conform to the ideology of a communally supported undertaking maintained for the benefit of citizens who have children of pupillary age, and the School as an instrumentality of the Commonwealth falls into the background and is forgotten.

2. Second, while the indubitable civil function of the schools is analogous to those of the courts, the civil service, the Army and Navy, that is to say the function of an instrument of democratic Government, the corporate character puts teachers and school officers in the status of labor under contract. We do not contract with the servants of the State and Federal Governments; we elect them or appoint them or enlist them. A formidable body of law has grown up around the contractual relations of teachers.

3. Third, one of the most unfortunate consequences is the universal tendency of the best teachers to drift into the wealthier districts and into those in which the teaching is the easiest. The effect is that the districts which have but slender fiscal resources, and those in which teaching is most difficult—and which by consequence need good teaching the most—have to put up with relatively inferior and frequently incompetent teaching.89

While few people in the cities or larger towns have any notion that they are citizens of school districts, supposing that the term is reserved to the rural sections, nevertheless the school district ideology appears as truly in the large cities as in the rural areas. The possible exception is in those chartered cities in which by the terms of the charter the school system is part of the city government. But Chicago, for instance, is a school district in Cook County, having its own budget and is separate from the Fire, Police, Streets, and other municipal enterprises.

89Morrison, American Schools, p. 263.
Although the schools are an instrumentality of the State, the State Government has little or no control over the actual efficiency in Public Instruction. State control is almost entirely in the domain of legislation governing the civil rights and obligations of citizens in respect to taxation and the schooling of their children; governing the institution of school districts and the conduct of their affairs; and to some extent prescribing what shall and shall not be taught. From that point on, State regulation appears chiefly in court decisions which arise out of litigation initiated by citizens who conceive themselves to be wronged by some action arising out of the conduct of schools. Thus there is abundant legislative and judicial regulation, but the all important executive and administrative control appears almost entirely in the local school boards.

Either the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or that of the State Board of Education is now to be found in every state, but its duties are limited to the following:

1. Executive control of State enterprises like teachers' colleges.

2. Ministerial functions, such as computing the apportionment of State school money.

3. Semi-judicial functions, such as hearing complaints concerning the conduct of local schools and issuing approval to schools, usually high schools.

4. Hortatory missions over the State, in which it is hoped to arouse the people to better efforts and more intelligence through sheer eloquence.90
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The fulfillment of these duties has limited educational impact on the quality of the schools or school system of the State.

Perhaps the greatest absurdity of the school district and the concept of local control emerges in the fiscal inequality which exists from school district to school district throughout the state. The gross inequalities in the ability of the local school districts to finance their schools has been the subject of research among educators for many years. Several studies have been made and books written on the problems of school finance during the early years of the twentieth century. It is perhaps the most critical problem of all, or at least the most immediate. Morrison himself decried this fiscal inequality while he was Superintendent of Public Instruction in New Hampshire in the early years of the twentieth century. He served on a survey team which studied the financial conditions of the schools in the State of Illinois in 1924. His concern was so great that he wrote a significant book on the subject entitled School Revenue in 1930. In 1931 he served as Editor for Part I of the Thirtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education which analyzed the topic "Financing

---
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the Rural School. His ideas on the subject of school finance are quite definite and clearly stated in the major works mentioned as well as in several articles which appeared in the educational journals.

Most of the states, according to Morrison, have attempted to correct fiscal inequality among school districts by apportioning State school aid according to a mathematical formula. Morrison said, "I have shown that any such policy involves a mathematical absurdity." Whenever the State apportions money to the local school districts on the basis of aid it evades its constitutional mandate to provide Public Instruction. No matter what formula is used to attempt to equalize fiscal inequalities, it is contrary to the fulfillment of the State's responsibility to the education of its citizens. He argues that the only way in which inequalities in support, and other inequalities as well, can be eliminated is through consolidation of management and support in the State Government itself, even as the cities have similarly abolished their own internal inequalities.

Morrison further asserts that even with an equitable financial structure designed to provide for education within the State, equality of educational opportunity would not be the necessary result. Equality of educational opportunity depends on the quality of the supervisory and teaching personnel

94Morrison, School Revenue, Chapter VIII.
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that can be secured, and the latter in turn upon the quality of the school board members who are available in the several districts. Moreover, mere equalization of educational opportunity gets us nowhere. The education may be meager, misdirected, quite without validity. Morrison asserts forcefully:

What is imperative in the modern world, in the interests of both justice to the individual and of sound society and good Government, is General Education for all future citizens, not "an education" that is as good here as it is there and adequate nowhere.\(^9\)

In conclusion Morrison states that the sum of the whole matter seems plainly to be that the school district system is so obsolete, so far removed from the society in which it was once valid, that it has become an incurable malady in our commonwealths.\(^9\)

And yet the malady has been recognized and steps taken to cope with the matter. For more than half a century past many of the States have been taking steps designed to correct the situation. A review of these steps is worthwhile in observing the directions in which they have all been moving.

1. The absurdity of the division of cities into fiscally and politically independent school districts long ago became manifest and that practice has long been forgotten. The city school district is made coterminous with the municipality.

2. The subtownship districts have long ago been abolished in several of the States which formerly had them, and the township district substituted for the State as a whole.

3. The county unit, or rather county district, for the county in such cases is the same kind of corporation

---


\(^9\)Ibid., p. 267.
as the subtownship or town district, but it appears in incomplete form.

4. Finally, all distinctions in political and fiscal local units are abolished, except perhaps for a single overpowering city, and there is the State unit, with a State Board of Education, and a Commissioner as its executive officer, in direct control of all schools, and teachers, and school officers a state body of professional people. Only three states – Delaware, Maryland and New Hampshire – have in substance reached this final stage of efficient and effective State School administration and supervision.  

In this process of evolution inequality has been mitigated in the only way in which that evil can be mitigated and finally abolished.

In all this transition from very small units into larger and larger units, much the same opposition has been found everywhere and always. The school district as a political and legal conception has been defended largely on the following grounds, whether the issue be passing from the subtownship district to the town district or from that to the county unit. Morrison lists the six main reasons given for the continuation of local control and counters the reasoning of each.

1. It keeps the schools close to the people and is thus a corner-stone of democracy.

- The local control of schools was not set up on any kind of political theory but because that was the only way in which it seemed feasible to get any schools at all.

2. It performs the cardinal function of throwing the responsibility on the people in their local assemblies.

- If good schools redounded to the exclusive benefit of the local communities which support them, and the local community alone suffered from the con-

\[^{98}\text{Ibid., pp. 266-267.}\]
sequences of poor schools; and further if there were no such things as Federal and State elective officers - then the contention might be sound. But that is not the case. Local responsibility for good schools is too remote to be felt.

3. It gives local people an education in the conduct of schools through service on school boards.

- Morrison responded to this with a question. "Do the schools exist for the education of school boards or for that of children?"

4. We must avoid centralization, and a multitude of school districts is the best way to do it.

- Consolidation is not centralization. When all the schools of a city are brought together in a single organization, there is no centralization about it.

5. A multitude of school districts gives room for experiment.

- Experimenting is a highly technical process, and so far as schools are concerned, it belongs in the psychological laboratory and other laboratories in the search for light on educational and pedagogical processes.

6. Too many eggs in one basket.

- This is an objection to giving up local control rather than a defense of the district system. Granted that the objection is sincere and has merit, it has that quality only as the principle is defensible that schools exist primarily for the good of the community that supports them. And that principle is not defensible.99

Learning from experience, the American people have been adjusting their school system from the beginning, hastening the process somewhat since the beginning of the twentieth century; but the process has been purely empirical and pragmatic, without widely recognized principles upon
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which deliberate action could be founded. The effect has been that adjustment has been altogether too slow to keep pace with advancing material culture and the rapid social changes which are the consequence. Morrison assesses the current situation:

Some states are still in the main on a basis which suited frontier days, even the Colonial frontier. Three perhaps have completed or nearly completed, at least for the time being, the adjustment which reasoning based on facts suggests as the complete adjustment. Other states are at various stages in between. All of them in varying degrees are still under the curse of ignorant and corrupt politics. We ought to realize by now that muddling through in any kind of public matters is no longer safe.100

In assessing the American educational system Morrison showed or at least suggested the following serious discontinuities in the system: (1) the obsolescence of State systems of Public Instruction; (2) the maladaptation of the system to the requirements of Society and to an order of living which is always changing and expanding in its societal relationships. To place our State systems on the best and surest foundations is to discover the rationale of an adaptable system good in any society and capable of prompt adjustment without sacrifice of principle. That is an ambitious task.

Morrison proposed to pursue the task as stated but his approach would be similar to the method used in his study of the school structure. Morrison discussed his approach:

We shall adhere to the belief that wisdom was not born with any of the generations now living and that our predecessors for the most part acted according to reasonable judgements in their time.

100 Ibid., p. 271.
we shall remind ourselves of the experience of our people in seeking to make over their systems, and we shall seek to substitute for their empirics some principles which will be useful in guiding us to a more deliberate and rational course of action.\textsuperscript{101}

Thus Morrison began his effort to develop the framework for a modern school system which was designed to attain the originally stated purposes of Education in a well articulated structure with the greatest efficiency and effectiveness which could be established in a State system of education.

Henry Morrison recognized only two types of law, two types of sovereignties: federal and state. If a service to be rendered by the government for its citizens was national in scope, that service was to be performed by the national government and the obligation to pay for this service rested upon taxables wherever they were located. These services were enumerated in the Federal Constitution. If the character of the service was to be statewide, that service was to be performed by the state and obligations to pay for this service rested on taxables wherever they were located within the state. Education was such a function to be performed by the State.

For Morrison, the State was an important unit of local government. "So prominent is Washington in the focus of attention," he said ". . . that we forget how much of our lives for better or worse passed under the aegis of state sovereignty. Thus, is property held, devised, and inherited;

\textsuperscript{101}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 272.
security of life and limb guaranteed; family relationships established and confirmed; the public health protected; education provided for; the larger part of justice administered; convenient intercommunication on the highways provided for; the care of the poor and defective classes looked after. Early in our historical past, when communication and transportation were difficult and tedious, the state deemed it convenient to create counties, townships, and school districts to carry out these functions locally. The functions these "creatures of the state" performed were "fundamental concerns of the local community which happened to be related to the civil division in question." Unlike the states and the federal union, "counties and townships could be abolished, if it were deemed expedient, without in any way altering our form of government." As has been shown, these administrative units, including the school districts, had unfortunately been surrounded by an aura of local self-government. This was unfortunate because "it tends powerfully to create the notion that law and order and other intimate concerns of society are matters of local option. And if local option, then individual choice."

102 Morrison, School Revenue, pp. 223-224.
103 Ibid., p. 225.
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As Morrison surveyed the historical development of this concept of local self-government, he discerned trends which indicated that this concept was in the process of gradual disintegration. First, he saw the apparent lack of interest of the local citizenry in local affairs as evidenced by a comparison of the vote cast at ordinary local elections with that cast at state and national elections.\textsuperscript{106}

Second, Morrison saw the ease with which other State functions had evolved from control of many small governing units to support and control by the State itself. One instance was the development of roads, streets, and highways.\textsuperscript{107} Originally, roads and bridges were of purely local concern and under local planning. Turnpikes were chartered if necessary and gradually the roads were under county control. As late as 1919, roads were in miserable condition under local control. With the advent of the automobile, however, the State gradually assumed maintenance of roads until 1943 in most states non-political State Highway Commissions plan, construct, support, and maintain all the major highways in the state paid out of gasoline taxes earmarked for that purpose.

Third, Morrison thought he saw a comparable trend in the enlargement of school districts. He states:

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{107} Morrison, \textit{American Schools}, pp. 277-280.
The story is much the same with schools, highways, and constabulary. From the neighborhood road district to the Highway Commission; from the village constable to the New York, Pennsylvania, or Texas State Constabulary, or the Royal Mounted in Canada—the development follows much the same lines as might be followed in our school systems—from the subtownship district to the [Maryland] State Board of Education.108

Morrison also thought he saw a basic principle involved as follows:

When a given function is in its nature municipal, as are fire protection, traffic control, city parks, streets and services, and a host of others, it tends to get well done locally. When the function is civil rather than municipal, as in the case with schools, highways, and constabulary, it tends to be poorly done locally.109

Morrison's view of State school organization and control anticipated the actual occurrence of consolidation of the schools, which took place in the 1950's.

In 1942, Morrison saw a few states trying out the notion of the county as the fiscal and administrative unit; he also cited the examples of the three states of Maryland, Delaware, and New Hampshire as having reached the final evolutionary development in that the State itself was the "basic unit, comprehensive of all schools in respect to both control and financial support."110 Morrison described the final evolutionary process:

At that point the local "instrumentalities of the State," disappear, and the Government of the State or Commonwealth assumes the burden of maintaining and governing and administering its school system, in an

---

108 Ibid., p. 281.
109 Ibid.
110 Ibid., p. 276.
executive as well as in a legislative and judicial sense. The school district of Colonial and frontier times, having long since served its purpose, lapses, and with it goes corporate as well as local political implications.111

Morrison tried to anticipate several arguments which many would use against having the State as the basic unit. The sanctity of local control argument has already been discussed. Another argument which he anticipated was the fear of centralization.

Many persons associate centralization with despotism, bureaucracy, and the destruction of civil liberties, he said. Centralization may develop into these undemocratic tendencies but not necessarily so. Centralization is a policy or theory of administration and not a governmental or a fiscal term,112 and it is no better or worse than the people in whose hands the authority rests. There is no reason why a State school system cannot be decentralized, providing there is a means devised to hold the lower echelon personnel responsible for results. Our present system of many boards is ineffective because there has been developed no systematic way to hold local boards responsible for results. Dismissing a whole board at one time is impractical and time-consuming. If, however, State boards were constituted in such a manner that they handled the administrative and executive functions,

111 Ibid.

they could decentralize administrative functions because they would have power to remove local boards immediately for malfeasance in office.

The third argument Morrison foresaw was the charge that under a system with the State as a unit, the schools would be embroiled in State politics. Schools have always been in politics and this may be good or bad depending upon the public conception of politics. "Politics," as a word, is a cognate of "policy," and in the American democratic form of government, politics is expressed in the popular participation in the determination of public policy. Thus, politics is closely tied in with the voting and elective processes. Voters do not elect federal judges, or members of State tax commissions or highway commissions, since these offices do not establish policy. They carry out public policy which is determined in some instances in the States by the State legislature. Thus, voters elect State legislators and appoint judges. For Morrison, there was no good reason why this same procedure would not be followed for the State school system. If citizens desire to keep the schools out of politics, therefore, "the starting point at least is to keep all who have to do with schools as far away from election as possible."

113 Morrison, American Schools, pp. 286-289.
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The organization of the "modern school system" as Morrison envisioned it included several aspects. Among these the most significant were the Administrative District, the State Board of Education and its Functions, the Instrumentalities of the State System, and the Financing of a State District. Morrison proceeded to develop his design which would result in the control and organization of the school in the hands of State government where it was originally centered by constitutional mandate.

Under Morrison's "modern system," the entire state would be the political and fiscal unit but not necessarily the administrative unit. To assist in administration, the State Board could set up regional boards over cities and larger areas. This would "avoid the vice of administrative centralization, minimize the growth of bureaucracy, and make it possible to vest school property in a legal and orderly manner." 116 These regional boards then would be an integral part of the State system; and they would be in the same relationship to the State Board as a city principal is to the superintendent. To maintain the separation of powers in our governmental system, the State Board would be appointed by the Governor and would have executive and administrative powers only.

116 Ibid., p. 286.
The legislature would enact laws governing the civil rights and obligations of citizens, parents, and pupils as schooling is affected. This would include such matters as school attendance, limits of punitive discipline, and similar issues. The courts would still interpret these enactments by decisions. The legislatures would be concerned with "politics," i.e., the establishment of broad general policy within which the State Board would administer this policy in "well-thought-out set of principles which can be used for guidance rather than for express direction."117

When Morrison looked at the existing relations in 1943 between the State Boards of Education and the Legislatures, in most states, he found the Legislature meddling in the executive and administrative field. They have interfered with the "Curriculum, with the grading of schools, with examinations, with school building design, with school government, with school budgets."118 These tasks were all administrative tasks. When the Legislature froze these tasks into law, it resulted in a cumbersome inflexibility since it is difficult to change laws frequently.

Once the State Board was appointed by the Governor, they, in turn, would appoint the State Commissioner. During the 1830's and 1840's the office of State Superintendent of

117 Ibid.
118 Ibid., p. 284.
Public Instruction emerged as a permanent office with the duties of "general supervision and control of the school system of the State."119 But at the same time the legislature established this office, it reduced the exercise of these powers and made the Superintendent an ex-officio functionary, a ministerial, and quasi-judicial officer.120 Morrison recommended a return to the Superintendent's original powers and duties. The original powers and duties of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction included those pertaining to the organization and executive management of Public Instruction such as the administration and direction of instruction, responsibility for economic and financial control, the nomination of teachers, principals and State school officers, recommendations pertaining to disciplinary matters among school personnel, and full responsibility as the educational advisor to the State Board of Education. These originally envisioned powers and duties were eroded because the public mind had been assimilating the ideology of district control of schools for two hundred years and was not ready to shift the locus of authority and control.

Morrison did not precisely differentiate between the functions of the Commissioner and the Board but he established rough guidelines.121 In the administration of

instruction, the Commissioner "ought to be supreme and the law ought not to tolerate interference of the Board--save when there is appeal from the acts of the Commissioner and his subordinates--and appeal ought to be allowed only when there is something vital involved." 122 All personnel such as teachers, principals, custodians, and finance officers in the State System, for example, would be nominated by the Commissioner and confirmed by the State Board.

In matters of administrative law, however, the State Board would have the last word but this would only be after consultation and guidance from the Commissioner. An example of this area would be the determination of curriculum content. 123 In the main, the Board would be responsible for securing needed public understanding and support. In matters political and in dealing with the legislature, the State Board, through its Chairman, should be the responsible head and not expect the instructional head to perform these duties. 124

In general, Morrison saw similarities in the relationship between the Board and its Superintendent or Commissioner which ought to exist between the City Board and its Superintendent. In the relationship between the State Commissioner and the regional superintendent, the same principles would apply which exist between superintendents today and principals within a district.

122 Ibid., p. 302.
123 Ibid.
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Morrison then considered the special instrumentalties required within the State for instruction. These included the high schools, special schools, schools existing under extenuating circumstances, the large city district, and technical schools. A brief review of his views on each special school follows.

**High schools.**—Under a State system, high schools would be located "where they would best subserve the interests of the schooling of future citizens, without reference to local fiscal ability to maintain such schools or to local address in establishing and managing them."\(^{125}\) It was conceivable that there would be few children in the United States who would then not have access to full General Education even within their own township. Children in impoverished areas or in remote geographical locations would have the same educational opportunity as children in the wealthier districts.

**Special schools.**—Handicapped children—blind, deaf, and dumb, crippled—all were the responsibility of the State. The content of their education was the Curriculum of the Common School except "in those particulars in which sensory and motor defects block the learning process."\(^{126}\) The instruction would not put a burden on any one district but would be organized under the regular state-wide pattern.

Besides, since the State would control the teachers' colleges,


they could more adequately and systematically provide for the training of teachers for special schools.

**Schools existing under extenuating circumstances.**—Often local districts with limited resources found it difficult, if not impossible to establish Common Schools capable of providing General Education in such sections as (1) sparsely settled territory; (2) remote mountainous areas; (3) small islands off the seacoast or in the Great Lakes; (4) slum sections in cities; and (5) temporary communities founded chiefly on the development of forest and mineral wealth. Under a State operated system, these peculiar sections would present no great problem since the State could finance a common school program from State revenue and operate it within these "uneconomical" areas.

**The large city district.**—Morrison would have liked to have put the large city districts in a special class because they had special problems but he could not in principle. The principle was that education was the constitutional responsibility of the State. He realized that as a population grew larger, the cost of government increased, not in arithmetical, but in some geometrical ratio. The chief reason centered around the increasing complexity in city life. He saw that the bulk of city revenue came from the taxation of real estate and that the tax base begins to be destroyed at a low tax rate. He recognized the flight of both people and

---
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industry to the less-heavily taxed areas. Morrison felt that removal of the cost of education from the city level to the State level would equitably distribute the cost of schooling the State's future citizens and of enforcing the State's laws over suburbs, residential and lightly taxed communities, and over "tax colonies" which had grown up in order to escape heavy taxation. This would raise somewhat the critical point above which the city became self-destructive. He saw the city as a "sort of cancerous growth on the body politic,"¹²⁸ heading for eventual self-destruction due to increased size, complexity, and the limited opportunity for self-government. Yet, none of these special problems was sufficient reason not to include the city in the state system. He would permit the city to be a regional administrative district with city boards appointed by the governor with powers to make regulations "not repugnant to the law or to the superior regulations of the State Board"¹²⁹ but the schools within the city would be in fact State schools supported by State taxes.

Technical schools.--It has already been stated that Morrison's view was that technical schools were outside the responsibility of the Common State of citizenship school. However, they may be supported by private, State, Federal, municipal or business agencies. Technical training was not

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 296.
¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 298.
a function of the State System of Public Instruction with the exception of the Teachers' College.

Morrison was deeply concerned with the low professional status accorded teachers in many communities. This was to be expected under conditions where it was possible for "some domineering individual in the local community or some group of chronic malcontents" to force the firing of competent professional teachers. The custom of annual contracts, or annual appointments, was conducive to whole school community engaging in "expressing opinions about the teachers' methods and personal character." Under such conditions, no self-respecting teachers would remain in teaching.

The State Unit would correct such conditions since there would be a State Teaching Force. Under Morrison's system, the appointment, training, pay, and dismissal of teachers would follow procedures similar to those which the Federal Government uses for career officers in the Army and Navy. The training and recruitment of the State Teaching Force would follow these patterns:

1. Promising teacher material would tentatively be selected in the Junior College, as schools now are, and encouraged to look forward to a school career. The possible candidates would thus be put through a preliminary selective process. Then would follow examinations or some other method of surveying the relative qualifications. The successful would be admitted to a teachers' college for study and training.

130 Ibid., p. 306.
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2. When once admitted to training, it would be assumed that students are already cadets of the teaching force of the State, and they might well be paid a subsistence salary as such.

3. They would then be submitted to a full course of training intended:

a. To complete their full General Education. If a full Common School establishment were in existence, graduation therefrom would carry the presumption that General Education was already complete.

b. To give them full academic qualifications in the fields in which they propose to teach, but qualification in the catholic or comprehensive sense and not in that of the specialist.

c. To give them a sound basis in educational and instructional principles.

4. Along with the foregoing, they would be put through adequate observation and practice as practice teachers.

5. Like all other suitable forms of post-school training, the whole course would be selective, indeed severely selective, and by no means all would survive to graduation.

6. Finally, upon graduation each of them would be given an appointment under pay to the regular teaching force of the State and would be subject to assignment to the position in which his or her services might be needed.\textsuperscript{133}

Under such a system, all institutions of higher learning not under the direct control of the State Board of Education would be prohibited from training teachers for the State citizenship school.\textsuperscript{134} This does not mean that private teacher training institutions or University Departments of Education would be abolished. There would still be a need for teachers of family schools, private schools, parochial schools and universities. Departments of Education would

\textsuperscript{133}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 307-308.
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still be encouraged to be responsible for the "special training of school officers in the line and staff"\(^{135}\) such as personnel, supervisory, and financial officers, but first these specialists must have been graduates of the State Teachers' College.

As discussed previously, there would be no question of the State aiding financially the local district. The State itself would be the fiscal unit and by using such taxes as state income taxes and corporation taxes, there would be adequate funds to finance the State system providing its function was limited to the purpose authorized in the State constitutions to provide General Education so that future citizens may intelligently vote and choose leaders who will govern wisely so that the State may be perpetuated. The perpetuation of the State will ensure the citizenry the continuing opportunity to lead to a just and moral life and pass on the heritage, culture, and civilization to the succeeding generations.

And so Henry Morrison came to the end of his plan. This plan led to the gradual demise of the local system of school organization and control and made the State the administrative and the fiscal unit in the system of public instruction. The local control of schools, he argued, was an archaic remnant of a past condition in society that no longer existed. In the days when transportation and com-

\(^{135}\) Ibid., p. 309.
munication were difficult and almost impossible, the local control of schools was the only possible way to extend the benefits of education to isolated communities. But to retain this method of control in the modern era when transportation and communication were thought of in terms of minutes and hours and not in days and weeks was utter folly. Morrison's plan anticipated the movement toward the consolidation of schools that occurred in the 1950's.

Morrison based his argument on the differentiation between government locally administered and local self-government. Constitutionally, there are only two forms of sovereignty: state and national. It is possible to administer state and federal functions locally as post offices and health clinics are. But this does not imply that the local citizenry has either the right or the responsibility to establish basic policy in these areas. Local self-government arises only in those areas in which the action of the local citizenry proved beneficial or harmful to themselves alone. If a local unit does not want street lights or a public park, it is only that local unit which is effected. Education, however, is not in that category for two reasons: (1) it is so crucial to the perpetuation of society that society dare not permit it to be controlled by local whims and opinions; (2) the rapid mobility of citizens within and among the states magnifies the harmful effects of inequality in educational opportunity existing within the state.
And so, Morrison would have each one of the states control, direct, and finance the public educational system. Instead of having numerous basic educational administrative units, he would have wanted only fifty. The State would determine the curriculum, build the school buildings, subsidize the education of teachers, and then assign these teachers to any area in the State where they were most needed. The State would exercise monopoly over the training of all primary and secondary school teachers.

How far this State monopoly would extend over the pupils Morrison does not make clear. Although not stating he would have parochial or private schools abolished, he fails to provide for the existence of these schools in his organizational pattern. Consequently, one would imagine that he would prefer that they not exist.

There can be little doubt that such a centralized system as Morrison discussed could be a highly efficient operation. But that such a system would be feasible in the United States or even desirable is another matter. Any tight centralized system runs the risk of being used for purposes inimical to individual freedom. As long as the state leaders are just, honorable men dedicated to extending the rights and privileges of the individual citizen, a centralized system may work well. But it also can be easily perverted into a system whereby the rights and freedoms of citizens may be abridged. This can best be illustrated by looking at the schools in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and
Communist Russia where the schools have been an arm of the centralized governmental policy and the rights of parents have been minimized.

Again and again, our courts have called attention to the basic principles that the child is not a mere creature of the State; that government exists for the welfare of citizens and not that the citizens exist for the government. One gets the unmistakable impression, however, that Morrison thought more of the welfare of society than the welfare of the individual. The individual must adapt to society; society cannot adapt to the individual. The individual must adapt to the school; the school cannot adapt to the individual.

Henry C. Morrison presented a strong indictment against the whole system of Public Instruction and of the University establishment as well. But, he also presented a plan for reconstruction, one which would meet the needs of our current society. He based his discussion and design on certain principles which he believed to be established principles. According to Morrison these principles are:

1. First, the school in its institutional function is of necessity common school and not in any sense class school, either in constituency or purpose.

2. Second, whatever may have been at different times the views of schoolmasters, other school authorities, and the public at large, social evolution, in a country having our economic foundations and our national institutions, was bound to continue to a point at which the entire rising generation would be in school somewhere and stay there until schools in their nature have nothing more to offer - as was the case with our original common school and academy.
3. Third, in a country with national institutions like ours, and the implied obligations toward the education of citizens, the valid presumption must be that schools exist to put the rising generation in possession of the elements of civilization rather than to prepare individuals for something else. See that the former is done, and the latter will take care of itself.

4. Fourth, rights and obligations in each of the two institutions, Family and School, must be recognized; and neither of the two may trespass on the rights or assume the obligations of the other.

The thesis which Morrison developed as he viewed the American educational system, historically, educationally, and administratively was that the evolution of school structure, during nearly a century past and where not interfered with, had been in the direction of bringing the whole structure into conformity with what the old common school potentially was in the beginning of our national existence, "abort the process as schoolmasters, school boards, professors and the general public might." 136

Morrison's hopes for the future of education were stated in an article written in 1929.

In the end there will be a school organization which will carry nearly all young people to the end of the period of general education. If they continue beyond the secondary school, it will not be for the purpose of completing their education but rather for the purpose of special training and the pursuit of mature intellectual interests. It is a wonderful prospect, but I believe that confidence in the outcome is abundantly justified by the whole body of facts which are before us. 137

136 Ibid., p. 111.

Having discussed the social and educational theories of Henry C. Morrison, and these theories as they applied to his conception of the American educational system, it is time to move on to a study of the Curriculum as he interpreted it. Morrison's main purpose was to ascertain not what the Curriculum ought to be, but rather what the Curriculum is. "What is the valid content of education?" was the guiding question which led Morrison to pursue his study and the development of a general conception of the curriculum and a design for the curriculum of the common school.
CHAPTER IV

Morrison's Conception of the Curriculum

Henry C. Morrison spent his professional life in seeking to answer several significant questions which, for him, affected education and society; past, present and future. The basic questions which prompted his research and writing were:

1. What is education?
2. What is the nature of the learning process?
3. How is this whole learning process organized?
4. What is the content of education?
5. How is this content organized and taught?

Morrison sought to develop four theories based on scientific principles which would provide the answers to his questions; a theory of education, a theory of organization, a theory of the curriculum, and a theory of instruction.¹ This he did. Morrison wrote four basic books during his professional career which present the development of these theories. These works in order of their appearance were:

The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, 1926;
Basic Principles in Education, 1934;
The Curriculum of the Common School, 1940;

Thus far in this dissertation, Morrison’s theory of education and its relationship to society, his conceptions of the American educational system, its strengths and weakness, and a plan for the future have been discussed. Attention will now be directed to Morrison’s fourth question, “What is the content of education?”

Morrison examined the content of education in his book *The Curriculum of the Common School*, which was his third work in chronological order of publication, but second in logical order in the development of his theories. In the Preface of this book Morrison discusses the developmental aspects of his works.

This volume [*The Curriculum of the Common School*] is a development of the argument in instruction and education which first appeared some fifteen years ago in my *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School*. It is in method a sequel to *Basic Principles in Education*. In the latter work, the evolutionary principle is the foundation, and it is carried out in the light of fundamental disclosures touching Man as a part of the order of Nature which have emerged out of the investigations made in sundry scientific fields. . . . That work [*Basic Principles*] adheres to the doctrine that the scientific approach to all educational and instructional problems is to be found in a factually defensible theory of what education is. . . .

Following a similar method in the present work [*The Curriculum of the Common School*], and passing on from the chapters dealing with Personality in *Basic Principles*, it is here sought to find a defensible answer to the question, “What then must the content of General Education be?”, or, in other words, “What must be the valid Curriculum of the Common School?”

---

Morrison proceeds to reaffirm his basic belief in the doctrine of evolution:

To that end we recognize at once that the individual human is inescapably social in his educational status at any period of his development, as contrasted with his equally asocial nature at birth. The problem then becomes at the outset one of finding a workable definition of society and its elementary structure. ... From that point, following the evolutionary argument and especially the doctrine of Emergent Evolution, ... we arrive at positive conclusions as to what the cultural content of General Education must be and, by consequence the elements of the Curriculum of the Common School, up to the point of educational maturity. 3

As has been stated, by education, Morrison meant the "taking on of the arts and sciences and moral attitudes which make up the fabric of civilization." 4 An acceptance of this definition gives rise to two questions. What learnings are involved in this process? How can these learnings be organized and how can they be taught so that learning can most effectively and most certainly take place? It was in exploration of these questions that Morrison wrote The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School and a companion volume, The Curriculum of the Common School. Both of these books are, in turn, based on Basic Principles in Education even though The Practice of Teaching preceded Basic Principles by eight years in publication.

To understand the nature of the curriculum and the principles involved in teaching the curriculum, it is necessary

3Ibid., p. viii.
to understand Morrison's concepts of the structure, content, and measure of civilization. A brief review of these ideas which were developed in Chapter II follows. Civilization, for him, was the "art of living together in communities in harmony, and in cooperation in the presence of the natural and cultural environments." The measure or test of a civilization was to be found in the following principles:

1. Justice is most evenly, promptly, and effectively administered.

2. The national defense against the external enemy and the internal criminal is most adequately provided for.

3. The perils of the geographical and biological environments are most effectively warded off.

4. Mental and bodily health of the population is at a maximum.

5. The national resources are most effectively conserved.

6. The distribution of wealth is at the maximum consistent with maximum total production.

These are the criteria for civilization but civilization also has structure and content. An understanding of the structure of civilization can be gained by a re-examination of Morrison's analysis of the social foundations of all human living. Morrison accepted Albion Small's definition of society as being "that phase of the conditions of human life which consists of inevitable action and reaction between


many individuals," and a "living together in mutual relationships." These mutual relationships were based on "common estimates of the world of common experience and under common expectations of what each will do under certain sets of circumstances." Society was organized and controlled on the basis of these common estimates and common expectations. These estimates and expectations were expressed in an ascending order of importance in four ways:

1. By folkways.

2. By mores, which are attitudes characteristic of a given population.

3. By custom, which is a "compelling code of conduct, out of which civil law has evolved."9

4. By institutions, which arise when a "particular element in the folkways or mores, or a particular custom, becomes so important in experience that other elements in folkways or mores or a whole group of customs cluster around it and become integrated."10

Gradually, advanced societies evolved institutions which were universal. Morrison defined a universal institution:

A universal institution is a system of popular usages or beliefs which originating in human nature, in the common sense and experience of mankind, has survived as a useful form of harmony and cooperation, has become

---
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organized, extended, and refined, in the course of social evolution, and is, finally, capable of being rationally comprehended as a necessary element in the structure of all advancing societies.\textsuperscript{11}

This, then, was the structure of civilization. Folkways, mores, customs, and institutions were the social relationships that had been built up in society which enable civilization to develop.

Furthermore, man was a being capable of learning and transmitting this knowledge. Hence, he developed artifacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, habits, and values. He could and did develop a culture. The function of universal institutions was to serve as carriers of culture. Since this culture could be transmitted to succeeding generations, man could gradually perfect the art of living together in harmony and in cooperation. Hence, civilization developed on higher and higher levels. The structure of civilization then depended upon the existence of universal institutions.\textsuperscript{12}

But civilization, and the universal institutions comprising it also had content. If education was "taking on" the arts, sciences, and moral attitudes which make up the fabric of civilization and if civilization, in turn, was dependent upon the existence of universal institutions, the problem of "the Curriculum of the Common School [was] reduced then to enumerating the universal institutions."\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 14.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., pp. 15-17.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 25.
Or stated differently, the curriculum must be geared to developing civilized persons, and "a civilized individual at any stage of the world’s development is the person who is in possession of the universal institutions available in his time." 14

A "universal institution" was too broad a concept to be adequately developed within the curriculum. The content of the institution had to be broken down into manageable and significant parts within the grasp of the individual student. So Morrison developed and utilized the term "unit" to signify this manageable portion. A unit, then, would be a "comprehensive and significant aspect of the environment [cultural or natural], of an organized science, of an art, or of conduct, which being learned results in an adaptation in personality." 15

An adaptation in personality may be expressed in several ways. It may be a change in the attitude of an individual toward understanding where reflection and rationalization were involved, or it could be a change in the attitude of appreciation where acceptance of values had taken place. It may take the form of the acquisition of a special ability, as a reading adaptation, or it may be in the attainment of some form of skill or facility in manipulating instrumentalities or materials, as in speaking

14Ibid., pp. 17-18.

a foreign language. The objectives of teaching were always directed toward a change in attitudes or acquisition of special abilities or skills. Because these three objectives, the development of attitudes of understanding or appreciation, the acquisition of special abilities, the attainment of skills, were different, Morrison had to develop a theory of teaching which would encompass all three objectives. Moreover, since he believed that some subject-matter was more effective than other subject-matter to develop one or the other objectives, his theory of teaching had to differentiate between kinds of subject matter.

In any event, a true adaptive change had to occur in the individual if true learning was to take place. Otherwise, spurious adaptive responses took place. If the adaptation is true, however, the individual "does not and cannot react to nature as he did before. . . . The new attitude inevitably modifies his whole social behavior; he conceives new ends and adopts new means."16 If actual learning has occurred, a true adaptation has been made, an adaptive change has taken place, a learning product has been acquired, and there has been an accretion to the personality of the pupil.

A true adaptation had certain characteristics according to Morrison:

16 Ibid., pp. 17-18.
1. It was a unitary thing—either a pupil attained a change in attitude of understanding or appreciation or he did not. Skill and ability were variable and there could be degrees of proficiency.

2. The adaptation was never lost nor ever simply faded out other than through its transformation into new adaptations or through the rise of pathological inhibitions. "17

3. It must be used in a functional manner in ordinary activities of life.

4. It caused a modification in thinking, acting, or feeling.

There were, according to Morrison, two conditions which, if they prevailed, could facilitate change from a mere adaptive response to a true adaptive change. These were:

1. The subject matter must be organized into comprehensive and significant units. These units would contain a "body of principles to be understood or a definite power to be gained."18

2. This body of principles or definite power must be mastered. The "technique of pedagogical attack was pre-test, teach, test the result, adapt procedure, teach and test again to the point of actual learning."19

Mastery thus signified a change in the basic personality of the individual. Mastery of a true unit of learning was not to be equated with pupil performance on assigned tasks or with recalling content or with a passing grade.

These latter methods stressed performance values and not learning values. They resulted in lesson learning and

17Ibid., pp. 21-22.


19Morrison, The Practice of Teaching, p. 81.
lesson testing. And lesson learning was the characteristic pattern of pedagogy in Morrison's day, one which he decried in numerous lectures, journal articles and his major writings.

Throughout his life, Morrison never relented on his basic attack on spurious learning, the notions of time-to-be-spent, methods-to-be-followed, ground-to-be-covered. In one of his most cogent critiques of spurious learning, he traced the evolution of these ideas and assigned blame to the following false conceptions responsible for lesson learning. 20

1. The fallacy of the passing grade. "There is much reason to think that the graded system of school administration launched us on this half-learning career."

2. The abuse of the probability curve.

3. The fallacy of intelligence rating. "It does not follow that because a child is bright he has therefore achieved. He may achieve more easily than the dull, but achieve he must."

4. The fallacy of time to be spent and ground to be covered. "We began with the pedagogic fallacy of lesson-learning, crowned with the honors of hoary tradition, and we have reached the logical and legitimate end of the series in this 'reductio ad absurdum,' educational credit for time spent and ground covered. 21"

Morrison concludes his remarks by criticizing school administration:


21 Ibid., pp. 107-117.
Note that our whole process of administration tends to be a thing apart from teaching and learning. Our administrative procedure tends to deal with its problems not in terms of teaching and learning, but in terms of abstractions entirely apart from these processes for which schools exist.22

The two concepts of "unit" and "mastery" are essential for an understanding of Morrison's conception of the curriculum and the teaching process. The unit was the element out of which Morrison built his concept of curriculum. It was the way in which he divided the curriculum into smaller parts so that it would be manageable for the pupils. And mastery was the basic technique by which the units were learned.

In Basic Principles in Education, Morrison concentrated on the makeup and structure of the individual learner. In The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, the emphasis was on the teacher and the subject matter. In The Curriculum of the Common Schools, the focus shifted to society and the subject-matter which grows out of the needs of society. In consequence, The Curriculum of the Common Schools was a natural sequel to Morrison's first two books, and was an answer to the basic question: Given an individual who is capable of learning, given a society whose structure is such that survival depends on adjustment to its demands, what is the valid curriculum which must be taught in the schools?

Morrison developed his theory of the curriculum in successive stages. Education was "taking on the arts and

22 Ibid., p. 118.
sciences and moral attitudes which make up the fabric of civilization." Education was becoming the kind of person who knew what to do. It was learning how to "get on" in the world and it arose "in all creatures which exist in a changeable environment in which there must be in the nature of the case solutions of problems of some sort." It was a natural process driven onward by natural laws clustering about self-preservation and self-assertion, and centering in adjustment.

Education was the end product and was the result of learning by the individual out of his experience in life. The experience a person had determined the personality but the "result of experience in the world [was] . . ., in principle as likely to produce the worst of criminals as the best of citizens." The social process by which the community sought to guarantee that the education of the rising generation shall be right education was through instruction, which was carried on in schools, and upbringing, which was carried on in the family.

The instruction, which was to be carried on in the schools and which was to guarantee right education, was to develop from the Curriculum of the Common School. This curriculum was to consist of an enumeration and study of

24Ibid.
25Ibid., pp. 2-3.
26Ibid., p. 3.
the basic universal institutions of society. Thus, Morrison's task as he conceived it, was to enumerate these institutions and he did not seem dismayed by its complexity. He recognized the task as arduous but not impossible. He established certain ground rules for himself in determining these institutions. There were three:

1. . . . I have tried to impose upon myself the obligation of refusing hospitality to any presumptions whatever, or to be influenced by any sort of tradition. So much so that I have gladly gone on as if the final result might be to prove that an entirely new kind of Curriculum is essential or that the General Education of the masses is an impossibility.

2. . . . I have declined to allow myself to be governed by the limitation of what is at present feasible . . .[e.g.], "Can teachers be found to conduct these courses, or principals to administer them?"

3. . . . Nor have I allowed adventitious circumstances to interfere, notably whether under our political institutions and laws, certain subjects can legally be taught at all or taught without interfering with the prejudices of large classes of citizens.27

And so Morrison began his ambitious task. The results may be noted in his concluding comment:

Now that the work is done. . . , I have come out at a result in terms of courses to be taught which reveals that there is little or nothing contained in the work but has been taught somewhere, in some form at some time, short of the junior year in college.28

Morrison identified twelve basic universal institutions in all, the first three being what he termed symbolic institutions and nine being content institutions. Here Morrison refers to institutions as a body of relationships

27Ibid., p. viii.
28Ibid.
which have developed between individuals or a set of
popular usages which have become organized, refined and
extended. He applies this definitive test to each of the
institutions which he included in his list of twelve.

The three basic universal institutions which Morrison
identified as symbolic ones were Language, Mathematics, and
Graphics. Morrison deals with Language as a primary insti-
tution:

In the beginning was the word. Civilization as we have
studied it started its evolutionary journey in Language
... The word is symbol of reality, and so Language
can properly be called a "symbolic institution." 29

Morrison goes on to say that if a person says "I am sick,"
he sets up a theory in Language and thus explains himself.
He could not do so unless there were also in consciousness
a generalized idea associated with the word "sick." Through
the word, the symbol of reality, can the sick man make him-
self intelligible to others. Intelligibility is in thought,
not reflective thinking, but thought, a logic. "Thus,"
stated Morrison, "arises social experience out of which
the Intelligence of the race emerges." 30 Morrison asserted:

The primitive in his imaginings can find ideas and
words to stand for ideas, but there is no thought
until he can utter a simple declarative sentence.
When he can do that, he has set out on the road which
leads to modern Science and Philosophy. 31

29 Ibid., p. 34.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
According to Morrison's analysis, the social value of Language arises as others have been trained in their language up to the point at which they can share their language as thought. "Therein," Morrison stated, "is the real justification of Language in the Curriculum, and the vague notion that it is very useful to the individual is no justification at all." 32

Language, as an institution is made possible by speech, an organic human process. The normal infant learns to speak without being taught through imitation of the speech of the mother. As the child grows he has to be taught his language, that means of thoughtful discourse which is above the level of crude dialect or patois. If it were not for the fact that he lives in society, he would not learn to speak at all, much less learn any language.

It can be seen, asserted Morrison, that Language evolves, as do all other institutions, through variation and survival of appropriate forms of expression. "It becomes organized and refined and is expanded, because it is inherently in the nature of Society itself as a body of relationships between individuals." 33

The second symbolic institution, Mathematics, was defined by Morrison:

Mathematics, the second of the great symbolic institutions, content in pure thought or abstract thought, the science of number, the science of form, the science of function. 34

32 Ibid., p. 35.
33 Ibid., p. 36.
34 Ibid., p. 68.
The development of Mathematics was traced by Morrison. Number and Measurement originated as did Language in the inescapable relationships between individuals in society. There was little likelihood that either would have evolved unless there was somebody to talk to and the possibility of speech. With the savage as with the civilized person, communication did not evolve until some common understanding that touched matters involving quantity and space forms existed. Thus, folkways tend to develop in a crude and imprecise manner. However, this is still preferable to a condition in which there is no possibility of intercourse in that field at all. According to Morrison:

The folkway once established, survived because of its social utility, became institutionalized, the institution became organized into systems of number, gave rise to mathematics and thus to the most indubitably universal of all institutions, a system of thought which is self-verified. 35

Morrison defends the inclusion of higher mathematics in the Curriculum of the Common School as follows:

The supreme contribution to the Intelligence in Civilization, to understandings of how the world is put together, and to reflection on such understandings, comes from Mathematics. It does not "teach us how to think," but it is in itself pure thought within its own sphere and, by its symbolism, often beyond its own sphere. 36

Mathematics is kindred to Language, both in the sense that it is a medium of communication and in the sense that it is thought. Moreover, mathematical thought does pass over into advanced Language. Morrison asserted that "its

35 Ibid.
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greatest value in General Education is achieved when it ceases to be mathematics confined to number, form, and space and comes to be a body of terms in common language use."37

No doubt, Morrison goes on to say, Mathematics as the science of number, function, and form is practically useful to the individual, but that utility is soon exhausted. "Its supreme utility is in the great principle that the individual possessing it is to that extent a highly civilized individual, and where Mathematical concepts are common in the mores, there is a highly civilized community and society."38

Of the three major symbolic institutions, Morrison said that "Graphical Representation of Ideas seems to have been first in the order of development."39 In Graphical Representation are the beginnings of written language in the pictograph. Developed into Geometry, Graphics was the larger part of Mathematics down through the Middle Ages. "Language and Mathematics however, so far outran the parent form that they became greatly more important as thought forms, that is to say, as discourse."40, Morrison stated in his usual manner of tracing origins and development.

Nevertheless, Graphics originated in the fundamental nature of the human organism, in the common sense and experience of mankind, and it still occupies its original place.

37Ibid., p. 115.
38Ibid., p. 116.
39Ibid., p. 117.
40Ibid.
It too, has steadily evolved, become organized and refined, and even in our own time has expanded into an essential and peculiar form of concrete and economical thought. On the one hand, Morrison stated, "it has developed into the medium of pictorial representation as the artist employs it; and, on the other, through an extension of mathematical thought, as an outcome of Cartesian Geometry into graphical analysis."41

Graphics is universal, according to Morrison, not merely because logical inference leads us to that conclusion but also because "it is in fact part of the culture of all peoples who are at all advanced in the scale of Civilization."42 It is a major and universal institution and as such a significant part of the Curriculum of the Common School. In truth, Morrison felt that those of us who lack it are less educated than we should be if we had it.

When the primitive made a pictograph, he represented in graphic form some ideas which were in his consciousness. When he made a picture of his acts or intended actions, he entered into discourse in a crude way. It was a matter of common sense, both because the picture was the obvious thing and because the picture as a cultural product was a matter of common, ready apprehension. For these reasons, Morrison asserted, "a cultural product was left behind, and social experience in a somewhat advanced form was made possible."

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.
Wherever social experience becomes more widely possible, civilization the more rapidly moves forward. 43

The final stage of the institution, or at least the present stage, is, first, that of an instrument for sharing thought or sentiment that cannot be shared in any other way and, second, that of an argument which can be set forth only with difficulty in any other form. Morrison concludes, "The mental processes involved in Graphical Representation apply to all of us." 44 In concluding his discussion of the three symbolic institutions, Language, Mathematics, and Graphics, Morrison summarily comments on them as Thought and primary instruments in thinking.

Throughout our studies of Culture, and in the common experience of life, according to Morrison, "we are constantly coming upon antithetic pairs of concepts: form and substance, theory and practice, the abstract and the concrete. Unbalanced materialism is forever exalting the second members and decrying the first; unbalanced idealism is constantly neglecting the second." 45 In truth, the members of the pairs are bound up together as are waves and water, or life and bodily existence. Morrison said, "The substance is not more than the form, nor yet the form more than the substance." 46

43 Ibid., p. 118.
44 Ibid., p. 119.
46 Ibid.
Morrison supposed that all would admit that the world of physical existence, that of biological life, and that of social rightness are ultimately controlled by the solving of problems as they arise in any of the fields and bringing the solutions into application to the facts of life. Solving problems is thinking, and there is no actual thinking without Thought or Logic of some kind. Except as humans are able to think out the conditions which surround them and bring the conditions under ideational control, "they are but the sport of shifting circumstance." 47

Continuing on with his line of reasoning, Morrison stated that when we seek a basis for our Thinking, we discover Thought in the external scheme of things in its formal aspect. "So has the race found it in the course of social evolution, and its findings have been chiefly Language, Mathematics, and Graphics." Morrison concludes by saying:

Nevertheless, a sentence, or an equation, or a curve, may be formally impeccable and still have no meaning because it lacks substance. The words are stereotypes, the curve is but a mathematical artifact, the equation is no more than an abstraction. Substance is of course in the ideas which are derived out of experience, but it is still more in the experience of the race, and out of that have come Science, Religion, Morality, Art, The State, Commerce, Industry, and Health. These are what are called content subjects, and not inaptly. However, not a single one of them has ever arisen out of the primitive, save in terms of the formal aspects of Thought. 48

Within each of the three basic symbolic institutions Morrison developed a list of the basic courses which would

47Ibid.

48Ibid., p. 133.
be included in that phase of the Curriculum of the Common School. These were as follows:

1. Language, including the spoken language, reading; written expression, including handwriting and composition; usage, including punctuation, capitalization, sentence sense, use of manuals and dictionaries, and the right use of words; spelling; grammar; logic; and foreign languages. 49

2. Mathematics, including arithmetic which would consist of the number system, the fundamental processes, processes in denominate numbers, factors, fractions, decimal fractions, percentage; algebra which would consist of algebraic notation and numeration, the fundamental processes, the equation, factors and factoring, fractions, theory of exponents, logarithms, ratio and proportion, permutations and combinations, probabilities and the doctrine of chance, and variation; geometry; trigonometry; Cartesian geometry; and calculus. 50

3. Graphics, including drawing, mapping, and mathematical graphics. 51

Morrison continued the identification of the basic universal institutions which were to be included in the Curriculum of the Common School by listing the following nine additional institutions which he referred to as "content institutions:"

1. Science
2. Religion
3. Morality and Moral Institutions
4. Art
5. The State and Civil Institutions - Civics
6. Civil Government - Politics

49 Ibid., pp. 36-55.
50 Ibid., pp. 74-110.
51 Ibid., pp. 120-132.
Morrison stated previously that "Substance is in the ideas which are derived out of experience, primarily in the experience of the race, and out of that have come... the content subjects... Not a single one of them has ever arisen out of the primitive save in terms of the formal aspects of Thought." And Thought was discovered in the external scheme of things chiefly in the three symbolic institutions, and extended and developed in the content institutions. In his work on Curriculum, Morrison devoted an entire chapter to each of the content institutions. This dissertation will discuss each institution in relation to its institutional status, its evolution, development and refinement, a justification for its placement in the Curriculum of the Common School, and, finally, a listing of the courses to be included in each content institutional area of the Morrisonian Curriculum.

As Morrison studied the curriculum, he read ethnological treatises dealing with primitive culture and noted a characteristic which appeared everywhere, except among the most degraded savages. "The nature peoples, one and all, endeavor to find some satisfactory way of managing the external world of nature - to avert the stroke of lightning, to ward off

52 Ibid., pp. xi-xii.
53 Ibid., p. 133.
pestilence, to secure good luck, and, not less, to use the forces of nature for the betterment of the standard of living." 54

Along with this primitive management goes the satisfaction of curiosity about the make-up of the world and their place in it, in other words, a quest of a philosophy.

Morrison believed that the primitive could form no conception of causation, but only of agency. He saw things happen about him daily, done by his neighbors, and, following the fundamental law of all learning which is ideational in character, he inferred that all things happen in the same way. If the wind destroyed his hut, he personalizes the wind as an active and perhaps malignant spirit. If the season gave him a rich run of fish or an abundant yield of corn, again a beneficient spirit did it. No cause was ever dreamed of or sought after. "That is in its various levels of development, Mythology. Mythology explains the primitive's world and gives him common estimates." 55

Little by little, in the course of many milleniums, ideas of causation appeared to provide a more satisfactory explanation of natural phenomenon. From Mythology, Science emerged. Morrison explains:

If a cut in the bone of the skull is made in order to remove a tumor or a bit of spearhead, it is only because

54 Ibid., p. 134.

55 Ibid., p. 135.
the surgeon has seen a sequence of cause and effect, both in ailment and in remedy. Hence, Magic gives place to Technology. Error gives place to positive knowledge.56

In summarizing his conclusions, Morrison stated that both primitive and modern man commonly shared: "first, the perceived necessity of managing the world; and, second, an overwhelming curiosity to know how the world is put together."57 What is peculiar to the mind of the modern man is the "perception that the world is governed by laws; that, by understanding and obeying those laws, men can reach freedom and escape not the malignant but the inexorable purposes of nature."58

It then follows for Morrison, that Science is a major and universal part of the art of living together in cooperation in the management of the external environment. So Science is part of Civilization and not the modern conveniences which technology in Industry and Commerce make possible. Science, therefore, "is indefeasible in the Curriculum of the Common School, an essential part of General Education."59

Morrison identified the courses to be included in the Science area:

56 Ibid.
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Science, including geography, history, general science, physics and chemistry, biology, and sociology. 60

For Morrison, physics, biology, and sociology covered the "comprehensive and fundamental areas of Science." 61 Physics dealt with the world of physical inorganic things; biology was concerned with the world of living organisms; sociology, examining social existence, included ethics, social studies, the community, and economics.

Morrison summarized the body of principles developed in his Chapter on Science which he stated "give us an impartial foundation from which to judge what sciences are essential contributions to fundamental Science, to basal Intelligence, and for that reason are in principle indefeasibly parts of the Curriculum." 62 Morrison summarized these principles as follows:

1. That only is justified which is in principle essential and fundamental, comprehensive and significant.

2. The only sciences which qualify are those which seem to have reached the stage at which they are organized bodies of the substance of thought; and those which are necessary phenomenological foundations in instruction for the organized sciences.

3. The exception [to the test] is in Geography and History, which we have shown to be background of all practical, intellectual apprehensions of the environment, especially in all that concerns Society. 63

Finally, Morrison concludes, "the function of the

Common School is not to teach everything but rather to

60 Ibid., pp. 138-204.
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generate that adaptability which makes the pupil capable of learning by himself whatever his needs and interests in mature life determine." 64

The next three content institutions which Morrison identified were Religion, Morality and moral institutions, and Art. In his analysis of these three areas, he changes his approach as can be noted in his introductory comment:

For these three chapters to come (Chapter VII on Religion, Chapter VIII on Morality and Moral Institutions and Chapter IX on Art) we turn sharply away from the argument of the last four, away from logic, from the forms of thought, from thought in content, to what is not thought but sentiment, not understanding but appreciation, not reason but the reasonable in human experience; away from Science to what have been called the Humanities. 65

Morrison develops his new approach to this area by stating that "the persistent fallacy of what was once called the Age of Reason, and is now worshipped as the wonders of Science, is that nothing is learned save by the exercise of a mythical faculty called the Reason, and that there is no certainty save in what is logically justified." 66 Morrison disagrees with this and reaffirms his position that the adaptive response which we call learning, in all forms of life, rests on experience, and there is no learning except out of experience of some sort. This then raises a question for Morrison. "Is there any valid learning product in the race or in the individual, which arises out of unanalyzed

64 Ibid., p. 206.
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experience, or are the sentiments and their organized products sheer fancy and delusion?"67

In answering his own query, Morrison distinguished between gross experience as all men find it and selected experience focused deliberately on particular inquiries, the latter known as the empirical method which is used by scientists in the search for scientific truth. The use of the empirical method always requires the presence of rational analysis and dialectic, which means determining the facts in reality. In accepting the empirical method and the use of dialectic in both empirical and non-empirical investigations, Morrison then identifies and defines another area of experience. He said:

We remind ourselves then that there is an abundance of experience which is in no sense empirical in the strict sense of the word and cannot be. Aside from that which is dialectic, there is the common, uncritical experience of life. It is the source of our values as distinguished from our rational insights, of what we call the Humanities.68

A religious or moral conviction arises in the same way as an aesthetic conviction. The experience of any one individual in the quest of assurance is insignificant compared with the experience of the race. In empirical investigation the experience of an individual can stand against the experience of the race, and necessarily has done so, for there is common experience in empirical

67 Ibid.

68 Ibid., p. 208.
matters. Scientific truth is common in contrast to subjective experience. Morrison exemplifies this point:

Intelligence is positive, what goes into it can be logically demonstrated. Conscience and Taste are not positive, but they are no less real. Conviction does not come through demonstration, but directly out of affective experience. Our moral and aesthetic convictions are acquired tastes. 69

According to Morrison, the Humanities rest on experience as does Science. However, this is differently apprehended and differently managed. Their products in culture might well be called "the outcome of the dialectic of the race." 70 What has long persisted in the sentiments of men has again and again disappeared and then reappeared, has been found in one form or another everywhere, or nearly everywhere, is probably valid, right, and basal in all human experience. The reasoned conclusions of individuals on the other hand, are as likely to be wrong as to be right, except that they are capable of demonstration and are in fact demonstrated. Thus does Henry C. Morrison introduce the three basic content institutions of Religion, Morality and moral institutions, and Art as elements in the Curriculum of the Common School.

Perhaps the most conspicuous historical social phenomena and in point of influence the most dynamic is Religion. Morrison's analysis of Religion begins with a tracing of the evolutionary development of this institution. He said,

69 Ibid., pp. 208-209.
70 Ibid., p. 209.
"We have all along seen that the evolution of an organ or institution as a functional entity defines that organ or institution."\(^1\) Morrison believed that ethnologists had occasionally treated the evolutionary process incorrectly because they had assumed that primitive folkways and modern religious cults were the same. Some ethnologists argued that because we find everywhere in the primitive world belief in spirits which animate objects and sorcery intended to control the activities of ghosts, therefore Religion originated in spiritism and ghost worship. In disagreeing with this argument, Morrison claimed that the animism and spiritism of primitive man was an entirely comprehensible system which evolved to meet his needs of managing his external world. In locating all this magical and mystical activity in the roots of Science and not in that of Religion, Morrison stated:

It is maintained here that the process by which we reach experience of God is as natural and nonmystical as that by which we have experience of material force, but vastly different in quality and form.\(^2\)

Morrison asserted, however, that the origins of reverence and worship were back in the primitive world. They appeared in sun worship and in the pantheism which was more or less common among the Indians. It was found in universally prevalent ancestor worship and the cult of local


\(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 212.
divinities common to the Aryan racial line. Wherever is found the sense of reverence and feeling of the sacred and whenever guidance rather than material intervention is sought, and whatever tends to liberate man from the curse of his original egoism and self-love - there is found the common sentiments of both the primitive and the modern.\(^73\)

There is another aspect to Religion, the one which gives it its name, for "religion means a binding," and that aspect survives still in dynamic Religion. It is this:

That right and justice, the good which is actual in the customs which are primitive law, are seen and accounted for as the will of revered ancestors, as the will of national heroes, as the will of God. All that is the germ of the idealistic philosophy by which civilized peoples are governed today, if they are justly governed at all. It is to accept conduct as resting on principles and not on expediency or pragmatic conclusions.\(^74\)

In truth, then, Morrison concludes that there is scarcely any of our major institutions, except perhaps Language and Number, which shows so clear an institutional history as Religion. "It is," stated Morrison, "indefensibly part of Civilization and as such an element in the Curriculum of the Common School, having the same sort of justification which Language and Mathematics and Science have."\(^75\) Religion, thus established as an element in the curriculum would include the following in course content:

\(^73\)Ibid., p. 213.

\(^74\)Ibid., p. 214.

\(^75\)Ibid., p. 219.
Religion, which deals with man's search after God would have as its two major goals: 1) a sense of the sacred and the holy as it is found in various situations in life, and 2) a sense of dependence upon, and communion with, a Supreme Being who is the impersonation of the Ideal and the Right, and whom we call God.  

Morrison knew that instruction in Religion could not be given in the tax-supported schools of the United States. To him, this was unfortunate. He stated that "national polity does not establish what in principle is right, and in working out a theoretical Curriculum we are under no restrictions derived from constitutional and statutory considerations."  

The next content institution which Morrison discussed was Morality and moral institutions. He said that from the early American national period, at least, the management of schools has seldom had any clear social purpose in the ordering of curriculum and methods. Morality, the basis of ordered society everywhere, tended to be only incidental to the maintenance of school room order. This did not mean, however, that Morality had been consistently ignored or that school government and administration was altogether devoid of ethical foundations. Morrison distinguished three stages in instructional theory that related to character building:

76 Ibid., pp. 223-224.
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1. In the first place, in one form or another, there has been approach from the assumptions of ethical theory, with inferences drawn deductively concerning both curriculum content and general school procedure.

2. A corollary of the preceding... has been the development of actual moral laissez-faire, which... means: Leave the pupil in the school and the child in the home to do as he pleases, in the expectation that he will learn wisdom from his follies.

3. A third approach consists in the collection of mention of desirable moral traits and statistical treatment of frequency. A list of objectives can be built up arranged in a hierarchy of assumed relative values.78

Morrison criticized the three approaches, from ethical theory, training ethical judgment and analysis of moral traits. The first based on ethical theory he felt was unsound since its logic started from assumption and inference rather than from facts. He said, "The moral history of the race is factual; valid ethical theories are rational inferences and applications."79 The second approach, training ethical judgment, Morrison felt rested on a long discarded educational psychology. It assumed the existence of a faculty of judgment which could be trained through exercise to make discriminating and accurate decisions whenever the individual faced an ethical situation. Morrison said:

The whole pedagogical theory is a far cry from that of the intrasigents who a generation ago held vigorously to formal discipline and automatic transfer, but at bottom the modern liberal and his intrasigent parent rest on the same erroneous principle.80

---
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The third approach, an analysis of moral traits, he said, had the defects which are characteristic of the job-analysis approach to curriculum construction. The difficulty was partly in the principle that a thousand opinions are opinion still, and partly in the principle that the method does no more than explore the current mores. While mores can make anything seem right, they never determine what is right. Morrison stated:

In the end, critical analysis will show that most of the virtuous traits named are only symptoms of something else. Some of the traits which we value most highly today, and which have been valued for thousands of years, have never proved to be capable of institutionalization, [and] that is the test of the fundamental and the teachable.

Returning to history in his analysis of Morality and moral institutions, Morrison said that if man followed the historical and genetic point of view and read the dissertations of the moralists, on one hand, and of the history of conduct, on the other, there would be found but one common denominator in all discussions, ancient or modern. That is:

Since a remote antiquity some men have more or less been doing what they believed to be right because in their eyes it was right, without regard to expediency to the hope of reward, or to the fear of punishment. In brief, Morality so conceived seems to be, more than most things, service to the Ideal, regardless of the ethical question whether what is believed to be right is in truth objectively right. When an individual so acts, his act has moral quality.

81 Ibid., p. 233.
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Conceivably, a whole population might be made up of men and women whose conduct was consistently affected with moral quality, and yet no Civilization would appear, since there could be no common expectation. That is exactly what happens when the dogma is set up which holds that a man's morals are his private affair. Society, itself, can break down because there is not enough common moral expectation in the mores to make the culture manageable.

There is then, according to Morrison, something more than moral quality in conduct. That might serve the purpose if there were no such thing as Society as one of the conditioning factors in existence. "Socially speaking," Morrison states, "Morality, moral orders, codes, the moral law were inevitable. The tendency toward moral quality in the acts of individuals was bound from the beginning to generate content and substance, and that is what we call Morality."83

Thus, the moral order is arranged in terms of moral institutions which are valid in that they are the products of long ages of variation in the mores, folkways, and hence in customs. Morrison asserts, "Each of the institutions has followed the typical history of major and universal institutions which we have so often studied. They must be the fundamentals of the Curriculum in respect to education in moral character."84
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In his attempt to identify moral institutions, Morrison followed the test applied in all cases of conformity to the definition of a universal institution. He found that not a great many clear cases emerged, but those which did appear were "wonderfully comprehensive and significant." Morrison elaborated:

Each of them is discernible in its beginnings in very early times; it has survived as recognized value in the innumerable vicissitudes of social change because of its social utility; it shows a history of expansion and refinement; and it is rationally comprehensible as an element in the structure of stable and advancing societies, in the art of living together. Indeed, in one way or another, all of them in the course of centuries have crept into the Law, either civil, canonical, or martial, or all three.

But here, as is true of all the products of social evolution, Morrison reasserts that "a surviving institution is socially useful because it is right and not right because it is socially useful." Morrison included in the content institution of Morality and moral institutions the following courses:

Morality and moral institutions, which would include cleanliness, loyalty, obedience, fortitude, patriotism, prudence, veracity, respect for sex, equity, good faith, labor, punctuality, and cooperation.

The units in the course were thus listed. "But," Morrison said, "the course cannot be given didactically in a classroom, for a particular year or term or semester, under a
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particular teacher or department of teachers. The influence of a school is a general influence, and the course lasts until maturity."\textsuperscript{89} The units then provide the broad definition of the course content, the systematic bases for directing the influence of the school, a means by which the administration can evaluate and estimate progress, and terms under which ways and means of applying new influences can be studied.

Morrison listed eight significant instructional influences which the school must provide in this area:

2. Example - Good example of a real and vicarious nature.
3. Moral sanitation - the exclusion of vicious influences and literature.
4. Selection of activities, especially in sports, out of which some of the units can emerge.
5. Individual and collective exhortation applied as occasion suggests.
6. Pastoral relations with the homes...the immediate personal influence of the head of the school.
7. Psychiatric counselling.
8. Skill and ingenuity in discovering the immediate pedagogical objectives which contribute to the ultimate curriculum objectives.\textsuperscript{90}

Thus Morrison reaffirms his statement, "The influence of the school is a general influence and the course lasts until maturity."\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{89}Ibid., p. 256.
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In the history of instruction, Art is a very old subject if one is not particular as to definitions and content. The word "art" in itself is one of the most difficult in the language if it has to be used exactly. At bottom, the meaning is "a method of doing." Language is an art. Common parlance also refers to the art of the physician, the teacher, and the craftsman. As a method of doing, it gives rise to "artificial" as opposed to "natural." Again, it means the distinguishing characteristics of a particular artist or craftsman. Finally states Morrison:

It means the accumulated products in culture of the methods, ideas, principles, and works of artists during the ages; and that for our purposes is the important meaning.92

Morrison again refers to the history of the race, to the origins and evolution of Civilization. He notes that from a remote period there have been forms of activity in the Community in which great thoughts have been recorded, action urged, events memorialized, beautiful scenes and beautiful persons made permanent and transportable, great men made visible for succeeding generations, a god or a government or a family adequately and significantly housed. Morrison concludes, "Out of all this has sprung up, become organized, refined, and extended, five great arts; Music, Literature, Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture."93

The five in their history show the typical institutional development with great clarity. Above all others,
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they are the media in which the whole fabric of Civilization has been transmitted and ordered societies made possible.

According to Morrison:

If they are not yet in the mores in terms of appreciation and taste, the society is crude and limited. If they disappear out of the mores or themselves become corrupted, society becomes sorely crippled. ... If they fall into the hands of the degenerates and miscreants, the whole community tends more or less to become demoralized. In them somewhere is the possibility of the discourses which make Science, Religion, and Morality effective; and not only these but the State, Commerce and Industry as well.94

In each of these arts, the kernel of their institutional character lies in the principle that each is a particular method of conveying meaning or substance of thought. Morrison felt that the five great arts of Music, Literature, Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, "were indefeasible elements in the Curriculum of the Common School, for precisely the same reason that has led us to include Language, Mathematics, and Graphics. They constitute Art in the Curriculum, just the same as sundry of the important sciences constitute Science."95

In Art is accumulated and sorted out a great body of feeling and sentiment, digested out of the experience and association of the human race. From these Arts, may be added to the common philosophy a sense of the appropriate, a sense of balance, and perhaps a sense of humor. Its
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contribution is a matrix against which both Intelligence and Conscience may be brought to bear.

Morrison proceeds with his argument in favor of Art in the Curriculum. He feels that well bred tastes incline man toward vicarious experience which is wholesome in character, tending toward the enrichment of personality. So education goes on and on all the way through life. Man's tastes have been formed on universal values, and man enjoys that which keeps ideals alive. He concludes by stating that "where tastes of that sort are in the mores, there can be common estimates, and those estimates are likely to be right estimates. Therein is the social value of instruction in this whole field." 96

The content of the Curriculum in Art as a universal institution was developed and detailed by Morrison:

Art, which would include, music, consisting of singing, the scale and the staff, choral music and participation, and music appreciation of the classics and the various musical forms; literature, which consists of oratory, drama, epic poetry, the ballad, the lyric, the novel, history and biography, the journal, the essay, and the treatise; painting, which would include illustration, portrait, life-active and still, landscape, decoration, genre, symbolic painting, and photography; sculpture, which would consist of life, genre, decoration in buildings, portrait, memorials, and symbolical; and Architecture, which would include elementary structure, the building on the ground, ornamentation and decoration, and functional buildings of varied types and times.97

Morrison stated that in any of the Arts, the problem of unit organization is to find the most general forms in
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which the content of the Art is expressed and transmitted. In that way the pupil learns as the race has learned and what the race has learned; he follows the evolution of the Art, although not necessarily in the historic order of forms. Precisely the same principles apply to the organization of the courses in each of the Arts listed by Morrison in his Curriculum. He stated, "We look for the forms of content which constitute culture in the field... We do not look for the technical organization as the artist sees it." Thus Morrison concludes his analysis of the three content institutions, Religion, Morality and moral institutions, and Art, which he felt were based on the Humanities, the source of our values and appreciations as distinguished from our rational insights. Their [the Humanities] products in culture Morrison said, might well be called "the outcome of the dialectic of the race." Nothing is good because it is old; some things are old because they have always been good. They have stood the test as truthful interpreters of human experience a long time and under varied conditions of life. The race does not tire of them because they are forever new. Morrison said, "The significant facts in the Humanities are the tested survivals, since the very name "humanity" imports human experience which is without time limitations."

---

The State and Civil Institutions are significant units in human affairs. About all the positive security there is anywhere in a perilous world is ultimately under their shield. That being true, it would seem that Civics would everywhere be central in public instruction. "Yet," stated Morrison, "so far as I know it has seldom been even marginal. Certainly, the great curriculums of the past have never given it any place at all."\textsuperscript{102} Morrison had expressed serious concern about the uninformed civic and political condition of the citizenry, who were the products of our educational system:

Aside from the practical consideration, \textsuperscript{103}the analysis of Civics and Politics in his study of \textit{The Curriculum of the Common School}...are founded on the conviction that here is one of the most important of the intellectual pursuits of mankind, out of which there has grown a rich body of cultural material, that in the Common School as much space should be devoted to Civics and Politics as are given to the whole field of Science, in the same spirit of serious study which is on the whole characteristic of that subject in our best schools.

The word "state" has different connotations and needs to be clearly defined in order to follow Morrison's usage and inclusion as a universal institution in his \textit{Curriculum of the Common School}. The State as civil institution is usually described as "a population organized for the purpose of governing and being governed." That is the sense in which the term is used by historians and publicists. In the United States, commonwealths are called States. Finally there is

\textsuperscript{102}Ibid., p. 308.
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"The State", an abstract term, which was used by Morrison in his analysis of the State and Civil Institutions as an element in the Curriculum of the Common School. He developed a working definition: "The State is coercive power acting upon a whole population," and then proceeded to answer factually some of the questions raised by the definition.

Morrison looked into history and noted that even in the proto-societies which existed among the lower animals, a leader would always emerge to head the pack, herd, or flock. The rise to leadership can also be observed under normal circumstances in human relationships. The leader is one whom the others will follow, either because he has superior prowess, or is thought to have superior wisdom and skill, or because he can compel others to follow. So it is in smaller groups, regardless of the justification of the group purpose. Wherever you find leadership well established, you tend to find some kind of capacity and strength and safety which supercedes weakness, some kind of order which succeeds chaos. People prefer it that way; it has social utility. Morrison summarized his findings:

Everywhere in organized groups there is some sort of coercive power in a head, whether the head be a strong man who rules by dint of physical force, or another kind of strong man who rules by power of personal influence.105
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Pursuing his historical search, Morrison identifies two more features which are significant. The first is the reign of custom, and historical jurists tell us that custom was primitive law and that valid modern law still has in it a large element of custom. Moreover, the customs seem to keep apart from the evolution of rule. The second feature is the recognition of right in kingship of some sort or rulership. Recognition of right in the fact of rulership bestows sovereignty. These two elements in coercive power had come into existence in prehistoric times. The story from then to now is a highly complicated one. It is the story of the evolution of custom into law, and of personal rule into Civil Government. 106

The State, then asserts Morrison, is thus a universal institution that arose out of the nature, common sense, and experience of mankind. Its evolution can be traced historically; it has come to be organized and refined, and is in the end rationally understandable as a principle factor in an ordered Society, an element in the fabric of Civilization. But the State is only one institution among many. Morrison noted its strength and its individual weakness:

Among them all, it [The State] is head dominance in a social organism, but it can no more exist as sovereign, apart from Language, Morality, Science, Commerce, Industry, and all the rest of the structure of Civilization, than the human head can exist and function without heart, lungs, nervous system, organs of digestion and so on. 107
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The transition to the Civil State rests on two marked changes which have occurred in Law and Government.

1. Lawgivers and their codes meant written law in place of traditional law.

2. Law began to be a body of principles to be used in thinking out juristic and political situations. Government came to be definitely Government in accordance with law, called constitutional Government. The Civil State is thus a State of citizens rather than subjects. It is also called a Juristic State, or one in which Government is conducted on principles of right and justice.

Morrison then returns to his working definition of The State; "...coercive power acting upon a whole population." He concludes that what has been evolving all along is Sovereignty, and that Sovereignty is supreme, "coercive and restraining power recognized as existing of right." The important aspect about sovereignty for Morrison's purposes was what lawyers call its residence. Where does it reside? The residence of Sovereignty determines the form of The State, not the form of its Government, but of the State itself. Thus assured of the universal institutional status of The State and Civil Institutions, Morrison compiled the content to be included in this area of the Curriculum:
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The State and Civil Institutions - Civics, would include such areas as the State as evolving Sovereignty; the civil state resting on law; forms of government; democracy as rule of the folk or people; civil institutions, as public defense and law; the family; the corporation; the school.  

Morrison was greatly concerned that equal school time be applied to Civics and to Politics. According to Morrison, the word "politics" began as one of the noblest in the language. It meant "those things that pertain to the polis or city," that is to say Public Affairs. It came to mean the theory and practice of Government in the city-state of antiquity. So it is today, the art of governing a people in the application of sovereignty. The real meaning of the term "politics" has become lost in sinister and irrelevant connotations, such as dishonesty, intrigue, trickery, corruption, demagoguery, racketeering. Now a politician may be engaged in any or all of these; but so may a physician, a merchant, a mechanic, a priest, a teacher, a professor. "The effect of this loose use of words is that we have no respectable word in common use to define the art of government."  

According to Morrison, Civil Government is The State in action, or perhaps better, being applied. It is not, however, like the other aspects of The State which have been discussed, universal institution. It is not an institution at all although it is founded on national institutions. Morrison justified this point:
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We study Civil Government because it is essential to our understanding of the State to do so. It is not merely part of "education for citizenship," but rather instruction leading in part to the education of a person possessed of intelligence. 113

Several significant points of clarification are discussed by Morrison. He said that Civil Government does not include city or village government. That is an affair of the Corporation, a business matter, in which there is no room for politics, not even in the correct use of that abused term. "Municipal government is business and not politics; Civil Government is politics and not business." 114

Morrison felt that it was critically important to draw a distinction which is seldom noted, namely, that between Government proper, and Administration of public enterprises which are sanctioned by the Government. According to Morrison, "The critical difference between the two comes in the principle that Government deals with policy, whereas Administration applies objective facts and principles without regard to policy." 115

Two services are discussed by Morrison, The Civil Service, and the Judicial Service. The Civil Service organization rests on the distinction just discussed. It means that all administrative officers will be sorted out in terms of essential function and be placed on a permanent
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list, to receive appointments on grounds of personal merit and efficiency, without regard to the party affiliations of the officer, or his influence with the appointing power.

Morrison states a corollary to this:

The major political functionaries should also be sorted out, and these should be the only positions which appear on the ballot. All others should be appointive - the administrative officers under civil law. 116

By far, states Morrison, the most vital service we have is the judiciary. Judges are governmental officers, but they are not policy-determining officers. On the contrary, "they administer justice, and justice is rational and impersonal and impartial; it has nothing whatever to do with policy." 117 Judges do not pass on the wisdom of acts of the Legislature; they interpret and apply on legal and juristic principles.

In organizing the content of the Curriculum in the area of Politics, Morrison followed this line of reasoning. There is no Intelligence about Government, if instruction be limited to memorizing the framework of our Government, and conning the names of the offices and the duties attached to them. "The basis of Intelligence about anything is an understanding of its principles." 118 Thus Morrison included these topics in the area of Politics in the Curriculum:
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Civil Government – Politics, would include studying the forms of our government, the Constitution, the Constitution as fundamental law, and taxation. 119

Morrison's task of identifying and justifying the universal institutions which were to be included in the Curriculum of the Common School continued as he moved into the area of Commerce. At this point he said, "We pass more and more into the field of institutions which are the outgrowth of the fundamental institutions in which Intelligence, Conscience, and Taste have their origins – the symbolic institutions, and Science, Religion, Morality, and Art." 120

According to Morrison, Commerce and Industry, also included as an element in the Curriculum, in practice are hard to separate; there is nothing to distribute until something has been produced, and when something has been produced, it commonly is for sale. Commerce, however, in its early development far outran Industry, and modern Industry is a thing of two centuries past or less.

Again Morrison felt that one had to go back to earlier stages in human experience and trace the origins and development of institutions. He found that he had to go back to stages of human experience found only in the lower levels of savagery before he arrived at a point at which he could find no traces of Commerce, as we understand Commerce today. He said:

119 Ibid., pp. 408-493.
120 Ibid., p. 494.
Indeed, among people so primitive as some of the South American river tribes, we find illustrations of the working of principles governing price which are at bottom fundamental to trade today. In the remains uncovered by archeologists dating 2000 B.C., early forms of metallic money are found. Commercial forms are found in ancient Babylon which served the same mercantile function as bills of lading, promissory notes, and agreements in contract with which we are familiar. Commercial law is perhaps the earliest common law of nations. 121

Moreover, Commerce is universal today as always, despite the fact that, in periods of dark ages when Civilization disappeared out of the mores, trade regressed to lower forms. Commerce originated in the common sense and experience of mankind; it survived because of its social utility, became organized, expanded, and refined; and is, finally, rationally comprehensible as a method of enabling people to live together in ordered societies. "It is a prime element in the fabric of Civilization." 122

Morrison goes on to say that on our principles, Commerce would be an element in the content of General Education, even though there were no practical utility in it. Since it is part of Civilization, it is part of the foundations of Intelligence in the presence of the modern cultural environment. But we can see in it practical utility of the most fundamental sort, for everybody who lives is directly or indirectly affected by Commerce, by far the larger part 121Ibid.
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of us directly. Every time we make a purchase, or sell an article, or draw a check, or make a savings deposit, or sign a contract, we are personally engaged in Commerce.

Since Economics is commonly confused with Commerce and Industry, Morrison distinguished their differences:

\[\text{[Commerce and Industry]}\] are economic in import, but they are much else besides. They are ethical as well, whereas Economics has nothing to do with Ethics, since it is a discipline by itself. . . . Commerce deals with the exchange of goods and services; Economics deals with the goods and services themselves, in their nature and in their social meaning.\(^{123}\)

Morrison developed the material to be included in the Curriculum in the area of Commerce. He said, "In order that we may have before us in considerable detail what ought to enter into the Curriculum in Commerce, it is desirable that the whole field should be sketched out as a matter of content, much as it might appear in a textbook. . . ."\(^{124}\) And sketch out the whole field of Commerce he did in Chapter XII of The Curriculum of the Common School. Briefly, the units to be included in the area of Commerce as selected by Morrison were the following:

Commerce, would include the study of barter or exchange, the price structure, bookkeeping and accountancy, financial institutions, insurance, the Exchange, and commercial law.\(^{125}\)

Moving into the field of Industry as an element in the Curriculum, Morrison reiterated the problem of dis-
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tinnuishing Commerce and Industry in experience. Industrial enterprises engage in the sale of their products, and in their financial relations they are not essentially different from commercial undertakings. They compete for the market, and the tendency is for the large concern to survive until the production of a whole nation is carried on by a few great corporations. Morrison states, "Nevertheless, in social analysis, Industry is concerned with production, and Commerce is concerned with distribution." 126

Production is of services as well as goods. Transportation companies are engaged in the production of services, but so are professional people and household servants. So are managerial workers in manufacturing. In truth, Morrison asserted, all of us who depend for our living upon either wages or salaries, or the fees which are paid for individual services are engaged in the production of services and are therefore in Industry and in Labor. So far as his salary measures his place in the enterprise, the president of a great steel company is just as truly an employee as is his humblest wage-earner. According to Morrison:

The social contrast is not between the higher-ups and the lower-downs, but between
a) employees, that is, wage and salary-earners, who constitute the labor element in production;
b) enterprisers who organize and carry on and who are compensated in profits or fees;
c) capitalists and land-owners who receive interest and rent rather than wages, salaries, fees, or profits. 127
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In the United States and in other nations in which there is no tradition of caste or status, the tendency is for these three economic classes to overlap. In the early stages, when the individual enterpriser lay at the foundation of the whole structure, the three were combined in one. Today, enterprisership becomes diffused among several million stockholders, and capitalist earnings arise to a large extent out of the savings of wage earners.

Morrison goes on to discuss the institutional character of Industry as it relates to its inclusion in the Curriculum. He stated, "If we were to take the whole field of Industry and assume that we must generate Intelligence over the whole field, in its technological as well as its institutional aspects, we should embark on an impossible task."128

Furthermore, Morrison felt it would be unnecessary even if it were possible to generate Intelligence over the whole field of Industry. It contributes very little to the working intelligence of the common man to understand the manufacture of airplanes, or hosiery, or firearms, or breakfast cereals; and yet the individual who could form no conception of the whole matter at all would be little better than a savage set down in a world of machine industry in which he must live. But the sciences, and especially an understanding of the primary machines and mechanical processes give the individual an outlook on what
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the technologists are about. He can read in the whole field, all the way from the manufacture of automobiles and the installation of electrical apparatus to the gross aspects of surgical processes. He cannot become qualified offhand as an engineer or a surgeon, but there is a world of difference between that informed cultural status and the attitude in which all these things are accepted in a purely passive and mystified sense.

On the other hand, Morrison states, "There is an institutional organization of Industry, which is, of course, social in its nature, one in which are involved relationships between individuals and which must be understood if one is to become an intelligent citizen as well as a civilized individual - civilized, for assuredly Industry is a major element in the fabric of Civilization. It is that institutional organization of Industry with which we are in the main concerned."129

And so Morrison details the elements to be included in the curriculum in the field of Industry:

Industry, would include such areas as the organization of industry; price and production; production cycles; distribution of wealth; the conditions of labor, including such topics as industrial jurisprudence, wages and salaries, and retirement pay; tools and machines; vocational instruction, and vocational guidance and placement.130
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The final institution which Morrison identified as one to be included in the Curriculum of the Common School was Health. He said, "Few people would ever think of Health as institution." However, he set about to justify its status as such.

Morrison's argument began with definitions and usages of terms. He said that in the common use of terms, health is the name for a bodily condition. More than that, it is symbolic of normality in sundry directions, wherever in fact we sense an organic condition as distinguished from a mechanical. Thus we speak of mental health, and about that conception there have been for ages not only cults but more or less scientific discipline. We further speak of social health and that quite rightly, for, regardless of sociological disciplines, we intuitively feel that there are abnormal conditions in society as well as normal. "In truth," Morrison states, "wherever we have spoken of a society as a "going concern," I suppose we have had in mind social normality, a healthy condition of the body politic and economic and juristic." He goes on to say, "Nevertheless, Health is also institution. Perhaps we might better say sanitation, and we might indeed do so were it not for the fact that the term has acquired somewhat special connotations as a branch of Medicine."  

---

131 Ibid., p. 639.
132 Ibid.
133 Ibid.
Morrison goes on to state that one does not go far in the study of evolving Civilization before coming upon folkways which have had an obviously sanitary implication, even though the people studied had not the least idea of logical principle. More often, one comes upon ridiculous ritualistic practices which were thought to ward off disease. Sometimes, individuals were put to death because they were believed to have an unfavorable effect upon the health of the tribe.

Throughout all the tangle of absurdities, however, runs the thread of some sense about sanitation, and everywhere the feeling for public health. And so it goes all down the story of advancing Civilization: peoples have commonly had practices, of which quarantine is the best example, which in fact had sanitary import, whether the people knew the how and why or not; and the practices have survived because they had sanitary utility. 134

So in its blundering way the race has worked out a system of ideas and practices which, originating in the common sense and need of mankind, has expanded, become organized and refined, and has eventually become a scientific system. It is so far capable of being recognized as a fundamental condition of living together in Society and in the presence of a hostile environment that the behavior
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of contagious diseases is the very epitome of social existence. Morrison concludes:

Certainly, no less than any other of the universal institutions we have studied, Health is also universal and a major element in the fabric of Civilization. It is that which makes it an indefeasible part of the Curriculum of the Common School.135

According to Morrison, the current notions of "health education," so called within the last forty years seem to be centered about the following activities; informal talks on hygiene, medical inspections in schools, free clinics and free lunches, plays and games for bodily exercise, and organized athletics. All these things, Morrison asserts are illustrations of the working of a false principle, namely, ignoring the functional distinctions which are part of the framework of the well-ordered community. "Clinics for children as well as adults belong to the hospital organization. Care for the needs of the necessitous man and his family belong to organized charity or else to the municipal department of Charities and Corrections. Public athletic entertainment belongs to the Public Parks and much better to private enterprise."136

With the foregoing historical survey and critique in mind, Morrison turned to the content of what does belong to the school, either as legitimate or proper part of the exercises of the school as minor community, or else as
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directly or indirectly related to instruction in Health, including Curriculum proper. He listed the following courses to be included in the Curriculum in the area of Health:

Health, would include hygiene, health instruction, athletics, and physiology.\textsuperscript{137}

Thus Morrison finished the identification and enumeration of the twelve basic universal institutions of which the Curriculum of the Common School would consist. The Curriculum was the cultural content out of which formal General Education could emerge. The Curriculum consisted of these twelve basic universal institutions, and this Curriculum was "in its nature constant and universal."\textsuperscript{138}

Morrison's reasoning may be stated as follows:

1. The world is common to all mankind - a world of physical and biological conditions, social conditions, moral and aesthetic values.

2. Human nature is at bottom the same the world over, however varied may be cultural accumulations.

Therefore, the content of education is the same the world over for Morrison. Therefore, the Curriculum, which is the framework on which the content is hung, is the same in essentials.\textsuperscript{139}

What was constant and universal were the twelve basic institutions in the abstract or in principle. Every society
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had need for communication through languages, through quantitative computation, a system of graphic portrayal, a form of religion, art or health. Every society had means of subsistence, labor responsibilities, and a need for governing. It was crucial for every society that the next generation, either through upbringing or instruction, should become familiar with these areas of learning. All of these needs as stated were universal and constant. What was not constant was the particular way in which various societies at various times and places had met any one of these universal demands. Hence, though the curriculum was universal, teaching and instruction varied with these particulars.

In analyzing Morrison's notion of the curriculum, one has to differentiate between his concept of the curriculum and his notion of the program of studies. It was the curriculum that was constant, universal, and natural. The program of studies was merely the structural organization intended primarily to make it possible to administer a curriculum. The minute a curriculum is defined in specifics and the units and courses in the curriculum arranged for teaching purposes, it becomes a program of studies.

The curriculum of general education for the Common School had as its purpose the integration of individual personality and the adjustment of the individual person.

---

to the society in which he lived. Consequently, the individual adjusted to the world and not the world to the individual. "The common life cannot be adjusted to several million children." Therefore, according to Morrison, the notion of a differentiated curriculum or the elective system is archaic in principle and antiquated in social evolution. The inclinations of youth were not the measure of what he should learn. Thus, every child had to master the major social learnings which have produced civilization and which were therefore "best calculated to be good instruments for the development of the civilized individual, the citizen.

The curriculum of general education must, in principle, be an undifferentiated curriculum. But this did not mean that every student had to follow the same subject-matter courses at the same time and at the same rate. Constructive individual pupil programs of adjustment, however, was a teaching and administrative problem and not a curriculum problem. In Morrison's operative technique there was wide latitude in providing for individual differences through free reading, library usage, and exemption from unit study already mastered. A series of differentiated pupil adjustment programs to meet occasional individual situations,
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however, was "a very different thing from a program which was predicated on the principle that all young people should be permitted to pursue individual choices according to pure individual caprice, or according to a casual administrative belief that such and such a selection is best for a particular pupil." 144 In the final analysis, it was the constant and universal curriculum that Morrison insisted upon.

Morrison based his whole notion of the curriculum on what he considered to be the structure and function of society. From an analysis of the basic elements in society that have enabled civilization to exist and prosper over the centuries, Morrison developed his idea of a basic, unchanging curriculum. Out of the needs of society the curriculum grew. Not that the needs of the learner were discounted, but these latter needs could be achieved only if the needs of society were met.

Morrison was interested in the rising science of sociology in the early 1920's. Education was to be thoroughly grounded in the social and made possible by common estimates and expectations which society developed through communication. That the curriculum which Morrison proposed on the basis of the analysis of society turned out to be essentially the same as what was being taught in the secondary schools in his day does not affirm or destroy the
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validity of his proposals. It merely indicates that he arrived at similar conclusions in regard to the curriculum by approaching it from a different perspective.

Morrison's argument that an analysis of the basic institutions of society are valid subjects of study for the general education of students to the point of educational maturity or the beginning of university work is fundamentally sound. His enumeration of the institutions into twelve categories is broad enough to cover practically all subject matter. Subject matter is included or excluded on the basis of its contribution to adjustment, and adjustment is the product of education in Morrison's theory. He did not conceive of his enumeration to be final. He was never quite sure that he had listed all the basic institutions. He said, "One can be confident concerning those which he lists, but he can never be sure that he has listed them all." He goes on to enumerate all the tests that can be applied in identifying the universal institutions and concludes by saying, "All this I have tried diligently to do." There was provision for change in these basic institutions if a basic change occurred.

When Morrison moves into the area of specifics of the curriculum, the program of studies, his analysis moves to weaker grounds. He never clearly formulates the criteria for determining what specifics will or will not enter a
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program of studies. He, himself, expressed serious reservations about going into the units in the curriculum in detail. One can only assume that the criteria he chose to determine the specifics were based on his six tests of civilization which were discussed previously. But this leads us no closer to the analysis of the criteria because the source of these measures is not discussed or analyzed in any depth at all.

These reservations, however, do not seriously weaken his basic argument for the study of universal institutions. By identifying these institutions, Morrison could define the curriculum for all students. Without this study of the curriculum, society could not continue to adapt and hence would perish. So crucial was the study of these institutions to society’s continued interest and welfare, that it was the responsibility of society, itself, to control firmly and to direct the schools which were responsible for these learnings. If society controlled the schools, in justice, society had the responsibility of financing them.

According to Morrison, the term “curriculum” may be applied to the organized content of an educational purpose,
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such as general education, or medical training, or religious education. A term of less fundamental but more practical import is "program" or "program of studies," which means a structural organization intended to make it possible to administer a curriculum. Morrison said, "Thus the medieval Trivium and Quadrivium was a curriculum, while our eight grades, plus fifteen Carnegie units, plus one hundred and twenty semester hours constitutes a program - a very poor one to be sure, but still a program."  

Morrison felt that it was useless to discuss independently the curriculum of the elementary school, or of the high school, or of the college. "None of them has a curriculum except it be related to the curriculum of the others. This system of discontinuous schools is an anachronism..."  

He stated:

The curriculum of general education must in principle be an undifferentiated curriculum and the administrative program a common school program. . . .Further, there will never be a true American university until this problem of general education is understood and formulated in concrete administrative terms.  

Henry C. Morrison tried diligently to identify and organize a Curriculum for the Common School, designed to provide a general education, adequate for the civilized man and the good citizen, and sound enough to provide the
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ideational basis for the pursuit of University work for those mature men and women who were so interested and inclined. Once Morrison had defined the Curriculum of the Common School, his next problem was to consider the way in which this curriculum was to be most effectively and economically taught. Morrison's conceptions of educational methodology will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

MORRISON'S CONCEPTION OF EDUCATIONAL METHODOLOGY

Henry C. Morrison spent his educational career in pursuit of answers to several questions which were of significance to education, society and the perpetuation of civilization. Thus far in our study, we have discussed Morrison's responses to the questions regarding the definition of education, the organization and administration of the educational process, and the identification of the valid content of education. At this point, our study will move into an analysis of Morrison's response to the question, "How is the content of education organized and taught?"

Henry C. Morrison produced his first major work, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School\(^1\) as his response to that question. In the Preface of this work, Morrison stated:

> In undertaking the preparation of this volume, I have been actuated by a conviction, . . . that genuinely effective education, whether it be for the service of the individual or the service of society, must be founded upon a coherent theory of the whole field of teaching, capable of being organized into a practicable system; and further that such a system must be one which at least makes possible much more thorough and genuine learning by all than any which we have usually been able to secure. This book is therefore

---

not an exhibit of method - although it brings together a great many phases of method which seem to have adequate foundation in fact and in principle - but rather an analysis of teaching procedure in that field of non-specialized education which begins at the end of the primary school and is brought to a close when the youth is ready to enter the university proper.\(^2\)

Every enterprise which begins somewhere and turns out an eventual product is always conducted systematically and with due attention to method, and method is commonly in the trained mind and purpose of the worker and not in a ready reference book. "And so it must be with the effective teacher, fit to be entrusted with pupils,"\(^3\) said Morrison. For Morrison, method consists in a body of principles with which the teacher can think out pedagogical situations as they arise. He said:

He [the teacher] knows how to put together both materials for study and pupil activities so that there is the best chance that learning products in the pupil will emerge. He knows how to note, interpret, and correct pupil difficulties. He is aware of the right general methods of attack and knows why they are right.\(^4\)

Education lies behind method. And according to Morrison, education means substantially that growth in personality which arises out of learning as distinguished from that which is a process of physical growth. The method is only as effective as the teacher who utilizes it knowledgeably, and efficiently.

---

\(^2\)Ibid., p.v.


\(^4\)Ibid.
He states that the beginning of method is in the content of the curriculum, the fundamental content of which as it has come down to us is essentially sound. "The fabric of civilization rests upon certain cultural institutions, . . . [from which emerge] the learnings which are calculated to produce the civilized man, the citizen, just as they have produced civilization." 

The next next important element of method is the program of studies, an organized pathway along which the pupil can proceed and in terms of which his learnings can be checked on his progress toward educational maturity. Morrison asserts that "the effective organization of the program must be in terms of learnings, and not in terms of time-to-be-spent or relative performance upon the content of the daily recitation."

The third element of method is that of utilization in the classroom, which is a body of principles plus ingenuity and creativity in applying those principles. This then includes the teacher's procedure and more. The question, Does a given method work? is never appropriate. According to Morrison the real questions are these: "Is the teacher's procedure founded on well-established principle? Has he a reasonable interpretation of the learning situation that he

5Ibid., p. 112.
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is called upon to meet? In brief, is he working his method?"7

The end result of this process is educational maturity which means that "the pupil has become a citizen, can be trusted to find his way about in the world, and is "under his own power." That implies an immense amount of guidance and discipline which are not set down in the curriculum and which are not described in books on method.

Morrison's approach to teaching was based on the nature of the learner and the nature of the subject matter. Both, however, were to be viewed in the light of the needs of society to perpetuate itself. When he studied the ways in which individuals learned, the ways by which adaptive responses became true adaptive changes, the ways by which accretions to personality developed, Morrison saw that there were six principles which were common to all types of learning whether the learning was a change in attitudes of understanding or appreciation, the acquisition of abilities, or the attainment of skills.

Morrison then analyzed the basic institutions and concluded that there were fundamental differences in these institutions. Some were symbolic institutions, like language, mathematics, and graphics. Others were content institutions like science and religion. As learning products

7 Ibid., p. 113.
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in science, he argued for attitudes of understanding; in religion and art he sought attitudes of appreciation. Not only did the structure and content of the basic institutions vary, but within the institutions like language, there would be times when appreciation was the dominant concern, and other times when practice of skills would be indicated. Thus, Morrison evolved certain learning types of subject matter.

Once Morrison had determined the content of the Curriculum of the Common School, he analyzed the content of these basic learnings and found they could be classified into five types: the science type, the appreciation type, the practical arts type, the language arts type, and the pure practice type. He said:

We can, however, group all the subjects taught in the field of general education . . . into five different types, which characteristically differ among themselves in the nature of their objectives and in the nature of the learning process.9

Morrison held that teaching was necessary for learning to proceed most efficiently. By studying the way a child learned and by analyzing the different types of subject matter, Morrison developed a method of teaching which would be applicable to each of the five types of subject matter. Each of the five types, he argued, must be taught differently. He felt that in most cases the basic cause

---

9Morrison, The Practice of Teaching, p. 92.
of non-mastery of learnings by the pupil was due to the attempt to utilize the wrong technique for a given type of learning. Some types, like science, are more useful for developing attitudes of understanding in the pupil. Other types, like art or literature, are suitable for developing attitudes of appreciation. Practical arts types are geared to development of abilities to intelligently manipulate tools and materials. The pure practice type, like grammar, develops skills.

In the science type where the learning process essentially was "reflection upon experience in search of meaning," Morrison developed a unit method of teaching which came to be known as the "Five Steps." These five steps were: exploration, presentation, assimilation, organization, and recitation. Many authors and critics of Morrison have overlooked the point that the five steps were the method of teaching of only one of the five types of subject matter, the science type, and did not apply to the other types; but so popular did the five step notion become that the other methods of teaching are often neglected.

Morrison also devised a system of teaching which came to be known as the "mastery formula." This system could be utilized regardless of the subject matter type or the

10 Ibid., p. 180.
11 Ibid., pp. 225-231.
objectives of the curriculum the subject matter was to attain. In essence, this formula was: "pre-test, teach, test the results, adapt procedure, teach and test again to the point of actual learning."12 This was the only way, Morrison felt, that one could be sure that an adaptive response which a pupil made would become an adaptive change, an accretion to personality, a true learning product. Morrison was interested in understandings and behavior which exemplified these understandings. On this point he was extremely vocal. He was interested in seeing a basic change in the personality of the individual. He was not interested in passing grades, probability curves, or intelligence ratings. He continuously spoke out against the notions of time-to-be-spent, methods-to-be-followed, and ground-to-be-covered. He wanted actual learning products, not a facade.13

Morrison looked at the teaching-learning process in its entirety as it related to formal education and saw that it consisted of three broad areas: control technique, operative technique, and administrative technique. In the control technique, the teacher established a learning situation which motivated the students and gained their attention so that teaching and learning could proceed economically and effectively in the classroom.14

12Ibid., p. 79.
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technique was that "phase of the teaching process in which the units of learning were developed in the class and in the individual." 15 By administrative technique, Morrison meant the "study of the individual pupil, with his guidance, and with the control of the progress of his educational development in its manifold aspects." 16

Thus, Morrison's methods of teaching evolved from the nature of the learner and the learning process, the nature of the subject matter, and the interaction of the teaching-learning process. They were designed to attain the true learnings to the point of mastery in an organized and systematic way.

A detailed analysis of Morrison's conception of educational methodology as he developed it in his major work on teaching will follow. The basic concepts to be discussed in the order in which Morrison developed them are the nature of the secondary school, the scope of the teaching process, the objectives of systematic teaching, direct teaching for mastery, the types of teaching, the techniques of teaching and the principles underlying these techniques, and the unit method or the teaching cycle as Morrison called it.

Morrison states that the differentiation of educational institutions into elementary, secondary, and higher, as made concrete in buildings, school organization, administration

15 Ibid., p. 153.

16 Ibid., p. 543.
and the like, "arises in part out of a series of historical accidents, and in part out of administrative convenience and tradition." 17

Elementary, secondary, and higher schools have developed, not by differentiation from a common institutional origin for the better service of a common purpose, but from three distinct schools, each of them founded to serve a rather definite purpose and each of them in the beginning substantially unrelated to the others. The eight grade elementary school was the indigenous common school, modified by administrative efforts in the second quarter of the nineteenth century to adapt the Prussian theory of state school organization and institutional purpose to American needs. The high school, the most common institution of American secondary education, is directly descended from the academies which flourished in the northeastern states throughout the first three quarters of the nineteenth century. The oldest existing institutions is the college which early became essentially a pre-professional school and in which vocational purposes still largely persist. Now each of these schools had its own purpose and its own separate existence with little or no articulation or matriculation between them.

The surpassing educational awakening which began at

17Ibid., p.1.
the turn of the century changed matters. Ordinary people in increasing numbers began to send their children to high school and to college. "The history of educational administration since 1890 is to a large extent the story of endless efforts to make the elementary school, the high school, and the college pull together for a common educational purpose." 18

The persistence of these essentially separate institutions in the performance of an educational task which in its nature is not discontinuous has generated certain stereotypes in the thinking of both teachers and administrators. And the stereotype became firmly established that "education is primarily a matter of time to be spent, and further that an 8-4-4 distribution of years between the institutions is the one which is sanctioned by nature." 19 The rise of the junior high school, the junior college, graduate schools, and professional schools are all illustrations of the insertion of a new institution expressed in terms of years. Seldom has the test of educational attainment independent of time-to-be-spent been seriously considered.

Morrison proceeds to indicate that in a similar way, this stereotype has generated certain fundamental assumptions touching on the maturity of the individual and theories of

---

18 Ibid., p.4.
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teaching which have little or no basis in principle. The traditional administrative assumption is that a pupil is mature enough for high school when he has satisfactorily completed eight years of pre-high school study and mature enough for college when he has completed four more years of high school. "Education is thus defined in terms of years of experience and successive institutional stages." Theories of teaching then are not unnaturally based upon maturity assumptions. So it has come to pass that it is often taken for granted that the eight year elementary school calls for one conception of teaching, the four year high school for another, and the college for a third. The outcome of the whole development of the fundamental institutions does affect a valid theory of teaching and that says Morrison "is the heart of our present problem." 

The problem resolves itself into a search for that region in the process of formal education in the schools within which there are no essential and critical differences in the nature of the process of learning under instruction. Or to put it another way, "we must seek for the region throughout which there is some outstanding and controlling characteristic of teaching which is not found and cannot be applied earlier and which is not found and ought not to be found later." Morrison asserts:

20 Ibid., n.6.
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Such a comprehensible test can, we think, be found in the school procedure in which the pupil is capable of study but is incapable of systematic intellectual growth, except under the constant tutorial presence of the teacher. This region is the secondary school, at least so far as teaching is concerned.\textsuperscript{23}

Morrison proceeds to distinguish a second region on the basis of this test.

There is an earlier period during which the pupil is incapable of study because he has not the essential tools, which are ability to read his vernacular, ability to use the fundamental concepts of number, and ability to use the fundamental system of expression which we commonly call handwriting. The regions within which he is learning the use of these tools and becoming socially adapted to group existence under school conditions is the primary school.\textsuperscript{24}

And finally, Morrison distinguishes the third region:

There is a period beyond the secondary school during which the student has become capable of pursuing self-dependent study and in which he utilizes the instructor in the same sense in which he utilizes the library, the laboratory, the occasional public lecturer, the office consultant. This region is the university.\textsuperscript{25}

The mere fact of having completed a given number of years of schooling cannot in any rational sense define the pedagogical nature of the school in which the student finds himself. "The secondary school is thus defined in terms of fundamental and characteristic aspects of the pupil's intellectual growth."\textsuperscript{26} Secondary schooling must begin

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid. \\
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when the individual has attained the four primary adaptations of reading, mathematics, handwriting, and primary socialization. The terminal point of the secondary school is also important. It is not the twelfth grade or the sixteenth, but rather the point at which the evidence shows clearly that "an individual has found the sustaining intellectual interests and has attained the sense of intellectual responsibility and has acquired the fundamental methods of thinking which make him a self-governing individual and social unit." The teaching of the secondary school is the field which Morrison analyzes and his arguments are based on the nature of the secondary school itself.

Morrison presents a brief survey of the scope of the teaching process. For him, teaching is not concerned primarily with guiding and controlling the accumulation of knowledge. If it were, there would be little occasion for schools beyond the primary level which provide the reading adaptation, the ability to read and accumulate information and knowledge.

The teaching process throughout the secondary period, according to Morrison, is concerned with adjusting the pupil with the world in which he must live and with generating in him adaptability to a constantly changing world. The effect of the secondary school upon society should be to enable

---
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mankind to control its environmental relations rather than to live with an attitude of passive acceptance of environmental forces. In order to achieve this ultimate purpose, the school makes use of certain teaching processes. According to Morrison the teaching processes utilized by the school are:

1. It utilizes the cultural capital of society to generate in the pupil a horizon of intelligent attitudes toward his world of just standards of moral and aesthetic values, of the special abilities required in his reactions to his physical and social surroundings.

2. It guides the individual into the discovery of a succession of intellectual interests, pursuits which he will follow, wholly apart from the constraint of the school or the teacher.

3. It develops in the pupil ability to study. Now ability to study is no abstract, generalized, vaguely felt capacity but rather a series of very definite powers. It implies chiefly:

   a) the acquisition of a hierarchy of skills in the use of handwriting and in the conventions of the mother tongue;

   b) the development of an optimum efficiency in reading the printed page, at the level of the reading adaptation;

   c) the use of the vernacular as an instrument of clear, accurate, and cogent expression;

   d) unless the pupil's vernacular is the only language in which civilization expresses itself, the effective use of foreign languages;

   e) the methods of thinking found in mathematics, the physical, biological, and social sciences, and in linguistics;

   f) the capacity to interpret truth as it is revealed in literature and the fine arts;
g) the attainment of volition control, as for instance, sustained application in the presence of material which is not in itself initially interesting.

4. It generates right attitudes toward conduct and sees to it that they become incorporated into the personality of the pupil.29

Morrison proposes another question at this point;

"Does the secondary school thus defined, as one in which we find employed a single characteristic type of teaching procedure, necessarily imply that all pupils who are in the secondary period of education must be housed in the same building and enrolled within the same school organization?"30

According to Morrison, administrative needs often make it convenient to organize schools for different groups of pupils who have much in common apart from the teaching procedure to which all are subjected. Thus, it is often advantageous to bring adolescents together in one type of school; in another the early adolescents; and in a third the late adolescents. Thus is found the justification for elementary, junior high, and senior high schools composed of what is usually the senior high school and the junior college. Morrison stated:

There is, however, little justification in principle for division points which correspond to the end of the traditional first eight grades and the end of the four year high school. The secondary period begins early in the elementary school, and the other schools above named are secondary schools.31


30Ibid., p. 15.
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Morrison pointed out that the danger is that the rearrangement of school organization, which was well under way, might simply modify without destroying the mental stereotypes under which education is viewed as an affair of artificial stages completed, and not as a matter of growth in the pupil. In conclusion he said, "As long as we keep distinct in mind not less than four aspects of the maturing process - intellectual, mental, social, and physical - and remember that the institutional divisions which we have above justified are rightly founded upon social and physical maturity alone, we shall do no violence to the right appraisal of pupil progress." 32

At the beginning of the modern period of re-evaluation of the educative process, the student was confronted with two traditional conceptions of teaching objectives which have obstinately resisted change. The first of these was based on scholarly prestige. "From time immemorial, that man whose mind was fullest stored with the erudition of the ages had been conceived to be the best educated." 33 So education and erudition were mistakenly interchanged. Curriculum formulation was based on the conception that teachers should be expert in the subjects which they proposed to teach. While scholarly knowledge is necessary to good teaching, it is inadequate without methodological competence.
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33 Ibid., p. 18.
"The second conception had its origin in the very human tendency toward propagandism." The rising generation can provide a fertile field for the inculcation of propaganda. Hence, the objectives of teaching often become simply the indoctrination of young people in the habits of thinking peculiar to the ecclesiastical or political organization which happened to dominate the schools.

In the course of time, organized knowledge became so extensive that selections had to be made. Knowledge and education are not synonymous as some may still believe. Propaganda grew so extensive that the school found it difficult to settle upon any definite and comprehensive program at all. Any sort of actual product of the learning process was largely lost. "The school came to be thought of as education, and the popular notion became widely prevalent that wherever there is a school there education, whatever it is, must somehow be taking place." And yet, Morrison said, common sense and a modicum of knowledge will give anybody an obvious conception of what actual learning and teaching must be, and enable him to distinguish between what is and what is not learned:

In general, any actual learning is always expressed either as a change in the attitude of the individual or as the acquisition of a special ability or as the attainment of some form of skill in manipulating instrumentalities or materials.
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According to Morrison, the learning products which constitute that process of individual adjustment to the world which we call "education," and which are the objectives of teaching are always either attitudes, or special abilities, or skills. Attitudes were either those of understanding, involving reflection and rationalization, found typically in the sciences; or of appreciation, involving the values of beauty, goodness, love of truth. Special abilities could be found in language usage, in musical performance, in walking, swimming, skating, and many other activities. Skill, for Morrison, was nearly synonymous with facility. When a pupil had attained a given adaptation, he had to go on and acquire certain skills in applying his new attitude or ability to the situations which called for its use. In the case of reflective adaptations, skill consisted largely in the facility with which the individual identifies the situational elements which are subject to interpretation in terms of his new attitude. In the case of special abilities, such as reading, skills refer to the rate of reading and assimilation. In the reading of a foreign language, the associated skills can in general be described as fluency. In the practical arts, the skills are comprehended in the term "facility in execution." 37

As soon as the educator recognizes the objectives of

37 Ibid., pp. 19-21.
teaching in these terms, the whole process takes on a different aspect. According to Morrison:

He [the educator] sees that the subject matter used in the school is not valuable in education for its own sake but only as it is serviceable in generating intelligent and useful inclinations, abilities, and skills in pupils.

He has a new and more valid criterion of curriculum material and of teaching procedure.

He can distinguish more accurately between the region of general education in which the adjustment of the pupil is the center of effort and the region of the university where knowledge is in truth valuable for its own sake.38

According to Morrison, his view of the nature of the essential products of learning had been evolving throughout the modern period. The efforts of the Herbartians, the supervised study movement, project teaching, the direct teaching of the modern languages, improvement in primary methods, the educational measurement program, the contributions of educational psychology, "all had tended in the direction of identifying, describing and measuring actual learning products as contrasted with routine and formal products expressed in terms of time-to-be-spent, methods-to-be-followed, ground-to-be-covered, or in terms of erudition or information."39

The term "adaptation" is one which is used consistently and significantly throughout Morrison's analyses of the theory of teaching as well as in his theories of education.

38Ibid., p. 21.
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and curriculum. He defined the term explicitly in his first major work and it became a recurring part of the terminology he employed throughout his writings. Morrison states:

The biologist makes very large use of the term [adaptation], and by it he means both the process and the result of the modification of an organ, or indeed a whole organism, so that the plant or the animal concerned is brought into a state of better adjustment to the environmental conditions which it must meet. Thus, by a long series of adaptations a creature has been evolved who walks erect, and we call the creature "man." ... In brief, organic evolution is a story of manifold adaptation by which, on the whole, higher forms of life have been produced and in the process have been brought into better and more comprehensive adjustment to the environment. In much the same fashion, the individual human being goes through a process of adjustment to the world in which he must live; only this adjustment is largely ideational rather than physical. In other words, he learns how to live. The successive steps in the process are adaptations in much the same sense as the innumerable steps in the evolution of the physical organism were adaptations.  

Morrison says that, "the essence of the adaptation is in the principle that it represents a change in the organism itself." When the individual pupil really understands a principle, such as that of natural selection for example, he has taken on a new attitude; he has made an adaptation. He no longer looks on the world as he did before; he cannot do so for he is a changed individual. "Thus the process of education or adjustment to life conditions is made up of adaptations and the true learning products are for the most part true adaptations."  
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"The adaptation is a unitary thing and the pupil has either attained it or he has not," 43 Morrison said. Individuals may differ greatly in the length of time and the ease with which they take on the change which a given adaptation implies, but if two pupils have attained a given adaptation, they cannot differ with respect to their attainment.

The single type of learning product to which this analysis and the term adaptation did not apply was that comprehended in the category of skills. According to Morrison, skill was essentially a variable. Any individual can be at different points on the curve of skill development at different times and it can be said that at each point he has some skill. Two individuals can differ widely in skill and yet each possess skill. Morrison felt that it was often critically important in pedagogical analysis to determine whether one was dealing with an adaptation or a skill. Morrison asserted:

The ultimate test of a product of learning which has involved a genuine adaptation is that it is never lost, otherwise than through its transformation into new adaptations or through the vise of pathological inhibitions. 44

There is another set of ability adaptations which Morrison identifies, those which are acquired apart from any thought process whatever. Among the schoolroom subjects,
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spelling is the best illustration. Better illustrations are found in the extensive list of pure neuro-muscular adaptations such as walking, swimming, and skating. Here the adaptation is apparently in the form of a set in the coordination of a system of neuro-muscular adjustments.

According to Morrison, "The adaptation is attained through a period of practice during which for a long time it is in doubt. In the end, it is evidenced by reliable use apart from guidance or constraint." \(^45\)

The test of a real product of learning is then: first, its permanency; and, second, its habitual use in the ordinary activities of life. Morrison said that the second aspect is so fundamental that any truly educated person can appraise the whole education of his fellow in its terms. However one tests the products of learning and however the tests may differ, ultimate reliance may be found in two forms; "the assimilation test, which seeks to determine whether or not a given adaptation has taken place; and the behavior or functional test, which seeks to verify the assimilation test through observation of the unconstrained behavior of the pupil." \(^46\)

Thus far, learning products which are associated with specific adaptations has been discussed. Morrison's analysis moves a step further to survey the more generalized adapta-

\(^{45}\) Ibid., p. 28.
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tions which are essential, not only as final products in the education of the individual, but also as means in the development of the specific adaptations. "Perhaps the most obvious of these," Morrison said, "is that which is implied in the expression "learning to think." 47

Thinking, for some psychologists, is simply a period of mediation in the higher nerve centers between the reception of an incoming impulse and its discharge in some form of re-establishment of neural equilibrium; or viewed in mental terms, it is a period of reflection intervening between stimulus and reaction. It is human nature to think, contradictory as this may seem to the facts of common experience. People no doubt differ greatly in their innate thinking capacity. Those incapable of thinking are identified as mental deficiencies. Some think rapidly and others slowly. On the whole, however, all normal people think, or at least can think. Morrison says that the failure of children and adults to exhibit any concrete sign of the thought process is due rather to the absence of the conditions under which thinking occurs rather than to lack of training in some abstract sense. He asserts:

We can say with a great deal of confidence that, given; a) material to think about; b) a method of thinking; and, c) a motive for thinking, any normal individual will think within the limitations which his native mental structure, or his mental age determines. These are the conditions under which thinking takes place. 48
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He goes on to say that the verdict of science does not differ from that of common experience. Modern psychology finds little or no evidence for supposing that education or any form of training improves the native inherent capacity to think.

"What then," asks Morrison, "is accountable for the superiority of the highly educated in thinking capacity?" Morrison responds:

1. In the first place, they have enjoyed a vastly greater range of experience, both direct and vicarious, than have the untutored.

2. They have more to think about, and by consequence a greatly extended range of interests.

3. Their range of impelling motives is as greatly extended as the range of interests.

4. They have come into the possession of a variety of methods of thinking which are sealed books to the uneducated.

5. The educated man, armed with varied methods of thinking, possesses a trained mind in the sense that he has the intellectual instruments needed for the interpretation of a wide variety of specialized situations.

The process of training pupils to think, Morrison concludes, is that of furnishing them with an abundance of the vicarious experience made possible by the establishing of the reading adaptation, and establishing the adaptations which are implied in the study of the sciences. The student who has actually acquired the true products in the learning
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of physics has by the very fact learned to think as the physicist thinks. He who has really learned his history has acquired historical-mindedness, and so on.  

Finally, Morrison states the two major products of the secondary school: a) a wide range of interest and the discovery of some dominating interest and b) the capacity for self-dependent intellectual life. He defines these major products:

An intellectual interest may be defined as an intellectual pursuit which the individual follows independently of the constraint of the school; and educational self-dependence as that stage at which the student has realized the meaning and purpose of study, has acquired the self-control which self-dependence implies, and has further acquired the range of methods of thinking and of study which remove him from constant dependence on the teacher.

For Morrison the generalized adaptations, the ability to use the innate capacity to think armed with material to think about, methods of thinking, and motives for thinking; the possession of a wide range of interests and one dominating interest; and the capacity for self-dependent intellectual life were essential as final products in the education of the individual. He stated further that educational self-dependence, one of the learning products, was probably "the essential product in a democratic society."

---
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In 1921, Morrison wrote a series of three articles which appeared in *The School Review* entitled "Studies in High School Procedure." The first dealt with "Direct and Indirect Teaching;"\(^5^4\) the second with "Half-Learning;"\(^5^5\) and the third with "Mastery."\(^5^6\) The first article in the series Morrison referred to as "a piece of destructive criticism." The following two articles presented useful suggestions to solve the difficulties he identified. In the final article on "Mastery" Morrison reviewed his criticisms and recommendations:

In the two preceding articles of this series, I have discussed certain types of fallacies involved in high school procedure, and have attempted to show how they result in a kind of half-learning or no-learning which is cumulative in effect and which probably has disastrous influence upon the character of society in an age of universal education.\(^5^7\)

Morrison continues:

In the January number of *The School Review* I discussed the fallacy of lesson learning and exhibited some evidence tending to show that there is little or no necessary relation between the learning of a lesson and the achievements for which that lesson or series of lessons is supposed to stand. I characterized lesson-giving as indirect teaching. I shall set forth in this article in substance what I mean by direct teaching.\(^5^8\)

---

\(^5^4\)Morrison, "Direct and Indirect Teaching," 19-30.
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continuing on, Morrison discusses an area of great and consistent concern to him:

In the February number I pointed out the fallacies involved in current marking, grading, and promotion; in the misuse of the normal distribution surface in school administration; in the abuse of intelligence or mentality ratings; and in ground-to-be-covered and time-to-be-spent and methods-to-be-used. I attempted to show how the whole congeries of fallacies, the legitimate outcome of the graded system of school government and administration, has caught us up in such a net that we cannot teach thoroughly if we would.59

Having thus enumerated his criticisms and concerns, Morrison asserted the need to return to some solid ground from which educators could make a fresh start in their thinking, if not in actual practice:

We can find that solid ground in the concept of mastery - in the old notion that what is worth doing at all is worth doing well.60

According to Morrison, educators then would get away from percentages and passing marks and know only one objective, that of getting the task done. He went on to say that you either understand a principle or you do not. There is no such thing as seventy percent understanding. You can either do a thing or you cannot, there is no half doing it nor three quarters doing it. "You may understand more of a subject than another, you may do a thing better than another, but understand and do you must."61 Morrison
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enumerates the implications of utilizing the concept of mastery:

Nor does mastery in school work involve any serious difficulties. It does involve a new conception of teaching and a new orientation in administration. It involves ceasing to measure a pupil by his average mark and measuring him by the excess quality of his achievement. It involves ceasing to evaluate our success by averages or medians of class achievement and beginning to measure ourselves, as other scientific workers do, by the percentage of our failures.62

Hence for Morrison, the essence of direct teaching of the learning unit, as distinguished from teaching for lesson learning was the application of the mastery formula. He had been advocating this approach for many years prior to the publication of the volume The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School in 1926. He refined and elaborated on the concept of direct teaching and the application of the mastery formula in his first major book.

According to Morrison, a student has fully acquired a piece of learning when he has mastered it. Half-learning, or learning rather well, or being on the way to learning are not mastery. "Mastery implies completeness; the thing is done; the student has arrived as far as that particular learning is concerned."63 There is no question of how well the student has mastered it; he has either mastered it or
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he has not. The student may continue to other masteries, and there will be all sorts of degrees in the number of masteries he attains. He may acquire skill in the application of his learning, and there may be infinite degrees in his skill as he improves from no skill at all to expertise. But in the unit learning itself there are no degrees. He either has it or he has not. Morrison then applied the term mastery in substance to the true learning products which were discussed previously:

Whenever the adaptation in the individual which corresponds to a given product in learning has taken place, the individual has arrived at the mastery level for that particular product.°

Thus, the child who has reached the primary reading adaptation and can actually read may be said to have reached a mastery level. The pupil who has actually acquired that view of the material world which is implied in the atomic theory has attained a mastery level. He who has caught a vision of truth or beauty from the reading of a classic has attained a mastery. Similarly, the student who has reached the level of intellectual responsibility is a master at a vitally important stage in his intellectual and volitional development.

Now the whole process of education, of adjustment to the objective conditions of life, is made up of unit learnings, each of which must be mastered or else no adaptation

---
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is made. A serviceable learning unit for Morrison was a comprehensive and significant aspect of the environment, of an organized science, of an art, or of conduct, which being learned results in an adaptation in personality."65 This method of organization gradually came to be known as the Morrison Method. The term "Morrison Method" was applied not only to the method of subject matter organization but also to the method of teaching units. Morrison's "Five Steps," which he referred to as the "teaching cycle," also came to be known as the Morrison Method.66

Morrison proceeds to say that these unit learnings cannot be measured, but they can be evidenced by signs revealed in the learner's behavior. Some symptoms are plainly manifest if one observes carefully and thoughtfully; others can be detected only by tests designed to bring them out; others still can be observed only by the methods, and often with the help of the instruments, of the skilled psychologist. Morrison says that whatever the test, its purpose is to throw light on the question, "Has the pupil learned or has he not?"67 According to Morrison's analysis, it follows then that the course material to be found in the curriculum is valuable in education only as it is analyzed into significant units of learning which generate adaptations in the pupil and in that way contribute to his adjustment.
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For Morrison getting back to solid ground in educational thinking and practice meant the elimination of the lesson-learning and lesson-hearing theory of teaching and the adoption of direct teaching for mastery of true learning products. He summarizes his position:

We may conclude that the normal product of practice in lesson-learning is improvement in ability to get lessons, and that lesson performance transfers to learning in the real units only casually and in a minority of instances. 68

Morrison asked, "What is to be done about it?" He generalized his answer in the directive:

Abandon the lesson-learning and lesson-hearing theory of teaching, with its implications of ground-to-be-covered and passing grades, and substitute there for the direct teaching of the real learning products, with tests applied to the identification of specific adaptations in the pupil and used primarily as bases of correction in pedagogical treatment rather than as bases of crediting the pupil with performance accomplished. 69

The primary consideration in any teaching activity is the identification of the learning units and the teaching objectives. Morrison said:

In any case an objective will certainly not be a bit of ground-to-be-covered more or less well. In every case, it will be either a principle or a body of principles to be understood or a power to be gained. 70

The learning units are likely to be hidden in the mass of assimilative material or school exercises out of

---
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which they are supposed to emerge. "The unit," Morrison stated, "is both the objective principle or art or value and the corresponding subjective transformation in the pupil which results in a new attitude or special ability or skill."

Having defined mastery and the learning unit Morrison approached the next problem which he identified as the technique of pedagogical attack. Here he applied what he called the "mastery formula: Pre-test, teach, test the result, teach and test again to the point of actual learning." It can be noted that this is precisely the procedure adopted by other practitioners who work in the field of organic adaptation.

The pre-test phase of the mastery formula serves two important purposes: "first, it orients the teacher and gives him ground for intelligent approach to the particular problem before him; and, second, it tends to establish in the minds of the pupils a connection between prospective learning and present attainments." It may, in rare instances, disclose the fact that one or more pupils may be excused from presence in class during the study of the unit on the ground that they have already acquired the adaptation for which that unit stands.
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In practice, the orientation of the teacher is the matter of most importance. Teachers are prone to take specific preparation for a given unit or course for granted. It often happens, that while the class is in general ready for the unit, there are details which, if left untaught, will create wasteful and perhaps fatal inhibitions. The result of the pre-test is no part of the system of appraising pupil progress. "Its function is purely to throw light on the teaching process, and to include its results in any average of marks, if such still exist, is pedagogically absurd."73 The teaching member of the mastery formula will be dealt with fully later in this chapter when the techniques of teaching, control, operative, and administrative are presented and analyzed.

In the mastery formula, Morrison emphasized the principle that the results of the testing member are purely for the purpose of deciding: first, whether or not the teaching has actually registered and the teacher can go on to the next step or to the next unit; or, second, what modification in procedure is needed, assuming that the test discloses that the teaching has not fully registered. The results are again, as in the pre-test, no part of the final appraisal of the pupil's progress. "The test results may be way-marks as well as guides on the road to mastery, but they are not them-
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selves any part of mastery." 74

When the result of the teaching discloses non-learning in the class as a whole or in any significant number of pupils, there is indicated the need for study and interpretation of the test results. Every set of test results is a body of phenomena which arose in some sequence of cause and effect and as such they have meaning. Putting the test results and the teacher's recollection of the teaching procedure together, there should emerge a hypothesis touching the character and location of the fault in teaching. The teaching is then redirected and the element is retaught. Reteaching may at certain stages take the form of redirection of study.

It is important that the teacher give the results of the teaching tests serious study before reteaching or redirecting study. Before reteaching at all, every effort should be made to locate the trouble. Morrison recounts several illustrations showing the kind of difficulty which the test may disclose:

1. The commonest cause of non-learning is poor attention.

2. Poor control is another probable reason for poor results on testing.

3. The use of material which is not suited to the receptivity and response of the class may result in half of the class getting the explanation and the other half not doing so.
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4. In subjects like languages, in which learning arises out of practice, the teaching test will frequently disclose as non-learners, individuals who are either slow reactors or require unusually long periods of practice at a given level before the progress in learning sets in.

5. In subjects like grammar, mathematics, and the sciences, the teacher ultimately finds that he is trying to teach an uneconomical or even an impossible unit. The unit is not extensive enough, or it may be a unit which corresponds to no possible adaptation, in other words there is nothing to understand.

6. It may transpire from the evidence of the tests that the course itself is an impossible one.75

Morrison concludes, that such is direct teaching of the learning unit, or on his principles, teaching as distinguished from lesson learning in any of its forms. The essence of the matter is the application of the mastery formula, and the root of the latter is the teaching test and reteaching. The whole theory of systematic teaching rests upon the mastery formula and its application. It does not guarantee success to all teachers nor to any teacher for all pupils; but it does furnish a method by which such progress as is made can be real progress, and it furnishes a method by which the individual pupil can be given that consideration to which he is entitled. It provides a theory of teaching, from which may be developed actual individual self-dependence, in brief, citizens who are capable of thinking for themselves rather than citizens who merely assert the right to think for themselves.
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Morrison turned his attention to the types of teaching found in the school. He felt that most theories of teaching have been founded on the assumption that all teaching is one, that a theory of technique can be found which is equally applicable to all subjects found in the school. In a sense, this is true for there are certain laws which apply in one form or another to all forms of learning. Among these are the principle of apperceptive approach, the principle of motivation, the law of initial diffuse movements, and the canon of the concrete before the abstract. Morrison stated, "In the theory which we here advocate, we make large use of the principle that all real learning, except the learning of skills, is in the form of adaptations in the individual." 76

Nevertheless, in Morrison's view, a workable theory of teaching must take into account that the psychology of learning, the nature of the essential objectives sought, and consequently, the teaching process itself, all differ in important details as one moves from one subject to another in the secondary school. Morrison asserted:

We can, however, group all the subjects taught in the field of general education...into five different types, which characteristically differ among themselves in the nature of their objectives and in the psychology of the learning process." 77

Morrison identified five teaching types; the science, the appreciation, the practical arts, the language arts, and
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the pure practice type. He said, "Each of the several types of teaching has its own underlying psychology of the learning process, its own methodic procedure, and its own appropriate technique of teaching." Morrison stated that there was no single factor so commonly responsible for non-mastery as persistent attempts to achieve a given learning product under the wrong type of technique. He discussed each of the learning types in great detail in The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School. We shall discuss briefly the significant aspects of each type as Morrison viewed them.

In the science type, the learning process is essentially "reflection upon experience in the search for meaning." This experience may be direct experience dealing with the present world or it may be vicarious experience. If vicarious experience, it could be a horizontal expansion of experience as in geography where one studied the world or it could be vertical experience as in history where one studied the past. In any event, rationalization and reflection are the two basic processes involved and the heart of reflective thinking is problem solving.

The form the adaptation would take in this area would be an attitude of understanding of principles or processes in relation to cause and effect. It would consist of prin-
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ciples to be applied to everyday living and an understanding and interpretation of the environment, past and present, in order that one may exercise intelligent control of the future.

The more important subjects included in this type were courses and units in physical and social science, history and geography, and mathematics and grammar. These seemingly unrelated subjects were common in that the basic learnings derived from them would be attitudes of understanding and principles. History was not pure narrative but units in history so organized that principles would stand out. Geography was not a study of exports and imports but rather an understanding of the principle of how climate affected the livelihood of inhabitants. Mathematics and grammar were not valid in and of themselves for general education but had value only as "means of access to learnings which are otherwise inaccessible." 81

These diverse subjects were all closely allied also because they were most effectively and economically taught by the same method, a method which came to be known as Morrison's five steps: exploration, presentation, assimilation, organization, and recitation. These five steps in the teaching cycle were closely allied to the learning cycle: exploration and presentation were the stimulus; assimilation was the process of gathering the experience or information needed to cope with the problem, organization and recitation

were the reaction. The five step procedure or operative technique applied solely to the science type subjects.

In the science type subjects, the teacher deals with reasoned convictions, reflective thinking, understanding. In the appreciation type the teacher deals with values, worth, and the quest for the good, the beautiful, and the true. He deals with values which have survived "untold centuries of social experimentation" and have become standard because "they are the values which have been capable of constituting civilization." These values are commonly present in the mores of society.

Subjects belonging to this type are conduct, religion, literature, music, and the pictorial and plastic arts. But there are appreciations inherent in other courses: in civics, appreciation of citizenship; in science, appreciation of scientific and intelligent attitudes. Without these values, without ideals, society would disintegrate. Hence, the development of appreciations are perhaps our most fundamental educational objective. The crux of the problem is that schools must teach preferences and attitudes toward conduct and this cannot be done in a specific course, as a character education course. The entire area of appreciation must be
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taught throughout the whole period of general education. The fundamental problem of the schools is to develop in pupils from their earliest days in school a rich and varied experiential background of values.

This background may be in the form of abundant literary materials, good music, and good painting within the schools. But most of all it comes from the emulation by the students of cultured teachers and administrators and by patient guidance on the part of sympathetic teachers. Morrison said, "Teachers are patterns of value for the child." 85

There is no question in the appreciation type of complete mastery as desired in conduct or literature. There is continued growth which may be inferred from report testing by the teacher or checking the improvement in the character of the pupils' free reading. 86

The principle operative techniques in appreciation are not the basic five science type steps. They would follow this pattern:

1. The principle of exploratory testing and the selection of material best calculated to come into apperceptive sequence with the pupil's existing level of appreciation.

2. The principle of illumination of the field at the hands of the competent teacher.

3. The principle of class discussion calculated to bring out the attitudes of the several pupils and to contribute to the group attitude the reactions of individuals.

4. The principle of individual reports on music heard or examples of art seen.
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5. The principle of notation of results by observation of unsupervised preferences of pupils.

6. The principle of voluntary projects.\(^{87}\)

The third of the learning types out of which arise the fundamental adjustments to the environment Morrison called the practical-arts type. Modern man lives in an age of industrialization dominated by the machine. If man is to control his environment, the first step is to understand the technology that dominates that environment. The practical arts type would involve processes of "manipulation of physical material or the intelligent operation of appliances."\(^{88}\)

Learning in this area is both a process of reflection and learning by doing. The operative technique centers around projects which are "comprehensive and significant pieces of construction or manipulation. . . .\(^{89}\) with all teaching directed toward general education.

The teaching may be concerned with agriculture; with cooking or dressmaking; with accounting or office practice; with drawing, design, or modeling. The common characteristics of these courses are:

- Organization in comprehensive and significant units which can be mastered as intelligent attitudes; the selection of significant and comprehensive projects which focus upon the several units; insistence upon creditable performance in working the projects; effective testing and follow-up; and finally testing.

\(^{87}\)Ibid., p. 398.
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for the learning products implied.  

The teaching-learning types which have been enumerated and characterized thus far are fundamental in the sense that out of them arise the adaptations which make up the educative process. The form of teaching which is of primary importance, Morrison identified as the language arts type. He stated; "The language arts type is of primary importance because out of it arise the adaptations through which access is had to most of the materials of learning. It is the type through which the use of spoken and written discourse is learned, but it is far from being limited to the learning of language."  

In the language arts type, the pupil practices with the "reception and expression of meanings through symbolic discourse until he reaches adaptations in terms of which he receives or expresses meanings in discourse without inhibition." Discourse and communication through the use of symbols are involved. The symbols may be in reading, writing, or speaking a language vernacular or foreign language; or may be in music or dramatic expression. Unlike the three previous types which deal with attitude, the language arts type deals with skills or abilities involving discourse; the ability to "read or hear or feel a message expressed in some form of language, or else an ability to use some form of language to express thought or feeling, without in either case focal consciousness of the discourse itself." The

---
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pupil is able to convey thought easily and readily without conscious attention being paid to which specific words to use or the tone and modulation of voice and gestures. Again, the student is able to listen for meaning and significance rather than having to translate the words spoken.

The operative technique of written expression may be summarized in the statement, "We learn to write by writing."
The best training for writing is in the science type subjects where the pupil summarizes, organizes, and communicates meaningful material. Grammar, punctuation, and capitalization are introduced when the pupil's papers show the need for using these tools for a more precise meaning. Grammar and usage are not organized as separate courses but are valuable as they contribute, as tools, to the facility of written expression. Here again, children vary in skill and facility; consequently, each should have a "moving goal" to motivate them to more accurate and precise usage. The test of competency is in the everyday written materials which students produce and not in tests of isolated grammar items.94

There remains one field of learning in which the objectives are in the form of automatic facility, and the learning process is pure repetition until the adaptation sought becomes established. To this field Morrison applied the term, the pure practice type. In this area, learning
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arises through "sheer repetition with little or no thought element involved." It involves practice upon the basis of adaptations acquired in other types of learning. Instances of this type of learning are spelling, number tables, paradigms in grammar, frequently used constants in the sciences, and dates in history.

Within the pure practice area, Morrison distinguishes three sub-types. In the first of these, a new special ability is gained by pure practice. Typical of this sub-type is the learning of the primitive neuro-muscular adjustments, such as walking, swimming, skating and the like. In the secondary school, the best illustration might be the training of the vocal organs for the purposes of foreign language or vocal music. Finger exercises in musical instrumentation also conform to this sub-type.

The objective of the second of the sub-types is the fixing in the mind of elements which are constant in character and which require no adjustment to the content in which they are found. The outstanding illustrations of this sub-type are the tables in arithmetic and spelling.

The third sub-type has for its objective the fixation of convenient formal elements which have been developed through another type, usually the science or the practical arts. In this area when certain adaptations of the science or practical arts type have once been mastered, it is convenient in subsequent learning to have verbal statements so
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automatized that the previous learning is made rapidly available. According to Morrison, the characteristic and most searching test of the pure practice adaptation is "ability to use the power to which it corresponds while something else is in focal consciousness." 96

Summarizing the essential nature of the five learning types, Morrison said that it would be of little consequence to enumerate the different types of learning merely to set up a convenient form of classification but that was not the case. He asserted:

Each type stands for a form of learning and consequently for a form of teaching technique which is appropriate to the specific objectives within the type and no others. 97

Therefore a language arts objective cannot be learned under the principles appropriate to the science type. Nor can a science type objective be acquired under the principles of pure practice. Morrison reaffirmed his convictions thus:

There is perhaps no single factor so commonly responsible for non-mastery as persistent attempts to achieve a given learning product under the wrong type of technique. 98

As Morrison examined the entire teaching-learning process in its relationship to formal education, he saw that it consisted of the three broad technique areas of the control, the operative, and the administrative. The teaching-learning process was a continuous and unitary process but, "if one wanted to think more clearly and more precisely about the process of
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teaching itself one could distinguish three broad areas of technique; control, operative, and administrative.  

Underlying the control, operative, and administrative techniques but especially applicable to operative technique was a series of learning principles common to all types of teaching. Morrison's discussion of these learning principles follows:

1. The learning cycle is composed of stimulus, assimilation, and reaction. Stimulus may take the form of curiosity, desire, constraint, or any other immediate incentive originating either within the pupil but more often stimulated by the teacher. The pupil faces a new or challenging situation; a problem is posed which causes a state of dis-equilibrium to exist. Assimilation is the gathering of experience or information to solve this problem. When the explanation or solution "dawns upon" the pupil, the assimilation culminates and the pupil reacts with an appropriate adjustment. Equilibrium is restored and the pupil can react intelligently the next time when the same or similar situation develops.

2. In any learning there are initial diffuse movements until a principle is seen. "The law of initial diffuse movements spells patience, abundant assimilative practice or experience for the pupil, and a realization that early blunders are signs of learning health rather than evidences of failure."  

3. The starting point for the operative technique is the identification of specific learning and teaching objectives which the curriculum implies.

4. Direct teaching, attacking the adaptation desired rather than teaching about the adaptation, is the only effective method of teaching pupils to learn "by doing." For example, in English one would develop the power to use the language as a form of discourse by practice in such use rather than to approach it through the study of language structure.

5. A pupil learns economically by study, learning by one's own efforts through the use of books or
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other material which give access to enlightenment or to an art. The function of the school is to train pupils how to study, develop in them the inclination to attack their world through study, and finally make them capable of formulating their own problems and studying at the level of self-dependence. . . . 101

6. An inescapable condition of effective operative technique is the establishment of adequate ideational background. This means that "all learning is clearly the piecing of new learning to the old. . . . We learn the new in terms of the old." Since pupils learn most readily and effectively when they have a rich and varied experimental background, it behooves the school to provide this background to pupils whose experiences are restricted or perverted by the home. 102

The three expressions of learning, which are attitudes, abilities, and skills are all grounded in these six basic principles, but each expression is learned in a different way by pupils and hence, must be taught differently. Each of the three expressions has its own peculiar means for developing mastery and each is developed through its own type of subject matter. Each stands for a "form of learning, and consequently for a teaching procedure which is appropriate to the specific objectives within the type and to no others." 103

For Morrison, control technique was the establishing of a learning situation by the teacher. It was getting the students in the classroom under control so that learning could proceed economically and effectively. He stated:

The foundation of any systematic technique of teaching must obviously be the establishment of a condition in the class group, and in the attitudes of the individual
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pupils who make up the group, in which the adaptations implied by the teaching become possible. We shall call such a condition the learning situation.¹⁰⁴

The major elements of the learning situation, according to Morrison, are motivation and attention. The two elements seem to be mutually related. There is not likely to arise a sustained attention, apart from the establishment of motivation, and conversely no real motivation is possible without the development of capacity for voluntary attention to the subject matter of teaching and study. Students of the educative process recognized a long time ago the principle that no real learning takes place apart from that sense of value which is commonly called "interest." Interest, in the meaning which educators have given to the term, implies an emotional condition with which pleasure may or may not be associated. It frequently arouses in the individual a sense of devotion to toil and hardship and sometimes to experiences which are not always pleasurable.

As applied to the mastery of the objectives of any given course in the secondary school, the doctrine of interest requires the establishment of what is called in current pedagogical terminology "motivation," that is a desire to learn. It further requires that such motivation shall not only be sustained but shall increase in intensity as the learning process goes on. A pupil studying under
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the influence of powerful motivation exhibits a characteristic type of attention which Morrison identifies as "absorption, that is attention sustained over long periods with only occasional or momentary intermissions." This evident absorption is characteristic of study under strong motivation.

Now, if all learning had its own initial appeal, motivation would take care of itself. Much of the learning of the school is indeed for many pupils what may be called "self-motivated," and it is no less learning for that reason. But many of the essential elements of learning are not initially appealing to all pupils, and some elements may lack this quality entirely. According to Morrison, one of the major obligations of the school is to train the pupils to voluntarily apply themselves to learning which may not be initially interesting. A pupil so trained becomes capable of developing interest and consequently sustaining motivation, in most of the learning which a well-ordered school system sets before him. After a period, the remote initial motivation founded only on a sense of duty and voluntary application, in many cases becomes transformed into real, immediate, and sustaining motivation as the subject matter has opportunity to yield its inherent interest. Morrison stated:

Sustaining motivation arising out of genuine interest

105 Ibid., p. 104.
is a very intimate relationship between subject matter and learner, and it is obviously the only form which can be depended upon as an element of the ultimate learning products, namely, abiding and general intellectual interest and educational self-dependence.106

The development in the pupil of the capacity for willing sustained attention founded only on the expectation that the subject matter will ultimately yield a sustaining interest is the foundation of any systematic technique of teaching and learning. "It is the starting point of control technique."107

Morrison develops his reasoning one step further. He says that continuous attention or sustained attention is the condition precedent to effective group teaching. He identifies a second term, "sustained application" to refer to the similar attitude in the pupil during periods of study. Now, while sustained application is in the main the pupil's own affair, sustained attention requires the mental participation of both pupil and teacher. The pupil learns to apply himself to the study at hand, with such help as he can get from the teacher or fails so to learn. Sustained attention, on the other hand, "requires not only a willing and attentive pupil but an intelligible and forceful teacher conscious of the necessity of keeping every
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member of the class group within the reach of a compelling personality." Forceful and intelligible teaching is only one of two factors at work. The other is volitional training of the pupil into the capacity of assimilative listening to the spoken word just as in study he is trained into assimilative reading of the printed word. Morrison concludes:

The development of capacity for sustained attention and sustained application is obviously the practical foundation of training pupils in effective study habits.

Good control technique with its ultimate effect upon the volitional powers of the individual is clearly the foundation upon which all good study habits must be built.

While control technique is primarily concerned with securing and building up attention, it should be thought of as applied to the learning situation as a whole. Among other elements which are related to control of the learning situation the following are enumerated by Morrison:

1. The reduction of the mechanical detail of class conduct to a minimum.

2. Control technique implies control of the physical conditions under which learning goes on.

3. Due respect for the teacher, for the class, and for study is an essential element in the establishment of the learning situation and a major problem of control technique.

The effective utilization of control technique, according to Morrison, is essential to the teaching-learning process.
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The second broad area of the teaching-learning process which Morrison identified was operative technique which he defined:

By operative technique we mean that phase of the teaching process in which the units of learning are developed in the class and in the individuals thereof.110

This area includes presentation, supervision of study, testing of the pupils for the adaptations which the learning units contemplate, identification of pupil problems, and corrective teaching.

Morrison asks, "Why distinguish different phases of the teaching process, such as control technique and operative technique?"111 If this distinction results in the habit of looking upon the two phases as essentially disparate and successive, the effect would be unfortunate. "Good control technique is the foundation of good operative technique, but poor operative technique may make good control difficult or impossible."112 The two phases of teaching are closely interrelated as is indeed administrative technique. Morrison felt it was useful, in spite of the dangers of misinterpretation, to distinguish several aspects of teaching for a variety of reasons among which he mentioned the following:

1. To do so [distinguish the different aspects of teaching] enables us to think more clearly about the process of teaching itself.113

---

110 Ibid., p. 153.
111 Ibid.
112 Ibid.
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It is a great help in orderly and clear thinking about matters which are at best complicated, to be able to analyze the subject of our thoughts in significant ways, to deal with each part by itself, and then to see the interrelationships of the several parts.

2. It is useful to distinguish the different aspects of teaching because it makes it easier to locate and correct teaching troubles.\textsuperscript{114}

It has been shown that the first step in dealing with a problem case, or with a poor class, is to investigate the control technique. The difficulty can often be corrected at that point. If the control technique is good that region can be eliminated and the source of the problem may be sought in the fields of operative and administrative technique, both of which are capable of analysis.

The five types of teaching and learning were discussed previously. These form the subject matter of Part III in \textit{The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School}. According to Morrison, the differences in operative technique from type to type are a great deal more important than the features common to all types as noted in the previous discussion of the five teaching-learning types. A brief review of each type and the corresponding operative technique will illustrate Morrison's comment regarding the significant differences which exist in operative technique from type to type.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., p. 154.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching-Learning Type</th>
<th>Operative Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Science Type</td>
<td>Morrison's Five Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Recitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appreciation Type</td>
<td>Six Basic Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Exploratory Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Illumination of the Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Class Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Individual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Notation of results by observation of unsupervised pupil preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Voluntary Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Practical Arts Type</td>
<td>Construction and Manipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Centers around projects which are comprehensive and significant pieces of construction or manipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Directed Toward General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Arts Type</td>
<td>Learning by Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Actual practice with the reception and expression of meanings through symbolic discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Listening, speaking, reading, writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Continued to point of no inhibition in symbolic discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pure Practice Type</td>
<td>Five Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Presentation of correct information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Re-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Test of functional use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus operative technique, that phase of the teaching process in which the units of learning are developed in the class and in the individuals, will differ according to the nature of the subject matter, the nature of the objectives, and the nature of the learning type.

As Morrison developed his study of the teaching process, first as control technique, and then as operative technique, he also dealt with another phase of teaching activity which had to do with the study of the individual pupil, with his guidance, and with the control of the progress of his educational development. This was the third broad area of teaching which Morrison identified as administrative technique.\textsuperscript{115}

According to Morrison's interpretation, the school is a unit in its influence upon the pupil. Every experience which he has in school tends to modify his attitude toward life. Such experiences may be organized and focused upon common objectives or they may be left to inhibit or counteract one another. Morrison stated:

Unless the needful administrative procedure is properly conceived and adequately carried out, the educational product is purely in the hands of chance - it may be brilliant success and a normally adjusted personality or it may be wretched failure and a perverted, unhappy, and vicious personality.\textsuperscript{116}

This area of administrative technique demonstrated Morrison's deep concern for the individual person. The

\begin{footnotes}
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physically handicapped, the slow learner, the gifted one were all fit subjects of the common school. Only the ir-
remediably organically defective child was outside the
scope of the common school, and even in this case, the
educator was responsible in seeing that other social agencies
assumed their role and responsibility in the custodial care
of such a child.

Morrison started from the assumption that all children
were educable and shifted the burden of proof to those who
maintained differently. He especially opposed the wanton
misuses of intelligence tests and the I.Q. as determinants
of innate or organic capacity. A child may have a low I.Q.
because he was defective; he was not defective because of
the low I.Q. he argued. "The best of them [I.Q. tests]
give us a very inadequate measure of personality at any one
time, for they necessarily ignore conduct and appreciation
elements in general."\textsuperscript{117}

Morrison saw differences in the pupil's learning
ability and learning rate. There were slow pupils, made
slower by virtue of our lesson-learning ideology and in-
adequate teaching. There were dependent, delinquent, and
defective classes of pupils but these groups were largely
"made up of unadjusted, maladjusted, and perverted indivi-
duals"\textsuperscript{118} whose education had gone awry at some point.

\textsuperscript{117}Ibid., p. 603.
\textsuperscript{118}Ibid., p. 638.
corrective case subjects or remedial case subjects. Corrective cases were those which were susceptible of treatment within the pedagogical resources of the regular course in which the pupil is enrolled. Remedial case work, on the other hand, necessitated utilizing the resources of medical doctors, psychiatrists, and social workers.

To be able to know and understand each child, Morrison created a staff of supervisory assistants to deal with pupil personnel and developed a system of records and recording pupil data. There was a personnel function to be performed regardless of whether the principal did it in a small school or whether the principal had an assistant. The staff would consist of medical specialists who would be concerned with physical and psychological defects. A visiting teacher would work with social service agencies for home reconstruction and general out-of-school correction; a remedial teacher would work with pupils to correct defective experiential background; specially adapted members of the staff would work with pupils with emotional and volitional inadequacies. There would be custodial care in special rooms or institutions for mental defectives. In essence, this was in the area which Morrison referred to as the pastoral function of the school.120

119 Ibid., p. 585.

The topics discussed by Morrison as essential aspects in administrative technique included the integrity of the school, pupil administration, control of pupil progress, the problem pupil and case work, and the organization of the school. Morrison summarized:

The foundation of administrative technique we conceive to be in the clear apprehension of the terms ability, adjustment, performance, behavior and in a just evaluation of their relative significance in the educative process.\textsuperscript{121}

Thus Morrison concluded his analysis of the teaching-learning process in its three broad areas which he designated and defined as control technique, the establishing of a learning situation by the teacher; operative technique, that phase of the teaching-learning process in which the units of learning were developed in the class and in the individuals; and administrative technique, the study of the individual pupil, with his guidance, and with the control of the progress of his educational development in its manifold aspects. All three phases of the teaching-learning process are closely interrelated and Morrison's identification and analysis of the different phases enables one to think more clearly and more precisely about the process of teaching itself.

Now the whole process of education, of adjustment to the objective conditions of life for Morrison was made up of unit learnings, each of which must be mastered or else no adaptation is made. The course material found in

\textsuperscript{121}Ibid., p. 552.
the curriculum would be valuable in education only as it
was analyzed into significant units of learning which gen-
erate adaptations in the individual and in that way con-
tribute to his adjustment. A serviceable learning unit
for Morrison was "a comprehensive and significant aspect
of the environment, of an organized science, of an art, or
of conduct, which being learned, results in an adaptation
to personality."122 This method of organization came to
be known as the Morrison Method, the Morrison Plan, and
the Unit Method. The terms "Morrison Method" and/or "Unit
Method" were applied not only to the method of organization
but also to the method of teaching units. The five steps
in teaching a unit which Morrison referred to as the
"teaching cycle,"123 also came to be known as the Morrison
Method.

Once Morrison felt that the unit objectives were
clearly in the mind, he said that there was a need to seek
and to analyze the teaching and study procedure by which
the successive understandings could be established. He
said, "An effective procedure involves much more than a
teaching method as that term is commonly used."124 For
Morrison a method consists in a body of principles with
which the teacher can think out pedagogical situations

122 Ibid., p. 36.
123 Ibid., pp. 225-231.
124 Ibid., p. 220.
as they arise.\textsuperscript{125}

In Morrison's view, there was gradually being developed a body of verified principles touching the application and results of teaching methods to which one could properly apply the designation, "methodology," or science of education. But he felt that it did not follow that a method, no matter how well established in principle, can be applied to any situation and the teacher rest content that he had done his part. On the contrary, there is much more involved in teaching than a method. Morrison elaborated:

In the end, success depends upon the teacher and upon his skill in applying an elaborate fund of special knowledge to the solution of teaching problems. No method has ever yet been evolved and no book written, nor in the nature of the case is it likely that such ever will be produced, which will enable anybody to follow a routine course in the assurance that certain results must follow.\textsuperscript{126}

This general attitude toward the problem of teaching to Morrison was evidence of another mental stereotype like the ground-to-be-covered and time-to-be-spent stereotypes. This one he called the "method-to-be-followed stereotype," and he consistently disputed its validity.

Thus Morrison set about to develop a systematic teaching technique which would apply to the science type learnings. He said, "As soon as we turn to our task of analyzing the problem of establishing the appropriate understandings under

\begin{footnotesize}
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the science type, we encounter a diversity of factors. It at once becomes plain that no mere routine can be set which will operate itself." 127 The systematic technique, at best, only provides a plan for reducing to an appropriate system what would otherwise be confusion. Morrison repeated his conviction, "Successful teaching again depends upon the personality, intelligence, professional insight and skill, learning, and diligence of the teacher." 128 A technique-to-be-followed would be no better than any other stereotype.

Morrison felt compelled to set up a systematic technique which was calculated to keep before educators' minds all of the significant elements of the teaching process. He enumerated five aspects of the teaching-learning process to be considered in developing a systematic teaching technique:

1. In the teaching of any unit there is first of all to be considered the preliminary appraisal of the present experiential background of the pupil with respect to the unit itself.

2. At the beginning of a course, and of each unit in the course, there must be awakened in the pupil's mind normal learning curiosity, which is the chief constraint upon which the teacher has to rely for pedagogical purposes.

3. The essential understanding must be established in broad terms by expository teaching at the outset.

4. Under the process of supervised and guided assimilative study is the possibility of developing a student who is started on his way to self-dependence. . . .

127 Ibid.
128 Ibid., p. 223.
5. Finally, a systematic technique must provide for every unit of learning a period in which the pupil is led to react as effectively as may be to the content of the learning. It is this reaction which seems to accomplish the final establishment of the new attitude. 129

Based on his analysis of the elements of the teaching-learning process and the significant aspects of a systematic technique, Morrison enumerated and defined his five steps. He said, "We may then proceed to the setting up of the outlines of systematic technique applicable to each unit in a science type subject. For this purpose, the steps we have enumerated and developed have been found convenient." 130 Morrison identified five steps in his teaching method; exploration, presentation, assimilation, organization, and recitation. These five steps were closely allied to the learning cycle: exploration and presentation were the stimulus; assimilation was the gathering of data needed to resolve the problem; organization and recitation were the reaction. He analyzed the five steps in the following manner.

Exploration seeks to determine the intellectual content and ideational background which the pupils bring to the unit. This may be done by a written pre-test or an oral quiz and class discussion. Those pupils who already possessed an adequate background and exhibited sufficient social maturity to use free time might engage in independent study during this unit. Exploration is the attempt to assess existing

129 Ibid., pp. 223-225.
130 Ibid., p. 225.
experience so new learnings may be pieced on. Furthermore, it gives, or should give, the teacher a "sense of the point of view from which the new unit should be attacked with this particular class or section."132

In presentation, the teacher relies on "straight expository explanation of a definite body of related concepts."133 The teacher explains, presents a sketch of the unit, and reduces detail to a minimum until the students have a valid notion of the unit and possess an intelligent attitude to that aspect of the environment which they are studying.

Assimilation, essentially, is the opportunity for study. If exploration and presentation have been effective, the student will possess the necessary motivation for studying and be conscious of what he is about to learn. Assimilation is a period of supervised study in which the pupil studies at his own rate. The teacher makes explanations when needed, assembles the materials of study, and puts the pupil in "effective contact with his material."134 The teacher determines the mastery of the elements in the unit by the pupil and each pupil is permitted to advance as rapidly as he is able. If the teacher is successful, an

131 Ibid., p. 259.
132 Ibid., p. 261.
133 Ibid., p. 274.
134 Ibid., p. 285.
adaptive change takes place in the pupil's personality. He takes on new attitudes toward the world and he becomes a "modified and more capable individual in that he better interprets the complex affairs in which his life is passed." 135

In organization, the class assembles as a group and gathers up the argument of the unit in outline form with the essential supporting facts. Organization is focused on the central understandings of the unit and not on the assimilative material. Each individual will organize the argument a little differently because "individual pupils will see the argument in somewhat different lines, and this individuality is to be encouraged rather than suppressed." 136

Recitation is the reverse of presentation and it is the pupil who recites to the class and teacher in an audience situation. Only a few students recite on each unit; the remainder prepare a written recitation. Such is the process of teaching mastery in the science-type subjects through the use of Morrison's method, his five steps.

Morrison devoted a great deal of space to the science type in his work The Practice of Teaching, more than to any of the other types. And that fact had a certain significance which Morrison explained:

135 Ibid., p. 282.
136 Ibid., p. 327.
In the first place, many of the principles set forth will find a place in succeeding types. But more than that, the subject matter which falls under this type constitutes the content of the greater part of that adjustment in the individual to environment which is education.

If we include the practical arts type as an offshoot and corollary of the science type, there is found in the broad field thus covered all the adaptations which constitute the stock of the individual's intelligent and reasoned attitudes toward his physical, biological, and social world. He has still to acquire those attitudes which are not reasoned but felt and to this field we turn to the appreciation type.\textsuperscript{137}

Morrison, as he himself pointed out, was first and foremost a teacher regardless of the many administrative posts which he held. His first major work was directed towards teaching and he constantly stressed the point that the main administrative concern should be to facilitate teaching. In the Preface of his major work on teaching he said:

\textldots the message is addressed first of all to students of the general educative process and especially to the executive and staff officers of schools who realize that teaching is by far the most important activity which they have to administer.\textsuperscript{138}

Because he devoted so much time and effort to effective teaching, it is not surprising that he developed some of his most fruitful ideas in this area. One significant insight into the nature of teaching and learning was the concept of direct teaching for mastery. Morrison was interested in changes in attitudes that would be reflected in changes in behavior and he vigorously spoke out against the notion

\textsuperscript{137}Ibid., pp. 315-316.
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of lesson-learning, grade-getting, time-to-be-spent in school, and the notion of the accumulation of credits earned as being synonymous with a true learning product. It was understanding of principles that Morrison wanted; he wanted people to behave as law abiding and virtuous citizens should.

Morrison also advanced the concept that method was inherent in content and by the analysis of the structure of any discipline one could evolve an effective method by which the academic discipline could be taught to pupils. He believed that each subject had a structural organization and one could evolve basic principles from that organization. Principles had to be understood to be learned and then these principles had to be mastered.

Morrison also contributed significantly to the organization of knowledge through his great stress on the unit of work as being a comprehensive and significant aspect of each subject matter field.

Another notion in the area of teaching which Morrison advocated was the notion characterized in a popular vein as the "Morrison Method," a series of five steps in a systematic teaching procedure. The "Five Steps" offered a method of teaching which, if conscientiously used, could be of benefit in enabling students to learn more effectively.

Finally, Morrison made a significant contribution to the individualizing of instruction. For a man who was supposed to be teacher-oriented and subject matter oriented,
he was ingenious in his day for providing for individualized instruction. Free reading periods, supplementary reports, and even the release of some students from work based on evidence of learning show his interest in providing for the individualizing of the pupil's progress through school.

As one reads the major writings, and the many articles that Morrison directed to the improvement of teaching, one fact stands out clearly, probably no man in educational history had a deeper commitment to the educability of children than did Morrison. An evaluation of the contributions of Henry C. Morrison to educational theory and practice will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VI

EVALUATION OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF HENRY C. MORRISON TO EDUCATIONAL
THEORY AND PRACTICE

The educational career of Henry C. Morrison spanned half a century (1895-1945), encompassed varied teaching and administrative activities, and yielded numerous written works which covered a broad range of topics. In attempting to evaluate the contributions of Morrison to the broad spectrum of education in general, and to educational theory and practice in particular, the following approach will be used. Morrison's work will be discussed in four categories which parallel the development within this study; his approach to theory and his theory of education, his conception of the organizational structure of the school system, his conception of the nature and content of the curriculum, and his theory of teaching. Each category will be briefly summarized and an attempt will be made to assess the contributions which are suggested by his ideas and by the reactions of the educational public to his ideas during and after his lifetime.

The reactions of the educational public were varied as can be observed from the following comments. According to Moehlman:

[Morrison was] perfectly certain of his country's mission and of his own place in the general plan, he stood firmly against all diverting pressures or persons. His influence on public education was deep and will be felt for many
years to come.¹

Harry A. Brown asserts positively:

The idea by which Morrison is best known is probably his principle of unit-learning. His institutional conception of the school and the curriculum of general education, together with his learning unit, are ideas that are capable of making a significant transformation in the theory and practice of teaching when properly understood in terms of his own conception. His idea of the nature of personality and its integration as the objective of education has far greater possibilities than have yet been realized in educational practice.²

Ernest E. Bayles states the need for a critical evaluation of Morrison's work:

Within the past half-dozen years, we have witnessed the phenomenal growth and widespread popularity of the theory and plan of teaching in the secondary school formulated and sponsored by Henry Clinton Morrison. The surprising feature of this whole development is the almost total absence of any systematic attempt at a critical evaluation of the Morrison theory.³

Bayles wrote three articles which provided the critical evaluation he felt was needed. These articles analyzed and criticized Morrison's definition of learning and the lack of training for independence in the progressive reconstruction of habits;⁴ Morrison's theory which presupposed the acceptance of a static social order in which there was no prospect for changes of sufficient signifi-

¹Arthur B. Moehlman, "Henry Clinton Morrison: Master Teacher," The Nation's Schools, XXV (June, 1945) 19.

²Harry A. Brown, "Henry C. Morrison and his Contributions to American Education," School and Society, LXI (June, 1945) 382.

³Ernest E. Bayles, "The Objectives of Teaching with Special Reference to the Morrison Theory," Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (November, 1934) 561.

⁴Ibid., pp. 561-568.
cance to be recognized in the educational program; and the limitations of the Morrison unit in the science type learnings which were to result in the understanding of principles that Bayles felt were subject to applications to differing situations and interpretations based on various levels of education and experience.

Woelfel in his work, Molders of the American Mind, appraised and critically interpreted Morrison's work. He stated:

Morrison has proceeded boldly to experiment and to theorize about the method of education. He asks no fundamental questions beyond those strictly allied to method or technique. But he nevertheless answers some very fundamental questions in an incidental way.

Essentially, there are four basic questions which must be answered as one attempts to objectively evaluate the contributions of Henry C. Morrison.

1. What changes did Morrison actually produce in the educational thinking and practice of his time and subsequent times?

2. What potential changes could his ideas produce in our times if we were to follow his ideas?

3. Were the changes that Morrison did produce of a beneficial sort?

4. Would the changes we would make be beneficial if we were to follow Morrison's ideas today?

5Ernest E. Bayles, "The Social Significance of Teaching with Special Reference to the Morrison Theory," Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (December, 1934) 650-658.


A beneficial act or thought may be defined as any act or thought which will enable the professional educator to improve the quality of student learning which in turn depends in great part upon the quality of instruction. Professional educators, especially educational administrators have the responsibility of contributing directly to the improvement of the instructional program. The proper organization, administration, and financing of the schools are subordinated to this main task of improving learning and instruction although they make a significant contribution to it. Morrison was throughout his life primarily a teacher, interested in the improvement of teaching and learning. His work focused on those aspects which in any way aided in this improvement.

The study of education, Morrison believed, was still in a stage of empiric observation and he thought that it was his task to move the analysis of the educational process from empiricism to valid principle or theory. His analysis of theory as a heuristic tool is as valid now as when he first published his theory in 1934. The phraseology which he used is similar to that which is in current usage today. Mathematical formulations, interdisciplinary approaches, operational definitions were all part of Morrison's thinking. He was impatient with plans for action, inner mysticism of people's thinking, and the curious collection of value laden judgments as to what education ought to be. He was interested in description, explanation, and prediction of events
in education. He sought to find a coherent and systematic structure underlying the educational process.

Morrison looked upon theory as a guide to action in the practical world. If it could be demonstrated that man had to adjust and adapt to the society in which he lived, and if it could be shown that there were different qualitative levels at which man adapted, then the schools should be so organized that the pupil learned the basic adaptations in a different type of school. And so he developed the notion of a primary school and a secondary school in which a different set of adaptations took place.

Morrison looked upon theory as a guide to the collection of facts which would have relevance for the documentation of his theory. He turned to the fields of sociology, psychology, pathology, zoology, medicine, biology, physiology, and anthropology to bring insights from these disciplines to the explanation of the educative process. For example, in discussing the nature of the adaptive organism of man, he turned to three basic sources:

1.) "the classics in the field of physiology" as Sherrington's Integrative Action of the Nervous System, and Child's Physiological Foundations of Behavior;

2.) "specific laboratory studies" of S.I. Franz and K.S. Lashley;


9Ibid., p. 137.
3.) clinical studies as reported in journals like *The Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*. Once he had finished studying these sources, he compiled the evidence, conceding that his interpretation was admittedly at the stage of hypothesis and then he tried to determine what relevance these disclosures had for understanding the adaptive organism of man.

Thus, Morrison's approach to theory was relatively modern. Much of the terminology which he used is still in use today. And yet, the influence which Morrison exerted in the area of theory building was almost negligible. His interest in theory was not the major interest of his day. Educators in his day, spurred on by men like J.M. Rice and Charles Judd and organizations like the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, were trying to construct a scientific basis for the study of education but their interests were empirically oriented. Little attention was paid to theoretical formulations which would require experimental studies. In our time, Morrison is an obscure figure in the area of theory building and exists in men's minds only as an example of a practitioner.

There are several reasons for the lack of impact which Morrison had in educational theory. In the first place, the theoretical foundation for Morrison's position was published after his reputation as a leading educator was established by the tremendous popularity and acclaim of a most practical book, *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary*.

often overlooked for the solution at hand. Second, the cornerstone of Morrison's theory of education was based on adjustment to the society and world as it existed. In 1934, with the country still in the midst of a world-wide depression, adjustment to the existing society held little appeal. Educators were calling for basic and rapid changes in society. Morrison's theory, grounded as it was on evolutionary principles, had provision for change in society but when change did occur, it was the result of a long and tedious process. Change, for Morrison, was reckoned in terms of decades and centuries and not in terms of a new social order to be constructed at once. The content of Morrison's theory was not divorced from his approach to theory, but the latter was ignored and the former questioned. Finally, Morrison was at the University of Chicago and, during the thirties, theoreticians and intellectuals were looking to Teachers College at Columbia University for leadership in the field of education. George Counts was "daring the schools to build a new social order." The Social Frontier became required reading in liberal educational circles. The Lincoln School of Teachers College supplanted John Dewey's Laboratory School as being the radical experiment in classroom teaching. The University of Chicago was having a profound effect on the practitioner and little on the theoretician. Thus, Morrison's contribution to the

approach to theory in education has been largely neglected due to the times, his location, and current events.

If attention would be directed to Morrison's approach to theory today, would his approach make any significant contributions? To a certain extent, his approach to theory might be disregarded because the modern approach in theory is oriented in a different direction than was Morrison's. On the other hand, his approach to theory, if needed, might exert a significant influence on current thinking about theory.

Much contemporary theory building is directed toward administrative and supervisory theory as separate entities. Administrative theory, moreover, tends to look upon educational administration as being just one aspect of general administrative theory and contends that there is essentially administration, and administration in general. Nor do modern theorists relate the relevance of administrative theory to the instructional program, the organization of the schools, or the purposes of the schools as an institution.

Morrison would have disagreed with these notions of the modern theorists. It is true that he did not apply his theory of education specifically, narrowly, and directly to the administrative process. But he did include the role of the administrator, the instructional program of the school, the nature of the learner, the nature of society, and the purposes of education within his broad theory. He insisted that educational administration was a unique area of study.
and that there had been, even in his day, too many efforts to apply the concepts of business administration to the administration of the schools. Schools, he insisted, were basically different from businesses. He maintained that the superintendent and principal first had to demonstrate competence as teachers and had to understand the whole educational process before attempting to be an administrator. He argued that one theory had to account for the many variables within education.

Morrison was not a theorist in the sense that he wrote about the nature of theory. He was first and foremost a teacher and directed his theory of education to accomplish better the tasks for which formal schooling had evolved. He was interested in developing a theory which would have direct relevance for the improvement of the learning situation.

One criterion of a good theory in education is comprehensiveness. The theory must be able to explain and account for a number and variety of variables if it is to be a useful theory. On this criterion alone, Morrison's theory of education is extremely useful because it encompassed a wide variety of important variables in education.

Once Morrison had determined that the main task of the individual in life was to adjust to society and the environment in which the individual lived, he had to make certain that the individual understood that environment. The role of the formal school was essential in this understanding. The clue was to be found in the process by which both the
individual and society had evolved through the evolutionary process. In studying the evolutionary development of the individual Morrison marked the point at which education could develop. That occurred when vocal organs evolved to the point where man could communicate his knowledge. The pupil was capable of learning what the formal school could teach. But what was the pupil to learn? One had to analyze the basic institutions that had evolved which had enabled man to adjust in society and those institutions would form the curriculum of this school, Morrison asserted. A study of the institutions was the subject matter of the school. By analyzing the subject matter of the school, one could isolate the structure of each subject. By studying the way the pupil learned, one could determine the best method for enabling the pupil to learn. By putting the structure of the subject matter and the nature of the learning process together, one developed a theory of teaching. By analyzing the social control which society demanded, one could see the need for "right" education for the perpetuation of society. Hence, followed the need of society to operate and finance these schools. Finally, some institutions of society such as reading, handwriting, mathematics, computation, and socialization were more basic than others. Here was the organization of the primary school. The further development and analysis of these basic institutions plus the learning of the other institutions that make up the fabric of civilization were delegated to the secondary school.
The union of the primary and the secondary school formed the "Common School" which was the school that the state operated, controlled, and financed for its own self-preservation and survival. Thus, in his theory of education, Morrison gave attention to the learner, the student, the milieu in which both operate, the purpose of education, materials and methods of teaching, and organization. Morrison's theory of education was indeed macroscopic.

All of these variables emanated, in Morrison's thinking, from the theory of evolution which he considered to be the "most important generalization of modern times, probably the most revealing of all times." Evolution explained the nature of all organic life, the nature of the human individual, and the nature of society in which the human individual lived. The laws governing the evolutionary process were few. Variation occurred in living creatures. Some variations developed which enabled living creatures to continue to exist; other variations occurred which caused misery or extinction. Creatures who survived did so because they adapted to the environment; those who did not adapt, perished. The process was adaptation; the goal was adjustment.

Education, for Morrison, was adjustment. The individual adapts and becomes adjusted. He summarized education as follows:

It seems to follow that education is a process of adjustment by adaptation—that is to say, adjustment by inner personal

Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 60.
changes each of them in the direction of adjustment; that right education is a process of becoming civilized; that civilization or the art of living together in the presence of natural law is inherent in the institutional products of social evolution; that right personal adaptations must be the elements of civilization.\(^{13}\)

Education was not erudition, information, knowledge, the unfoldment of individual potentiality, mental discipline, or habit formation. To be educated one had to become the kind of man who would know what to do.

The purpose of education, then, was adjustment and to this adjustment the curriculum, the instructional program, and the organization, administration, and financing of the school must contribute. In essence, this was Morrison's thesis. He had looked to Darwin and the theory of evolution to explain the physical nature of man. He had looked to Spencer to extend the evolutionary theory to include societies. On these two generalizations, Morrison built his theory of education. The strength and validity of Morrison's theory rests, in the final analysis, on the strength and validity of the theories of Darwin and Spencer. Not all evolutionists accept Spencer's analogy of biological evolution to social evolution but it was a basic point for Morrison and the validity of his theory rises or falls with the acceptance of this analogy.

Criticism of Morrison's adjustment theory of education is often made on the grounds that a theory of adjustment leaves little or no room for change in society or progress.\(^{13}\) 

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 366.
to take place. Boardman, in reviewing *Basic Principles in Education*, summarized his reaction to Morrison's work in the title of his review, "Adjustment to the Society of Yesterday."  

Boardman stated:

Professor Morrison apparently is well satisfied with the status quo and would have education serve its interests by attempting to adjust individuals to it and make them satisfied with the present state of affairs. To be adjusted to civilization is to be civilized regardless of how uncivilized contemporary civilization may be. . . .

So well satisfied is the author with the present state of the world that he has a tendency to scoff at any attempt to change it. . . . True enough, changes do occur, but they are the result of impersonal evolutionary forces and apparently intelligence has nothing to say about the direction that these forces may take.  

Bayles in a series of three articles which analyzed Morrison's theory arrived at a similar criticism:

There is practically no question that we are entirely justified in saying that Morrison's theory presupposes the acceptance of a static social order; one in which there is no prospect for changes of sufficient significance to be recognized in the educational program. It is the "Faith of Our Fathers" which is to be inculcated into the minds and the actions of our school children if Morrison is to have his way. Moreover, the character of his later publications indicates that he has not changed his attitude since the book under discussion (*The Practice of Teaching*) was written or revised.  

Since the chief criticism of the adjustment theory of education is that the theory left little room for either change or progress, it would be well to review Morrison's reaction to these charges and note his ideas on change and


15 Ibid.

16 Bayles, "Social Significance of Teaching," 652.
progress. Morrison recognized these criticisms as being the major challenge of his theory:

The chief criticism of the adjustment theory rests on the indubitable fact that the fabric of society is and always has been constantly changing, and on the further fact that in many respects peace and well-being do not exist for multitudes of individuals in what is sometimes called the present day social order. . . . But all this is to misconceive the nature of adjustment in its evolutionary meaning. Progress has meant not only the adjustment to a static environment which we find in the lowest forms of life, but, more and more, adjustment to an increasing range of environmental variations. . . . So it is with the primates including man. . . . So it is with personality. . . . So it is that the tastes, and moral attitudes, the arts and sciences which constitute the fabric of civilization likewise constitute the fabric of adjustment in one age as well as in another.17

As has been discussed, education for Morrison was a process of adjustment by inner personal changes. He stressed the adaptive change, not the adaptive response. Adaptation was not the goal; adaptability was. One can adjust to conditions that are changing; one can adjust to conditions that remain unchanged. The concept of adjustment does not exercise control over the changing or static nature of that to which adjustment is made. In 1934, Morrison summarized his attitude toward social change:

The fundamentals of civilization change but slowly. The fabric of society, on the other hand, changes frequently, as cultural products accumulate; it always has done so and probably always will do so. Social problems arise, but most of them are the consequence of the ignorance, sloth, and vice of the individuals who make up the community. Just now they are largely the outcome, in part of appalling ignorance of history, in part of sheer self-indulgence, in part of widespread

17Morrison, Basic Principles, pp. 368-369.
infantile negativism rationalized as pursuit of liberty. Be that as it may, as Professor Bagley has so often told us, the more kaleidoscopic society becomes, the more reason there is why the school and university should hold firmly to the external verities and inculcate them.

Society changes, mostly in cycles of longer or shorter duration. So does the climate. A period of severe winters is followed by one of mild weather, but we do not for that reason revise meteorological principles. New maladies appear or old ones are revived, but we do not for that reason find a different physiology to teach. We do not write a new solar physics for every shift in the sun-spot cycle or a new mechanics because men have learned to navigate the air.18

Speaking of progress, he made this observation:

The only kind of progress in which we as humans are interested is human progress under the conditions of human living. We seek to understand Nature, in order to escape what she would do to us if we did not understand. Evolution is not progressive because we judge it to be; we judge it to be progress because it is evolution.19

Thus, it would seem from Morrison's comments that he did place a significant emphasis on both change and progress. Change, to be sure, was not a rapid process nor did the basic structure of society change but slowly. There was no way to stop biological and social evolution, but biological evolution was a slow process. Social evolution was faster, but the difficulty was, as Morrison pointed out, that many people mistook slight shifts for basic evolutionary changes. The fabric of society changes frequently; the structure changes slowly.

Civilization, itself, was not an absolute. That too changed. "The best hope the world has consists in the increase


19 Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 74.
in the number of individuals who are as highly civilized as are the most civilized today.\textsuperscript{20} It was to be the function of the school to increase the number of civilized persons.

Morrison was rather philosophical about the notion of change. He argued that just as the fabric of society may change in cycles, so do reformers come and go in cycles. Each new generation refers to the earlier reformers as "Victorians.\textsuperscript{21} The only way out of this circular motion, he suggested, was for men to discover valid scientific principles. For Morrison, the basic scientific principle was adjustment.

Adjustment is the fundamental fact and point of departure. Starting from that point we gather evidence, reason backward and endeavor to find out how adjustment came about. We are then in a position to reason forward and see what is in fact within our powers. The principle is as good in studying education as it is in the study of evolution. The scientific study of education begins at that point.\textsuperscript{22}

The scientific principles are based on a set of inerorable laws of Nature at work which perpetuate the evolutionary process. Better and better adjustment of the individual takes place as man discovers these laws and adapts his behavior to them. Within this process, progress toward a more highly developed civilization takes place, Morrison asserted.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., p. 320.
\textsuperscript{21}Morrison, \textit{School and Commonwealth}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{22}Morrison, \textit{Basic Principles}, p. 75.
developed more civilized individuals, progress toward the higher civilization occurred. The tests of a higher civilization had a direct relation to the degree of attainment of the following six measures of civilization which Morrison proposed:

1. Justice is most evenly, promptly, and effectively administered.

2. The national defense against the external enemy and the internal criminal is most adequately provided for.

3. The perils of the geographical and biological environments are most effectively warded off.

4. Mental and bodily health in the population is at the maximum.

5. The national resources are most effectively conserved.

6. The distribution of wealth is at the maximum consistent with maximum total production.23

The attainment of these six measures is the goal of adjustment. It is unfortunate that Morrison did not develop these basic goals. He merely states them but does not indicate how he arrived at them. Most would agree that these are valid goals of any society but his lack of indication of how he developed these ideas is a weak link in an otherwise logical development of a theory of education based on adjustment. This weakness does not validate the argument that Morrison left little room in his theory for change and progress to occur, however.

It is difficult in this area of theory of education to evaluate the contributions of any one man. Outside of the fact that Morrison demonstrated that it was possible to deal critically with the most important variables of education and relate them to one basic theory of education, there are no major contributions which can be ascribed to Morrison and to Morrison alone. As part of a larger movement or "school," he does share in the contribution that the larger movements have made.

Morrison did not claim to be a philosopher. He would have considered himself a scientist. In works on educational philosophy, he is generally classified as an Essentialist; one who derives the curriculum from the basic core of knowledge that has stood the test of time and which all students must attain, as contrasted with the Progressivist; one who derives the curriculum from the needs, interest, and abilities of individual students.\(^ {24}\) In another classification, Morrison would be considered a Social Conservationist; one who stresses the perpetuation of existing society, as contrasted with a Social Reconstructionist; one who would remake and redirect the social order.\(^ {25}\) If the world must be divided into two camps, both these designations would be essentially correct in their application to Henry C. Morrison and to his theory of education.


Morrison was first and foremost a teacher, even though he held a variety of administrative posts. Because he was so vitally interested in the teaching process, it is not surprising that his greatest impact on the educational thinking and practice of his time and ours has been in this area. However, Morrison's contribution to future educational progress may occur in the area of the organizational structure of the schools and the school systems.

According to Harry A. Brown:

His [Morrison's] proposal touching the structure of American education, with school and University as major institutions and supplemented by the Technological Institute, is something to which to give serious consideration in the postwar educational and cultural reconstruction in America and in the world. 26

Arthur Moehlman stated:

His [Morrison's] last work, American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System, appeared in 1943. A number of educationists consider this book to be his most important contribution. 27

It is in this area of the organizational structure of the school system that Morrison suggested some penetrating insights which are current and timely today. Two broad areas will be considered: the internal organization of the schools, and the external organization and relations of the school.

Morrison conceived of two types of schools: the Common School and the University. The Common School was the school

26 Brown, "Morrison; Contributions to American Education,“ 382.

27 Moehlman, "Morrison: Master Teacher,“ 19.
for the common man, "not common man in the demagogic sense but all of us in our non-specialized, personal character, the citizen as distinguished from the professional man, the craftsman, the business man, the learned man." It was the school evolved by society to develop intelligent citizens; a school which could guarantee the perpetuation of society. The Common School was the school of general education and when the pupil could direct his own learning, he was ready for university work. The Common School itself was divided into two schools: the primary school and the secondary school. Each of these two schools was based on both psychological and pedagogical principles, on the nature of the learner, and the learning process.

Education, for Morrison, was adjustment to society. Society itself was organized around folkways, mores, customs, and institutions. If one analyzed the basic institutions which enabled society to exist, one had determined the content of the curriculum of the Common School. The pupil, in studying this curriculum, had to have the necessary tools of study in order to adapt or adjust to these learnings.

In the primary school, the pupil was incapable of study because he did not possess the necessary tools of study. His learnings were ordered by the teacher and he had to acquire four basic adaptations: reading, handwriting, numerical, and social adaptation. Once the pupil had developed the

---

ability to "see through the symbolic content of the printed page to the thought or scene of action which is the subject of discourse without constant focal consciousness of the discourse itself." Once the pupil could do quantitative thinking, once the pupil could commit "his thoughts to paper without focal consciousness of the elements of discourse which he writes," and "habitually to go on with his classmates and to cooperate in the learnings which the school has to administer," the pupil was ready to leave the primary school and enter the secondary school. He was ready to study.

In the secondary school, the pupil was "capable of learning through study and the use of books but was incapable of systematic personal growth except under the constant tutorial presence and constraint of the teacher." In this school, the student developed in maturity, built and enriched the content of the basic institutions of society, and learned how to attack problems in an economical and effective manner. When the student reached the stage where he could carry on independent study, he was ready for university work and he had completed the Common School. It is assumed by Morrison at this point that the student had moved forward and reached


30 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
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the stage of educational maturity, which signifies that the individual has reached a stage at which he is capable of directing widely his own further learning. Morrison asserted:

For him the period of general education is at an end and the period of true specialized or scholarly or professional study has begun. He is out of the secondary period and in the university.\(^{33}\)

Allowing for two separate stages of educational development in the child, pupil to student, Morrison also allowed for two school periods to parallel this growth, the primary school and the secondary school. However, he envisioned them as two steps along the educational continuum leading to educational maturity and independent learning which was the province of the scholars, not as separate and unrelated entities.

Societal pressures of new demands for education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries resulted in the development of separate educational institutions; elementary schools, secondary schools, Junior High Schools, and Junior Colleges. These separate entities emerged to meet the needs of increased enrollments and newly identified social and educational needs. The end product was discontinuity in the educational system. Morrison spoke out against this distortion of the system.

Discontinuity is a state of affairs in the structure of a school system in which there has come to exist several schools in a hierarchy of progress, each of these schools being more or less like a thing in itself, rather than a functional part of a system.\(^{34}\)

The essential organization of the Common School, as Morrison envisioned it, would consist of the primary school and the secondary school designed to provide the four basic adaptations and extended opportunities to use those learning tools through study under direction up to the point of educational maturity. Pupils could enter in kindergarten and by the end of what is typically the sophomore year in college, they would complete their general education. The schools could be under one roof or in separate buildings. What was important was that pupil progress from primary school to secondary school to university be made on the basis of actual learning and adaptations, and not on years spent, credits amassed, or ground covered. Morrison asserted:

> Time is not of the essence. Learning acquired is the substance of the school. The time required is merely a circumstance. Maturity is of the essence. The age of emergence is not of the essence.\(^{35}\)

Morrison’s conception of internal school organization has much to commend it. It forces the school administrator to examine critically the multiplicity of overlapping organizational devices in current use. It suggests to educators and administrators that they define precisely what an elementary

\(^{34}\)Morrison, *American Schools*, p. 100.

\(^{35}\)Ibid., p. 187.
school, a junior high school, a high school, a junior college, a college, and a university is or should be.

It provides a stimulus to evaluate the graded structure, the credits, and the requirements for graduation of each of the separate institutions maintained today. Morrison's criticism of the discontinuous school system of the 1940's might indeed be provocative:

The disastrous final result has been the universal establishment of an inverted ideology in which the securing of credits, graduation from school, and the attainment of a degree are put in the place of education, until only a pitifully small proportion of the graduates of schools and colleges is composed of even partially educated people. 36

It is a relatively simple organizational pattern which Morrison suggests but one which would be difficult to put into practice if for no other reason than the multiplicity of boards of education and board members it would eliminate. It would further necessitate a complete revision of evaluating grades, of promotions, and retentions. It would strike at the very heart of the "Carnegie unit," and the credit system. It would shatter the administrative efficiency and economy inherent in the graded school concept and the time-to-be-spent, ground-to-be-covered stereotypes which are firmly implanted in traditional educational thinking and practice.

Unless properly understood, Morrison's conception of internal school organization could become an organizational roadblock to educational progress. Herein lies the

36 Ibid., p. 112.
weakness of Morrison's presentation of his internal organizational pattern. He did not apparently realize that any organizational pattern is not an automatic guarantee of educational progress. It may facilitate learning but can never guarantee it. If Morrison had presented the plan of organization as a logical and psychological method of organizing schools instead of as a natural pattern that was an inevitable outgrowth of evolutionary development, it might have had more appeal. As it was, Morrison's organization has had little direct influence. No system of schools, as far as the author has ascertained, is organized specifically on the basis of primary schools, secondary schools, colleges, and universities as Morrison conceived them. The trend toward the "non-graded school" which appears, disappears, and reappears periodically, is one approach that resembles Morrison's plan. The "open classroom" and the variety of "Alternative Schools" which have sprung up in recent years reflect an awareness of Morrison's emphasis on the identification and evaluation of pupil progress in terms of actual learning, and actual adaptations rather than on the current stereotypes of years-to-be-spent, ground-to-be-covered, and credits-to-be-earned. Current discontent with the products of the schools indicates the need for a reassessment of our school structure, its purpose, design, and operational efficiency and effectiveness.

These criticisms, however, do not negate the possibility of Morrison's ideas on internal organization having an
ultimate effect. It is suggested that his discussion of internal organization would be a worthwhile one for any administrator to undertake, especially an administrator who would like to be able to define precisely what he means when he speaks of the elementary school, and the high school.

For Morrison, the external organization of the school included the aspects of organization, finance, control and administration. The Common School was to be the school which the State would organize, control, direct, and finance. The only justifiable reason for State concern for education was the necessity of providing an intelligent citizenry so that the State would be perpetuated. State constitutions and judicial decisions have consistently reaffirmed this concept. If the State were to control the school, then the State had the responsibility to finance the cost of this school, Morrison asserted.

According to Morrison, the state-supported school did not exist primarily for the development of the potentiality of the individual or for the vocational training of future lawyers, artists, plumbers, doctors, or machinists. These were excellent goals to be furthered, but not at state expense.

If, Morrison argued, the purpose of the state school could be limited to the development of citizens, then it was not a question of the state aiding a local district; it was a question of the state financing education completely. The
moment a state thought of "aid" for the schools, as long
as schools were organized on a local district basis, there
would be no equalization regardless of the complicated
mathematical formulas any state could devise. Inequality
of effort, inequality of educational opportunity, and in-
equality of financial burden were bound to grow.

The only method of equalization that ever worked, as
far as Morrison was concerned, was consolidation. The
economic unit of support had to be coterminous with the
administrative unit. Once you had made the state the basic
economic unit of support as well as the administrative unit,
there was still the question of a sound system of taxation.
Here again, Morrison advocated a basically simple approach:
all taxation, regardless of what it is called or how it is
collected, is paid out of the income which a person receives,
whether this is in actual cash or in goods or property which
could be converted into cash. Consequently, Morrison ad-
vocated a progressive state income tax as the basic measure
of support for schools. The property tax he would reserve
for actual improvement of property value, somewhat like what
we now refer to as "assessments" on property.

The schools, instead of being an economic drain on
tax funds, would in the long run contribute to the gross
national product by educating economically literate citizens.
They, in turn, would curtail their leisure and recreational
spending to contribute to the support of education and would
regulate their purchasing power in relation to supply and demand.
Morrison stressed the need for cultivating the economic intelligence of citizens. He believed that if the schools did a creditable job in economic education that the economic literacy of citizens would provide adequate tax revenue to support basic state functions.

Finally, Morrison saw with keen insight the need for civilian, lay, and public control of broad policy affecting the schools, especially in financial matters. The superintendent was the executive; he was not the "expert," who told the governing board what to do and how to do it. As an adviser, he had to operate on moral persuasion to convince the board of education of the wisdom of his recommendations. In the final analysis, however, the decision belonged rightfully to the board.

Morrison's idea that the state should be both the administrative and fiscal unit in the system of public education spelled the demise of the local system of school organization. In Morrison's view, the local system was an archaic remnant of a past condition in society which no longer existed. In the days when transportation and communication were difficult and almost impossible, the local control of schools was the only possible way to extend the benefits of education to isolated communities. But to retain this method of control in the modern era when transportation and communication are thought of in terms of

37 Henry C. Morrison, "Wanted: Superintendents Who are Executives not Experts," The Nation's Schools, XXXIII (May, 1944) 42.
minutes and hours and not in days or weeks was unwise and unsound.

Morrison based his argument on the differentiation between government locally administered and local self-government. Constitutionally, there were only two forms of sovereignty: state and national. It was possible to administer state and federal functions locally as in the case of the post office and health clinics. But this did not imply that the local citizenry had either the right or the responsibility to establish basic policy in these areas. Local self-government arose only in those areas in which the action of the local citizenry proved beneficial or harmful to themselves alone. If a local unit did not want street lights or a public park, that affected that local unit adversely and no one else. Education, however, was not in that category for two reasons: it was so crucial to the perpetuation of society that society dare not permit it to be controlled by local whims and opinions; and, second, the rapid mobility of citizens within and among the states magnified the baneful effects of inequality in educational opportunity existing within the state.

Morrison saw instances of the local instrumentalities of government gradually disappearing and being replaced by a centralized state system of administration and fiscal control. Nor did this disturb him. Morrison did not see this centralization as inevitably leading into bureaucracy, destruction of civil liberties, or despotism. For him, it
was easier to find a few honest and intelligent men for state positions than a host of honest and intelligent men for local positions. Morrison seemed to imply that the schools could produce a few men for state governmental posts but not enough to go around.

One the one hand, Morrison suggested the schools could "breed into the mores" in one or two generations a high degree of civilized behavior if they would become really effective in their basic task of educating citizens. But he seems to doubt that this will ever come to pass, at least for the great majority of persons. Consequently, the solution was to dissolve the local instrumentalities and utilize state resources and control in the hopes of getting a few intelligent leaders.

Morrison's contribution to the field of external organization of the schools and school system is more in the nature of a potential contribution than an actual one. Many of the present writings in school finance skip lightly over the contributions of Morrison. However, there have been several significant court decisions within the last few years which have drawn attention to the inequities of school finance and the need for a more equitable distribution of funds with the state assuming more of the responsibility and the burden. In the McInnis case which was heard in the State of Illinois in 1969, the court ruled that differences in the quality of education due to inequitable
funding should not be allowed to exist. In the Serrano Case in California in 1971, a legal principle regarding school finance was established, that of "fiscal neutrality," which held that if property wealth is a factor in providing education that it should be based on the "wealth of the state." The way in which money is raised has to be neutral or non-discriminatory.

The Rodriguez Case was originally heard under federal court jurisdiction in Texas in 1971. It was reviewed the following year by the Supreme Court. This case raised essentially the same question as the Serrano Case; do present state systems for supporting public schools conflict with the equal protection clause of the fourteenth Amendment? The decisions in both cases have had the effect of severely challenging the constitutionality of the state systems' method of financing public education.

The court cases cited focused the attention of the states on the method of school finance and a search for viable alternative methods began. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois appointed a committee to develop a revised system of school finance to meet the possible criteria of the courts. Four alternative methods were identified and studied as possible solutions:


1. State-wide Property Tax

2. Power Equalization

3. Full State Funding
   a. Property Tax
   b. Income Tax
   c. Other Taxes

4. School District Reorganization

The thinking of Henry C. Morrison is indeed reflected in the alternatives currently proposed. Morrison was ahead of his times in his thinking in the area of school organization and finance, but behind the times in the publication of his thoughts in the field of finance which did not appear until 1930.

The lack of recognition of Morrison in this field is curious because he, as far back as 1905, had a clear and penetrating outlook on the problems of finance. Nelson Henry makes the point succinctly. He suggests that most authors in the field agree that the present body of school finance developed largely during the twentieth century with the work of Cubberly, Strayer, and Elliot in 1905, and Updegraff's work in 1912. But in 1905, Morrison was deeply concerned with problems of finance. In his first report as State Superintendent of New Hampshire, Henry points out,


Morrison discussed each of the following phases of school finance: sources of school revenue; state and local taxation for school purposes; permanent state school funds; private contributions to the support of public education; insuring the receipt of revenues to which the schools are entitled; territorial units of school support; inequalities in ability and effort; the peculiar problem of school support in rural areas; methods of equalization of educational privileges; state control of local expenditures; economy in financial administration of local school systems; distribution of expenditures for services and materials; salaries, tenure, and retirement allowances for teachers; professional control of financial management; accounting procedure; cooperative purchasing; free textbooks; transportation of pupils; and tuition of non-residents. In addition to this quantitative listing, Morrison also developed some qualitative concepts in finance which have relevance to current economics of education.\footnote{Nelson B. Henry, "Mr. Morrison's Contributions to the Study of School Finance," \textit{Zeta News of Phi Delta Kappa}, XXII (April, 1937), 6-12.} Although Morrison's insights did not directly affect the total field of education, they had a significant impact on New Hampshire as can be observed by the forward position of that state in school organization and state control. Of the three states Morrison cited in 1943 as having reached the final evolutionary development in that the State itself was the "basic unit, comprehensive of all..."
schools in respect to both control and financial support," 44 the State of New Hampshire was a leader among them.

The one strong recommendation that Morrison made which is almost completely rejected today is the suggestion that the state become the basic unit of financial, administrative, executive, legislative, and judicial organization. Some thought is being given to making the state the financial unit of support as was pointed out, but the idea of complete centralization of the school system in the hands of the state has never been seriously entertained. In fact, current thinking tends toward the concept of a greater degree of decentralization as evidenced in the State of New York and in the city of Chicago. That the present system of local control has serious drawbacks, that it is inefficient and ineffective, that it puts the school at the mercy of every locally elected school board, that it compounds inequality of opportunity of children can be demonstrated. That the only method of eliminating these disadvantages is to have the state as the basic unit of school organization and administration can be questioned.

Morrison's great contribution to thought in this area, however, is his distinction between local government and local self-government. Education, for Morrison, because of its essential impact on society, the rapid migration of students from one district and state to another, and the deleterious effect that an ineffective district could have

44Morrison, American Schools, p. 276.
on its neighbors, was not in the category of local self-government. Education could be, however, a function of local government. For Morrison, education was in the realm of local government and he would have it in the realm of state government.

Morrison went so far in his concept of state organization that he would have placed the education, control, assignments to jobs and pay of all the teachers of the Common School under complete state control. He would have forbidden other institutions to train teachers who would teach in the Common School supported by the state. Other institutions could still train supervisors, administrators, special service personnel such as teachers of the handicapped children, but the teacher would be educated at state expense, paid a stipend while in training, and then be assigned wherever he or she was needed. This system would be a cross between the civil service and status comparable to the military forces.

To those who might argue that Morrison's line of thinking could be applied to the removal of education to the national level, Morrison's response would be that education was constitutionally a state concern and not federal. In this area it is interesting to note his ambivalent attitude on federal aid for education. In 1919 he argued in this manner:

The only possible way out [of the financial crises schools faced in 1919], both for adequate support and equality of educational opportunity, is for the state
to bear the whole current cost of operating schools... and further for the federal government to devote a larger proportion of its own revenue from incomes to the equalization of its revenues for school purposes as between the states.45

Yet one war later in 1943, Morrison's position on federal intervention in education was reversed and his argument ran as follows:

... If equalization of school revenue is all there is in the picture, then the only equalization that has ever worked, namely, consolidation, is good argument for the consolidation of the whole function of public instruction in the federal government. But that is to bring the whole argument into reductio ad absurdum. Step by step, as the administrative powers and duties belonging to municipalities or to the 48 states have been filched away, by equal pace we have lost the art of self-government.... It is rooted in our schools that this field the federal government shall not enter. When the federal government enters, it abandons democracy and cultivates totalitarianism.46

Thus, Morrison wanted centralization and consolidation only up to a certain level. That level was the state level. Beyond that, he feared, democracy was abandoned, powers were taken away, and the art of self-government was lost.

Complete state control of the educational system in this country has never been an acceptable procedure to most Americans. Within the space of a century, we have seen how Bismarck and Hitler controlled the education of Germany and how Stalin and Khrushchev controlled the schools of the U.S.S.R.

45Henry C. Morrison, "Taxation, Teachers' Salaries and Cost of Education," The Elementary School Journal, XX (September, 1919) 56.

depriving citizens of basic freedoms instead of using the educational systems to enhance and promote freedom. There is a fine line between a state controlling education for democratic means and a state controlling education for totalitarian purposes. Morrison would have abhorred the perverted use of the schools in both Germany and Russia. His own thinking was so conditioned by the necessity of an intelligent citizenry for the perpetuation of society that he failed to provide adequately for sufficient safeguards to guarantee that the schools would not be perverted in their purpose into non-democratic ways of behavior. His failure to provide safeguards rested ultimately on his faith in the power of education to produce an educated man, a true citizen who was capable of sublimating his egoistic desires into altruistic goals and responses.

Morrison's stress on state domination probably accounts for some of the reasons why his contributions to the external organization and administration of the schools and the school system are more potential than actual. Far too often people look at the final conclusions which a man draws without making the effort of proceeding with the author in the development of his argument. Educators and administrators will find much of value in Morrison's basic argument, even though they may disagree with his conclusions.

Morrison sought to answer the question, "What is the content of education?" He set this as one of his major tasks and in 1940 this task was completed with the publication
of his third major work, *The Curriculum of the Common School: From the Beginning of the Primary School to the End of Junior College*. In the Preface of this work, Morrison stated:

This volume [*The Curriculum of the Common School*] is a development of an argument in instruction and education which first appeared some fifteen years ago in my *Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School*. It is in method a sequel to *Basic Principles in Education*... That work adheres to the doctrine that the scientific approach to all educational and instructional problems is to be found in a factually defensible theory of what education is. ...

Following a similar method in the present work, and passing on from the chapters dealing with Personality in *Basic Principles*, it is here sought to find a defensible answer to the question, "What then must the Content of General Education be?", or, in other words, "What must be the valid Curriculum of the Common School?" 47

Education, for Morrison, was the end product and the result of learning by the individual out of his experience in life. The experience a person had determined the personality, but the "result of experience in the world was... in principle as likely to produce the worst of criminals as the best of citizens." 48 The social process by which the community sought to guarantee that the education of the rising generation shall be right education was through instruction, which was carried on in the schools, and upbringing, which was carried on in the family. The instruction, which was to be carried on in the schools and which was to guarantee right education, was to develop from the Curriculum of the

48Ibid., p. 3.
Common School. This curriculum was to consist of an enumeration and study of the basic universal institutions of society. Thus, Morrison's task as he conceived it, was to identify, validate, and enumerate these basic universal institutions. He recognized the task as arduous but not impossible.

The curriculum, for Morrison, was "necessarily determinate." And on the completion of his major task of identifying the content of general education in 1940, Morrison had determined what he considered to be the valid and universal curriculum which contained the basic learnings of the Common School. The curriculum was "determined" on the basis of the universal institutions which had evolved in society. Morrison did not believe that this listing would last forever since society was still in the process of evolving but these were the basic institutions which had evolved up to date.

Morrison proposed twelve basic institutions which would form the content of the curriculum: language, mathematics, graphics, science, religion, morality and moral institutions, art, the state and civil institutions, civil government, commerce, industry, and health. These institutions consisted of popular usages and beliefs that had become organized, refined, and expanded in the course of social evolution. If one had a basic understanding of these twelve institutions, one was well equipped to adapt to the modern world and to

49Morrison, Basic Principles, p. 49.
pass on this heritage of civilized behavior to the next generation.

The content of the curriculum, as Morrison conceived of it, has had little effect on the educational world in his time or in ours. In his listing of curricular content he had come up with nothing new. He pointed this out himself before those who might review his book could. He stated in the Preface:

Now that the work is done, so far from proving anything of the sort [that an entirely new kind of curriculum is essential or that the general education of the masses is an impossibility] I have come out as a result in terms of courses to be taught which reveals that there is little or nothing contained in the work but has been taught somewhere, in some form, at some time, short of the junior year in college. 50

There is a silence in the current literature on curriculum in regard to Morrison's conception of the curriculum. This is probably due to the fact that some of the current writers in curriculum theory shy away from his notion of a universal and perennial curriculum, mainly because they do not accept his definition of the term "curriculum." Morrison's definition of curriculum is as follows:

Curriculum is in its nature constant and universal. It is in substance an outline of the fabric of civilization, as the latter subsists in its universal and major institutions. 51

As Morrison developed his curriculum, which he referred to as a study of the system of popular usages and beliefs that

50 Morrison, Curriculum, p. viii.

51 Ibid., p. 187.
have become organized in the course of social evolution into institutions, it is difficult to argue the Morrison's twelve basic institutions are not universal. It was the programming of the curriculum that was contingent. Each society developed its own individual content of the basic institutions. Each society determined the specific way in which each institution achieved its goal in that society.

Moehlman suggested another reason for the absence of comment on Morrison in the current literature in this field. He asserted:

Since it is the psychology of the teaching profession, particularly in administration, to center its praise and adulation on the activist rather than on the retired specialist, his [Morrison's] recent works, in terms of circulation, did not receive the same attention as did his earlier books.52

Morrison, as few others have done in the field of curriculum, grounded his study of the curriculum in the very basis of society. That which was essential for the perpetuation of society had to be studied in the schools. Not that the needs of the individual could or would be ignored but, for Morrison, the individual prospered only insofar as society prospered.

The significant effect on society through the study of the basic institutions can be observed in Morrison's stress on the social studies. Morrison was deeply concerned

52 Moehlman, "Morrison: Master Teacher" 19.
by the lack of competence shown by the average graduate in the field of social studies. A large portion of his book on Curriculum is devoted to an analysis of the state and civil institutions, politics, commerce, and industry. He considered these sections to be "the most important part of the book and the most imperatively needed in the instruction of our young people." Morrison's complaints that the average citizen is economically, politically, and geographically illiterate, that our voting record in local, state, and national elections is poor, and that the average citizen is still very ignorant of the responsibilities of citizenship is echoed today in our newspapers, magazines and on radio and television reports.

Today many educators, city officials, and law enforcement agencies merely bemoan the lack of civic responsibility and civic virtue in the graduates of the public school system. Morrison, over thirty years ago, devoted half of his book on Curriculum to an analysis of the basic content of the social studies. He recommended units of study on the state as a civil institution, the nature of law, taxation, supply and demand, the exchange system in economics, pricing policies and production, banking, insurance, stocks, and labor relations. All these areas still form the basic knowledge required of good citizens, but they are areas sadly neglected in the curriculum of the schools today. Three decades ago Morrison saw the need for increased emphasis in the social
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studies. His analysis of the basic content in the area is still valid and would furnish a broad field of study which might shed light on the current concerns of educators and officials regarding the causes of existing deficiencies in civic responsibility and civic virtue in our current social situation.

Unlike the limited impact Morrison had on the content of the curriculum, his analysis of the organization of the curriculum had a significant impact. The curriculum, as developed by Morrison, was "a body of learnings which are presumed to constitute the content of right education." And further defined by Morrison, "...It [the curriculum] is in substance an outline of the fabric of civilization as the latter subsists in its universal and major institutions."

A "universal institution" was too broad a concept to be adequately developed within the curriculum. The content of the institution had to be broken down into manageable and significant parts within the grasp of the individual student. So Morrison utilized the term "unit" to signify this manageable portion. A unit, then, would be "a comprehensive and significant aspect of the environment [cultural or natural], of an organized science, of an art, or of conduct, which being learned results in an adaptation in personality."
In Morrison's analysis of the curriculum, he differentiated between the curriculum and the program of studies. The curriculum was constant, universal and natural. The program of studies was "the structural organization intended primarily to make it possible to administer a curriculum." Morrison expanded on this definition later when he said that a program of studies is "a list of courses properly organized in learning units, intended to be pursued by pupils, and presumed to be the best method of attaining the objectives set up by the curriculum."  

In the program of studies, the most important element was the unit. A serviceable learning unit for Morrison was, as previously stated, a comprehensive and significant aspect of the environment, of science, of art, or of conduct, the learning of which results in an adaptation to personality. This method of organization by units, or unit learnings came to be known as the Morrison Method. Gradually, the term "Morrison Method" was applied not only to the method of organization by units but also to the method of teaching units. Morrison's "Five Steps" in the teaching cycle which he developed for the science-type learning also came to be known as the "Morrison Method."

57 Morrison, School and Commonwealth, p. 68.
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So great was Morrison's influence in the organization of the unit, that one author took pains to point out that Morrison did not create the notion of unit learning.\textsuperscript{59} That he popularized it there can be no doubt. Wesley and Wronski state: "He [Morrison] started the unit on its road to popularity in the elementary as well as the high school."\textsuperscript{60} Gwynn suggests that "during the last half-century probably the greatest single effect on the method and technique of teaching was produced by H.C. Morrison's book, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School. The "Morrison" or "unit" method of teaching is generally known and widely used - at least in name."\textsuperscript{61} Quillen and Hanna state: "Although unit organization is based upon the ideas of Herbart, Charles A. McMurry, Dewey, and their followers, the impetus to the current interest in units undoubtedly came from Morrison."\textsuperscript{62} Burton credits Morrison with contributing the first "stream of thought" concerning the unit which accounts for its current high status as a method of organizing subject matter.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{59}Roy O. Billet, "Plans Characterized by Unit Assignment," \textit{The School Review}, XL (November, 1932) 656.


The unit method was especially popular in the fields of science and social studies. Reavis, who was principal of the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago when Morrison was Superintendent observed:

One of the most striking bits of evidence on his influence is found in the organization of textbooks in science. Prior to 1918 there was not a single book in secondary-school science organized on the basis of comprehensive teaching units. Since 1926, the date of the publication of his book setting forth the unit conception of curriculum materials, 90 per cent of the texts have adopted this plan of organization, many acknowledging their debts to Professor Morrison.64

Bayles made the following comment:

If one should assume that the trend of recent articles on the organization of subject matter is indicative of the trend of progressive thought, one is likely to conclude that the lesson which Morrison has attempted to teach with regard to learning units has been fairly well received.65

Thus it can be concluded that Morrison's unit method of organization had an immediate and far reaching effect on education in his day and for years to come.

Morrison's argument that an analysis of the basic institutions of society are valid subjects of study for the general education of students to the point of educational maturity or the beginning of university work appears to be fundamentally sound. His enumeration of the institutions into twelve categories is broad enough to cover practically all subject matter. Subject matter is included or excluded on the basis of its contribution to adjustment to society.64

64 William Reavis, "The Contributions of Professor Morrison to the Improvement of Instruction," Zeta News of Phi Delta Kappa, XXII (April, 1937) 7.

65 Bayles, "Limitations of the Morrison Unit," 203.
That the curriculum which Morrison proposed on the basis of the analysis of society turned out to be essentially the same as what was being taught in the secondary schools of his day does not affirm or destroy the validity of his proposals. It merely indicates that he arrived at similar conclusions in regard to the curriculum by approaching it from a different perspective. Morrison said:

The medieval Trivium and Quadrivium was a curriculum, while our eight grades, plus fifteen Carnegie units, plus one hundred and twenty semester hours constitutes a program - a very poor one to be sure, but still a program.\(^{66}\)

Morrison went on to assert:

The curriculum of general education must in principle be an undifferentiated curriculum and the administrative program a common school program. . . . Further, there will never be a true American university until this problem of general education is understood and formulated in concrete administrative terms.\(^{67}\)

In these days of discontent and unrest in educational circles as well as in society as a whole, the sound, sane and substantial writings of Henry C. Morrison might provide a new perspective for educators, curriculum builders, and curriculum implementers in their search for answers to the vexing educational problems of the day, even though they might arrive at different conclusions.

Harry A. Brown made a predictive statement in 1945 which present day educators might consider:

\(^{66}\)Morrison, *School and Commonwealth*, p. 68.

\(^{67}\)Ibid., p. 72.
The idea by which Morrison is best known is probably his principle of unit learning. His institutional conception of the school and the curriculum of general education, together with his learning unit, are ideas that are capable of making a significant transformation in the theory and practice of teaching when properly understood in terms of his own conceptions.

The process of teaching was one aspect of the field of education which was of primary and lasting interest to Morrison throughout his life. It is in this area that he made his most significant contributions. For Morrison, "Education is the development in the individual by the process of learning as distinguished from physical growth. It is the means by which civilization is transmitted from one generation to another." All the things an individual learns can contribute to the development of personality. "Learning is becoming, and...the product [that which has been learned] is a new birth in the individual, a changed point of view, a new taste or set of values, a new inward ability," an accretion to personality. Every step in the development process is a learning product. When the learning products are acquired from the parents or immediate family, Morrison referred to the family's action as upbringing. However, the "process through which education is brought under positive and systematic control and guidance [by the formal school] is instruction." The formal school furthers the
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instructional process by teaching. And Morrison defines teaching as "that intimate contact between a more mature personality and a less mature which is designed to further the education of the latter in a situation where the more mature person feels a responsibility for seeing that the less mature learns."\textsuperscript{72} The body of principles which describe and explain the teaching process is known as "didactics."\textsuperscript{73} The object of teaching is the pupil who is a member of the school under formal discipline. The pupil becomes involved and submits willingly to constraint by the teacher "in the interest not only of the group but of the self-respect and happiness of individuals within the group as well."\textsuperscript{74} The body of learnings "which are presumed to constitute the content of right education"\textsuperscript{75} and which, if learned, will produce the educated man "who will know what to do instead of having to be told what to do"\textsuperscript{76} is called the curriculum.

These basic definitions constitute the core of Morrison's thinking about the educational process. On these definitions and their implications, he built his theory of curriculum and his theory of teaching which together constitute his theory of instruction, the rationale for the

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid., pp. 41-42.
\textsuperscript{73}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., p. 45.
\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., p. 48.
\textsuperscript{76}Ibid., p. 33.
process by which education is brought under positive and systematic control and guidance by the formal school.

The main contributions which Morrison has made to a theory of instruction would include the development of an effective teaching plan, the mastery concept, and his organization of the unit of subject matter. At a time in our history when high school enrollments were doubling every decade and thousands of unqualified teachers were "holding school", Morrison presented them with a workable teaching plan which, if followed, had great potential for improving the quality of teaching.

Morrison's concept of mastery of the learning product emphasized the point that not mere understanding was important, but also behavior which exhibited that understanding. Unless a person could exhibit behavior which indicated that he had acquired the basic understandings, skills, and abilities, he had not mastered the learning product. He was not educated.

Morrison's organization of the unit of subject matter with the characteristics of comprehensiveness and significance will survive as long as subject matter is organized. Morrison did not create the unit idea but he did popularize it to a significant extent.

In the area of teaching and method Morrison also had a significant impact. Once Morrison had determined the content of the Curriculum of the Common School, he analyzed
the content of these basic learnings and discovered they could be classified into five types; the science, the appreciation, the practical arts, the language arts, and the pure practice type. In regard to this classification Morrison said:

We can, however, group all the subjects taught in the field of general education...into five different types, which characteristically differ among themselves in the nature of their objectives and in the nature of the learning process.??

Each of the five types, he argued, must be taught differently. Morrison felt that the basic cause of non-mastery was due to the attempt to utilize the wrong technique for a given type of learning. Some learning types like science, are more useful in developing attitudes of understanding in the pupil. Other types, like art or literature are suitable for developing attitudes of appreciation. Practical arts types are geared to the development of abilities to intelligently manipulate tools and materials. The pure practice type, like grammar, develops skills.

In the science type where the learning process was essentially "reflection upon experience in search of meaning," Morrison developed a unit method of teaching which came to be known as the "Morrison Method" or the "Unit Method." The unit method of teaching which Morrison developed consisted of five steps. These five steps were: exploration,??

77Morrison, Practice of Teaching, p. 92.
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presentation, assimilation, organization, and recitation. Many authors and critics of Morrison have overlooked the fact that the five steps were the method of teaching of only one of the five types of subject matter, the science type, and did not apply to the other types. But so popular did the five step unit method of teaching become that the other methods of teaching are often neglected. In justice to the critics position, two facts should be stated. The science type subjects, according to Morrison, comprised the greater part of the content of the curriculum. And further, Morrison does not clearly spell out and discuss the methods to be employed in the other subject matter types. He said:

We have devoted a great deal of space to the science type, more than will fall to the lot of any other, and the fact has a certain significance. In the first place, many of the principles set forth will find a place in the succeeding types. But more than that, the subject matter which falls under this [the science] type constitutes the greater part of that adjustment of the individual to environment which is education.79

Morrison also devised a system of teaching which could be utilized regardless of the subject matter type or the objectives of the curriculum the subject matter was to attain. This system of teaching came to be known as the "mastery formula." In essence, this formula was: "pre-test, teach, test the results, adapt procedure, teach and test again to the point of actual learning."80 In Morrison's

79 Ibid., pp. 315-316.
80 Ibid., p. 81.
view, this was the only way one could be sure that an adaptive response which a pupil made would become an adaptive change, an accretion to personality, a true learning product. Morrison was vitally interested in understandings and subsequent behavior which exemplified these understandings. He was not interested in passing grades, probability curves, or intelligence ratings. He wanted actual learning products not a facade.

In the area of teaching Morrison made a number of significant contributions. One of these contributions is the notion that method is inherent in content. By an analysis of the organization of the discipline and the purposes for which the resulting knowledge is to be used, one can develop a method by which that particular subject can best be taught to pupils. Morrison was aware that one also had to analyze the nature of the learning process and the demands of the society in which the child lived in the development of method. However, his approach through the organization of a discipline was one source of methodology which had long been overlooked.

Morrison did not believe there was such a thing as a generalized method of teaching all subjects. He did identify certain basic learning principles common to all types of learning, whether the learning be a change in attitudes of appreciation or understanding, the acquisition of abilities, or the attainment of a skill. However, for
Morrison, these similarities were far less important than the learning principles that differentiated the type of learning.

It is of interest to note that recently attention is being redirected to the notion of the characteristics of specific subject matter, how knowledge is constantly being reorganized and reconstituted, and what implications this reorganization has for the method of learning the subject matter and the method of teaching it. Bruner discusses the need for the recognition of the basic principles inherent in a discipline. The long range objective of the course content improvement programs of the National Science Foundation is geared to bring about a major reconstruction and modernization of the course content and methodology in the fields of mathematics and science. There has been a renewed interest in the nature of the organization of subject matter. To link Morrison to this renewed interest would be extremely tenuous. It is maintained, however, that Morrison's work in this area might help us to understand the differentiating characteristics of subject matter today and thus aid in utilizing the most effective means of teaching a specific subject.

When any method of teaching becomes as popular as

82 National Science Foundation, "The Role of the National Science Foundation in Course Content Improvement in Secondary Schools," The School Review, LXX (Spring, 1962) 2.
Morrison's method, it is natural that criticisms by his fellow educators would be forthcoming. The major criticism of Morrison's unit method of teaching can be summarized in four broad categories:

1. The unit method of teaching was non-reflective, complicated, formal, and rigid.

2. The unit method of teaching placed an inordinate amount of emphasis on the teacher and the subject matter and insufficient stress on the needs and interests of the children.

3. The unit method of teaching did not take into sufficient consideration the whole problem of motivation.

4. The unit method of teaching was based on the old stimulus-response psychology.

In regard to the criticisms directed at Morrison's theory of teaching, the only criticism that is valid is that which identifies the lack of depth in Morrison's analysis of student motivation. Morrison speaks of the inevitable clash between the innate trait of curiosity and organic adaptive inertia. He refers to the volitional development of the child being so well achieved that "motivation is provided for by superior pedagogical organization" without the pupil being aware of the process. But nowhere does he describe the process in detail nor does he describe the basic sources from which he derives his ideas. Morrison makes reference to motivation on three pages in *The Practice of Teaching*, and in *Basic Principles* he does not discuss the
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specific area of motivation at all. Thus, the area of motivation is one which is subject to the criticisms which were directed to it.

Other criticisms of Morrison's method can be explained, if not completely defended. If the unit method of teaching was non-reflective, complicated, rigid, and formal, it was so because of the incompetency of the teacher utilizing the method in Morrison's view.

The criticism directed toward the non-reflective aspect of the method, and the absence of the development of problem solving abilities does not stand up under analysis. Morrison dealt with the objectives of problem solving in The Practice of Teaching. The solving of problems, he says, "should be devised for the purpose of developing the unit of understanding intended and not for the purpose of training pupils in problem-solving." 85 Morrison objected to the development of an abstract power such as implied by the phrase "problem solving ability." He states further: "Problem solving is essentially and fundamentally reflective thinking, and, conversely, reflective thinking is problem solving." 86 In Morrison's view, once we have added the adaptation of reflective thinking to the child's repertoire, we have given

85 Ibid., p. 248.
86 Ibid., p. 251.
him "an additional tool for use in his reflective process." Thus, problem solving and reflective thinking, synonymous terms for Morrison, were definitively included in his unit method of teaching although differently conceived than by his critics, especially Bayles. 88

That the unit method of teaching placed a great stress on the role of the teacher and the role of the subject matter may be admitted but it does not follow that the needs and interests of the learner were neglected. Morrison conceived of the teacher as being a more mature, enlightened, intelligent individual. He suggested that a teacher was a more mature person in contact with less mature individuals for the purpose of seeing that the less mature learns. 89 Nor did he want the students grappling with problems that were beyond them in terms of experience and previous learnings. Therefore, it was the teacher who knew, or at least was expected to know, what basic principles and understandings the pupils must acquire if they were to adjust in society. An immature person could not be expected to know this. Education at the level of the basic curriculum and even the program of studies, for Morrison, was not a matter of
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choice but of necessity. The learnings which a child had to master to adjust to society was not a matter to be decided upon by either pupil or teacher. The Curriculum of the Common School as Morrison conceived it was "necessarily determinate." 90

One additional point needs to be discussed in regard to the role of the teacher. In the primary school, the teachers organized, directed, and controlled the pupil's learning. In the university, the student was expected to be able to organize his own learning, utilizing the teacher in the same manner as the students would use the library, as a resource. It was the task of the secondary school to develop in the student the abilities required to make the transition from dependence in learning to self-dependence in the pursuit of further learning. Thus, while Morrison placed great stress on the role of the teacher, he reduced the significance of this role as the pupil went through school and into the university, as he moved from educational immaturity to the desired goal of educational maturity. The needs and interests of the child were not ignored, because Morrison never allowed the teacher to forget that the child was the object of his teaching effort and the teacher was a successful teacher only if the child could eventually direct and control his own learning. Only then could he be well adjusted in society.

90Ibid., p. 49.
The criticism that Morrison's unit method of teaching was based solely on stimulus-response psychology is probably the result of Morrison's designation of the learning cycle consisting of stimulus, assimilation, and reaction. In *Basic Principles of Education*, Morrison rejected the notion that learning could be explained on the basis of tropism, chain reflex, conditioned response, association or bonding, or trial and error alone. In regard to conditioned responses he said:

So far from education being a matter of organized conditioned responses, it is exactly the opposite. If any such thing were possible—and we may thank Heaven it is not—the result would be personal nullity, an individual controlled by inescapable preorganized behavior. Just the contrary, one of the objectives of sound upbringing and instruction is to forestall and prevent the conditioning process.

Morrison's whole conception of the development of personality is in conflict with pure stimulus-response. Stimulus-response, for Morrison, was just one of many ways learning could take place.

Within the field of instruction and teaching, two further elements in the realm of Morrison's contributions should be assessed: the educability of pupils and the individualization of instruction.

Perhaps no man in educational history had a deeper commitment to the educability of children than Henry C. Morrison. He recognized that some children had organic
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deficiencies that precluded any learning but this group was very small. He also recognized that a significant number of children did not learn as effectively or efficiently as they could. This, he felt, was not due to their non-educability but was due to either poor teaching or an arid environmental background, both of which could be remedied. His insistence that extensive records be kept on each child and that numerous teachers be employed to assist in the corrective and remedial cases bear testimony to the fact that Morrison had this deep feeling that the great majority of all children were educable, at least up through general education. For him, the burden of proof lay on those who held that only a few children were educable. Until these people came up with better evidence, Morrison was committed to the educability of all children.

Morrison demonstrated his concern for the individual in a variety of ways. The unit method itself and the manner in which it was taught was considered to be a method of individualizing instruction. All children were not limited to working on the same unit at the same time. If any child demonstrated mastery of the principles described in the presentation, he was either excused from that unit or could work on that unit in greater depth. It was not unusual for the great majority of students within one class to be working on different projects. During the period of assimilation, pupils all worked at their own speed.
At the Laboratory Schools, Morrison inaugurated free library reading for the pupils and employed a host of specialized personnel to assist in studying the individual pupils so that there would be a minimum of corrective and remedial cases of non-learning. He added librarians, visiting teachers, remedial teachers in subjects other than reading, doctors, clinicians, and social workers. Any child with a learning difficulty was carefully studied and detailed case studies were developed to help the individual. Finally, his position on the educability of children reveals his concern for each and every child.

The contributions which Morrison actually made in the area of the educability of children and its corollary of individualizing instruction are few indeed as determined by references to his work in the literature in this area. It is surprising that people in educational guidance have not paid more attention to the way in which he organized the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago for guidance purposes, which he referred to as administrative technique.\(^9^3\) His classification of problem cases into corrective cases, "when the difficulty is not such as to make necessary segregation from the group,"\(^9^4\) and remedial cases, "when the difficulty does not respond to corrective measures within the class group"\(^9^5\) is still widely used in the diagnosis of

\(^9^3\)Morrison, Practice of Teaching, pp. 636-666.
\(^9^4\)Ibid., p. 88.
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reading handicaps. On the whole, Morrison's classification of problem cases had limited impact, at least insofar as one can tell from references in guidance literature.

In the area of individualized instruction, the "Morrison Plan" is discussed in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research in the 1950 edition in some detail, being listed under the heading of individual differences. The same pattern is followed in the 1960 edition where the "Morrison Plan" is discussed as the "best known" plan of individualizing instruction. And yet this aspect of his work is not included in other educational literature beyond the year 1940. As Moehlman said, the field of education tends to lose sight of the retired specialist.

In the event that attention were redirected to Morrison's basic approach to instruction, what contributions might his principles and recommended practices make to the field of education today? There are four main areas in which Morrison's ideas might have current relevance in the field of education.

Morrison stressed the fact that the nature or organization of a discipline might have relevance for the method of teaching. He did not ignore the contributions which the nature of the learning process or the demands of society would have for method. He did suggest that an analysis of the subject matter content and an analysis of the purpose for which that subject matter is taught might furnish valuable clues for evolving methods of teaching which might enable the teaching of the subject matter to be done more
effectively and economically. Redirection of current educational thought to Morrison's analysis in this way might yield insights which would be applicable to current practices of teaching, which are yielding questionable results as evidenced by public protest and concern.

Morrison's stress on the educability of the overwhelming majority of children has relevance today when there is an emphasis on utilizing the intellectual manpower of all Americans and on providing education for all children in light of and in spite of so-called disadvantage; cultural, social, economic, and experiential. A positive approach to the problem might result in a more objective assessment of needs and more constructive recommendations in the area of program planning and remediation.

Morrison's insistence on, and demonstration of, the fact that the individualization of instruction could be effectively carried out in the classroom bears closer analysis for possible adaptation or adoption by schools. This fact is timely in light of the current trend and innovative practices designed to individualize instruction which are emerging on the educational scene such as the Open Classroom, Individually Guided Instruction and the Continuous Progress Program.

Morrison's approach to the way in which children with learning difficulties can be helped has implications for assisting schools in reaching all children especially those who learn with great difficulty. The field of learning
disabilities is in its developmental period in both theory and practice in education in the seventies. An analysis of Morrison's established and scientific practice in this field might be a source of valuable insights for future planning and implementation in meeting the special needs of these children.

The attempt of this study to assess the contributions of Henry C. Morrison to the broad spectrum of the field of education with which he was intimately involved for half a century clearly demonstrates two facts. First, that Henry Clinton Morrison made significant contributions to the field of education as a practitioner rather than as a theorist during his long and productive career. And, second, the works of the man in education do not live on too long after he retires from active participation in the educational arena. Due to the continuing changes in society and the pressing demands for education to meet emerging needs, educational innovations appear and tend to replace the tried and true methods of the past in the rush to meet the needs of the moment. A review and reconsideration of the educational ideas and insights of men such as Henry Clinton Morrison reveals that what we, who are currently involved in the field of education, think of as innovative and modern, generally has its counterpart firmly rooted in educational history.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Each era in our history has been confronted by problems which have been peculiar to that era in some respects and yet have had aspects which were timeless. Questions and challenges facing educators in Morrison's day are still facing educators today. Several of these unresolved questions are:

1. What is education?
2. What is the nature of the learning process?
3. What contribution can learning theory, administrative organization and structure, curriculum theory, and methods make in providing equal educational opportunity for all children?
4. Are all children educable to the same degree?
5. Is there a difference between education and schooling?
6. Are there valid distinctions between primary, secondary, and higher education?
7. How can the educational system be organized and articulated as a continuous one from nursery school through the university?
8. What is the role of state supported education in a democratic society?
9. How does one reconcile state responsibility for education with local control?
10. Finally, is there a scientific basis on which we can build our solutions to educational problems so that these problems will not keep recurring from generation to generation in almost the same form?

Morrison's professional life was spent in seeking
answers to these burning questions which he felt affected education and society; past, present, and future. His search for answers to these socio-educational problems prompted his continuous research and experimentation which culminated in the publication of his four major works and numerous other writings. These works contained Morrison's responses to the major socio-educational questions of his day on which he placed his hopes for the future; the future of education, society, and civilization.

Morrison's responses in his major writings were developed in reverse order, moving from the practical to the theoretical. His first book, *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School* was a practical exposition of methods of teaching in the secondary school. This work was a resounding success and received both national and international acclaim. According to Moehlman:

> During his nine years as head of the laboratory schools, Mr. Morrison developed and published *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School*. This book, revised and republished in 1931, was probably the most widely read of his numerous publications. It also had considerable vogue in England.¹

In fact, according to Morrison, *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School* had been developing in his mind for a much longer period of time than nine years as Moehlman stated. Morrison said:

> The volume *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School* is the product of a study of teaching as it is

found in schools and in undergraduate colleges, and of the literature bearing upon the subject, extending over a period of about twenty-five years.  

According to Harry Brown, "Dr. Morrison's most popular book has been his Practice of Teaching."  

Morrison's initial impact on the educational public was as that of a practitioner and not a theoretician. Consequently, his succeeding works which presented the theoretical bases of education, of curriculum, and of the organizational structure of the school system as he conceived them, did not receive the same degree of critical acclaim and response as his initial publication.

At the University of Chicago, Morrison taught, wrote, and lectured extensively for eighteen years until in 1937 he reached retirement age and became professor emeritus. During those years he wrote several books subsequent to The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School. These were: School Revenue in 1930; The Management of School Money in 1932; The Evolving Common School in 1933; Basic Principles in Education in 1934; The Curriculum of the Common School in 1940; and American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System in 1943. According to Moehlman:

His last work, American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System appeared in 1943. A number

---


3 Harry A. Brown, "Henry C. Morrison and His Contributions to American Education," School and Society, LXI (June, 1945) 382.
of educationists consider this book to be his most important contribution. 4

However, due to social, economic, political, and philosophical problems which were pressing in the 1930's and 1940's, Morrison's later works were of lesser impact on the educational public than his first.

Morrison, himself, recognized the lack of a logical exposition of his theories which resulted from the chronological appearance of his publications. In the Preface to his final work Morrison concluded:

Three volumes have preceded the present publication. The four are, in logical order although not in order of appearance, Basic Principles in Education, The Curriculum of the Common School, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, and American Schools: A Critical Study of Our School System. 5

Morrison's responses to the questions which served as stimuli in his professional life were the result of his varied educational activities and responsibilities at that time. His primary concern was to meet the existing needs in the most efficient and effective way, always with the intention of improving the instructional program. He decried the dreadful waste of the educational potential of children who were exposed to inefficient and ineffective teaching-learning situations. Being a practical man he dealt with first things first. However, in their totality and their logical development, Morrison's major writings did provide, for him, the


answers to those questions posed previously: What is education? What is the content of education? How is this content organized and taught? How is this whole process organized?

Morrison concluded that "every step in the development process for which we use the term education is a piece of learning, or a learning product, and the learning process is the change in personality which constitutes a new insight, or sense of value, or ability." Every learning product was an accretion to personality, made possible by virtue of the fact that man had both a physical and a psychical aspect. All learning had to be in the direction of "right" learning, learning which contributed to the better adjustment of the individual to society. Our schools had to be so organized and the curriculum so taught that all, or practically all, children would be given equal opportunity for adjustment. All children had to adjust because they lived in a common world with common problems of adjustment. There were distinctions between primary, secondary, and university training. The primary and the secondary phase constituted the Common School which was a continuous school that must lead to educational maturity, at which point the individual was ready for university work or his life's work. The Common Curriculum based on the basic universal institutions was to be taught in the Common

School. Knowledge of the basic universal institutions was essential to the perpetuation of society. Since the common curriculum was so crucial to the Common School and to society, the state should organize, control, and completely finance the Common School to guarantee effective citizenship. Local control was an archaic method of organizing schools and the sooner the state fulfilled its constitutional responsibilities and organized the state on the basis of one school district the better. If the schools did an effective job of developing citizenship, there would be sufficient money in the state to fully finance all the educational costs of the Common School. And finally, Morrison believed that there was a scientific basis on which to build solutions to recurring problems in education based upon the result of his continuous research and evidenced by the development and exposition of his theories.

These were Morrison's answers to some of the basic problems in education. We would do well today to reflect on some of Morrison's ideas and insights because these problems are with us yet. The problems, still present today in a new social setting are magnified by current social, economic, and political forces. They might be summarized by considering several pertinent questions.

The questions to be posed for current consideration would deal with the purpose of education, curriculum, methods of teaching, and the organization, control, and financing of the schools. With regard to education, one might ask what
is it, why is it necessary, and when shall it begin and end. In the area of curriculum the questions might focus on the concept of relevance, relevant to what and to whom. Consideration of methods of teaching raises the question whether methods should be systematic, spontaneous, or laissez-faire. An analysis of the patterns of school system organization leads to questions relating to the need and value of structure and articulation. The area of school control is replete with unanswered concerns regarding centralization, decentralization, and community involvement or community control. The final question of school finance is one which is in the minds of educators, politicians, and the general public. Realistic answers to the who, how, why, and when questions of school finance are currently being sought at all levels of government and society.

Insights can come from a variety of sources. There are many ways of knowing. One way is to take advantage of the contemplation given those problems by men of past eras and to use their ideas, if promising, as material for developing current solutions. "By presenting the theories and ideas of Henry Clinton Morrison it is hoped that this study has made a contribution to our understanding of the similarity of problems facing education in different eras, and of the value of looking into the past to review the origins of our current educational "innovations," in our search for solutions to our present problems."
It has been pointed out earlier that a man's activities in his life are the result of the kind of man he has become, the social setting in which he has lived, and the task in life he has set out to do. These three components formed the fabric and basic pattern of the professional life of Henry Clinton Morrison. Here was a rugged New England man with a religious background, brought up in the rough lumber town of Oldtown, Maine, seeing there the breakdown of a society in which there were not enough virtuous, law abiding citizens. His concept of the role the school could and should play in alleviating this condition began to develop. While at college, he was impressed by James Fairbanks Colby in whose classroom he came to see the "a good American was not a product of racial inheritance but a moral and intellectual development."\(^7\) As city superintendent of schools, he developed an idea that was to serve as the basis of his philosophy and practice throughout his life. According to Morrison, "That idea was and always has been the notion that character and intelligence broadly diffused amongst the population is the only possible basis for the welfare of people in society, and that the only instrument useful for that end is universal education of the rising generation."\(^8\)

That notion was the very basis of the American Commonwealth. Several years of study and analysis brought him to a further idea. He wrote:


And so in the great matter of the instruction of each new generation, we can give our minds to the organi-
ization of the school system, to management and admini-
stration, to the shaping of the curriculum, to teaching... and we shall have learned little unless and until we have mastered a valid theory of education itself founded on demonstrated scientific principle. 9

It was to the attainment of these ideas that Morrison dedicated his life.

As one reviews the ideas of Henry C. Morrison, it is apparent that he was not just a man of his own times. He was behind his times, of his time and ahead of his time as he developed and proposed his educational ideas and recommenda-
tions. He was behind his times when he called for adjustment to a society in the 1930's to which few people had any desire to adjust. The United States was in the throes of a severe economic depression with far reaching social and political ramifications at all levels of society. Roosevelt's characterization of our country as one in which one-third of the nation was ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed was accepted as fact. Reform and revolt were in the air in all areas of life, political, economic, social, and educational. Change and reconstruction was the dominant theme of these dismal days. Adjustment to the society of the 1930's was neither appealing, popular nor desired by the American public. Morrison was a product of his times when he was attempting to improve and enhance the status and responsibility of the educational administrator at a time when that position was in its infancy and was held in low

9Morrison, Basic Principles, p.6.
esteem. He was timely when he presented a theory of teaching which, if followed, would be of significant benefit to thousands of teachers who had been pressed into service, not adequately prepared, to meet the needs of the expanding high school enrollments after the turn of the century. Morrison was ahead of his time in calling for the control, direction, and complete financing of education by the individual states. That the schools do need a greater amount of finances and a broader source of revenue to accomplish their educational goals is a well accepted fact in our society today; it was not in Morrison's day. That this additional revenue will come totally from the state is questionable. However, recent trends do indicate that some of the states are gradually exercising more control and direction over the schools, but whether this trend will evolve into complete state organization with the complete abolition of local school districts, as recommended by Morrison, is doubtful. The current intervention of the federal government in the field of education, especially through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and its periodic extensions, has added another level of control which Morrison feared. His article "Thumbs Down on Federal Equalization," published in 1943, enunciated his concerns in this area of educational finance and control. Morrison's differentiation between local self-government and local government may help

to refine thinking in this area, but his arguments against local control are not likely to bring about the disappearance of the "little republics at every crossroad," as he referred to local districts,\textsuperscript{11} or limit the increase of federal intervention into the field of education.

The roots of contemporary American education are imbedded in the historical development of the United States. From the eighteenth century onward into modern times, political statesmen have recognized the relationship of an intelligent citizenry to an effective form of democratic government. The philosophic thrust for education has been enmeshed in our political structure but it has been the educational statesmen who have had to translate into actuality the hopes and ideals of the American public school system. Henry Clinton Morrison was one of these men.

Throughout this study, the basic assumption has been that Henry C. Morrison had a definite conception of society and of the education required to prepare one to function effectively in that society. This analysis of Morrison's conceptions of society, of education, of curriculum, of instructional method and of the organization and control of the school system has demonstrated his concern with translating education from a mere philosophic thrust in the minds of the political statesmen into an actuality in the work of practicing educators in providing an intelligent

\textsuperscript{11}Morrison, \textit{American Schools}, p. 149.
citizenry so vital to a democratic form of government and to the perpetuation of society.

Morrison's basic approach to theory was one of comprehensiveness. He was impressed by the implications of the theory of evolution for the educational process. On this theory, he developed a theory of education broadly conceived. From this theory of education, his conceptions of curriculum, teaching, and organization evolved. One aspect is related to the other. The interrelationships of each aspect in the attainment of the final product, the educated man, the good citizen, are essential features of Morrison's educational theorizing. An attempt to analyze one aspect necessitates the analysis of the others. Morrison attempted to weave them all into one embracing pattern.

Morrison's approach is an invitation to modern educators to evolve a theory of education sufficiently macroscopic to include the basic variables in education. A theory pertaining to organization, administration, curriculum, or teaching alone will not provide the scope needed to attack the educational problems of today. Further fragmentation would be the result of such an endeavor. A theory in administration, for example, has relevance as it helps to explain the relation of the administrator to the wide scope of learning, curriculum, and purposes of education. The educational administrator does not operate in a vacuum. He is an integral factor in the interrelationships which exist between the individual, the society in which he lives, and
the education which will prepare him to participate effectively in the social order. Henry C. Morrison demonstrated the fact that a man could be a successful teacher, a practicing administrator, a theorist, a prolific author, and a profound thinker. For him there was no unbridgeable gap between educational practice and educational theory.

It is hoped that this study of the educational ideas of Henry C. Morrison may serve as a basis for further analysis of his ideas. Future studies might be directed toward a more detailed analysis of one of Morrison's theories, or some aspect of his educational thinking which has current relevance to the needs of the day in the field of education, or an analysis of Morrison's ideas in a few selected areas in which he exhibited discerning and penetrating thought. Some of these areas which might be considered worthy of future study and analysis are:

1. The fundamental purposes of the school are in need of clarification. Since Morrison's day, the emphasis on education has shifted from the civic purpose of schools to an emphasis on the development of the potentiality of the individual; from the social responsibilities of citizens to individual benefits. Morrison's analysis raises the question whether the shift to individual gain can be justified in a state financed system and whether some thought should be given to redirecting the schools to a greater emphasis on civic competence and the responsibilities of citizenship.
2. The relationship of local control to state responsibility in education must be resolved to preserve public participation in the formulation of policy while keeping the schools from being controlled by the whims and opinions of a variety of well intentioned but sometimes misinformed lay boards of education and special interest groups.

3. A proper method of organizing and articulating the educational system from kindergarten through junior college must be found. At present, credit, units, entrance examinations, accreditation policies, and a host of external influences are determining the organizational structure of our schools. Morrison's analysis of the role of the primary and secondary school in comprising the Common School may furnish us with some logical principles, psychological and pedagogical, around which to more effectively organize our schools.

4. There is some indication that current thought in the field of educational finance is close to Morrison's recommendations: the notion that schools, by creating value in use, are not a drain on the national wealth but rather contribute to it; the notion of the obsolescence of the property tax as the chief source of school revenue; and the idea that state equalization formulas are generally inadequate and inequitable and a new method of state financing must be found.

These are but a few of the areas in which further studies and in depth analyses of the ideas of Morrison might be both profitable and productive. In addition, the current
trend in education toward the identification of behavioral objectives, the utilization of a systematic method of teaching by which to attain the stated objectives, and evaluation of the products of learning in terms of mastery is but a faint echo of Morrison's ideas of direct teaching for mastery as developed in his first major publication, The Practice of Teaching. Here, too, is a fertile field for current investigation. Morrison's theory of teaching was based on twenty-five years of practical experience at various levels in education in differing times and places, and his exposition is clear, concise and scientifically grounded on valid educational principles. A study of Morrison's ideas in this area might yield an untapped reservoir of significant insights applicable to current problems in teaching and learning.

In conclusion, a man's contribution must be determined in light of his purposes. Three years before his death, Morrison reflected on the many years he had spent in education and commented:

For about twenty years past, I have been attempting to bring some sort of intellectual order into our activities in Public Instruction, utilizing as well as I could the methods which are common to all the sciences and especially to the social sciences. In so doing, I have thought to cover the disciplines which seem to be fundamental to our whole valid conception of the American public school and its operations.\(^\text{12}\)

Given these purposes, he succeeded in life, at least to the extent of formulating a theory and practice which could, if implemented, bring about some order into the

\(^{12}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \text{vi.}\)
activities of public instruction. He covered the disciplines which seemed to be fundamental to a valid conception of public education. He developed a theory of education which accounted for the way in which children learned, a theory directed toward a specific purpose: the adjustment of the child to society. He developed a curriculum, based on the fundamental institutions of society, which was best suited, in his opinion, to accomplish the goal of the educated man, the man adjusted to society, the law abiding, wise, and virtuous citizen. He described how the curriculum should be organized and taught. He discussed how the schools should be organized to attain the objectives of this curriculum. He argued for a system of complete state control and financing which would guarantee that the essential task of educating citizens would be equitably and competently accomplished. He believed that the state, through the Common School, had a responsibility to provide this education to all of its citizens. Morrison's efforts were continuously directed toward the attainment of his stated purpose in life, to bring some sort of intellectual order into the activities in the field of public instruction.

Henry Clinton Morrison lived a long and full life, 1871-1945. His educational career spanned half a century, 1895-1945. His career included positions at all levels of educational activity and involvement. His writings ranged across the entire spectrum of the field of education posing answers to why, what, how, when, and where questions which were plaguing educators during the difficult developmental
period of American public education. A careful and critical study of the major works of Henry Clinton Morrison should offer the educator invaluable insights and assistance in enabling our schools to become the free, compulsory, and universal system of education which our political forefathers envisioned. The notion of Henry Clinton Morrison as a counter-critic in the 1970's is not unrealistic. A return to the sane, solid, substantial and scientific studies of Morrison might provide an intellectual awakening among educators who appear to be grasping at straws in the wind. Morrison's contributions to the future will be limited only by the vision of those who read and study his works.
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