SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JAMES WILLIAM VAN WORMER

1976

ABSTRACT

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

By

James William Van Wormer

The purpose of the writer was to examine the educational impact in the United States of the Soviet space achievements in the later 1950s. The writer believes that such an examination is relevant and that with the advantage of hindsight it will be possible to determine if the impact of the Soviet space achievements was transitory or lasting. The writer posts the following assumptions:

1. The philosophical disputes which vexed American education in the years preceding World War II continued to dominate educational discussions in the post-war period.

2. The launching of Sputnik I and subsequent Soviet space achievements both intensified and added new dimensions to the lay and professional discussions concerning the aims, substance, and methods of education.

3. The Soviet space achievements resulted in immediate educational legislation at national, state, and local levels.

4. The Soviet space achievements and the subsequent American reaction resulted in changes in American educational theory and practice.

The assumptions were tested by:

1. An examination of lay and professional literature for the period 1957-62, with an examination of educational literature concerning the Soviet Union for the period 1926-1962.

2. An examination of the Congressional Record and selected government documents.

3. An examination of selected records to gather data for comparative purposes.

The data were examined to determine:

1. The nature of educational discussions in both lay and professional literature for the pre- and post-war periods.

2. The nature of educational discussions subsequent to the launching of Sputnik I on October 4, 1957.

3. The educational legislation which can meaningfully be related to the perceived Soviet challenge.

4. The changes which came into being as a reaction to the perceived Soviet challenge.

The data did not support the popular view that Sputnik fostered a significant change in American educational theory and practice. The so-called "new" curricula were inaugurated prior to the Soviet space achievements and, as measured by actual enrollment figures, no direct influence by Sputnik can be demonstrated. Such is also the case for statistical information on expenditures for education as a percentage of gross national product and the results of public school bonding elections.

On the other hand, Sputnik was not without some influence upon American education. The Soviet space achievements aided the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The popular furor influenced Representative Adam Clayton Powell to withdraw his crippling "Powell Amendment." Informed commentators viewed the inclusion of the "Powell Amendment" as fatal to aid to education

bills. Certainly, Sputnik sparked an increased interest in Soviet education. This interest can be demonstrated in the significant increase in book and periodical literature on Russian education after the launching of the Soviet satellite. Also, the character and authorship of the literature changed. Prior to Sputnik educational literature concerning the Soviet Union was descriptive in nature and was the almost exclusive work of professional educators. After Sputnik commentators used disclosures concerning Soviet education to criticize American education. Many of the post-Sputnik authors were not professional educators. This new wave of Russian educational literature was rather short-lived. It rose and fell with the rise and fall of Russian space leadership.

Judged on the whole, no significant change in American educational theory and practice can be directly related to Sputnik and subsequent Soviet space achievements.

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

By

James William Van Wormer

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1976

To my wife, Susan,

and my children, Stephen and Sara

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My thanks go out to Professor Carl H. Gross for having helped and tutored me in countless ways over several years. His ideas concerning the research and writing of this dissertation have been of enormous help. I am also indebted to the other members of my committee: Dr. Keith P. Anderson, Dr. Justin L. Kestenbaum, and Dr. Louis G. Romano.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

A cardinal belief of many Americans is that the fear and turmoil in this country which resulted from the launching of Sputnik marked a turning point in the history of American education. Since the Soviet Union launched its first Sputnik in 1957, millions of words have been printed in American newspapers, magazines, and books about the Soviet system of education. Very few of these words drew favorable comparisons with American education. Rather, the schools were the object of an orgy of recrimination. Someone or something had to be the culprit. Almost immediately, this painful role was assigned to public education. Many times persons who knew little about either Soviet or American education appeared on the platform and wrote magazine articles and books. Some took advantage of the situation to vent ancient grudges against certain educators and certain educational practices. Many of these critics suggested the wholesale importation of either Soviet or European educational practices and philosophies. Most demanded crash programs for the training of engineers and scientists. One might say, "many people went into orbit and started beeping."

The accepted interpretation holds that the curriculum reform movement was a response to Sputnik. This conventional wisdom is enshrined in official publications of the United States Office of

Education. Patterns of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1970-71, relates as follows:

> In the late 1950's, in consequence of the Soviet Union's launching of the first Sputnik, school authorities in the United States began to place greater emphasis on improving the mathematics and natural sciences curriculums of this Nation's schools. Under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation, new methods of instruction such as SMSG (School Mathematics Study Group) mathematics and BSCS (Biological Sciences Curriculum Study) biology were developed.[1]

This view had become entrenched as early as the spring of 1958 in the periodical press. In a five-part series (March 24 and 31, and April 7, 14, and 21) Life magazine examined what it termed "Crisis in Education." In the fourth installment entitled "Tryouts for Good Ideas: The Nation Stirs with New Interest in Science, New Plans for Schools," Life editors related that "in schools all over the country, science and math courses are being reassessed and tightened up."[2] The following year similar views were advanced in the widely acclaimed book The Big Red Schoolhouse by Fred M. Heckinger. Paul Woodring who authored the introduction to The Big Red Schoolhouse predicted that "When the history of twentieth-century America eventually is written it will be recorded that the date of October 4, 1957, was a turning point in American education."[3]

---

[1]Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Patterns of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1970-71, (OE) publication 73-11400 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 6.

[2]"Tryouts for Good Ideas: The Nation Stirs with New Interest in Science, New Plans for Schools," Life, April 14, 1958, p. 117.

[3]Fred M. Heckinger, The Big Red Schoolhouse (New York: Doubleday, 1959), p. 9.

The purpose of the writer is to determine the validity of the accepted interpretation. What follows, however, is not an exercise in idle revisionism. It should be understood at the onset that the accepted interpretation rests solely on the near unanimous point of view of the periodical and book presses for the period 1957-62. No subsequent research has buttressed the accepted interpretation. The belief that Sputnik spawned the curriculum reform movement uncritically passed into the history of twentieth-century American education. With the advantage of distance from the event and the availability of previously unused data on actual enrollments in science and mathetmatics courses before, during, and after the Sputnik period, it may be possible to write the history Paul Woodring predicted in 1959.

The writer will proceed employing the accepted interpretation as a point of departure. For purposes of analysis the accepted interpretation will be divided into four component parts or assumptions:

> The philosophical disputes which vexed American education in the years preceding World War II continued into the post-war period.
>
> The launching of Sputnik both intensified and added new dimensions to the lay and professional discussions concerning the aims, substance, and methods of education.
>
> The Soviet space achievements resulted in immediate educational legislation at the national, state, and local level.
>
> Sputnik and the subsequent American reaction resulted in changes in American educational theory and practice.

The writer employed the historical method examining three types of sources. Each type of source bore an obvious relationship to one or more of the assumptions which underlay the study. The periodical and book literature for the period 1957-62 received the most extended treatment. For self-evident reasons, educational literature concerning the Soviet Union was examined for a more extended period, primarily 1926-62. The examination of the educational literature yielded important data in three areas: (1) the character of educational discussions in both lay and professional literature for the pre- and post-war periods; (2) the character of educational discussions after the launching of Sputnik on October 4, 1957; and (3) how American educational literature pictured Soviet education during three distinct eras--the Revolution period (1926-39), the Cold War period (1945-1957), and the Sputnik period (since October 4, 1957). The Congressional Record was examined to identify educational legislation which can meaningfully be related to Sputnik. And lastly, but most importantly, selected government documents were searched to gather enrollment statistics for comparative purposes. In this section, particular attention was devoted to actual enrollment statistics in science and mathematics courses.

The treatment of the subject by the writer will for the most part be presented chronologically. The first section will give an overview of educational literature concerning the Soviet Union from the Bolshevik Revolution to 1957. The second section will give an overview of American periodical and book literature concerning education for the period 1947 to 1957. The third and fourth sections

will treat the post-Sputnik educational literature for the period 1957 to 1962. The fifth and last section will deal with legislation and actual course enrollments. In the final section statistics on GNP (Gross National Product) devoted to education and the results of public school bonding elections will also be examined.

The writer is keenly aware of the methodological problems which limit any historical study. To begin with, a multitude of doubts assail this enterprise. Our knowledge of the past--even the recent past--is always incomplete, probably inaccurate, beclouded by ambivalent evidence and biased historians. The historian himself is most probably biased, viewing the past through culturally colored lenses. The critical historian has to discover and correct these and many other types of falsifications.

The history of "Sputnik and American Education" is fraught with such pitfalls, not the least of which is the ideological conflict which has rent American education in the twentieth century. Granting the difficulties of isolating causative influences as well as the importance of relating particular issues to broader issues in the larger society, certainly, it is true that the ideological conflict within the educational community was related to a broader social cleavage along conservative-liberal lines. Also, in assessing Sputnik, the historian must consider the existence of the Cold War and the economic recession during 1957-58. All of which contributed to the sense of fear and turmoil in the wake of Sputnik. Certainly, what follows is not the final word on the matter.

CHAPTER I

THE AMERICAN PERCEPTION OF SOVIET EDUCATION, 1917-1957

In this section the American perception of Soviet educational theory and practice in the period 1917 to 1957 shall be examined. On the morning of November 7, 1917, the Russian Provisional Government was overthrown by the most revolutionary elements of the population under the leadership of about a quarter of a million members of the Bolshevik (majority) faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. A new government, dominated by the Bolsheviks, was founded with the avowed intention of completely smashing the old order and of installing entirely new ideas of society and government. In a series of decrees in late 1917 and early 1918, sweeping and fundamental changes were ordered in Russian society. Not the least of these were sweeping and fundamental changes in the Tsarist educational system.

Professor Scott Nearing, desiring information on the new Soviet education, and finding that there was practically no literature on the subject in French, German, or English, went to Russia to learn about it for himself.[1] Professor Nearing spent two months

[1]Scott Nearing, Education in Soviet Russia (New York: International Publishers, 1926), p. 7.

visiting Soviet schools from kindergartens to universities, attending class sessions, and talking with teachers and students. Education in Soviet Russia (1926) was the first book published on a heretofore unknown subject. Nearing reported that "despite conditions and equipment that were of the poorest condition, education in the Soviet Union was important to the rest of the world because of its experimental nature."[2]

The second book on Soviet education was the observations of the principal of the South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Lucy Langdon (Williams) Wilson. The book was largely a restatement of articles she had published in the National Education Association Journal: "New Education in New Russia" (January 1928) and "Russian Pioneers" (November 1928). The book entitled New Schools of Russia (1928) described Soviet Russia's attempt at a fundamental reorganization of its educational system. Wilson's findings largely confirmed those of Professor Nearing. Russian education was still largely primitive, especially in equipment and trained teachers. She described the centering of education about a new "practical-project curriculum."[3] And, notwithstanding primitive conditions, Russian education was responsible for the gains made in literacy.[4]

---

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

[3]Lucy Langdon Williams Wilson, "New Education in New Russia," National Education Association Journal 17 (January 1928): 15-17.

[4]Lucy Langdon Williams Wilson, "Russian Pioneers, "National Education Association Journal 17 (November 1928): 267-68.

The third Russian book, Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World: Mexico, China, Turkey (1929), was the work of John Dewey. The Dewey book was a collection of letters from Russia, Mexico, China, and Turkey which had appeared in the New Republic at various times in the ten years prior to the book's publication. The Russian letters filled half the volume. They had been composed during Dewey's 1928 Russian trip. The letters were not a technical analysis, but a collection of observations. The most striking feature of Soviet education was an emphasis on "socially useful labor." Dewey's "learn by doing" seemed compatible with the Soviet "school that does rather than a school that talks."

Two other books on Soviet education appeared in 1929: Samuel Northrup Harper's Civil Training in Soviet Russia, and New Education in the Soviet Republic by Albert Petrovich Pinkevitch. The latter is especially interesting because Pinkevitch was a Soviet educator writing for Soviet educators. It was the first time an exposition on Soviet education by a Soviet educator appeared in English. The book was published by Teachers College, Columbia University, with an introduction by George S. Counts. Counts noted that the Soviets had drawn considerable inspiration from progressive education in the United States. The book was a thorough exposition on how the whole system of Soviet education was being made to serve the interests of the Soviet Union's "new economic and social order." It demonstrated how education could be used to establish a new social system.

The idea that education could be used as a weapon between the Communist and non-Communist worlds was first introduced in The Soviet Challenge to America (1931) by George S. Counts. In the book Counts related that the great goal of the Soviets was "to overtake and surpass America." He outlined the economics of the Five-Year Plan and the social, cultural, and educational programs that were fundamental to it. This clear-cut and logical analysis of Soviet economic and social planning was considered by reviewers to be the book's main strength.[5] In fact, the volume was valued by non-educators for its non-educational sections on governmental structure, Bolshevik psychology, Russian temper, and economic planning. This would not be George S. Counts' last clear warning that Soviet education posed a threat to America.

New Minds: New Men? The Emergence of the Soviet Citizen by Dr. Thomas Woody appeared in 1932. The author had spent a year traveling through Russia. He visited some five hundred schools, observing the life in villages and towns. There was so much detail in the Woody book that it served more as a book of reference rather than as material for general reading. In the opinion of John Dewey, Woody had over-documented for general reading and had too conscientiously abstained from generalization.[6] The book was definitely

---

[5]Reviews of The Soviet Challenge to America by George S. Counts: American Economic Review 21 (December 1931): 720; Karl Scholtz, Annals of American Academy 156 (July 1931): 159; Louis Fisher, Boston Transcript, May 7, 1931, p. 7, reprinted in the Book Review Digest; and Harry Hansen, New York World, February 7, 1931, p. 11, reprinted in the Book Review Digest.

[6]John Dewey, Review of New Minds: New Men? by Thomas Woody, Review of Reviews 71 (March 1932): 104.

for the earnest reader and was relegated to the reference shelf. Yet, it did contain a vast amount of data on Soviet educational theory and practice.

The year 1935 witnessed two additional works on Soviet education: William Clark Trow (editor) and Paul D. Kalachov (translator) combined to produce Character Education in Soviet Russia and Albert Petrovich Pinkevich offered Science Education in the U.S.S.R. Significantly, both volumes were translated from the Russian, and taken as a unit they portray the product of the new Soviet education as a scientifically trained and dedicated builder of the communist world order. Character Education in Soviet Russia presented five articles, edited and summarized by Professor Trow. The articles gave insight into the ideas and aims for extra-curricular education because they were translated from a series written for leaders of the Pioneer youth movement in Russia. The Pioneer program was designed to develop "fighters and builders of Soviet communism." Science and Education in the U.S.S.R. stressed the role of science education in the Soviet curriculum. The Soviet educational system was thoroughly outlined: pre-school, primary, secondary, vocational, and higher education. Pinkevich stressed the great weight and respect given scientists and teachers in the Soviet system.

The only book on Soviet education published in the year 1936 was the joint endeavor of an American college professor and a Russian worker at the Central Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Infancy at Moscow--Nursery School and Parent Education in Soviet Russia by Patty Smith Hill and Vera Mikhailovna Fediaevskia.

The volume was true to its title and broke away from the challenge and scientific mold of its immediate predecessor. The book outlined the plan for the early care and education of infants and young children in Soviet Russia, and the parent education necessitated by the plan.

The following year saw the publication of Beatrice King's Changing Man: The Educational System in the U.S.S.R. (1937). This study of the Soviet educational system opened with an account of education under the tsars and the earliest Bolshevik experiments. The organizational structure of the Soviet school system was described. She also outlined the work and significance of the Octoberist, Pioneer, and Konsomol groups. Particularly interesting to reviewers were sections on the working out of the unity between school and life.[7] Miss King went on to describe the character of the educational reforms which began with the Central Committee decree on September 5, 1931, which altered the character of the curriculum from a concentration on "socially useful work" to "study language, history, mathematics, and science." In the words of the Central Committee,

> The basic defect of our school at the present moment is the fact that school instruction fails to give a sufficient body of general knowledge and thus fails to prepare for the technicums and higher schools fully literate people with a good command of the basic sciences (physics, chemistry, mathematics, native language, geography, and others).[8]

---

[7]Thomas Woody, Review of Changing Man by Beatrice King in Annals of the American Academy 194 (November 1937): 221.

[8]Quoted in George S. Counts, Khruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education (Pittsburgh: The University Press, 1960), p. 11.

The publication of Beatrice King's Changing Man: The Educational System in the U.S.S.R. marked a watershed. It was followed by ten years of monographic silence. It provides a convenient place to summarize American perceptions concerning Soviet education. Going into the period of the Second World War, Americans had eleven books on Soviet education available to them. A thoughtful review of the literature would have yielded the following generalizations:

1. Initially, Soviet education suffered from primitive conditions, poor equipment, and untrained teachers.[9]

2. Education in the Soviet Union was important to the rest of the world because so much of it was experimental.[10]

3. Russian education revolved around a new "practical-project curriculum."[11]

4. Soviet education served the interests of the Soviet economic and social order.[12]

5. Soviet education was the most important component in Russia's goal to overtake and surpass the United States.[13]

---

[9]Nearing, Education in Soviet Russia; Lucy Langdon (Williams) Wilson, New Schools of New Russia (New York: Vanguard Press, 1928); and John Dewey, Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World: Mexico, China, Turkey (New York: New Republic, Inc., 1929).

[10]Ibid. Also, Albert Petrovich Pinkevitch, The New Education in the Soviet Republic (New York: The John Day Company, 1929).

[11]Ibid.

[12]Samuel Northrup Harper, Civic Training in Soviet Russia (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929); and George S. Counts, The Soviet Challenge to America (New York: The John Day Company, 1931).

[13]Counts, Soviet Challenge.

6. Soviet education was designed to develop Communists, particularly at the higher levels, and in teacher education, especially to develop Communist leaders. It goes without saying that education was used to indoctrinate the general population.[14]

7. Science held a central place in the Soviet curriculum.[15]

8. The Soviets were constructing a unified "educational ladder" from preschool to adult level.[16]

9. Soviet education, as measured by increased literacy and increased enrollments, was making tremendous gains.[17]

10. Soviet education was being redesigned to emphasize the mastery of a body of knowledge.[18]

The conclusion that one draws from the foregoing is that if someone wanted to know what was going on in Soviet education in the pre-World War II period, American "educationists" had provided the data.

---

[14]Thomas Woody, New Minds: New Men? The Emergence of the Soviet Citizen (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932); William Clark Trow (ed.) and Paul D. Kalachov (trans.), Character Education in Soviet Russia (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Press, 1935); Counts, Soviet Challenge; and Harper, Civic Training.

[15]Counts, Soviet Challenge; Albert Petrovich Pinkevitch, Science Education in the U.S.S.R. (London: V. Gollancz, Ltd., 1935).

[16]Beatrice King, Changing Man: The Educational System in the U.S.S.R. (New York: Viking Press, 1937); Patty Smith Hill and Vera Mikhailovna Fediaeyskia, Nursery School and Parent Education in Soviet Russia (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1936); Nearing, Education in Soviet Russia; and Counts, Soviet Challenge.

[17]Wilson, New Schools; Pinkevitch, New Education; Counts, Soviet Challenge; and Woody, New Men: New Minds?

[18]King, Changing Man.

> What are the Soviet leaders up to? What are their plans for the long future? Are they abandoning the original Marxian doctrines? Are they changing their views of capitalism in general and American capitalism in particular? Are they reviving the nationalism of the old empire? Are they forsaking the ideas of leading the workers of the world in the overthrow and reconstitution of human society? Are they expecting a peaceful resolution of the differences now dividing the peoples of the earth? Are they interested in promoting mutual understanding and friendship between East and West? Do they have confidence in the United Nations? Are they preparing for war or peace? Do they believe in democracy? Are they relaxing or planning to relax the rigors of the dictatorship? In a word, what may we expect from the Soviet leaders in the years ahead?[19]

These questions broke ten years of monographic silence by the publication of I Want to Be Like Stalin (1947). The book was from the Russian textbook on Pedagogy by B. P. Yesipov and N. K. Goncharov and translated by George S. Counts and Nucia P. Lodge. "To find wholly trustworthy answers to these questions, Counts wrote in his introduction, "we would have to make our way into the so-called Russian enigma." After pointing out the impossibility of free communication between or within the Soviet Union, Counts indicated that "an examination of what the Russians are teaching their children should throw light on some of the questions . . . . It may be safely assumed that they do not frame their educational programs or write textbooks for the purpose of deceiving foreign governments and peoples."[20]

---

[19]George S. Counts, I Want to Be Like Stalin (New York: The John Day Company, 1947), p. 1.

[20]Ibid., p. 2. Emphasis mine.

The materials in the volume were taken from the third edition of a textbook on Pedagogy written by two Soviet educators. It was published in 1946 and was approved by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic for use in pedagogical schools. Pedagogy was more than two hundred thousand words in length and was organized into twenty-one chapters. I Want to Be Like Stalin included only six sections of Chapter XI of the Pedagogy, which is entitled "The Content and Method of Moral Education." The Soviet titles of these sections are "Principles of Moral Education," "Education in Soviet Patriotism," "Education in the Spirit of Socialist Humanism," "Education in Collectivism," "Education in Discipline," and "Education in the Volitional Qualities of Character." In his introduction, Counts defended his decision to translate and present only this section of the Pedagogy on the grounds of the "penetration of Soviet moral doctrine into every chapter of the book."[21]

Counts indicated that I Want to Be Like Stalin "must be taken far more seriously than any book ever published in the field of education in the United States . . . . It must be taken seriously because it represents concentrated power as no pedagogical work written in America ever has or, let us hope, ever will."[22] This was the case, Counts believed, because of three distinctive features of the Soviet educational system which must be understood if the

---

[21]Ibid., p. 6.

[22]Ibid., p. 13.

full meaning of the Pedagogy were to be grasped. In the first place, Counts stressed that education in the Soviet Union was "essentially and profoundly social in purpose." That is to say, the Soviet authorities assume in their approach to educational questions that throughout history organized education has been the handmaiden of politics. This assumption was grounded in the historical materialism of Marx and Engels. "The School," therefore, "was regarded as a powerful and indispensable organ of the Communist Party, of the same order as the government, the economy, the army, or the political police."[23]

In the second place, according to Counts, education in the Soviet Union was "extremely broad in scope." In both theory and practice Soviet education was by no means limited to the work of the system of schools. In addition to a system of schools which embraced a vast network from the nursery school and kindergarten through the university and scientific institutes, it included all organized agencies capable of influencing minds of both young and old: the the family, the factory, the collective farm, the coooperative, organizations, labor unions, organs of government, the Red Army, the book press, radio, the newspapers, the magazines, the theater, the motion picture, works of art, and all other sources of information and entertainment. Counts agreed with the statement of the Pedagogy that "Stalin and the Soviet government watch over every Soviet

---

[23]Ibid., p. 14.

person."[24] Thus, the Russian government and the Communist Party had forged an instrument of tremendous reach and power.

In the third place, Counts stressed, education in the Soviet Union was "emphatically monolithic in control." Regardless of forms of administration which recognize the political subdivisions and federal nature of the country, all important matters in education of this social and broad educational system rest in the hands of the All-Union Communist Party and its central organs. The way in which this monolithic control operated was illustrated by Counts with reference to the preparation of a set of history textbooks. On May 16, 1934, the Soviet of People's Commissars of the Union and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party adopted a resolution which called for the appointment of groups of scholars to prepare outlines for the preparation of an entirely new set of textbooks for the teaching of history in the schools. It also provided a committee of three of the most powerful men in the Soviet Union, Stalin, Kirov, and Zhdanov, to examine and recommend changes in the outlines if they vary from state policy. This the committee did in a series of documents under the common title of Remarks on the Outlines. The Remarks have served as a guide to all who have responsibility for the writing, criticism, or the approval of history textbooks.[25]

---

[24]Ibid., p. 16.

[25]Ibid., pp. 17-18.

Counts went on to set down "a few generalizations which are of profound concern to Americans."[26] First, the Russian were building in the minds of the young "two great myths, one about themselves and one about the rest of the world." Myth one describes the Soviet Union as the "largest country in the world," "the richest country in the world," and as the "most advanced country in the world." Myth two describes the rest of the world through Marxian analysis. The West, particularly America, was cast in the role of Imperialist, the highest and final stage of capitalism; therefore, the logical enemy for the Soviet Union. Second, the Russians were creating a synthesis of Soviet patriotism and Marxian doctrines. Third, the Russians were building in the minds of the young a fantastic loyalty to Stalin and the Communist Party. In the Pedagogy no possible rival among living political and military leaders is even mentioned by name; thus, the title, I Want to Be Like Stalin. Fourth, the Russians seemed to be relying on their own strength to meet all eventualities and overcome all hazards in the arena of international relations. This was pointed up by their reliance on military preparations from the nursery school through the university and the lack of any reference to the United Nations in the Pedagogy. Again and again the deep love of the "Motherland" linked to the bitter hatred of all enemies was stressed. Fifth, the Pedagogy had little to say about democracy in the educational program. In fact, the term was completely absent from the book. Sixth and in summary, George S.

---

[26] Ibid., p. 20.

Counts related that the Russians seemed to be building a theocracy on the philosophical foundations of materialism. He suggested that if William James "were writing his The Varieties of Religious Experience today, he undoubtedly would devote a long chapter to Soviet communism." He ended by stating that the current Soviet emphasis on patriotism in education had been equaled or exceeded only by the Fascist totalitarian powers.[27]

Counts' enumeration of these disturbing tendencies in Soviet education closed with an examination of the cultural ethos which spawned Soviet education as well as a program for thoughtful action to combat its disturbing nature. He related the impact of years of isolation and war on the Russian mind. "The people of the Soviet Union are still living in the fear of 'capitalist encirclement' and in the shadow of the Great Patriotic War--a war that came within a hair's breadth of destroying their institutions and dragging them down into slavery."[28] Furthermore, "their apprehensions can be understood, particularly when projected on the background of the long and unceasing struggle for survival on the unguarded plains of eastern Europe, from the days of the incursions of the Huns and Avars at the very beginning of Russian history."[29] Counts looked to the stabilization of the world, if it could be done as the key to defusing the Russian mind. He advanced the theory that "we should do

---

[27]Ibid., pp. 20-30.

[28]Ibid., p. 31.

[29]Ibid.

everything in our power to remove from the Russian mind every legitimate reason for fearing a military attack from any source."[30] He proposed to accomplish this through disarmament and the establishment of an international police force. This should be done through the United Nations. If the Soviets refused to cooperate, Counts believed that a Third World War would take place.

Finally, Counts discussed the challenge of Soviet education in what has come to be called the Third World.

> If the issue of war is resolved the moral challenge will remain . . . . It (the total Soviet social and educational program) contains elements which make a universal appeal. . . . It proclaims that the way of dictatorship, a dictatorship of "our best people," is the only way of removing gross inequities, injustices, and insecurities among the men and nations and of establishing a lasting peace on the earth.[31]

This phase of the Soviet challenge, Counts, believed, must be met by a ". . . new birth of freedom at home by endeavoring to order our life and institutions so that all of our people . . . will share fully in the benefits and blessings of our country.[32]

Maurice Joseph Shore's Soviet Education: Its Psychology and Philosophy (1947) was a deep philosophical work. Professor Shore traced the growth of Marxian education for more than a century, with documentation from primary sources in the original languages. In the author's words:

---

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid.

> The following pages will aim to present the story and nature of an educational process about a hundred years old in development. It is remarkable that this education, which had its beginnings on English soil, shifted later to France and Germany, to be finally transplanted and take deep roots in Russia.[33]

Shore's account divided Marxian educational development into four periods which also marked political and philosophical developments in Marxism:

1. Doctrinaire Marxism, from 1844 to 1871, the year of the Paris Commune.

2. Active Marxism, from 1871 to 1918, the Russian October Revolution.

3. Unified or Synthetic Marxism, a unity of theory and practice, or Leninist Marxism, from 1918 to 1936, the year of the Soviet Constitution.

4. Post Leninism or Leninism-Stalinism, from 1936 to the present.

Like Counts, Shore demonstrated that the Soviets fully appreciated and utilized education to promote communism. During the thirty-year period, 1917-1947, the Soviets pressed irresistibly toward the final goal of a Communist classless state. Education was directed firmly as an "educational, nurtural and ideological weapon, for the realization of communism."[34]

Shore declared that "the landmarks of Marxian-Soviet education can be seen better against the background of a panoramic difference on the conception of State structure and practice between the Soviet and that of the West." Below is produced his "Figure IX":

---

[33]Maurice Joseph Shore, Soviet Education: Its Psychology and Philosophy (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), p. 10.

[34]Ibid., p. 6.

Contradiction in State Bases Expressed in Educational Channels

SOVIET		AMERICAN
BASE:		
statist collectivist	vs	individualist, free-enterprise and corporate economy
EDUCATION:		
statist communist	vs	private, group, county, state, etc., sponsored education
PRESS:		
one party press	vs	individualist and chain press[35]

Shore demonstrated that criticism of capitalist educational practice preceded the emergence of Marxist-Soviet educational principles. This he demonstrated in two chapters which he summarized in his "Figure X" and "Figure XI."

Marxist Criticism of Capitalist Education and Substitutes Proclaimed

CAPITALIST NEGATIVE ASPECTS		MARXIAN CURATIVES
Contradiction	Educational Effects	
Economic	lack of provision, "two-track" system; "intervention" for status quo; bourgeois ideology	socialized economy; "one-track" education; "intervention" for change: transitory society education.
City and country	lack of educational provision; neglect of rural education; urban concentration, and factory industrialized family; lack of leisure and education under factory conditions; self-enforced rudiments of factory-child education	educational provision and spread; better and more education; education-labor combination.

[35]Ibid., p. 253.

Intellectual and physical labor	degradation of physical as compared with intellectual labor; one class-bourgeois-intellectualism and intellectuals; divorce between physical and intellectual labor	education-labor combination; communist intellectualism; intellectual and physical labor concilation in the classless society.[36]

Pre-Soviet Criticism of Capitalist Education and Substitute Proclaimed

CAPITALIST NEGATIVE ASPECTS		MARXIAN CURATIVES
Contradiction	Educational Effects	
Economic	lack of provision; "two-track" education; educational "intervention" for status quo	socialized economy; socialized "one-track" education; "intervention" for change; transitory, socialist, communist education.
City and country	poor educational provision; neglect of rural education; thought-police control; educational bureaucracy	educational spread; better and more education; polytechnism; full reconciliation in classless society.
Intellectual and physical labor	divorce between intellectual and physical labor; one-class bourgeois-intellectualism and intellectuals	polytechism: labor, the imperative category; full reconciliation in the classless society.
Intergroup or intercultural	discrimination in educational provision, admission, and professional employment	group-culture education with a common denominator: education for the classless society.[37]

He went on to propose a reconciliation between what he termed the "superimposed rigidity of Soviet education" and the "energized laissez-faire in American education" through the auspices of UNESCO.[38]

---

[36] Ibid., p. 254.

[37] Ibid., p. 255.

[38] Ibid., p. 262.

It is worth noting the similarity between Shore and Counts on the use of the United Nations to reconcile East-West educational practice.[39]

William E. Johnson's Russia's Educational Heritage (1950) was a study of the educational policies and programs characterizing the last three centuries of the tsarist regime. Johnson's work up-dated Beatrice King's Changing Man: The Educational System in the U.S.S.R. (1937). Many important connections between Empire and Soviet procedures were pointed out, indicating that instead of "smashing the old order," the Russian Revolution "created a new state on the foundations of the old."[40] The book revealed that the progressive educational theories and practices imported from abroad, during the early years of the Soviet regime, had been replaced by concepts and methods which had been outlawed and despised in the 1920s.

Johnson's approach, in the main, was chronological. Chapters Two through Six cover the era from the fifteenth to the middle nineteenth centuries, and deal with the early church schools, the establishment of state institutions of higher learning, the creation of secondary and elementary schools, the unification of many agencies into a national system, and the period of reaction which characterized the second quarter of the nineteenth century. At that point, a digression from chronology was made to provide an overview of the

---

[39]Counts, I Want to Be Like Stalin, p. 33.

[40]William E. Johnson, Russia's Educational Heritage (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1950), p. 250.

history of the St. Petersburg Main Pedagogical Institute. Returning to chronological order, the author follows the story down to 1917 and the breakdown of the tsarist regime during the reign of Nicholas II. A final chapter points out certain specific instances of tsarist influence in the Soviet period in order to sustain the views he expressed in Chapter One.

Johnson stressed that many students of the Soviet Union have made the mistake of concentrating on the ideas of Karl Marx. He uplifted such vision to Bolshevism and the teachings of Lenin which were deeply rooted in Slavic history, the autocratic tradition, the messianic vision, and in the revolutionary movements of imperial Russia. Thus, "the Russian Revolutions of 1917, whatever their intent, did not establish a complete break with the Russian past."[41] Johnson noted that the Soviets consciously and deliberately emulated many tsarist practices and laud many historical figures. He wrote:

> Strangely enough, the eighteenth century concept of separate higher schools for the upper and lower classes has also found acceptance in the Soviet Union, but on an ideological rather than a socio-economic basis. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union maintains its own system of higher education, entirely separate from the networks operated by the various government agencies.[42]

In addition to the above, a partial list of pre-Revolutionary practices in the Soviet Union includes:

1. Nationalism--the stress of the unique place and contribution of the Great Russian Slavic Race.
2. Orthodoxy--Communist doctrine has replaced religious orthodoxy.

---

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid., pp. 253-54.

3. Autocracy--with Commissar replacing tsar.

4. Centralized educational administration.

5. Emphasis on moral education.

6. Education for women.

7. Military education under the model established by Catherine II.

8. Complete acceptance of the mastery of a body of knowledge, lecture method of instruction, and the recitation.

George S. Counts, The Challenge of Soviet Education: The Study of Education as a Weapon (1957) was the last pre-Sputnik publication on Russian education. The jacket of the Counts' book greeted the reader with two questions and a statement:

> Are you aware that the Soviet Union is graduating two or three times as many engineers as is the United States? Or that the 3 percent expenditure of national income for education in this country compares, according to Soviet statistics, with 10 percent in the Soviet Union? Experts warn it is conceivable that, in the not too distant future, the Russian system of education may surpass our own.

Thus, the reader was introduced to an analysis of the most comprehensive and sustained effort in history to reach distant social goals by employing all the agencies and processes of twentieth century society for molding and training the minds of all the elements composing a vast population of many nations and peoples.

Counts' approach was topical. His chapters were entitled: "Soviet Education and Soviet Power," "The Roots of Soviet Power," "The Goals of Soviet Education," "The General Education of the Younger Generation," "The Political Education of the Younger Generation," "The Moral Education of the Younger Generation," "The

Transformation of the Intellectual Class," "The Training of Specialists," "The Political Education of the People," "The Reeducation of the Offender," "The Political Education of the Soldier," "The Education of the Political Elite," and "In Retrospect and Prospect."

In many ways The Challenge of Soviet Education was an updated restatement of Counts' Soviet Challenge to America (1931) and I Want to Be Like Stalin (1947). In Counts' opinion, the rise of the Soviet state was perhaps the outstanding political fact of the first half of the twentieth century. He pointed out that the Soviet Union had moved very rapidly along the path of industrialization since the launching of the First Five-Year Plan in the autumn of 1928. The level of science and technology achieved success in the production of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the perfection of airplanes, the mastery of electronics, and the improvement of weapons of warfare generally. American scientists, Counts reported, believed that the "Soviet Union had achieved a lead in high energy research physics that the United States probably could not overcome within the next ten years."[43] He quoted Khruschev in his opening address to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party on February 14, 1956:

> . . . not one capitalist country has such a quantity of schools, technicums, higher education establishments, scientific research institutes, experimental stations and laboratories, theatres, clubs, libraries, and other institutions of cultural enlightenment, as the Soviet Union.[44]

---

[43]George S. Counts, The Challenge of Soviet Education: The Study of Education as a Weapon (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), p. 3.

[44]Ibid., pp. 5-6.

Then Counts compared the percentage of total national income each nation invested in education. This was three percent in the United States as compared to ten percent in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In Chapter Two, Counts examined the "Roots of Soviet Education" which he believed reached far back into the past of Western man. They reached back at least to the invention of the school as a special institution, and for certain to the Platonic dialogue known as the Republic. Counts commented again and again how he was reminded of the Republic in which the power of rule rested in the hands of a small caste of philosophers. It will be recalled that Plato drew the outlines of an ideal society in which the citizens were divided into three classes: the philosophers who governed the state; the warriors who defended it; and the farmers and craftsmen who produced and distributed its material wealth. For the selection and training of each of these classes, a special system of education was provided. In the Soviet Union, Counts outlined at least three systems or streams of education: the system of people's schools, the system of military schools, and the system of party schools. The class nature of these special party schools had been discussed by William E. Johnson in Russia's Educational Heritage (1950). Counts listed the remaining "roots" as "Marxist philosophy as interpreted by Lenin," "the heritage of the Tsarist autocracy," and "the revolutionary tradition in Russia." He talks at length about each, but not with the insight or the zeal of his analysis of the heritage of Plato.

Counts began "In Retrospect and Prospect" with an updated quotation from the Communist Manifesto: "Today it is no longer a specter that is haunting Europe. On the contrary it is a thing of flesh and blood, of bone and muscle.[45] Counts noted that today the Soviet Union undoubtedly stands among the literate nations of the earth. The advance in the realm of science and technology, in the training of specialists of lower, middle, and higher qualifcations, had also been, to use Counts' phrase, "phenomenal." He pointed out that no nation in history had ever committed itself so unreservedly to the mastery and development of mathematics and science. The cultivation of "Communist morality" had also been a basic and persistent feature of the Soviet system of education. George S. Counts ended by challenging the "Pandora's Box" thesis of Allen Dulles that eventually the Soviet system may be changed by the very individuals who are being trained to be the system's bulwark. He saw absolutely no evidence to support such a contention.[46]

As noted earlier, The Challenge of Soviet Education was the last book published before the launching of Sputnik. Thus, it provided a convenient place to summarize the perception of informed American educators and laypersons concerning Soviet education. A thoughtful review of the four post-World War II monographs on Soviet education yields the following generalizations:

---

[45] Ibid., p. 286.

[46] Ibid., p. 293.

1. Soviet education served the interests of the Soviet economic order.[47]

2. Soviet education was the most important component in Russia's stated goal to overtake and surpass the United States.[48]

3. The Soviet Union possessed a vast quantity of schools, technicums, higher education establishments, scientific research institutes, experimental stations and laboratories, theaters, clubs, libraries, and other institutions of cultural enlightenment, all of the highest order.[49]

4. Soviet education was designed to mold what Communists called "The New Soviet Man," a dedicated fighter and builder of communism.[50]

5. Science and mathematics held a central place in the Soviet curriculum.[51]

6. Soviet education had made tremendous gains since the First Five-Year Plan in 1928.[52]

7. Soviet education had abandoned progressive educational theories and practices imported from abroad during the early years

---

[47]Counts, I Want to Be Like Stalin and Challenge of Soviet Education; Shore, Soviet Education.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Counts, Challenge of Soviet Education.

[50]Counts, I Want to Be Like Stalin.

[51]Counts, Challenge of Soviet Education.

[52]Ibid.

of the regime and replaced them with pre-Revolutionary concepts and methods--emphasis on a body of knowledge taught by lecture and recitation.[53]

8. Overall Soviet educational aims were ground in Marxian and pre-Soviet philosophy.[54]

9. The Soviet Union invested a greater share of total national income on education than the United States, ten percent as compared to three percent.[55]

10. The Russian educational system might in the near future surpass the American educational system; it already turned out two or three times as many engineering specialists of several grades each year as compared to the corresponding institutions in the United States.[56]

The conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing list and the list printed on pages 12 and 13, which summarized the pre-World War II American perception of Soviet education, is that American "educationists" had systematically informed the educational and national community concerning the theory and practice of Soviet education. Significantly absent was any "attack" on American educational philosophy and practice in the light of the disclosures concerning Soviet education. It should be emphasized that the fifteen books

---

[53]Johnson, Russia's Educational Heritage.

[54]Shore, Soviet Education.

[55]Counts, Challenge of Soviet Education.

[56]Ibid.

reviewed above are all the titles listed under the heading "Education: Russia" in the Book Review Digest from 1917 through 1957. Of the authorities who wrote on Soviet Russia, not one attacked American education in the light of disclosures concerning Soviet education. It should be noted that the above statement only applies to writers whose purpose was to describe Soviet education. The exposition on Soviet educational thought and practice proceeded largely independently of the domestic debate over educational thought and practice.

An overview of the periodical literature in the time frame 1917-1937 yields almost identical perceptions of Soviet education. The primary reason for the close parallel with perceptions presented in the book press is that the periodical writers were also the book writers. Authors tended to first advance their views in periodicals. This practice is evident as early as 1928 with Lucy Langdon (Williams) Wilson's New Schools of New Russia, portions of which appeared in a series of articles in the National Education Association Journal (January and November, 1928). John Dewey's Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World (1929) appeared first as a series of "letters" over a ten-year period in the New Republic. George S. Counts, Soviet Challenge to America (1931), and Dr. Thomas Woody, New Minds: New Men? The Emergence of the Soviet Citizen (1932), followed that same pattern. Such was even the case for Soviet writers. A section of Albert Petrovich Pinkevitch's New Education in the Soviet Republic (1932) appeared in School and Society

magazine under the title "Methods of Work in Higher Education Institutions in Soviet Russia" (September 27, 1930).

Similarly, post-World War II periodical literature contained the same information as the book literature. George S. Counts published "Recent Tendencies in Soviet Eduation" in the American Teacher (November 1947). The article was a restatement of material published in I Want to Be Like Stalin in the same year. Both summarized the official Soviet Pedagogy. Counts related how every subject of the curriculum was used to develop patriotism and "sacred love of the Motherland." It also emphasized the corollary of fostering a burning hatred of all enemies of Stalin or the Communist Party. He ended "Recent Tendencies" with a stark warning: "If the Russians continue on their present course, we shall doubtless march down the same road. We are already at the beginning of that road. We must strive to persuade the Russians that this is the way of madness."[57]

A three article series on Sovet education appeared in The Education Digest. W. A. Gatherer's "The Teaching of History in Russian Schools: In All Ages--Class Struggle" (November 13, 1953) described the secondary school syllabuses issued by the Russian Ministry of Education. His description revealed clearly a fundamental difference between the teaching of history in Russia and the West. In Britian, the author related, there was no clearcut, official dictated policy for history teaching. "Directives may be issued to guide teachers as to selection of topics, but aims and principles

---

[57]George S. Counts, "Recent Tendencies in Soviet Education," American Teacher 22 (November 1947): 19.

suggested are vague and often ambiguous." This practice he believed was "characteristic of our democratic way of life." He went on to note that "nothing was vague about the teaching of history in Russia." Rather, "history is the main instrument of the ideological-political education of the pupils."[58] In the Sovet Union the teaching of history must conform to a definitive and comprehensive scheme based on the theories of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. The underlying principle of the Russian syllabus was the interpretation of history in terms of class struggle. Thus, the study of history in the Soviet Union involves the study of man's economic development, and how in various periods the economic domination of one group has led to the exploitation of the "propertyless." Gatherer related that the theory of class struggle runs through the syllabus "like a strong cord linking all the events and movements of history." He summarized by stating: "History--as the best form of indoctrination--looms much larger in the Soviet school curriculum than ours."[59] Gatherer's findings substantiated the educational indoctrination outlined by George S. Counts in I Want to Be Like Stalin (1947).

John L. Kinloch began his "Education in the U.S.S.R." (June 10, 1955) by relating that during a three-week stay in the Soviet Union as guests of the Soviet Society for Development of Cultural Relations: "We were given every opportunity to investigate

---

[58] W. A. Gatherer, "The Teaching of History in Russian Schools: In All Ages, Class Struggle," Education Digest 36 (November 13, 1953): 698-699.

[59] Ibid.

all the social and cultural activities of the U.S.S.R."[60] He reported that even though as late as 1932 one-third of the adult population was illiterate, illiteracy had almost disappeared. "The Soviets," he wrote, "are getting on top of their educational problems."[61] He stated that the status of teachers among the Soviets was high, as was the teachers' remuneration. He described a vast array of secondary schools, elementary and nursery schools, universities, and Palaces of Culture. Taken as a unit, the Gatherer and Kinloch articles relate the same disclosures as Counts' I Want to Be Like Stalin and Challenge of Soviet Education.

Publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica and former United States Senator William Benton traveled to Russia in 1955, "specifically to observe Russian education and politial indoctrination."[62] He returned home with what to him was "astonishing information: that the Russians were turning out more scientists and technicians than the United States; that they would shortly pass America in total educational effort."[63] Benton presented an address at the Eleventh National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the Association for Higher Education at Chicago, Illinois, in March 1956. His

---

[60]John L. Kinlock, "Education in the U.S.S.R.," Education Digest 38 (June 10, 1955): 389.

[61]Ibid., p. 390.

[62]Book jacket to William Benton, This is the Challenge: The Benton Reports of 1956-1958 on the Nature of the Soviet Threat (New York: Associated College Press, 1958). Published after Sputnik, but many sections appeared before Sputnik.

[63]Ibid.

remarks were reprinted in the Education Digest under the title, "Soviet Education: More Ominous than the Hydrogen Bomb?"

He began by relating that education had become a main theater of the Cold War. Russia's classrooms and libraries, her laboratories and teaching methods, may threaten America more than her hydrogen bomb or her guided missiles. For decades, he continued, the Soviet Union has had a long-range plan for ideological and economic world conquest. At the heart of the Soviet design was the schooling for export of thousands of indoctrinated and capable engineers, scientists, school masters, and technicians of all kinds. What impressed Benton most was that in "in less than forty years the Soviets had created a first-rate school system and that they had already eclipsed the United States in the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level." He feared that the Soviets had found an educational "formula for combining on the one hand high quality in scientific and technological training and research--including production of original and creative work in the natural sciences--and on the other hand an acceptance and obedience in political, economic, philosophical, and moral matters."[64]

To counterbalance the amazing growth of the Soviet educational system, Benton presented a four-point program. Priority one was the establishment of a scholarship fund and fellowship program on a competitive basis. He felt the federal government should

---

[64]William Benton, "Soviet Education: More Ominous Than the Hydrogen Bomb?" Education Digest 21, No. 9 (May 1956): 4-8.

undertake immediately a national scholarship program with 20,000 scholarships, each covering four years of college, awarded annually. His second priority was to develop new incentives for teachers. Turning again to the federal government for leadership, Benton outlined a plan to add several billion dollars annually to teachers' salaries. Priority three was to upgrade the physical plant. He set a goal of $3.8 billion a year to secure 950,000 classrooms in the next ten years. Fourth and finally, Benton saw the need to re-examine teaching methods and the instructional setup in order to bring technology into the schools.

In this fourth priority, Benton outlined a reliance on educational hardware and differentiated staffing arrangements. He wrote that "we should expect more of teachers as we pay them better." Further, he went on to propose elimination of what he termed "many phony certification procedures after requring inferior courses at second rate colleges." He outlined what he termed the need for "subject matter trained specialists." He also spoke of the need to "cut down in many areas the enormous waste."[65] The reader familiar with Admiral Hyman G. Rickover's Education and Freedom (1959) will notice that Benton clearly anticipates Rickover's line of argument. This is the case even down to the example of Yale and Princeton graduates who are physics majors who are denied teaching positions because of the so-called "phony certification procedures."[66] In

---

[65]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[66]Ibid.

the flurry of publication which followed the launching of Sputnik I, Benton reissued an expanded version of his remarks under the title This Is the Challenge (1958). Interestingly, Benton seemed shocked at educational conditions in the Soviet Union. His alarm is of a different kind than, for example, George S. Counts' Challenge of Soviet Education (1957). Benton does not give evidence of doing his homework. Information concerning Soviet educational and scientific achievements was not restricted to narrow education publications. The Science News Letter (November 22, 1952) outlined the number of highly trained technicians and scientists the Soviets were preparing compared to the United States. The lay persons' Popular Science Magazine (November 1954) had featured a seven-page spread, complete with diagrams of atomic powered airliners, rockets, space stations and moonscapes, entitled "Russians Cram to Beat U.S. in Science." The Popular Science Magazine story even featured a description of the Soviet ten-year school curriculum, down to the hours per week of required homework in science and mathematics. These articles were not isolated examples.

"The Soviet Challenge and Secondary Education in the United States" in The Educational Forum (November 1956) by I. L. Kandel began by noting: "It is significant that in less than a year the challenge of the U.S.S.R. has succeeded in directing attention to deficiencies of American secondary education which critics at home have been unable to arouse over a period of more than a quarter of a

century."[67] The awakening Kandel described was the American public's interest in what he believed to be poor standards of attainment in science education. He went on to describe these standards in science education as "symptomatic of conditions that prevail in most other subjects--mathematics, foreign language, English, and history."[68] This failure in attainment Kandel laid at the door mat of the "educational frontier movement" which resulted in "education for life adjustment" and deemphasis on the mastery of "cardinal principles."[69]

Kandel's "Soviet Challenge and Secondary Education in the United States" fits the mold of William Benton's "Soviet Education: More Ominous than the Hydrogen Bomb?" Both anticipate the argument of Hyman Rickover's Education and Freedom. Both were written by non-experts in the area of Soviet education. Both, as evidenced by what they wrote, were largely ignorant of the extensive work in the field of Soviet education in both the pre- and post-World War II eras. More attention to this area will be presented in the next section of this dissertation.

Education in the U.S.S.R. (Office of Education: Bulletin 1957, No. 14) declared that "Soviet policy precisely enunciates that the function of education in the U.S.S.R. is to serve the interests of the state." The state, the report continued, attempts to decide

---

[67] I. L. Kandel, "The Soviet Challenge and Secondary Education in the United States," The Educational Forum 21 (November 1956): 27.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid.

through its planning mechanism what skills are needed and in what proportion they are needed for the most efficient development of the state. The state system of education covered all levels, from preschool through university, and cultural education for adults. The state plan for education was shown to be a function of the state economic plan for the nation. The Office of Education report went on to describe the technicums and scientific institutes which had so inflamed ex-Senator William Benton. As evidenced by this document, Washington policy makers in the Office of Education were fully informed as to the status of Soviet educational affairs. Education in the U.S.S.R. obviously drew on the pool of information developed over the period 1917 to 1957 by professional educators. It clearly lacked the evangelical approach of William Benton and I. L. Kandel and the wit of Hyman Rickover.

Fittingly, the last periodical literature to be examined in the time frame 1947 to 1957 is George S. Counts' "Soviet Education and Soviet Power" from Teachers College Record (March 1957). The article was a reprint from The Challenge of Soviet Education published by McGraw-Hill in the same year. Counts restated his recurring thesis that "the growth of Soviet power would have been impossible in the absence of the development of Soviet education."[70] Counts believed that the program of education was the key to understanding the Russian colossus. "For from the moment the Bolsheviks consolidated their rule over the Russian Empire, they employed

---

[70]George S. Counts, "Soviet Education and Soviet Power," Teachers College Record 58 (March 1957): 293.

education to change the course of history and the nature of man."[71] Counts had consistently reported this thesis beginning with The Soviet Challenge to America (1931). His understanding of the Platonic underpinning of Bolshevik educational philosophy placed him above other mere catalogers of information. He openly faced this issue in the Challenge of Soviet Education (1957). He was the only writer in the period 1947 to 1957 to see Soviet education as a challenge, not only in science and technology, but on a moral basis in the Third World. Clearly, he painted a picture of the whole tree of Soviet education: roots, trunk, and branches. He was not overcome by scientific and technical education and the emphasis on subject matter as were to be so many authors in the post-Sputnik period.

The data would seem to indicate two generalizations concerning the American perception of Soviet education in the time frame 1917-1957:

1. American writers on Soviet education presented a detailed, clear account of the theory and practice of Soviet education. The reader is directed to the twenty generalizations printed on pages 12, 13, 30, and 31 for specific details of the theory and practice.

2. With the exception of scattered reports in periodicals, authors of the period did not attack American education in the light of disclosures concerning American education.

---

[71] Ibid.

These two conclusions shall serve as a point of departure in section three of this dissertation. Section two of this dissertation will concern itself with the character of education discussions concerning American education for the period 1947 to October 4, 1957.

CHAPTER II

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT, 1947 TO OCTOBER 4, 1957

As John Dewey had forecast in Experience and Education (1938) progressivism had become the educational conventional wisdom in the post-World War II period.[1] Discussions of educational policy were honeycombed with phrases like "recognizing individual differences," "educating the whole child," "social and emotional growth," "teaching children, not subjects," and "adjusting the school to the child." The sources that document this view are legion: professional journals, education textbooks, school board reports, and various publications of the United States Office of Education. A Roper survey published in a special education issue of Life magazine (October 16, 1960) indicated that 67 percent of those polled agreed with the statements "School children are being taught more worthwhile and useful things than children were twenty years ago," and "We are getting better trained and more capable teachers in our public schools."[2]

---

[1] Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Knopf, 1961), p. 328.

[2] "What U.S. Thinks About Its Schools," Life, October 29, 1950, p. 11.

In July 1955, the Progressive Education Association was disbanded. The officers of the association announced that the organization's work had been accomplished and that there was no longer any need for the separate existence of the organization.[3] Perhaps the zenith of the movement had been reached with a series of volumes issued by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association entitled Education for All American Youth (1944), Educational Services for Young Children (1945), and Education for All American Children (1948), and the reports of the two U.S. Office of Education Commissions on Life Adjustment Education for Youth: Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth (no date), Vitalizing Secondary Education: Report of the First Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth (1951), and A Look Ahead in Secondary Education: Report of the Second Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth (1954).

The Commission's three volumes outline a blueprint of postwar education in "Farmville" and "American City," both located in the mythical state of "Columbia." The public schools in "Columbia" were comprehensive and concerned with all young people from age three through twenty, those in school as well as those outside school. All schools were dedicated to the proposition that:

> Every youth in these United States, regardless of sex, economic status, geographic location, or race, should experience a broad and balanced education which will (1) equip him to enter an occupation suited to his abilities and offering reasonable opportunity for personal growth and usefulness;

---

[3]Paul Woodring, A Fourth of a Nation (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), p. 15.

> (2) prepare him to assume the full responsibilities of American citizenship; (3) give him a fair chance to exercise his right to the pursuit of happiness; (4) stimulate intellectual achievement, and cultivate an ability to think rationally; and (5) help him to develop an appreciation of the ethical values which should undergird all life in a democratic society.[4]

Lawrence A. Cremin's The Transformation of the School (1957) characterized these reports as "patently progressive education."[5]

The life-adjustment movement originated in the activities of the Vocational Education Division of the United States Office of Education. Early in 1944 the division undertook a study of "Vocational Education in the Years Ahead." As part of the study a conference was organized for May 31 and June 1, 1945, at the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the conferees:

> It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form ("Vocational Education in the Years Ahead"), the vocational school of a community will be able better to prepare 20 percent of the youth of secondary school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare another 20 percent for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth will receive the life adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens, unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of vocational education leaders formulate a similar program for this group.
>
> We therefore request the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education to call at some early date a conference or a series of regional

---

[4]Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, Education for All American Youth (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1944), p. 21.

[5]Cremin, Transformation, p. 333.

> conferences between an equal number of representatives of general and of vocational education--to consider this problem and to take such initial steps as may be found advisable for its solution.[6]

The Office of Education was agreeable and five regional gatherings were held between April and November, 1946. These conferences brought together secondary school principals, school superintendents, representatives of state departments of education, supervisors of vocational education, administrators and professors of teacher education institutions, and national professional associations. No science or arts professors from universities were included. A national conference was held the following May, which recommended that a Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth be created and that a program be established to promote life-adjustment education at the state and local levels. The U.S. Commissioner of Education was agreeable and asked various professional associations to submit nominees for the proposed commission. Eventually, a nine member body was formed under the chairmanship of Superintendent Benjamin Willis of Yonkers, New York.[7]

The Commission viewed its task as one of translating the prevailing progressive theory into contemporary educational practice. The First Commission Report stated:

> National committees have been developing and extending basic theses for the past thirty years, and they have made progress in clarifying thought and securing consensus. It is

---

[6]United States Office of Education Commission on Life Adjustment for Youth, Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth (Washington, D.C., n.d.), p. 15.

[7]Cremin, Transformation, p. 335.

> the conviction of the Commission that there is available such a wealth of sound theory by which to achieve effective educational programs that at this time the great need is for action which translates theory into school practice.[8]

The Commission defined its goal as an education "designed to equip all American youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and a profit to society as home members, workers, and citizens."[9]

The First Commission on Life Adjustment for Youth worked three years and turned out a report in 1951. A Second Commission followed and issued its report in 1954. Both Commissions sponsored a number of regional and national conferences and engaged the cooperative efforts of several influential organizations such as the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the National School Boards Association. Despite this success, no new Commission was appointed in 1954, and no new funds were approved. The life-adjustment movement had come under bitter attack by the critics of progressive education, this not withstanding the remarks and action taken in disbanding the Progressive Education Association in 1955.

---

[8]U.S.O.E. Commission on Life Adjustment for Youth, Life Adjustment, p. 3.

[9]United States Office of Education Commission on Life Adjustment for Youth, Vitalizing Secondary Education: Report of the First Commission on Life-Adjustment Education for Youth (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1951), p. 1.

The bitter and corrosive attack on progressivism in the wake of the life-adjustment movement was a reaffirmation of the debate which vexed American eduation in the pre-war era. Irving Adler in What We Want of Our Schools: Plain Talk on Education, From Theory to Budgets (1957) outlined four major schools of anti-progressivism thought: "Criticism from the Extreme Right," "Criticism from the Chambers of Commerce," "Traditionalist Criticism," and what he termed "Constructive Critics" which represented the ideas of William C. Bagley, Robert M. Hutchins, Arthur Bestor, and Albert Lynd. Adler distinguished between criticism which attacked progressivism in the public schools and criticism which attacked the public schools in general. Because progressivism had acquired semi-official status in the public schools it was not always easy to make such a distinction.[10]

Education in a Divided World: The Function of the Public Schools in Our Unique Society (1948) by James B. Conant was the outgrowth of a series of lectures given at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the fall of 1945. Conant spoke for the need for national planning in the the wake of the struggle between the Soviet Union and the democracies.[11] As a member of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association from 1940 through 1945, he indicated that the material in his three lectures was

---

[10]Irving Adler, What We Want of Our Schools (New York: John Day Co., 1957), p. 195.

[11]James B. Conant, Education in a Divided World: The Function of the Schools in Our Unique Society (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. ix.

"though differing in many respects, in harmony in their basic recommendations" with Education for All American Youth (1944) by the Educational Policies Commission.[12] This fact is worthy of note, for Conant would be listed by many commentators as one of the critics of American education in the post-Sputnik period.[13] In Education in a Divided World, however, Conant does not take exception with progressivism or life adjustment. To the contrary, Conant states that he wrote the book to blunt hostility toward the schools by explaining the goals of American eduation. The "national planning in the wake of the struggle between the Soviet Union and the democracies" turns out to be the education in "Farmville" and "American City" in the mythical state of "Columbia." In other words, Conant called for the conversion of progressive theory into educational practice.[14]

The post-war assault on the principles and practices of modern education, the writings of John Dewey, the pronouncements of the Educational Policies Commission, and the Teachers College catalog began with Bernard Iddings Bell's Crisis in Education: A Challenge to American Complacency and Mortimer Smith's And Madly Teach, both of them published in 1949. Canon Bell of the Protestant Episcopal Church had long been critical of the contemporary trend toward relativism, secularism, and egalitarianism. Bell held that the public

---

[12]Ibid.

[13]See Frank G. Jennings, "Educational Reform 1957-1967: It Didn't Start with Sputnik," Saturday Review, September 16, 1967, pp. 77-79, 95-97 for an analysis of Conant as critic of progressive education.

[14]Conant, Education in a Divided World, pp. 1-37.

school must accept much of the blame for these trends. His stated intention was to "challenge American complacency" by asking and answering the question, To what extent was American educational theory and practice responsible for the unsatisfactory state of our life and culture? From kindergarten to the university, he believed the schools suffered from misplaced emphasis. The elementary schools failed to transmit the elemental wisdom of the race. The secondary schools coddled young minds rather than strengthening them. The colleges had deprived the nation of a humanely educated leadership. The schools had usurped domestic functions that were properly parental. Above all else, the schools had excluded religion, without which education could have no ultimate purpose. Bell held that the business of education is to minister to the common need and that "the common need is for reverence toward That Which Is [sic] and for discipline in the light of what such reverence reveals."[15] That is to say, religion should have the central place in the curriculum of publicly supported denominational schools, if necessary.

Bell's views on secondary education appeared in an article in Life Magazine on October 16, 1950. He said:

> Our school system seems to presuppose that, for education to be democratic, every man's child must be treated as the equal of every other's in kind of brains and in educability. The effect of this is to herd an increasing number

---

[15]Bernard Iddings Bell, Crisis in Education: A Challenge to American Complacency (New York: Whittlesey House, 1949), p. 178.

> of unfit persons into colleges of liberal arts whose proper business is to help students of exceptional intelligence to understand human affairs and develop sound judgments therein.[16]

He summed up his criticism as follows:

> These four, then, are the grievous criticisms being leveled today against American education. It neglects the basic disciplines. It tends to turn out graduates who expect the cheap success of reward without labor. It denies our society the training of leadership by madly mixing technology and liberal learning and trying to feed the indigestible stew to thousands who choke on it. By treating religion as a dispensable diversion, it deprives the young of all allegiance to any spiritual compulsion greater than love of country.[17]

The same idea was expressed more briefly in the title of an article in the New York Times Magazine, written by Douglas Brush of Harvard University: "Education of All Is Education for None." Here, clearly, is the "Traditionalist Criticism" of Irving Adler.

And Madly Teach, Mortimer Smith's little book of 107 pages, attacked the philosophy and doctrines which underlie progressive education. Even though Dr. Bell wrote the introduction to And Madly Teach, important differences separated the two men. Bell proposed to improve the teaching profession by better training, better pay, and better organization. Smith directed an attack against the teaching profession. Bell contended in his introduction that the "fault lies not in our pedagogues but in ourselves." Smith urged parents

---

[16]Bernard Iddings Bell, "Know How vs. Know Why: Canon Bell Finds Our System Superficial and Undisciplined," Life, October 16, 1950, p. 92.

[17]Ibid., p. 98.

"to rise up in righteous indignation against the pedagogues" and insist on education's historic role as moral and intellectual leader.

Benjamin Fine was the education editor of the New York Times. In Our Children Are Cheated: Crisis in American Education (1950), he stated in his forward:

> . . . what I found was shocking. Many schools have broken down; education faces a serious crisis. Hundreds of communities cannot get adequate teachers. I have spoken to men and women who have no more right to be in the classroom than I have to pilot a superpassenger plane . . . . We will suffer the consequences of our present neglect of education for generations hence.[18]

Fine's crisis was one of physical plants, teacher preparation, and monetary support, not one of pedagogues, progressivism, and subversion. The little volume was out of step with the times as evidenced by its failure to be quoted in other monographs, and was quietly relegated to taking up shelf space.

Earl Conrad's Public School Scandal: A Documented Exposé appeared in 1952. Conrad was an experienced newspaper man who conducted a personal survey of educational conditions, practices, and attitudes in the public schools. Unfortunately, he limited his "personal survey" to the public schools of New York City. The book contained a strong emotional undercurrent and appeared to many reviewers more of a tract than an exposé.[19] The 270 page volume

---

[18]Benjamin Fine, Our Children Are Cheated: Crisis in American Eduation (New York: H. Holt, 1950), book jacket.

[19]Reviews of Public School Scandal by Earl Conrad: Kelsey Guilford, Chicago Sunday Tribune, April 29, 1951, p. 8; Benjamin Fine, New York Times, April 15, 1951, p. 26; Fred M. Heckinger, Saturday Review of Literature, June 30, 1951, p. 15.

centered about a description of existing practices of teaching reading and of testing for reading readiness and their effects on children. Conrad's remedy for the "public school scandal" was the expenditure of more money to relieve congested classrooms and the introduction of federal-aid legislation. Notwithstanding his iconoclastic approach, Conrad's proposed remedy clearly placed him in the gallery of Irving Adler's "constructive critics."

Despite its title, Charles Wilson Sanford et al. (eds.), The Schools and National Security: Recommendations for Elementary and Secondary Schools (1951) was cast in the mold of progressive education. The grandiose report was produced by the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program. "In the social studies as in all general education," the report states, "teachers have several major tasks. They should reduce tensions and meet the needs of children and youth. They should illuminate the social realities. They should develop understanding and practice of democratic values."[20] This non-structured approach is epitomized by the section headed "Personal Problems." Here history is applied to the personal problems of youth. "Ask the students," the report suggests, "to make studies of how the last war affected the dating patterns in our culture."[21] Clearly, the social studies did not stand for the systematic study of history, political science, and economics.

---

[20]Charles Wilson Sanford et al., eds., The Schools and National Security: Recommendations for Elementary and Secondary Schools (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1945), p. 221.

[21]Ibid., p. 230.

Like James B. Conant's Education in a Divided World (1948), the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program was a self-acknowledged product of the Cold War. Similarly, both were in harmony with Education for All American Youth (1944) by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. Both saw nothing incompatible with a rigorous educational race with the Soviet Union and progressive and life-adjustment movements in American education. The third of the three parts of The Schools and National Security outlined the responsibilities of administrators, parent-teacher groups, librarians and teachers in promoting the "educational conventional wisdom." The criticisms of Bell, Smith, Fine, and Conrad had not shaken the confidence in the thought and practice of progressivism.

This Happened in Pasadena (1951) written by David Hulburd burst upon the educational scene the same year as The Schools and National Security. Its author, a professional journalist, described the political demise of William Goslin, the progressive Superintendent of Pasadena's schools. President of the American Association of School Administrators, Goslin had been forced out of one of the showcases of modern education by a combination of citizens opposed to school taxes, radicalism, and progressive education. It was shades of John Dewey's The Authoritarian Attempt to Capture Education. Hurlburd warned, and James B. Conant who reviewed the book warned: "Good education has been successfuly subverted in one American community; it could happen in any American community; now was the time for all interested citizens to come to the aid of the

schools.[22] "Fantastic? It can't happen here? Read this book. . . . It has happened here," proclaimed the jacket to Hulburd's book.

As judged by the literature of pamphlets and articles, collected and discussed by C. Winfield Scott and Clyde M. Hill in Public Education Under Criticism (1954), it was happening in a lot of places. The notion of a "calculated, far-reaching plot by ultra-rightists" was taken up by defenders of the new education. This progressive defense was epitomized by V. T. Thayer's Public Education and Its Critics (1954). He wrote in his introduction:

> It is hoped that this survey will help in a small way to stimulate a better understanding of the basic issues underlying the controversy over the schools and to clarify public policy regarding the kind of education the American people wish their schools to provide.[23]

He continued:

> Throughout the years, criticism of the public schools has been within the framework of their general acceptance as distinctive and valued instruments of American democracy. . . . By way of contrast in recent years attacks upon the public schools have taken a new and ominous character. While seemingly directed at specific conditions in schools within specific localities, they give evidence of being inspired by organizations operating on a much wider scale. Similarly, charges made and the techniques employed with which to sustain these charges are, by and large, those of skillful propagandists rather than of responsible and conscientious citizens seeking to reform an institution they love.[24]

---

[22]James B. Conant, "The Superintendent Was the Target," The New York Times Book Review, April 29, 1951, p. 27.

[23]V. T. Thayer, Public Education and Its Critics (New York: Macmillan, 1954), p. x.

[24]Ibid., pp. vii-viii. Emphasis mine.

Writing in the January 1952 issue of Progressive Education, editor Archibald W. Anderson of the University of Illinois advanced a theory concerning recent attacks on public education. Critics, he believed, should be divided into two groups. One group he labeled "honest and sincere critics." "Some of these critics, he wrote, "take the trouble to keep themselves well informed about educational matters, are willing to work with the schools, and generally favor the same lines of progress as the educators. Such critics are not likely to join an organized attack." The second group Anderson labeled as an assortment of "chronic tax conservationists," "congenital reactionaries," "witch hunters," "super-patriots," "dogma haters," and lastly, "academic conservatives."[25]

Hollis L. Caswell took exception to the thesis advanced by Thayer and Anderson in an article entitled "The Great Reappraisal of Public Education" published in Teachers College Record in October of 1953. Caswell laid the "plot theory" aside and advanced in its place the idea that what was happening was not merely a subversive attack on the schools but rather a "searching reappraisal of the whole philosophy of progressive education." Anderson's thesis, he contended, "ignored the growing number of citizens who took the trouble to make themselves well informed about educational matters, but who did not generally favor the same lines of progress as the educators."[26]

---

[25]Archibald W. Anderson, "The Cloak of Responsibility: The Attackers and Their Methods," Progressive Education 29, No. 3 (January 1952): 69-70. Emphasis mine.

[26]Hollis L. Caswell, "The Great Reappraisal of Education," Teachers College Record 54, No. 1 (October 1953): 12-22. Emphasis mine.

Writing five years later in A Fourth of a Nation (1957), Paul Woodring shared the Caswell thesis. Since the Second World War, he saw "two separate waves of attack." And the "failure to distinguish between them," he believed "to be the source of much of our current confusion." The first wave, which began right after the war, Woodring asserted, grew out of the uncertainties of the international situation and a fear the subversion was sweeping the land. This wave of attack took the form of assaults on academic freedom, critical examination of textbooks, and a search for subversive teachers. It led to loyalty oaths and a reexamination of the role of textbooks in teaching. During this wave of controversy, "the classroom teachers were supported by scholars and other intellectuals of the nation."[27] The second wave started later and, Woodring believed, reached its crest so far as published criticism is concerned, in the fall of 1953 when four major critical books were published within a month. This wave was completely unrelated to the first. It stemmed from different causes and was articulated by a very different group of people. "In this debate the great majority of scholars and other intellectuals stand in opposition to the spokesmen for professional education."[28] This attack, Woodring said, was not an attack upon the schools as alleged by Thayer and Anderson. Rather, "it is an attack along a broad front upon a set of philosophies and practices which the critics believe to have come to dominate

---

[27]Woodring, A Fourth, pp. 6-7.

[28]Ibid.

our schools and which they are convinced are false and dangerous."[29] Woodring legitimized such attacks by declaring them pro-public education, but anti-progressive education in philosophy.

Among the best known of the critics of Woodring's "second wave" were Arthur Bestor, Albert Lynd, and Mortimer Smith. The titles of their books, Educational Wastelands, Quackery in the Public Schools, and The Diminished Mind, tell something of their approach. To them Woodring added Dr. Rudolf Flesh's Why Johnny Can't Read. One could also add Paul Woodring's own Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools, all published in the same year, 1953. Despite the sound of their titles, it should not be overlooked that many of the criticisms contained in them may also be found in the more moderate writings of men such as Presidents Griswold of Yale, Dodds of Princeton, and Gordon Chalmers of Kenyon, as well as the articles of many scholars and scientists. Robert M. Hutchins presented a comprehensive restatement of his views in The Conflict in Education, also published in the seminal year, 1953. Hutchins had for years been critical of the philosophies and practices which alarmed the authors of the five monographs.

Hutchins believed that the philosophy of education was a secondary subject, dependent on our conception of man and society. He found American society dominated by drives for money, power, and success, instead of wisdom and goodness. He found the pressures tending toward this low cultural level in the schools. However, the schools were merely reflecting the pressures for a low cultural level which

---

[29]Ibid., p. 7.

originated in society. He rejected education for life adjustment on the ground that it implied adapting people to the status quo. He declared the progressive education doctrine of "felt needs" of children to be simply another version of life adjustment. The "felt needs" were molded by low level social influences. These influences were money, power, and success, which Hutchins found wanting.

Hutchins offers an alternative program of education based on his conviction that the schools should restore a program of liberal education, which he defined as training in the liberal arts and understanding the leading ideas that have animated mankind. It aims to help the human being to learn to think for himself, to develop his highest human powers. To realize this program of cultivating critical thinking, Hutchins advocated that secondary and higher schools make greater use of the classics. For if the object of the educational system is to help young people learn to think for themselves, it should help them to think about the most important subjects, and these are discussed in the greatest works of the greatest writers of the past and present.

Hutchins' emphasis on the "great books" as the core of a liberal education grows out of his own conception of human nature. As he put it in his book, The Higher Learnings in America:

> One purpose of education is to draw out the elements of our common human nature. These elements are the same in any time or place. The notion of educating a man to live in any particular time or place, to adjust him to any particular environment, is therefore foreign to a true conception of education.[30]

---

[30]Robert M. Hutchins, The Higher Learnings in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 66.

Thus the human problems discussed in the classics or great books are identical with the problems of today, so that the study of the classics is a direct value for contemporary life. In the classics one finds the accumulated experience of the human race. The rising generation must build upon this accumulated experience in order to carry human experience to wisdom and goodness and the rejection of wealth, power, and success. He attacked John Dewey's philosophy at its core, a faith in the scentific method. The questions that science can answer, he believed, are questions about the physical world. They deal with the material conditions of existence. "What is called social science cannot tell us what kind of society we ought to aim at. It is doubtful whether it can even tell us what the consequences of a given social policy will be."[31]

Arthur Bestor was an American historian who taught for a number of years at Teachers College, Columbia University, before going on to professorships at Stanford and then to the University of Illinois. Educational Wastelands (1953) was a savage attack on the life-adjustment movement. The book was widely reviewed and commented on, and a revised and enlarged edition was published in 1955 under the title The Restoration of Learning. His criticism dated from 1952 and the book incorporated passages from articles published in the William and Mary Quarterly (January 1952), the American Scholar (Spring 1952), the Scientific Monthly (August 1952), the American Association of University Professors Bulletin (Autumn 1952),

---

[31] Ibid., p. 65.

the New Republic (January 19, 1953), School and Society (January 31, 1953, and September 19, 1953), the Christian Register (March 1953), the Phi Delta Kappan (June 1954), Vital Speeches of the Day (August 15, 1954), the Teachers College Record (October 1954), and the National Parent-Teacher (October 1954). Clearly, both within and without the profession, these writings constituted a serious and influential attack on progressive education.

The great subversion of American education, Bestor contended, had been the divorce of the schools from scholarship and of teacher education from the academic disciplines. Bestor attacked an inter-locking directorate composed of professors of education, the school administrators they trained, and the state departments of education that require their courses for teacher certification.

Bestor proposed a three-fold program for reform: The organization of a coalition of parents and liberal arts professors who would remove the schools from the control of the "inter-locking directorate"; the redrawing of certification requirements to strengthen academic learning and deemphasize professional education courses; and the return of teacher education to the control of the university in the place of the professional school. The return of teacher education to the control of the total university was the crux of the Bestor reform. This "Restoration" was, to Bestor, essential, for the total university, not the department of pedagogy, was concerned with education. A statement of Bestor's reforms is

found in Part III, sub-titled "Roads to Educational Reform," in The Restoration of Learning.[32]

Albert Lynd, a member of the school board in a Massachusetts town near Boston, assailed "professional educators who comprise the faculties of teachers colleges, as well as their colleagues who control public education policies on the state and federal level." It was his contention that these groups, "constituting a tight bureaucracy unrivaled since the priesthood of ancient Egypt," actually do harm to education. He concentrated his denunciations on the programs in teacher training institutions, quoting the multiplicity of courses offered, and decrying the avoidance of basic subject matter. Quackery in the Public Schools (1953) and "Who Wants Progressive Education: The Influence of John Dewey on the Public Schools," the Atlantic Monthly (April 1953), traced how "one philosophy acquired in lower education a dominance quite out of proportion to its standing--considerable as it is--among professional philosophers? And fantastically out of proportion to popular agreement with its basic principles?"[33]

After tracing the development of the "New Education" from the Romanticism of Rousseau and Pestalozzi to the scientific pragmatism of John Dewey, Lynd wrote:

---

[32]Arthur Bestor, The Restoration of Learning (New York: Knopf, 1955), pp. 221-408.

[33]Albert Lynd, "Who Wants Progressive Education: The Influence of John Dewey on Public Schools," Atlantic Monthly, April 1953, reprinted in Reginald D. Archambault, ed., Dewey on Education: Appraisals (New York, Random House, 1966), p. 193.

> Dewey's great influence upon American education is usually explained by his disciples on the ground that his philosophy is peculiarly congenial to the spirit of American democracy. That is not wholly convincing: the argument is circular, because it includes conceptions of democracy which are themselves a part of Mr. Dewey's philosophy. His authority is more probably explainable as an historical accident; he was the only first-rate American philosopher to take an intense evangelical interest in the lower schools. For our graduates in Education who are uneducated in anything but their own trade, Dewey is to the American school what Aristotle was to the medieval school: simply "the Philosopher."[34]

Lynd went on to state that Dewey's educational theories were consistently related to his basic philosophical views. He then sketched out his own interpretation of Dewey's philosophy which he noted was usually called instrumentalism. The following points Lynd judged to be prominent: "There are no eternal truths."[35] The only test for truth in an idea is in its consequences in the life activities to which it leads. "There is no mind or soul in the traditional sense."[36] Since there is no mind or thought apart from environmental interaction, it follows there is no such thing as a soul or even a self which can exist and be educated apart from its own experiences. "There are no fixed moral laws."[37] This follows from the foregoing. The scientific method was to Dewey the only proper way for establishing moral codes, as it was for establishing any kind of knowledge. "Democracy is a moral value."[38] This is the case because of the

---

[34]Ibid., pp. 193-94. Emphasis mine.

[35]Ibid., p. 195.

[36]Ibid., p. 197.

[37]Ibid., p. 199.

[38]Ibid., p. 200.

social order it encourages; or in the scientific view, according to Dewey, democracy was the most successful relationship of the organism to its environment. And lastly, "Pragmatism justifies Progressive Education."[39] This followed from Dewey's rejection of the traditional distinction between mind and body. In other words, progressive education, like democracy, was the most successful accommodation between organism and environment. Acknowledging "Dewey's own unquestioned intellectual stature and integrity," Lynd ended with the question many other writers were offering up answers to: "You know your neighbors. How many of them would vote for Deweyism if they understood the philosophical ballot?"[40]

Diminished Mind: A Study of Planned Mediocrity in Our Public Schools (1953) by Mortimer Brewster Smith, like its predecessor And Madly Teach (1949), attacked progressive education, root and branch. In his prologue Mortimer Smith wrote:

> I have attempted to write a book which aims to present evidence in support of the thesis that learning, in the traditional sense of disciplined knowledge, is rapidly declining in our public schools, not through fortuitous circumstances but by deliberate, and almost invariably well intentioned, design of those responsible for setting the direction of public education.[41]

The little book's 150 pages were an uncompromising attack on the principles of modern education, especially the report of the Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth and the writings of John Dewey.

---

[39] Ibid., p. 202.

[40] Ibid., p. 208.

[41] Mortimer Smith, The Diminished Mind: A Study of Planned Mediocrity in Our Public Schools (Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1953), p. 1.

Rudolf Flesch's Why Johnny Can't Read (1953) differed from the other criticisms published in that year in that it does not discuss the aims and purposes of education and in no sense is a philosophical work. The book was a discussion on some alleged shortcomings of the "look-say" method of reading instruction. Flesch believed the "look-say" method, by completely ignoring phonetic analysis, had made English as hard to learn as Chinese ideograms or Egyptian hieroglyphics. Far from being critical of the philosophy and practices of progressivism, Flesch announced his agreement with that point of view. In fact, his doctorate is from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Before turning to the final volumes to be considered in this section, Paul Woodring's Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools (1953) and A Fourth of a Nation (1957), a summary of two descriptions of the American high school is in order. The first description appeared in a special eduational edition of Life magazine (October 16, 1950). It was entitled "A Good High School: New Trier Illustrates a U.S. Speciality." "A Good High School" described the New Trier Township High School, which served a suburban area near Chicago. New Trier, in the author's words,

> . . . exemplifies the U.S. high school at its best. Most high schools cannot match New Trier. The dull curricula, uninspiring surroundings and over worked teachers in many of them rebuff so many high schoolers that 48 out of every 100 drop out before graduation. At New Trier only two out of every 100 drop out.[42]

---

[42]"A Good School: New Trier Illustrates a U.S. Speciality," Life, October 16, 1950, p. 101.

The pictures which accompanied the spread showed a relaxed atmosphere which the author declared to be "somewhat deceptive." He announced that New Trier does not want or insist on stiff collar pedantry, but it "firmly sees to it that its scholars are scholarly." It gives them the equipment they need in the form of a big library, sunny classrooms, and plenty of teachers. It took pains to recognize "individual differences": offering five freshman English classes, for example, gauged to varying degrees of aptitude, and a special V (for velocity) group for students of extraordinary ability who take an additional course each year. The result was that New Trier rated scholastically among the top U.S. high schools. But New Trier did not believe scholarship made a complete man or woman. It developed an athletic and extra-curricular program that "it was almost impossible for a willing student not to be vice president of something."[43]

New Trier had 2,300 students, which made it a big high school. And a $1.4 million budget which in 1950 made New Trier a wealthy high school. The article related, however, that the board of education concentrated not on swank but on good teachers. It had good teachers because it paid as much as $6,000 and $7,000 a year, at a time when the estimated national average teacher salary was $3,400. Similarly, while its 145 courses leaned toward college preparatory, New Trier spent heavily to give non-college-goers the technical training that was "unique and traditional with U.S. high schools." "To the superficial the lesson New Trier teaches is that

---

[43]Ibid.

it is well to be rich. New Trier's real lesson is that it is well to pay adequate school taxes and to use them intelligently."[44] The photographs which accompanied the article featured an outdoor scene of a junior-English class Great Books course in which one instructor led the discussion while another stimulated by heckling. New Trier was an educational enterprise that raised a standard to which a great number of both progressives and traditionalists could point with pride. And despite the talk of finances, anyone reading the article could not help but come away with the impression that such an education was within the grasp of his community. It is also worthy of note that no post-Sputnik critic made any proposal that was not substantially operative at New Trier in October 1950.

James B. Conant's Education and Liberty (1953) followed the general lines of his Education in a Divided World (1948). He clearly relates education to the Cold War:

> If the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, it may well be that the ideological struggle with communism in the next fifty years will be won on the playing fields of the public schools of the United States.[45]

The book was a comparative study of education in the Anglo-Saxon World: England, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States. The book was based on a series of lectures delivered at the University of Virginia under the sponsorship of the Page-Barbour Foundation on February 12-14, 1952.

---

[44]Ibid. Emphasis mine.

[45]James B. Conant, Education and Liberty (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 62.

In a section entitled "Program for the Future," Conant made ten specific recommendations for the American secondary school. The recommendations were designed to aid in the Cold War. In light of his observations of secondary education in England, Scotland, Australia, and New Zealand, Conant suggests that:

> (1) We do not expand our four-year colleges either as to number or as to size.
> (2) We do not expand the four-year programs in our universities; rather, we contract them.
> (3) We attempt to make a two-year college course (following the regular high school course) fashionable; to this end we might award a bachelor's degree of general studies to graduates of such colleges.
> (4) We endeavor to create a climate of opinion in which the length of education beyond eighteen is <u>not</u> considered the hallmark of respectability.
> (5) We continue the expansion of our junior and senior high schools to meet the new bulge in the enrollments, but in doing so, recognize the need for remaking the curriculum in many schools.
> (6) We adhere to the principle of a comprehensive high school with a common core of studies and differentiated special programs, but in so doing we make far more effort to identify the gifted youth and give him or her more rigorous academic training in languages and mathematics.
> (7) We explore the success of some high schools in recent years with "work experience programs" and expand these programs, including particularly the thirteenth and fourteenth grades (the two-year college).
> (8) We provide by private and public action for more scholarships for high school graduates, but only for those who are potential professional men and women (advanced education for others should be offered locally by two-year terminal colleges).
> (9) We endeavor to transform all the present four-year colleges into institutions with high academic standards and arrange the curricula with the thought that a majority of students in these colleges will go on to professional training after two, three, or four years, depending on the ability and drive of the individual.
> (10) We continue to experiment with general education at every level for the future manual worker, the future salesman or executive, and the most highly specialized graduate.[46]

---

[46]Conant, <u>Education and Liberty</u>, pp. 57-59.

Conant characterized his ten suggestions as follows:

> There is little that is novel in these suggestions. They imply a continuation of that drive for general education which is so characteristic of the United States. . . . The type of secondary school I have been discussing has been described in a publication by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. It takes somewhat different forms, depending on whether the community to be served is an urban or rural area. The description is admittedly a blueprint of an ideal, but close approximations to it can be found in many towns and cities in the United States.[47]

The document to which Conant makes reference is, of course, Education for All American Youth (1944). The "close approximation" to the blueprint might well have been the high school of New Trier Township, Illinois, described in the Life magazine article of October 16, 1950. There should be no confusion over Conant's fundamental agreement with Education for All American Youth. In a section of Education and Liberty dealing with New Zealand, he spoke in glowing terms about the report, even to the point of stating that "New Zealand schools have been Americanized."[48] Clearly, in Conant's view, education for life adjustment was not inconsistent with a highly academic education for some, even though this highly academic education would be received in a comprehensive high school.

Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools (1953) and A Fourth of a Nation (1957) by Paul Woodring, former professor at Western Washington College of Education, were eclectic and synthetic. Woodring was a full-time consultant for the Fund for the Advancement of Education

---

[47]Ibid., pp. 59-61.

[48]Ibid., p. 21.

of the Ford Foundation. He went into the debate between proponents of progressive and classical education, and concluded that "what the nation really needs is a new philosophy of education. This philosophy should be based on a logical synthesis of what is best in classicism and progressivism."[49]

Portions of both books had appeared as articles in numerous periodicals. Harper's Magazine in July 1952 published "An Open Letter to Teachers" which was adapted to form Chapter 1 of Let's Talk Sense. Other writings appeared in U.S.A. (October 1952), Education Digest (December 1952), School and Society and the Journal of Teacher Education. Some sections were adapted from Woodring's contributions to The Carleton Faculty Study of Teacher Education and New Directions in Teacher Education, a publication of the Fund for the Advancement of Education. Several chapters of A Fourth of a Nation were used prior to publication as addresses at major universities.

Woodring's association with the Ford Foundation is significant, for it underscores two developments which had their beginnings in the 1940s and came to operational readiness in the early to middle 1950s. One was the emergence of the Ford Foundation as a national philanthropy with resources greater than many governments. The Foundation announced that as a result of its reorganization, education "emerged as the major strand that ties together the purposes of almost our entire activity." The second development was the establishment of the National Science Foundation as an independent agency

---

[49]Paul Woodring, Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools (New York: McGraw Hill, 1953), p. 7.

of the executive branch of the federal government, with a broad mandate to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences.[50]

The National Science Foundation budget has grown from $1.5 million in 1952 to more than $121 million in 1967. This money was used to provide support for fellowship aid to graduate students and post-doctoral students in the sciences; for supplemental training of teachers of science, mathematics, and engineering; for the improvement of subject matter of science and mathematics instruction, especially at the secondary level; and for the identification of talented high school and college students through a variety of special programs. In 1951 the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education set in motion a variety of experimental programs in teacher education. This program included the Master of Arts in Teaching, as well as classroom television, teacher aides, and similar departures from past practice.[51]

The Carnegie Corporation established the National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools in 1948. Paul Woodring also served as a part-time consultant to this group. Along with other foundations, Carnegie joined Ford in supporting the National Merit Scholarships. Grants were made to the Educational Testing Service to improve the quality of information about student performance. At the beginning of 1957, Carnegie persuaded Dr. James B. Conant to

---

[50]Jennings, "Educational Reform," pp. 77-97.

[51]Ibid.

conduct a series of studies of American public education. These studies became the famous "Conant Reports" of post-Sputnik fame.[52]

Other curriculum reform began in this early period. The University of Illinois Committee on School Mathematics began its revisions of the secondary curriculum in 1952.[53] The Physical Sciences Study Committee's development of a new high school physics course began in 1956.[54] And in the year of the suspension of publication of the journal of the Progressive Eduation Association, 1957, Jerrold Zacharias of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology organized some fellow scientists for curriculum reform.[55] These efforts had been preceded by a near decade of philosophical wrangling.

At this point it is appropriate to summarize. The data would seem to indicate the following generalizations:

1. Progressive education had become the educational practice in the period following the Second World War.[56]

2. The early portion of the time period marked the zenith of the progressive theory of education.[57]

---

[52]Ibid., p. 96.

[53]John L. Goodlad, "Curriculum: A Janus Look," Teachers College Record 70, No. 2 (November 1968): 95.

[54]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 169.

[55]Goodlad, "A Janus Look," p. 96.

[56]The sources which document this are legion.

[57]The reports of the Educational Policies Commission of the NEA and the U.S. Office of Education's Commissions on Life Adjustment Education for Youth.

3. A bitter and corrosive attack on the life-adjustment movement marked the reaffirmation of the pre-war progressive-traditionalist debate.[58]

4. Educators such as James B. Conant saw nothing incompatible between education for the Cold War and progressive education.[59]

5. Progressive educators such as Willard Goslin, the dismissed superintendent of Pasadena, California, became subject to political pressure from groups of tax conservatives, "witch hunters," and educational traditionalists.[60]

6. In response to pressures such as those which brought down Willard Goslin, progressive educators advanced the idea of a "plot by ultra-rightists" aimed at the capture of the schools.[61]

7. Most educators came to recognize the inadequacies of the "plot theory" and discovered a searching academic and public reappraisal of progressive educational theory and practice.[62]

8. A series of philosophical assaults by scholars who were pro-public education, but anti-progressive in philosophy took place.[63]

---

[58]Adler, What We Want, and Cremin, Transformation.

[59]Educational Policies Commission, Education for All American Youth; Conant, Education in a Divided World and Education and Liberty.

[60]David Hulburd, This Happened in Pasadena (New York: Macmillan, 1951).

[61]Conant, "The Superintendent"; Anderson, "Cloak of Respectability," pp. 69-70; and Thayer, Public Education.

[62]Caswell, "Reappraisal."

[63]Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953); Albert Lynd, Quackery in the Public Schools (Boston: Little, Brown, 1953); Woodring, Let's Talk Sense; Robert M. Hutchins, The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society (New York: Harper, 1953); Smith, Diminished Mind.

9. These assaults anticipated the specific post-Sputnik attacks on soft pedagogy, lack of academic preparation in graduates of teacher training institutions, and poor pupil achievement in subject matter, especially science and mathematics.[64]

10. The National Science Foundation and the Ford and other national foundations inaugurated programs which continued into the post-Sputnik period.[65]

11. Subject matter groups which resulted in the "new math," "new physics," and the "new social studies" were established prior to the launching of Sputnik.[66]

12. Significantly, however, not one critic suggested the Soviet curriculum as an educational model. In fact, the discussion of Soviet education proceeded independently of the domestic wrangle.

The effect of the launching of Sputnik I and subsequent Soviet space achievements on both discussions will be the subject of the next section of this paper.

---

[64] Ibid.

[65] Jennings, "Educational Reform."

[66] Goodlad, "A Janus Look," Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom.

CHAPTER III

SPUTNIK: INITIAL AMERICAN LITERARY REACTIONS

Essentially, the immediate effect of the launching of Sputnik was to bring together two streams of educational literature in order to form a torrent. As related previously, the treatment of Soviet education in American literature and the treatment of American education in American literature had heretofore proceeded independently of one another. Significantly missing was any attack upon American theory and practice in the light of disclosures concerning Soviet theory and practice. This situation cannot be overstressed considering the heated exchanges between the "traditionalist" minority and the "progressive" majority during the period of 1947-1957. Despite the fifteen books and even more numerous periodical literature, Americans apparently were only dimly aware of the "challenge of Soviet education." Only George S. Counts appeared to grasp the entire picture. Also, there was ex-Senator William Benton who wrote a midnight disclosure titled "Soviet Education: More Ominous Than the Hydrogen Bomb?"

Representative selections of periodical literature will be reviewed in the first part of this section. The selections will for the most part speak for themselves. They will approach the reactions to the Sputnik launch from a variety of points of view.

Some will reflect the pre-Sputnik debate, others will not. The first selection ably describes the initial U.S. public reaction to the Soviet space achievement.

"Soviet Satellite Sends U.S. Into a Tizzy," Life (October 14, 1957) described the furor which accompanied the launching of Sputnik I. The 23-inch, 184-pound sphere emitted an eerie croak which Life writers likened to "a cricket with a cold." The Life writers viewed Sputnik as a military and propaganda triumph. The launching seemed to prove that Russia's intercontinental ballistic missile is a perfected machine, since it would take such a rocket to launch the satellite. In addition, the satellite's 184 pounds were eight times the weight of the Vanguard satellite the U.S. was still struggling to launch. In a follow-up article, "The Feat That Shook the Earth," Life (October 21, 1957) summed up by stating that Sputnik "had crippled the U.S. chance to be first in space as well as the development of its military missiles."[1] Furthermore, Life related that the Russians were about to launch a second satellite twice as large as the first.

Life presented an analysis of "Why Did U.S. Lose the Race? Critics Speak Up" (October 21, 1957). The article was by Dr. C. C. Furnas, an expert on guided missiles and former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development. It was the Furnas thesis that "the U.S. should have been and could have been the first nation to launch a satellite." He asserted that the United States

---

[1]"The Feat That Shook the Earth," Life, October 21, 1957, p. 19.

could have launched an artificial moon as early as 1955. The reason we had not done so was that the Defense Department lacked the interest. The reason for the downgrading of effort in this area was that senior defense planners saw little direct military use for artificial satellites. Also, rivalries and jealousies among the military services prevented the most efficient use of money, talent, and facilities. More than anything else, Furnas attributed the Russian success to a massive bureaucratic foul-up.

> In order to go back and win the race for scientific supremacy, there are some things we must do.
>
> --We must revise our naive attitude towards basic research. The armed forces must understand that money spent on background research is not money thrown away. And Congress, now that it has created the National Science Foundation, should have the courage to vote it the funds it needs to carry out its many important programs.
>
> --We must give much more aid and encouragement to our educational institutions in turning out more engineers and scientists, especially at the graduate level.
>
> --We must change our public attitude toward science and scientists. At a time when Russia was building a scientific elite, we were treating our patriotic scientists with hostility and suspicion. No one can accurately estimate the amount of damage that was done.
>
> --Finally, we must somehow reorganize the obsolete administrative structure of the armed services. There is no reason why a civilized nation should not be able to use all the money and all the talent and all the facilities of all its branches of military service on those programs which it decides are consistent with the best national interests.[2]

Conspicuously missing is any general or specific charge against progressive education, life adjustment, or the "educationists." The Soviet space achievement was viewed primarily in terms of

---

[2]C. C. Furnas, "Why Did U.S. Lose the Race? Critics Speak Up," Life, October 21, 1957, p. 23.

institutional arrangements and commitment to basic research. The U.S. could have and should have won the race to space.

> It was not that our Defense Department lacked money. It lacked only interest. The Pentagon seemed unable to see the obvious military advantages of a satellite, even though some scientists and officers in the military forces were most vocal in pointing them out more than a decade ago.[3]

In the same issue Life presented an editorial entitled "Common Sense and Sputnik." Life boldly asserted that "the Russians are not a technologically backward people."[4] It had taken the Soviets only four years to break our A-bomb monopoly. It took them only nine months to overtake our H-bomb. "Now," Life continued, "they are apparently ahead of us in intercontinental ballistic missiles."[5] The Life editorial and the three articles which preceded it are noteworthy in that Sputnik was viewed exclusively in military not educational terms. The Russian feat was compared to our own Manhattan Project--"a great human accomplishment reached by hard effort."[6]

"The Truth About Russia's Weakness," U.S. News and World Report (April 11, 1958), noted that the great Russian success came at a time of economic recession, thus intensifying the view that Soviet Russia holds all the answers.[7] But the facts, the author believed, revealed another picture of Soviet Russia--the picture of

---

[3]Ibid., p. 22.

[4]Ibid., p. 35.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]"The Truth About Russia's Weakness," U.S. News and World Report, April 11, 1958, p. 46.

a troubled nation, neither as secure in her position nor as confident of the future as Communist propaganda would suggest. U.S. News outlined many limitations on Soviet power: "Government by Fear," "Weakness in Numbers," "Transportation Troubles," "Problems of the Farmer," and, finally, "City Living: Over-Crowded, Education: Limited, Productivity: Poor."[8] True, Soviet schools were graduating more scientists and engineers than American schools.

> But a closer look at the figures reveals that the United States, with a smaller population, has more pupils in elementary and secondary schools and a million more in universities. We have more college-trained people in the fields of health, agriculture and biological sciences than Russia. Soviet education, like so many other aspects of Soviet life, is pointed toward military and heavy-industrial uses.[9]

In total productivity the Soviet Union was way behind the United States: 150 billion dollars as compared to 434 billion dollars. The U.S. News article summed up with a quotation from an Italian economist to the effect that it was true that the Soviet Union does not have economic crises like those in non-Communist nations. The Soviet Union was in a state of permanent economic crisis.

This comforting view of the Soviet Union was attacked by Harold J. Berman in an article which appeared in The American Scholar (Spring 1958). The article was titled "The Devil and Soviet Russia." Berman began by noting that in both Russian and American thinking there was a strong strain of puritanism which tended to turn opponents into enemies, enemies into devils, and devils into ugly monsters.

---

[8]Ibid., pp. 46-54. Emphasis mine.

[9]Ibid., p. 54.

> An American reading what is printed in Soviet literature about life in the United States can only laugh at the fantastic caricatures that are presented to the Russian people as sober realities. It is a bitter truth that Russians who get a chance to read what is written about life in the Soviet Union in American newspapers, magazines, and books . . . also find, often not reality but a ridiculous distortion of reality.[10]

Berman asserted that American writers had exaggerated the violence, injustice, bureaucracy, and poverty of life under the Soviet regime. Furthermore, the Soviets had made sensational technological progress.

The American Scholar article resembled the earlier Life articles and editorial in that education was not factored out from a general Soviet technological achievement. Similarly, the view of Russia as a scientifically backward country was shown false; the Devil was given his due.

Clifton Fadiman's "The Mess in Education--Who Is Responsible?" obviously took a different tone. The article appeared in the August 1958 issue of Holiday. Fadiman openly attacked what he believed to be a "soft pedagogy." This soft pedagogy was not, in his view, all the responsibility of progressive education or a specific individual such as John Dewey. Rather, "we met the enemy and he is us." Soft pedagogy was at bottom, in Fadiman's view, merely the educational phase of the "Good Time" theory of happiness which pervaded all phases of American life. The schools had evolved into "gigantic supermarkets masquerading as educational institutions." And how did we reach this sorry state of affairs? It happened gradually:

---

[10]Harold J. Berman, "The Devil and Soviet Russia," The American Scholar 27 (Spring 1958): 147.

> We voted for a school bond issue to provide our children with a swimming pool instead of an acquaintance with the multiplication tables; each time that we taxed ourselves to guarantee hot lunches for kiddies and a continuance of starvation salaries for the teachers; each time we failed to cry murder when a report card system was abolished or compulsory promotion introduced; at each of these moments we were making sure that our children would turn out to be--what they are.[11]

"What opened our eyes? A flying box containing a dying dog. We were going to reform American education not because we are eager to produce finer citizens but because we are scared stiff."[12] And make no mistake about it, Fadiman continued, "we are engaging not in an educational task, but in a paramilitary one." Here is a thesis clearly requiring close examination. A thesis popular in the lay mind: Sputnik resulted in a reordering of American educational theory and practice.

Oscar Handlin penned a defense of progressivism and John Dewey entitled "Rejoinder to Critics of John Dewey" in the June 15, 1958, New York Times Magazine. Handlin related that in the past fifteen years there had grown up a tendency to blame the faults of American education at the doorstep of John Dewey. Johnny's inability to read, juvenile delinquency, the high divorce rate, and the presumed failure of American scientists to keep pace with the Russians had been ascribed to the corrupting influence of progressive education. Handlin labeled such a view "simple minded."[13] Furthermore, he saw

---

[11]Clifton Fadiman, "The Mess in Education--Who Is Responsible?" Holiday, August 1958, p. 8.

[12]Ibid., p. 10. Emphasis mine.

[13]Oscar Handlin, "Rejoinder to the Critics of John Dewey," New York Times Magazine, June 15, 1958, p. 19.

such ideas as dangerous. They were dangerous for two reasons: (1) they blinded us to the genuine deficiencies of our schools, and (2) they threatened to destroy what was vital and promising in the schools.

He continued by outlining a sympathic view of Dewey and an equally sympathic view of progressive education. In part, he wrote:

> Our schools are more adequate now than they were 60 years ago. The task of making them fully adequate is nevertheless far from complete. But it is more likely to be pushed forward by extending rather than narrowing Dewey's vision of freedom in which to learn to live in the modern world.[14]

Concerning Sputnik, Handlin pointed out that as early as 1928 John Dewey alerted the world to the significance of Russia's educational achievements. This was far sooner than any of his current detractors. Handlin ended by noting that Dewey "did not take nor would he now have taken technological proficiency or advances in rocketry as a test of the excellence of an educational system."[15]

In a five-part series (March 24 and 31, and April 7, 14, and 21), Life examined what it termed "Crisis In Education." The pictorial essays were limited to the elementary and secondary schools on the premise that "if things go wrong then there isn't much the colleges can do."[16] The reader should note Life's commitment toward the premise that elementary and secondary education existed solely as feeders to the higher education system.

---

[14]Ibid., p. 20.

[15]Ibid.

[16]"Crisis In Education," Life, March 24, 1958, p. 25.

The first installment, "Schoolboys Point Up a U.S. Weakness," examined the story of two schoolboys, an "easygoing American" and a "hard-striving Russian."[17] Sixteen-year-olds Stephen Lapekas of Chicago and Alexei Kutzkow of Moscow were receiving what their respective countries considered a good education. Stephen was an eleventh grader at Austin High, "one of the city's finest schools." Alexei was in his tenth and final year at Moscow School 49. According to Life, "the differences in what they learn and the atmosphere in which they learn it measures the frightening scale of the problems the U.S. now faces in its public schools."[18]

Life stressed the heavy standardized non-elective curriculum of the U.S.S.R. Proudly, the Life writer declared, "the laggards are forced out by tough periodic examinations and shunted to less demanding trade schools and apprenticeships. Only a third--1.4 million in 1957--survive all ten years and finish the course."[19] Three main headings sum up the author's philosophical commitment: "Schoolboys Point Up a U.S. Weakness," "In the U.S.S.R.: Rough Haul All the Way," and "In the U.S.: Relaxed Studies."

The Life author never defined education as such. However, his underlying philosophical commitment can be illustrated in the following excerpt from the first article:

---

[17]Ibid., p. 27.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

> For all its laxness, the system under which Stephen studies does develop flexibility and in Stephen qualities of leadership. For all its stern virtues, the system under which Alexei studies develops rigidity and subservience to an undemocratic state. But there is no blinking at the educational results. Academically Alexei is two years ahead of Stephen. As one example, he has read Shakespeare and Shaw in literature class while Stephen has only just finished reading Stevenson's Kidnapped.[20]

Among other things, this excerpt illustrates the author's fixation on what the modern jargon would term "cognitive learning." He sees the function of the school narrowly; that of imparting traditional learning in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics and science.

In the same issue (March 24, 1958), Life presented what the editor termed "a cogent article" by novelist Sloan Wilson. Wilson was best known for his novel The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit. From 1949 to 1953, Wilson had been assistant director of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. He was also a former education editor for the New York Herald Tribune. His "It's Time to Close Our Carnival" was self-evidently an attack on American educational theory and practice. After a series of horror statistics such as "only 12 1/2% are taking any mathematics more advanced than algebra,"[21] Wilson answered his own question: Why was America falling behind Russia in the field of educaton? He began by asserting that "as recently as 50 years ago our high schools were almost carbon copies of their European counterparts. They offered a narrow selection of strictly academic subjects."[22] Where did we go wrong?

---

[20]Ibid., p. 27. Emphasis mine.

[21]Ibid., p. 36.

[22]Ibid.

"Instead of trying to find students to fit a rigid curriculum, the schools decided to try to hand-tailor a course of instruction for each child."[23] To run the new schools a whole new breed of educator appeared. They were men such as John Dewey who, according to Wilson, "invented some of the silliest language ever heard."[24] Wilson accused progressive education of "degenerating into a system for coddling and entertaining the mediocre" and "doing almost nothing well."[25] He also attacked Columbia University Teachers College which he described as the "fountainhead of the new education." He accused Columbia University Teachers College of "exaggerating the bad aspects of progressive education." His program of reform, not explained in detail, was simply "it is time to close the carnival and go to work."

Clearly, the Life five-part series was a traditionalist attack upon progressivism coupled with an attack upon progressivism in the light of disclosures concerning Soviet theory and practice. Life's corrosive assault continued with a second installment entitled "An Underdog Profession Imperils the Schools" and a second editorial called "The Deeper Problem in Education: It Is Time to Dig Out Educationist Debris and Rediscover Learning's True Nature." The legacy of forty years of progressive education was characterized as a legacy of distorted play facilities, substandard curricula and principals whose intellectual confusion can no longer be disguised by the

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

"compulsory smiles on their faces." John Dewey and the Deweyites were taken to task. Much of the editorial was a scaled-down version of John Keat's Schools Without Scholars (1958). Schools Without Scholars was strongly endorsed in the editorial. John Dewey was quoted in such a way as to cast doubt on his intellect: "We agree that we are uncertain as to where we are going and where we want to go, and why we are doing what we do."[26] "Dewey and his boys" were sketched as villains who contended that because the ends of education were debatable they were not worth debating. In the place of the traditional ends of education, "Dewey and his boys," the editorial contended, "had substituted life-adjustment in order to bring the individual by a process of conditioning to a realization of his functional role in society."[27] If that didn't sound sinister enough, Life explained that it meant replacing Latin with home economics and driver education.

The teachers college and the taking of compulsory education courses in the place of the liberal arts college and subject matter courses were likewise attacked. Similarly, accreditation agencies such as the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools were denounced because they were oriented toward a progressive point of view. Also, "entrenched public school administrators" and their "gobbledygook cannons" were given a verbal lashing.

The Life editorial summed up with a statement on the role of education. Life believed:

---

[26] Ibid., p. 34.

[27] Ibid.

> American education exists first of all to educate the individual in a body of learning, with a tradition and a purpose behind it. A man so educated is far better equipped as a democratic citizen than the merely "well adjusted." For he will have not only the social ease to make his civilization comfortable, but the intellectual discipline to save it.[28]

Among the many problems which Life listed, the editor considered the weakness in teaching the most crucial. Teachers held in their hands the malleable minds of the nation's children.

> But despite the importance of the work they do--or should do--they are wretchedly overworked, underpaid and disregarded. And a discouraging number of them are incompetents. The shortage of teachers, which now amounts to a staggering 227,000, is particularly felt in the important fields of math and science.[29]

The third installment of the Life series was called "The Waste of Fine Minds." A mini-article on the table of contents page was titled "Life and the Experts with Similar Thoughts." Life related that in Washington, D.C., three distinguished Americans spelled out what they deemed wrong with the schools. The men were the President's science advisor Dr. James Killian; a director of the Carnegie Institution, Dr. Merle Tave; and the Navy's nuclear expert, Admiral Hyman Rickover. Their opinions matched the previous two Life issues almost point for point:

> We must raise the low standards of our secondary schools and eliminate their trivial classes.
> We must shore up the sagging quality of our science teaching, cut down on the teacher's extra jobs, give him time to become a professional scholar again.

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] "Crisis In Education," Life, March 31, 1948, p. 93.

> We must provide both opportunity and incentive for our gifted children. There must be an unremitting search for talent and intellectual giftedness.
>
> We must not slam the door in the faces of qualified people who want to teach, merely because they have not taken superfluous courses in teacher education.
>
> We must fight the pose that it is smart to be anti-intellectual and cultivate in our education a taste for what is excellent in intellect and spirit.[30]

"The Waste of Fine Minds" was primarily a case history of Barry Wichmann. Barry's I.Q. of 162 marked him superior to the sixth-graders he attended class with. Yet, largely because of his growing indifference to unstimulating work, Barry was doing poorly in school. Life made a major point of the disproportionate amount of time the teacher, Mrs. Nita Berg Carlson, gave to the five children with reading difficulties as compared to Barry who read at the eleventh grade level. Barry and youngsters like him, Life maintained,

> . . . should be getting the best education that the nation can provide. But because of ignorance, prejudice, and a paralyzing inflexibility in the whole public school system, tragically little is being done to help him. . . . Many communities oppose special programs as being too expensive. Yet the same communities will often spend generously on much more costly schooling for the retarded.[31]

In "Tryouts for Good Ideas: The Nation Stirs with New Interest in Science, New Plans for Schools," Life described how "in schools all over the country, science and math courses are being reassessed and tightened up. A wholly new way of teaching math and physics is being worked out and used."[32] Thousands of students, in Life's view,

---

[30]"Crisis In Education," Life, April 7, 1958, p. 2.

[31]Ibid., p. 93.

[32]"Crisis In Education," Life, April 14, 1958, p. 117.

were getting advanced subjects, expertly taught via TV in small rural high schools which hitherto were unable to offer them. And, finally, to raise the quality of the schools in general, Life offered "a famous educator's far-reaching plan for an entire model high school."[33] The famous educator was James Bryan Conant. An animated two-page chart which he and Life collaborated on was the first publication of Conant's to be famous, American High School Today (1959). That work will be examined in entirety at an appropriate time. At this time, the examination of Conant's ideas will be restricted to the two-page extrapolation in Life. Life described the chart as "his concept of an ideal high school." The plan's pedigree was described as a "first hand survey of 50 high schools in 16 states under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation."[34]

The "ideal high school" offered three general levels of courses: (1) a stiff pre-college academic curriculum for the higher education bound twenty percent of the student body; (2) an elementary level curriculum for the bottom twenty percent; and (3) a diversified vocational program for the remaining sixty percent. Students would move from one level to another to take certain courses. Every student must take four years of English, four years of social studies, two years of mathematics and two years of science. The classes would be separated into different sections according to academic ability. In addition, bright students should take three years of a foreign language.

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., p. 120.

All students would mix daily in heterogenously grouped homerooms, physical education and certain classrooms such as music, typing, and senior social studies. Conant emphasized that the success or failure of the model depended on the school guidance counselors, who must help every student choose the right curriculum. Conant stressed that counselors must "pressure bright students to take tough courses."[35]

The "great merit of the plan," Life stated, was that all its elements were being currently practiced in one school or another."[36] Conant had detailed only practices he had seen working successfully in schools he had visited. The schools best suited to the Life-Conant recommendations were so-called "comprehensive high schools." Only such schools were physically and financially able to offer such a wide range of academic and vocational subjects to their students, who in turn represented a cross section of the population in ability and background. According to Life, there were about 2,000 comprehensive high schools in the U.S. which fit Dr. Conant's definition. There will be many times more as soon as thousands of small, inadequate rural high schools consolidate into larger units--a policy he strongly recommends.

Life concluded the five-part series with an article entitled "Parents and Learning" and an editorial called "Painful Crisis, The Long Hard Cure" (April 21, 1958). Life summarized the series by stating:

---

[35]Ibid., p. 121.

[36]Ibid.

> We can hardly congratulate ourselves on the spectacle of the ill used teacher, the dwarfed school plant, the wasted talents of our brighter students, or the brutal fact that a spartan Soviet system is producing many students better equipped than ours to cope with the technicalities of the Space Age.[37]

Life reacted harshly to the criticism of its March 31st editorial. It attributed the criticism to "certain professional educators." And termed the criticism "cadenced howls of protest" and leveled a charge of "intellectual confusion" at the "howlers."[38] Life spoke approvingly about "a great many people, both educators and private educators who have been doing their best to improve the schools." And "many of them," Life declared, "were at it long years before Sputnik."[39] School systems highlighted in the April 7th installment, such as Newton, Massachusetts, and New Trier Township, Illinois, were billed as "a showcase for learning." Life chose these schools because they currently practiced most of the Conant plan's recommendations. The National Merit Scholarship Plan and the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education were termed "encouraging." Finally, Life called the work of a citizens group in New Canaan, Connecticut, "a shining example" of what could be accomplished by reformers.[40]

A shift in Life's attitude toward both Sputnik and American educational theory and practice had taken place after October 1957.

---

[37]"Crisis In Education," Life, April 21, 1958, p. 34.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Ibid.

In October Sputnik had to be viewed in only military and propaganda terms. "Common Sense and Sputnik" had been the title of a major editorial. The Soviet effort in space had been put on a par with the American Atomic Project during the Second World War. Both were viewed as great human accomplishments reached by hard effort. In no way was Sputnik seen as an indictment of American society or American education. In fact, education was not even mentioned. Similarly, New Trier Township, Illinois, High School was transformed from "a good high school: a U.S. speciality" to an indictment of progressive education. Life in October of 1950 had spotlighted New Trier as illustrative of the best in American education. And make no mistake about it, New Trier as featured in October of 1950 was progressive education. A living functioning example of education in "American City" as described by the Educational Policies Commission. In April of 1957, New Trier was transformed from being illustrative of "a U.S. speciality" to only an isolated instance of the Life-Conant model high school.

It is worth noting that all of the Life-Conant recommendations were incorporated and functioning at New Trier High School and described in Life magazine on October 16, 1950. The importance of the shift in Life editorial policy cannot be over stressed. For Life in March and April 1958 popularized and gave respectability to an assault on American educational philosophy and the American public school system.

Perhaps the best evidence for giving a precise date to the Life editorial switch is an opinion poll printed and evaluated in the

March 3, 1958, issue of Life. The name of the article was "Change of Mind: New Survey Shows Surprisingly Fast Switches in Public Ideas About Space, Schools, Spending." The article was written by Paul O'Neil. O'Neil declared in his introduction that "the shining legend of American technological superiority began to tarnish in the eyes of the world."[41] That "despite the subsequent success of the U.S. Army's Explorer, Russia's conquest of space has dominated the national attention." Interestingly, far from blaming the Eisenhower administration, Opinion Research found that the American people seemed to feel a "curious sort of personal guilt."[42]

Just before Sputnik I public opinion felt the nation's two most important problems were inflation and keeping out of war. After Sputnik I both of these important concerns were replaced in the public mind with catching up with the Russians in the defense race and training more and better scientists. The subsequent succesful launching of Explorer I by the U.S. Army had reduced from thirteen percent to five percent those who felt we were "dangerously behind Russia in the development of weapons."

O'Neil declared that "millions of Americans who had taken education for granted all their lives have now turned a sudden and dissatisfied eye upon U.S. schools and the children who inhabit

---

[41]Paul O'Neil, "Changes of Mind: New Survey Shows Surprisingly Fast Switches in Public Ideas About Space, Schools, Spending," Life, March 3, 1958, p. 91.

[42]Ibid.

them."[43] The dissatisfaction centered around the training of scientists. A central question in the Opinion Research Poll was: "Do you think Russia or the U.S. has the best school training in mathematics and science?" The answer was Russia, 39 percent; United States, 28 percent; both the same, 4 percent; and don't know, 29 percent. If the advent of earth satellites had done nothing else, O'Neil believed they had "jolted the U.S. loose from one stubbornly cherished concept: that it is perfectly all right to have special schools for backward children but undemocratic to have them for bright ones."[44] Unfortunately, in his view, "not all people have abandoned that idea by any means." Of all citizens, 62 percent now felt that schools should have special classes for bright students. This plight of the bright student was to become a major focus of the five-part Life series in March-April 1958.

But despite the concurrence of views on the need to provide special classes for bright students, the O'Neil article differed from the five-part series in several ways: (1) no attack was made on John Dewey, (2) no reference was made to progressive education, and (3) no use was made of loaded terms such as "educationist" or "life-adjustmentism." Nonetheless, the O'Neil article did reflect a significant change in tone between initial Life reactions to Sputnik I and the five-part series of March-April 1958.

In Life (April 21, 1958) the editor reported that "since Sputnik the reform effort has gathered speed and breath. According

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid., p. 97.

to a recent Gallup poll, one high school out of four has made some concrete curriculum changes; another 25% is at least discussing improvements. And the changes," Life continued, "are almost universally in the direction of stiffer academic standards. Fully 79% of the principals interviewed felt that their schools demanded too little work from students."[45]

The editor concluded with an attack on the "educationists" and their "utopian life-adjustment of the pupil." These two enemies --the "educationist" and "life-adjustment"--stood athwart the path of what Life called the "new trailblazers in education." The editor called for a "two front war." "Whatever the educationists say, the schools cannot educate the whole child. That our job. . . . For education is a continuing responsibility of the home." Life ended with a call to arms: "A national effort at this new learning must begin in every school, and in every home. If there is a democratic road to learning--and we firmly believe so--it is only as straight and as firm as each individual makes it."

An article by Robert M. Hutchins, long a critic of progressive education, appeared in Esquire (June 1958). Hutchins began by quoting Admiral Hyman G. Rickover's November 22, 1957, speech in Detroit, Michigan, that "Rightly Sputnik has from the first been seen as a triumph of Russian education."[46] Hutchins went on to state that in every other country in the world there was a serious approach to

---

[45]Life, April 21, 1958, p. 34.

[46]Robert M. Hutchins, "The Lessons of Khruschev's Little Red Schoolhouse," Esquire, June 1958, p. 84.

learning. In the United States, however, serious study was deferred until the professional school. Americans in his view had confused schooling with education. American schooling was a vast waste of money, time, and talent. Hutchins went on to urge Americans to forget about Sputnik and the Russians. "If they did not exist, conditions in American education still would be shameful."[47]

The article was simply a restatement of his views published in The Higher Learnings in America (1932) and elsewhere. Hutchins urged Americans to also forget about the production of scientists and engineers. Even if America out-produced the Soviets in scientists and engineers, American education still would be shameful. It would be shameful because the ultimate ends toward which education was directed in this country were shameful. Hutchins believed that education should center around the search for wisdom and goodness, not success, wealth, and power. He considered that despite surface differences, the quest of success, wealth, and power to be the goals of both Dewey-type progressive education and the scientific-mathematics popularizers. Hutchins arguments were based upon his conception of human nature and his definition of the good life.

Dr. Paul E. Elicker authored a rejoinder to the critics of American education in "Let's Speak the Truth About Our Schools," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (October 1958). Dr. Elicker was the Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NEA). Declaring it to be a fad to sound off on our American high school, Elicker

---

[47]Ibid., p. 86.

announced his purpose to consider only a few of the issues that were most prevalent among criticisms of education. The five issues he considered were: "(1) The Academically Talented are Neglected; (2) Too Little Mathematics and Science Available in our Schools; (3) We Are Less Educated Than Fifty Years Ago; (4) Foreign Country Systems of Education Are Superior to Ours; and (5) Too Much 'Gobbledy Gook' in the School Curriculum Such as Homemaking, Vocational Training of Many Kinds, Drivers' Eduation, etc." He tested them all and found them all to be wanting.

He paid particular attention to what he termed "misstated statistics."[48] Critics alleged "only 12 1/2% of the students are taking mathematics more advanced than elementary algebra (9th grade algebra." The actual United States Office of Education figure Dr. Elicker found to be 35.2%. Similarly, critics stated that "53% of our high schools do not teach physics and half do not teach chemistry." To the contrary, Elicker declared that "95.2% of all students who reach the twelfth grade in our schools are in schools that offer both chemistry and physics." One reason for the difference in statistics on this point was the failure of critics to allow for schools offering physics and chemistry on alternate years. Furthermore, Elicker related that reports in recent years from the National Science Teachers Association (NEA) revealed that there had been a steady growth in the numbers of students taking science in the

---

[48] Paul E. Elicker, "Let's Speak the Truth About Our Schools," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 42, No. 20 (October 1958): 1.

secondary schools. Lastly, Elicker challenged charges that foreign systems of education were academically superior to the American system. He reported that American students enrolled for one year in academic boarding schools in England either matched or excelled the academic standards of British students. Far from being overburdened with "gobbledy gook," Elicker believed the American secondary school provided "basic training for all youth"--the scholar, the professional, the homemaker, the mechanic, and the artisan.

"What Are Our Goals? European Education and American Education" by Harry D. Gideonse, The Educational Record (July 1958), agreed with Dr. Elicker's point of view. Noting the vast literature dealing with comparisons of the educational achievements in the United States with those in Western Europe and the Soviet Union initiated after the launching of Sputnik, Gideonse stated that only chaos would result in discussing educational programs apart from the cultures of which they were a characteristic expression. He pointed out that educational standards of the European and Soviet variety were directly related to the administrative and legal sanctions that were vested in the central government in all continental nations. By contrast, the political and legal philosophy of the United States had resulted in forty-eight state systems in which varying mixtures of private and public control compete with one another in rigor and laxity. It followed, he stated, "that a concern for standards can only be implemented if we are prepared to challenge the principle of local control."[49]

---

[49]Harry D. Gideonse, "What Are Our Goals? European Education and American Education," The Educational Record 39 (July 1958): 214.

Furthermore, Gideonse pointed out, there was no European equivalent of the American high school. The American high school was the product of American social and ideological democracy. It followed that average standards of academic performance were going to be different and inevitably lower in a country where ninety percent of the age group was expected to attend secondary school from those in a system where only seven to fifteen percent of the age group was expected to attend secondary school. Average standards should not be viewed as a valid basis of comparison. Rather, he asserted, the top ten or fifteen percent of the graduates of the American secondary school should be compared to the graduates of the various European systems.

"Interestingly," he continued, "both in the Russian and European systems there was a wealth of data to suggest all was not well."[50] In both systems literature was produced which idealized the American comprehensive or multi-track secondary school. Also, there was wide interest in the elective features of the American curriculum. This is worthy of special note because the Life five-part series neglected to report any self-criticism within the Soviet system. In fact, Life had written approvingly of the Soviet practice of forcing two-thirds of the age group to drop out of the non-elective ten-year school curriculum.

Gideonse concluded by asserting that some of the current criticism of American education was merely a contemporary version of the old attack on the democratic assumption that all children should have the benefit of an education designed to maximize each individual's

---

[50]Ibid.

achievement with his potential ability. He concluded this because "if the criticism is really based on a desire for comparative 'standards,' it should be directed at the deep-rooted political tradition of local control."[51] He ended by reminding his readers that the European educational system was an expression of a social organization and philosophy that was rapidly fading away and that the Russian experience was not a valid guide for the education of citizens who are to be made fit for the responsibilities of a free society.

There were five books worthy of note published in 1958: This Is the Challenge: The Benton Reports of 1956-1958 on the Nature of the Soviet Threat by William Benton; Schools Without Scholars by John Keats; Soviet Education edited by George Louis Kline and introduced by George S. Counts; Soviet Education for Science and Technology by Alexander Korol[52]; and The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

Former U.S. Senator William Benton's book, This Is the Challenge, consisted for the most part of articles and speeches that had been published and there was a great deal of repetition within the book itself. The great bulk of the material was based on a 1955 trip to the Soviet Union which Benton made as publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica. As indicated in a review in the New Republic (August 18, 1958), four of the fourteen chapters are the same as the 1956 Britannica Yearbook. Most of the remainder were either

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] The book's first printing actually was in 1957, but after the launching of Sputnik I. It went through several printings after the widespread public reaction to the Soviet satellite.

restatements of testimony Benton had given to Congressional committees or were part of his public speeches, the most important of the latter being an address at the Eleventh National Conference on Higher Education in March 1956. These remarks had been reprinted in Education Digest (May 1956) entitled "Soviet Education: More Ominous Than the Hydrogen Bomb?"

It was the Benton thesis that Soviet classrooms may threaten America more than Soviet hydrogen bombs, and that Soviet scientific progress was certainly not to be overestimated. In fact, the Russians were currently graduating more scientists and high grade technicians than the United States. He feared they would surpass the United States in the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level. Benton believed that American secondary and post-secondary schools could profitably learn from Russian and European models in terms of discipline, concentrated hard work, emphasis on basic intellectual subjects, and the absence of "frill" subjects. The book also contained material on Soviet propaganda methods, the use of the arts in propaganda, the partisan use of the Soviet Great Encyclopedia, and on the Soviet newspaper and book press.

This Is the Challenge was given both positive and negative reviews. The following commments are indicative of the book's positive reviews. "A firsthand comparison of U.S. and Soviet education," Booklist (September 1, 1958). "The book contains interesting material," Chicago Tribune (June 15, 1958). "It is a revealing book and deserves thoughtful reading by all aware citizens," Kirkus (June 1, 1958). Negative reviews included the following: "Benton in his zeal

to point up the Soviet challenge, somewhat exaggerates the Soviet educational achievement," Foreign Affairs (October 1958). "After all the fanfare that attended this book's publication and the promises of the dust jacket . . . it is something of a disappointment to find that Mr. Benton's book consists for the most part of articles and speeches that have been published," New Republic (August 18, 1958). And, "a book that is not really a book," Saturday Review (June 21, 1958).

By far the most revealing review--that is to say, revealing about the American state of mind--was by Terry Ferrer and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune (June 22, 1958). Ferrer noted that Benton's book was curiously both too late and too soon. "It was too late because the great bulk of the material in the book was dated. This Is the Challenge is published too soon because many of the warnings about Soviet supremacy which Mr. Benton has been reiterating for almost three years have failed to move Americans to the action he has urged." The two receptions of Benton's views--the one pre- and the second post-Sputnik--illustrate a shift in public opinion over roughly the same period as the previously noted shift in the editorial policy of Life. Sputnik I had been the catalyst.

Soviet Education, edited by George Louis Kline, was published by Columbia University Press. It contained nine reports by former Soviet teachers and students concerning educational methods and objectives in Russia during the 1920s and 1930s. Soviet Education was not a coherent account of Soviet education and had little to say about Russian education in the 1940s and 1950s. It missed the thrust

of the Soviet ten-year school as molded by Stalin. Rather, it was a series of personal observations on various aspects of education in widely separated areas of the Soviet Union. The authors had all left the Soviet Union before or during the Second World War. Hilda Neatby in the Canadian Forum (June 1958) wrote that Soviet Education was "inevitably scrappy" and rather "tendentious." She relegated the volume to a source of "curious and useful sidelights on the history of education in Soviet Russia."

Notwithstanding the publication date of 1958, Soviet Education neatly fits into the pre-Sputnik descriptive literature by professional educators. It was clearly outside the stream of Sputnik-spawned tracts such as This Is the Challenge.

Alexander Korol's Soviet Education for Science and Technology published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology likewise fits into the pre-Sputnik descriptive mold. In the opinion of most reviewers, it was "unquestionably the best book on Soviet education that has yet appeared in the West."[53] Of the twelve excerpted reviews in the 1958 Book Review Digest, eleven were positive. Korol had been born in Russia where he received his secondary education before leaving in 1920. Although Korol emphasized science and technology, his book gave a broad view of Soviet education. Korol had begun his study in 1953. In time frame and content, Soviet Education

---

[53]D. B. Shimkin, Review of Soviet Education for Science and Technology by Alexander Korol in American Journal of Sociology 64 (November 1958): 332.

for Science and Technology parallels George S. Counts' Challenge of Soviet Education (1957).

In "Comments and Reflections," Korol summed up and placed in context what he believed to be the significance of the Soviet educational system and the threat it posed to all democratic societies. "The choice of terms, incongruously linking the word 'threat' with 'education,' is unfortunate for its implication is false. The locus of the threat is not Soviet education but Soviet communism."[54] For he believed that communism long ago declared war against the free democratic societies, a war that "was still not taken seriously enough by many of its intended victims."[55] Korol believed that the communist threat would only be removed if free peoples vigorously continue to pursue their highest social goals and to maintain their combined scientific, technological, and moral superiority. But these goals and superiorities cannot be achieved if these nations continue their educational efforts and other pursuits of life as usual. Rather, "we free peoples must find a way to release a larger share of our aggregate resources and energy from nonessential material uses and devote them to the services of indispensable goals."[56] That is to say, the free societies must aggressively pursue laudable social, educational, and moral goals.

---

[54]Alexander Korol, Soviet Education for Science and Technology (Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957), p. 415.

[55]Ibid., p. 410.

[56]Ibid., p. 416.

Like the previous two books, Schools Without Scholars, by John Keats, could easily play the role of a pre-Sputnik publication. The Keats book makes no reference to Soviet education. Rather, it was a traditionalist attack upon the life-adjustment wing of progressive education. The book centers around a description of the techniques used in a traditionalist takeover of the New Canaan, Connecticut, public schools. The book was recommended as a guide to corrective action by Life magazine's five-part series (March 31, 1958).

Schools Without Scholars began with an indictment of teachers colleges. Keats referred to them as "mentally rumpsprung." At the same time he lauded the liberal arts colleges. He proposed that in each of the nation's more than 60,000 school districts concerned citizens organize what he termed a "citizens' grand jury."[57] The citizens' grand jury, he believed, should represent every point of view, social class, and occupation in the school district. "Most important, it should not come charging into the schoolhouse ready to skewer the school board members or the superintendent to the blackboard, no matter what the apparent provocation." Rather, "it should be formed with the idea of helping the school to become whatever the public thinks it should be."[58] An individual or community contemplating such a step was referred to the National Citizens Council for Better Schools[59] with headquarters at 9 East 40th

---

[57]John Keats, Schools Without Scholars (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958), pp. 9-10.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Formerly known as the National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools.

Street, New York 16, New York. The NCCBS was described as "a kind of clearing house of helpful hints." It is worthy of notation that Sloan Wilson, the author of the scathing Life magazine article, "It's Time to Close the Carnival" (March 24, 1958), was a former Assistant Director of NCCBS. Wilson was also a former education editor for the New York Herald Tribune. The Herald Tribune consistently gave good reviews to anti-progressive education books. Thus, Life magazine and authors associated with the National Citizens Council for Better Schools cross-fertilized one another.[60]

The operations of Keats proposed citizens' grand jury were outlined at length. First, the grand jury must compile facts relative to the school district's physical geography, trade patterns, tax base, sociology and cultural anthropology. Next, working with the school board and superintendent, Keats suggested that the grand jury discover the intelligence range of the student body and ascertain how well the children were living up to their mental ability. After these steps, the grand jury must study the current educational philosophies and spend hundreds of man-hours visiting classrooms in the home and other school districts to see the various educational philosophies in action. "We will discover at first hand whether it is true that Johnny can't read and if it is we will see a practical demonstration of why he can't."[61]

Keats illustrated the operation of the New Canaan Citizens' Council on the Public Schools. The Council had sought data on why

---

[60] Life, March 24, 1958, p. 36.

[61] Keats, Schools Without Scholars, p. 12.

New Canaan's "superior children failed to live up to their tested abilities." They confined their investigation to the Saxe Junior High School. Working through the administration as outlined in the master plan "several hundred classroom visits were made to Saxe Junior High." With some exceptions, the Council Report was in Keats' view "a devastating indictment of an educational theory and practice."[62] This was particularly true concerning the Report of the English Subcommittee. The Subcommittee report quoted the Yale president as saying "courses in effective living and auto-driving were being substituted in some high schools for Shakespeare." This was a particularly interesting quotation since the Subcommitee was supposed to be investigating a junior high school. The Subcommittee report in two sentences disposed of all educational theory since Comenius. The "citizens' grand jury" declared: "A child needs to flex his mental muscles. Just as his physical muscles grow flabby without exercise, so does his mental capacity to learn and use his own language--which is to say his capacity to think--shrink if not used."[63] Singled out for detailed attack was the widespread use of multiple-choice and true-false tests. The essay was lauded. "The only way to learn to write good English is to write and write more and write more, and to have each piece of writing checked carefully for content, order, care in choice of words, the interest of the subject, the uses of a sentence and a paragraph, etc."[64] The

---

[62]Ibid., p. 178.

[63]Ibid., p. 181.

[64]Ibid., p. 183.

schools, in short, were making a botch of the teaching of English. "The failure," the report declared, "was as national as it was obvious."[65] Over and over again other Subcommittee reports echoed the English report. Over and over again the citizens of New Canaan satisfied themselves that there was such a thing as "mental discipline" no matter what John Dewey and the teachers colleges said, a conclusion in substantial agreement with the five-part Life magazine series.

The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America was billed as "The Rockefeller Report on Education." The The report was for the most part based on two earlier studies. One was the recent and still unpublished study of James B. Conant.[66] The other was the recommendations of a conference sponsored by the National Education Association on "Education of the Academically Talented."[67] The Pursuit of Excellence prescribed "a general education for all in grades 1-8." It recommended the continuation of general education in grades 9-12. All students were to take the following: four years of English, three or four years of social studies, one year of mathematics, and one year of science. For the

---

[65]Ibid., p. 201.

[66]Published in 1959 as The American High School Today (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959). A mini-version of the Conant proposals had appeared in Life (April 14, 1958). Dr. Conant had also given numerous talks at various national conferences.

[67]Rockefeller Brothers Fund for Education, The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958), p. 27.

academically talented, the Rockefeller Commission called for two to three additional years of science, three additional years of mathematics, and at least three years of a foreign language. For certain students, the study of a second foreign language, for at least three years, might replace the fourth year of mathematics and the third year of science.[68]

For students of all ability levels, virtually every subject in the curriculum could profit by a lively reform. For the top two percent of the student population, the Rockefeller Commission called for expanding the number of secondary schools offering college-level courses to juniors and seniors. "From this highly selected group will come many of the young men and women who will reach the pinnacles of intellectual achievement in the years ahead. No effort should be spared to provide them with opportunities for challenging studies." The Commission also identified "highest priority subjects." They were science and mathematics. The Commissioners called for their modernization and improved quality. It laid the blame for the backward teaching of these subjects squarely at the door of "the leading authorities in these fields." These leaders had neglected to concern themselves over how their subject was being taught in the elementary and secondary schools.[69] Thus, even the "Rockefeller Report" could easily fit into a pre-Sputnik groove.

Problems of Secondary Education in International Perspective: A Comparison of American, Soviet, and European Educational Systems was

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid.

published by the Research Division of New York (State) University. Its authors were Theodore Bienenstok and William Sayers, both associates in Educational Research. The report began by noting that for some time now American education had been the focus of critical scrutiny. "The launching of the first Soviet space satellite has merely added a sense of urgency to the vigorous reappraisal of schools and curricula already underway."[70] They also noted that in the current controversy, American education was often compared with European and Soviet education. These foreign systems were used to gauge the quality of American performance. They declared:

> This approach is gouged with more pitfalls than is often realized. National systems of education in their organization, methods and results inevitably reflect the cultural aims, aspirations, and traditions of the societies they serve . . . . Even purely numerical comparisons of enrollments, number of degrees issued or percentages of pupils completing various phases of education are not really adequate measures of relative quality, except in a very superficial way, since they are influenced by prevailing social expectations and demands for professional manpower which vary substantially from one country to another.[71]

Keeping these reservations in mind, they proceeded to analyze and describe characteristics about the European, Soviet, and American educational systems. They hoped that "the triangular comparison attempted in this paper will help clarify some of the current

---

[70]Theodore Bienienstok and William Sayers, Problems of Secondary Education in International Perspective: A Comparison of American, Soviet, and European Educational Systems (The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department of Research, February 1959), p. 1.

[71]Ibid.

criticisms of American education and perhaps suggest clues for proposed improvements."[72]

The three systems explicitly recognized the need for secondary education; however, they differed in their interpretations of the need and the assignment of priorities. The mainspring of European education was a respect for scholarship and intellectual attainment. In the educational system intellectual objectives took precedence over all others. Attention was focused on appreciation and treatment of ideas, on comprehension of an esteem for the cultural values springing from language, history, literature and art, and on developing habits of acquiring and enjoying knowledge. For those to whom both the content and method of rigorous academic training was difficult or unattractive, other types of schooling was provided. The American educational system, though emergent from the European system, was sharply diverged from it. On the organizational level, all children were educated within the framework of a single comprehensive institution. Also, in contrast to the European system which served primarily as a channel for transmitting academic learning, the American system was an educational service agency for all youth in its jurisdictional area. Reflecting the pragmatic and practical temper of American life, American educational goals tended to reflect immediately useful and applicable knowledge. Whereas European education stressed skills associated with intellectual refinement, those of American education stress skills useful in solving current problems, getting along with others, making a living, and regulating

---

[72]Ibid., p. 2.

one's civic and personal life. The most striking feature of the Soviet system was the monolithic control of the Communist Party and philosophy. The core of the Soviet approach was that education was essentially a political matter. Consequently, the entire educational establishment was focused on the goals of the Communist Party. This commitment resulted in an attempt at mass education on the American model and the exacting academic standards of the European model.

As to the place allotted to mathematics and science in the curriculum of the various systems, Bienenstok and Sayers viewed them as reflecting the respective social and cultural orientations. In America, mathematics and science were two of many sometimes competing products in an educational supermarket. In the Soviet Union, science and mathematics were esteemed as technologically and politically functional instruments in the reconstruction of the nation and the promoting of Soviet supremacy. In the United States, which had been for a long time a technologically advanced country, the study of science and mathematics were considered only part of a liberal education, to be weighed according to the interests and aptitudes of individual students. Also, it was noted that in the United States a considerably higher proportion of the appropriate age group was enrolled in secondary grades than in the Soviet Union: about 75 percent as compared to only about 33 percent.

> Hence, in observing that all Soviet students in the ten-year system receive the prescribed training in science and mathematics, it should be kept in mind that Soviet students represent a much smaller proportion of their contemporaries than American students represent of theirs.[73]

---

[73]Ibid., p. 24.

And, "The deceptive character of similarities under such conditions is particularly important to keep in mind when ongoing changes are considered."[74]

Problems of Secondary Education in International Perspective was essentially an expanded, well-documented version of Dr. Harry D. Gideonse's "What Are Our Goals? European Education and American Education," in The Educational Record (July 1958).

In the March 1959 Educational Forum, George S. Counts offered his analysis of "The Real Challenge of Soviet Education." Counts wrote that the launching of Sputnik in October of 1957 had caught the American people off balance. "Our comforting illusions have been shattered." Counts reminded readers that in his The Challenge of Soviet Education, written about a year and a half before Sputnik, he had referred to Soviet education as "one of the great and inescapable realities of the contemporary epoch, and one which free peoples can ignore only at their peril."[75] He charged that "any informed person" should have known about the threat before Sputnik.

For several pages, Counts related the history of American education since October 4, 1957. "The first responses were for the most part emotional and uninformed." Persons who knew little about either Soviet or American education appeared on the platform or in the press. Some, Counts contended, had taken advantage of the situation to give expression to ancient grudges against certain

---

[74]Ibid., p. 39.

[75]Counts, Challenge of Soviet Education, p. 261.

educators and certain educational practices.[76] Many suggested we import Soviet practices and philosophy. Ironically, Counts related that the Soviets were moving away from the very practices and philosphies many in America sought to emulate.

Counts also outlined briefly the history of Soviet education. He identified three periods of Soviet theory and practice. The first he labeled "the experimental period" lasting from 1917 to 1936. The second period began in 1936 and apparently ended in 1958. It was typified by a return to a structured curriculum of the pre-Revolutionary Russian model and was closely identified with the regime of Joseph Stalin. The third period got off to a start in 1956 at the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party. At the Congress, Khruschev attacked the standard academic education for all as a factor making for social stratification contrary to the Marxist vision of growing equalitarianism. Education had become a means of individual advancement and severe competition had developed for the opportunity to continue one's schooling to the highest level. In this way a new class, "a new Soviet Intelligentsia," had come into being. The 1958 reform sought to make socially useful work equal to academic proficiency in the Soviet curriculum.

Counts also attacked the thesis that the Soviet ten-year school was responsible for Sputnik. He called the idea nonsense. A child of seven who entered the ten-year school the first year of its operation would have been twenty-seven in 1957. The idea that he or

---

[76]John Dewey and progressive education, particularly the life-adjustment wing of progressive education.

any of his classmates played a significant role in Sputnik was impossible. Of the three Soviet physicists awarded the Nobel Prize, the youngest was born in 1905 and finished secondary school during the "progressive" or "experimental" years prior to the creation of the ten-year school with its rigid curriculum. And if physics from the sixth grade did not produce Sputnik, what did? Two answers were commonly given. First, it was the captured German scientists who did the job. Second, it was the secrets gained through espionage that enabled the Soviets to achieve their great success. Counts rejected both. First, America, not the Soviet Union, skimmed the cream of captured German scientists. Second, if the Soviet success was due to espionage, how did they come to hold secrets we never possessed? This rejection led back to the question: What produced Sputnik? The answer, Counts related, had already been hinted at. Pre-Revolutionary Russian education produced the scientists and mathematicians who produced the space satellite. True, Russia as a whole had been backward. Yet this backward land could boast an intellectual class equal to any Western country. Most informed people were familiar with nineteenth century Russian writers, composers, and artists. Not so many were aware of the fact that there were also great Russian minds in the field of science and mathematics. Moreover, it had been in the area of basic and theoretical science that the Russian tradition had flourished. A second factor of great importance had been the place occupied by science in Soviet ideology. Science was placed in direct opposition to religion as the means for achievement of the communist heaven on earth. Science was virtually

worshiped in the Soviet world. Another basic factor accounting for Sputnik had been the centralized Soviet political system with all power concentrated in the Communist Party and its Central Committee. The Soviet economy, all of the time, was as centralized as Western economies were only in wartime.

Counts dismissed the question "Is the Soviet system of education better than the American system of education?" as a question making very little sense. He agreed with the position of Gideonse, Beininstok, and Sayers that comparisons between different systems of education were extremely difficult and hazardous. Counts opinioned that the political system required inculcation of loyalty even more than science and mathematics. The desire to produce the "New Soviet Man" was central to Khruschev's assault on the academic orientation of the ten-year school. At this point, Counts rephrased the original question into what he termed a more intelligent form: "Does the Soviet system of education serve the purposes of the Soviet political and social system better than our system of education serves the purposes of our political and social systems?"[77] Counts believed the answer might be yes. Here was the real challenge of Soviet education.

The most acclaimed book published in 1959 was James B. Conant's The American High School Today. The report's twenty-one recommendations inaugurated a fierce periodical literature over a period of three years. As indicated on two previous occasions, the study began prior to the launching of Sputnik. Dr. Conant made

---

[77]George S. Counts, "The Real Challenge of Soviet Education," The Educational Forum 23 (March 1959): 269.

little use of comparisons of Russian and American schools. In fact, he believed that such comparisons were unsound and misleading and resulted in false impressions and foolish conclusions.[78] Interestingly, Conant, who was in basic agreement with American educational theory and practice, was perceived by many--Life magazine being the most prominent--as hostile to American education and desiring the wholesale importation of Soviet educational theory and practice.[79]

In 1957, on a $350,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation, Conant set out to find the "best" comprehensive high schools in the country. His divining rod was a list of standards of his own choosing.[80] Conant believed that every student should spend half his regular English course learning to write; he should write at least one theme a week. All should have at least one year of science, mathematics, American history, and a course in U.S. problems. To keep the school cohesive yet challenging, all should be grouped according to ability. The academically talented "should never get a chance to loaf." They should take a minimum of eighteen courses with homework, including four years of English, four years of mathematics, three years of science, four years of one foreign language, and three years of social studies. Taking one year to personally

---

[78]Conant, American High School Today, p. xi. Also see James B. Conant, "A Comparison of Six Talents: Development of Talent in Europe and the United States," The North Central Association Quarterly 34 (April 1960): 265.

[79]"Tryouts," pp. 117-121.

[80]Frank E. Henzlek, "The Conant Report: A Critique," The School Executive 79 (October 1959): 19-21; Conant, American High School Today, p. xi; "Education for All the Children of All the People," Time, September 14, 1959, pp. 70-79.

inspect fifty-five top schools in eighteen states, Conant found only eight that came close to being exactly right. The most common shortcomings were (1) only two years of a foreign language, (2) able girls avoided mathematics and science, (3) able boys neglected foreign language and English, and (4) academically talented students were not being sufficiently challenged.[81] "Yet," Conant opinioned, "all of the schools could be made as good as the best or even better."[82] In The Education Digest, he wrote, "I am convinced American secondary education can be made satisfactory without any radical change in the basic pattern."[83] This was the same program he had outlined for Life magazine (April 14, 1958). Life did not choose to emphasize Conant's basic agreement and lack of a call to arms against American education.

The major reform Conant advocated was the elimination of the small high school and the forming of large comprehensive high schools. Only the comprehensive high school could reasonably attain the three main objectives he set for the secondary school. Those objectives were: First, to provide a general education for all future citizens. Second, to provide good elective programs for those who wish to use their acquired skills immediately upon graduation. Third, to provide satisfactory academic programs for those who will continue their

---

[81]Conant, American High School Today, pp. 41-76.

[82]Ibid., p. 41.

[83]James B. Conant, "Twenty-One Recommendations for Improving Public Secondary Education," The Education Digest 24, No. 8 (April 1959): 6; and Conant, American High School Today, p. 76.

education at a college or university. His observations convinced him that the small high school could be maintained only at an exorbitant monetary and social expense.

The American High School Today was in substantial agreement with Conant's Education in a Divided World (1948). At that time, Conant agreed with the program of the Educational Policies Commission's Education for All American Youth (1944). Conant had served as a member of the Commission from 1940 to 1945. The American High School Today was a description of education in "Farmville" and "American City" as outlined by the United States Office of Education Commissions on Life-Adjustment Education. Despite Life's characterization of Conant as being critical of current educational theories and practices, Conant himself was of the opinion that "American secondary education can be made satisfactory without any radical change in the basic pattern."[84]

Stephen Corey took the "Conant Report" to task on its implied principles.[85] The first principle underlying The American High School Today, Corey opinioned, was that foundations and their officers have an obligation to decide what is good for the American people and then to use their resources to get accepted whatever they deem desirable. A second principle was that what is good for the American people and what is good for boys and girls is best determined by the subjective judgments of a distinguished citizen. The third principle was that

---

[84]Conant, American High School Today, p. 76.

[85]Stephen Corey, "The Conant Report on the American High School," The Educational Forum 24 (November 1959): 7-9.

curricular problems can be solved largely through quantitative arrangements. The fourth principle was that the prime purpose of the serious part of the secondary school curriculum is to teach boys and girls subject matter. The fifth principle was that in the development of high school curriculum the learners' wishes are irrelevant. The sixth and final principle was that for school work to be meaningful and important it must be hard. Using difficulty of comprehension as an important criterion of curriculum inclusion seemed to Corey to be coming close to "representing educational bankruptcy."[86]

In due course, Corey hoped it would be recognized that "the major purpose of secondary education is not to give boys and girls an opportunity to learn vast amounts of subject matter, but rather to improve their behavior in many respects." He believed that "the most important single fact to be considered in curriculum development is probably the perception by the learner of the importance of what he is learning." He further wrote, "what is learned is meaningful in the degree that it is relevant to the learners' problems and not to the degree that it is hard."[87]

Second only to the "Conant Report" in 1959 was Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover's Education and Freedom. A readable yet redundant book, Education and Freedom was a collection of speeches made during the previous four years. Some had been shortened, others expanded, and some new material had been added in an attempt to produce an

---

[86]Ibid.

[87]Ibid., p. 9.

orderly sequence. In many respects it resembled the "Benton Report" of the previous year. It was the Admiral's thesis that we must raise the academic level of our curriculum which had been watered down by John Dewey, progressive education and life adjustment. Rickover considered all three to be cut from the same tree and labeled their proponents as "educationists"--a term not meant as a compliment. Life-Adjustment Education for American Youth was singled out for a spirited attack.[88] Rickover endorsed what he termed "John Keats' revealing book Schools Without Scholars. And he termed "excellent" the five-part Life magazine series on the "Crisis In Education."[89] Rickover noted that Sputnik had widened the appeal of such views.

> It was difficult, before Sputnik, to present the full picture of Russian successes in the realm of the intellect. There was little patience in this country with anyone who told of areas where we were no longer supreme. Unpleasant facts were so unwelcome that it was actually risky to mention them.[90]

Rickover certainly had no trouble gaining wide acceptance for Education and Freedom. He would restate his thesis in Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (1962) and American Education, a National Failure: The Problem of Our Schools and What We Can Learn from England (1963). To many persons, Rickover's credentials were unimpeachable: Annapolis graduate (1922) and pioneer work on nuclear power plants for the Navy. "No one is better qualified than

---

[88]Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, Education and Freedom (New York: E. P. Dutton Co., Inc., 1959), p. 23.

[89]Ibid., p. 24.

[90]Ibid., pp. 35-36.

Admiral Rickover to assess the intellectual demands the future is certain to make," reported the New York Times (February 1, 1959). Life magazine (April 7, 1958) used superlatives like "nuclear expert" and "distinguished American" in evaluating Rickover. Certainly these charismatic titles added much to the success of Rickover's attack on American education.

A third widely acclaimed book appeared in 1959: The Big Red Schoolhouse by Fred M. Heckinger. Heckinger was education editor for the New York Times. He had served as secretary to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund Panel on Education, the authors of The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America (1958). Heckinger had been educated in Europe. He came to America in 1937 and was graduated Phi Beta Kapa from the College of the City of New York. After wartime service in the United States Army Intelligence, he became education editor for the Washington Post and later for the New York Herald Tribune. The Herald Tribune, as related earlier, held a common educational view with the National Citizens Council for Better Schools and Life magazine. These, in turn, shared a common interest with John Keats and Admiral Hyman Rickover. Interestingly, Paul Woodring, who also had served in the U.S. Army Intelligence and was associated with both the Ford and Carnegie Foundations, wrote the introduction to The Big Red Schoolhouse. The ties and associations between these groups and individuals are outside the scope of this paper.

In his introduction, Woodring presented an abbreviated history of both American and Soviet education. The fact that Russia

launched the first satellite was described as a "blow to our national ego and an implied threat to our security."[91] Many people "immediately went into orbit and started beeping."[92] They demanded crash programs for the training of engineers and scientists. Some wanted a national system of education with national standards set by a group of scholars. Many demanded a selective system as compared to a universal system of education. In turning to the Soviet Union, Woodring noted that even before the 1917 Revolution there had been some excellent schools in Russia. "The half million who went through the secondary schools provided a considerable nucleus of educated manpower."[93] After the Revolution, during the 1920s, the U.S.S.R. went through a period similar to progressive education in the United States. "Permissiveness," Woodring wrote, "was carried to its 'ultimate absurdity'--much further than in the United States."[94] In the 1930s the Soviets did an about-face in the direction of a highly disciplined, subject-centered curriculum. "It is this new education that is now seen by some as a threat to the United States."[95] Woodring's mini-history stopped at this point. He made no mention of the 1958 Reforms and seemed unaware of their existence.

---

[91]Heckinger, Big Red Schoolhouse, p. 10.

[92]Ibid.

[93]Ibid., p. 11.

[94]Ibid., p. 12.

[95]Ibid.

Woodring's philosophical agreement with Life magazine and Admiral Hyman G. Rickover can be illustrated with the following excerpt from the introduction:

> When the history of twentieth-century America eventually is written it will be recorded that the date of October 4, 1957, was a turning point in American education. Sputnik didn't do it alone--the times were ripe for change. For ten years and more the schools had been undergoing a vigorous reassessment at the hands of the American people and their intellectual leaders. Writers on education had divided themselves into two opposing camps; those who viewed the schools with complacency and defended the status quo, and those who viewed with alarm and were sharply critical of the educational trends of our generation.[96]

Interestingly, Woodring questioned his own "turning point" statement only five pages later. Rarely was such a decisive statement so quickly abandoned. "The great danger," he wrote, "is that now the first period of panic is past, we shall again lapse into complacency before the necessary reforms in our schools have been achieved."[97] Was Sputnik a flash in the pan, or a shot heard 'round the world?

Fred Heckinger entered the foray by first acknowledging his intellectual debts. He gave special thanks to Nicholas DeWitt, author of Soviet Professional Manpower (1955); Alexander G. Korol, author of Soviet Education for Science and Technology (1957); and the the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for its Education in the U.S.S.R. (1957). Although listed in his bibliography, he gave no special recognition to George S. Counts' Challenge of Soviet Education (1957). The lack of special recognition

---

[96]Ibid., p. 9. Emphasis mine.

[97]Ibid., p. 14.

for Counts is of interest for two reasons. First, Alexander Korol, who Heckinger did recognize, had high praise for the Counts' book. Second, Heckinger complained of the difficulty of obtaining information on Soviet education.[98] Counts was a fountainhead of such information. Perhaps Heckinger had never forgiven Counts for being a progressive and authoring Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order.

The most readable and effective portion of The Big Red Schoolhouse was the first chapter, "Ivan or Johnny" (pp. 23-29). Heckinger made use of long quotations from a CBS special on American and Russian education broadcast after the launching of Sputnik. He described how CBS had outlined the education of Ivan, "a typical teenager in Moscow." A CBS interviewer next had talked to a group of American high school students in Tennessee. "The consensus was that too much work had undoubtedly made Ivan a dull boy."[99] American teenage girls, Heckinger related, indicated they would not enjoy a date with Ivan because they would have little to talk about. Worse, from Heckinger's viewpoint, the teenagers considered the rigid academic training described from Moscow as a waste of time and boring. When asked what they thought was the important ingredient of good high school education, they indicated the most valuable lesson they were learning was how to get along with other people.

---

[98]Ibid., p. 11.

[99]Ibid., p. 23.

Heckinger described the comparison as "nothing short of devastating."[100] He went on to label the American teenagers' answers as "semi-literate ramblings" and "parroting of semi-digested social philosophies."[101] He veritably erupted with indignation as he related how CBS had interviewed a group of West Coast teenage boys taking a course in coed cooking, instead of mathematics.

Now Heckinger was described on the dust cover of The Big Red Schoolhouse as "one of America's leading educational authorities." Certainly, no one could fault his credentials. Yet, such a leading authority identifies his own political and social philosophies when he uses epithets such as "semi-literate ramblings" and "parroting semi-digested social philosophies." Certainly, learning to get along with other people is no mean accomplishment. Also, the American teenage girls were depreciating the educational tradition of which Heckinger was a product.

Recognizing that a nation's schools are not created in a vacuum, Heckinger cautioned against thoughtless importation and imitation. Specifically, he described the inappropriateness of the highly centralized French or the regimented Soviet systems. However, he had serious doubts whether a school system without some national standards could assure survival in a world of all-out technological competition. He proposed that given America's long established, deep-rooted tradition of local control of education, that some

---

[100] Ibid.

[101] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

national board of educational advisors be created. This board would write suggested standards.

Two exclusively descriptive accounts of Soviet education appeared in 1959. Gaylord P. Harnwell's Russian Diary was a simply written travel diary. Harnwell was the President of the University of Pennsylvania. He had visited the Soviet Union for a two-week period in the spring of 1958. He described various educational institutions in Moscow, Leningrad, and Asiatic Russia. The book contained Harnwell's observations on food, hotels, stores, and entertainment. It offered no new educational information.[102]

Deana Levin's Soviet Education Today was the personal observations of a British educator who had taught elementary school in Moscow. It was presented without any reference to social, political, or philosophical implications. It centered about a description of teaching methods used at the kindergarten and elementary level. More than anything else, Soviet Education Today was a wealth of personal experiences. It, like the Harnwell book, was out of step with the times. They were largely ignored.[103]

Irving R. Levine's "Trouble in Red Schoolhouses," The New Leader (June 8, 1959), was a refreshing change of pace from most Soviet descriptive literature.[104] Levine was a former NBC

---

[102]Gaylord P. Harnwell, Russian Diary (Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959).

[103]Deana Levin, Soviet Education Today (New York: J. DeGraff, 1959).

[104]Reprinted in Reader's Digest (July 1959), thus giving the information to a widespread audience.

correspondent in Moscow and the author of Mainstreet U.S.S.R.[105] "Trouble in Red Schoolhouse" described the furor in Russia which had given impetus to the 1958 Reforms. Levine quoted Khruschev to the effect "there is a serious dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs in secondary and higher schools . . . . Most young people who have attended school for teenagers turn out to be unprepared for life upon graduation."[106] Levine reported that the Soviet leader had recently made "drastic changes in the Soviet educational system." Ten years of compulsory schooling had been reduced to eight. Furthermore, the curriculum had been revised to stress socially useful work and deemphasize academics. "If the test of an educational system," Levine opinioned," is how well it prepares citizens to live in their society, Russian schools were far from successful. The Soviet educational system had failed to produce the atheistic, production-conscious, Marxist-minded citizens the Kremlin ordered."[107] Though atheism was taught from early grades, some village schools are forced to close on Saints' Days and other religious holidays because so many youngsters stay home.

Worst of all, in Khruschev's view, a scornful attitude toward physical labor existed among the population. Physical labor had become something to scare children with. This was incompatible with

---

[105]Irving R. Levine, Mainstreet U.S.S.R. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1959).

[106]Irving R. Levine, "Trouble in Red Schoolhouses," The New Leader, June 8, 1959; reprinted in Reader's Digest, July 1959, p. 55.

[107]Ibid.

with a socialist world view. Further, Khruschev exposed many fraudulent academic practices, admission rackets, and widespread cheating on the much vaunted examination system. If this were not enough, there also existed many low standard facilities, underpaid teachers, academically ill-prepared graduates, discipline problems and widespread juvenile delinquency. The latter was so rampant that Levine quoted Pravda's description of a workers' militia organized to subdue juvenile crime as a "struggle against drunkenness, hooliganism, robbery and murder."[108]

The last book printed in 1959 to be examined here is The Great Debate: Our Schools in Crisis, edited by C. Winfield Scott, Clyde M. Hill, and Hobert W. Burns. It will be compared and contrasted with another readings book by the first two editors, Public Education Under Criticism (1954). In the earlier book Scott and Hill noted that criticisms "have mushroomed to alarming proportions."[109] A chart documenting this trend was presented. The chart illustrated by year the number of entries in the Education Index under the heading "Public Schools--Criticism."[110]

1942 -- 3	1948 -- 7
1943 -- 5	1949 -- 13
1944 -- 8	1950 -- 12
1945 -- 7	1951 -- 35
1946 -- 6	1952 -- 49
1947 -- 10	

---

[108]Levine, "Trouble," p. 58.

[109]C. Winfield Scott and Clyde M. Hill, eds., Public Education Under Criticism (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 3.

[110]Ibid.

These figures tend to confirm the almost universal view that the years immediately preceding Sputnik witnessed a growth in the criticism of the public schools.

Scott and Hill divided critics into four groups: scholars, professional educators, professional writers, and outright enemies of education. A large portion of the book was directed to techniques for blunting criticism--"Handling Criticism" (pp. 305-382), and "Concluding Statements" (pp. 391-406).

Superficially the same, the 1959 book markedly differed from the 1954 book. Scott and Hill noted that "since Soviet Russia launched its first globe-circling satellite in the fall of 1957, shrill criticism of public education has reached a new crescendo."[111] In fact, the post-1957 criticism was a new synthesis. It was not a function of the pre-1957 criticism. Scott and Hill did not offer it, but the number of entries in the Education Index under the heading "Public Schools--Criticism" for 1953-1957 were as follows:

1953 -- 25
1954 -- 30
1955 -- 14
1956 -- 9
1957 -- 6

By 1955 the number of entries had returned to their 1949 level. And in 1957, the number of entries had fallen to the pre-1946 level. In other words, as reflected by the number of entries in Education Index, criticism of American education was on the decline at the time of the

---

[111] C. Winfield Scott, Clyde M. Hill, and Hobert W. Burns, eds., The Great Debate: Our Schools in Crisis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 1.

launching of the Soviet space satellite. Sputnik inaugurated a new wave of criticism.

Scott and Hill now divided critics into five, not four, groups. The five groups were: scholars, professional educators, public figures, professional writers, and outright enemies of public education. No section of the 1959 book was devoted to techniques for blunting criticism. A comparison of the main headings in the tables of contents of the two books will further illustrate the substantial differences between the two volumes:

	Public Education Under Criticism (1954)		The Great Debate: Our Schools in Crisis (1959)
1.	The Situation and How It Will Be Presented	1.	Bird's-Eye View of the Great Debate
2.	General and Philosophical	2.	General Pros and Cons
3.	Progressive Education	3.	Neglect of Fundamental Subjects
4.	The Fundamentals	4.	The Challenge of Soviet Education
5.	Religion	5.	Do We Do Enough for the Gifted Child?
6.	The Social Studies	6.	Are Schools Too Fancy?
7.	Teacher Education and Teachers	7.	Can Teacher Training and Certification Be Justified?
8.	General Defenses	8.	Decision of the Judges
9.	Evaluation of Critics and Criticism	9.	Some Proposals for Action
10.	How to Handle Criticisms		
11.	Concluding Statements		

Immediately, the reader notices that things have moved from criticism to crisis, at least as far as the titles are concerned. Very significant is the absence of any section in the 1959 book on

defending education from its critics. Twenty-five percent of the 1954 book had been devoted to handling criticism. The topic of religion had been dropped. And clearly, "The Challenge of Soviet Education" was the focus of the 1959 book. The reader should also notice the clearer statements and eye-catching questions in the 1959 book. Most important, notice where the authors left the reader in the two volumes. In 1954, the reader was led down a path and given basic training in handling critics. In 1959, the reader was also led down a path--this time the path of educational reform.

At this point, it is appropriate to summarize the perceptions of informed Americans concerning the discussion of American educational theory and practice in the light of disclosures concerning Soviet education in the period from October 1957 to December 1958. The data would seem to indicate the following generalizations:

1. Sputnik was initially perceived as a Soviet military and propaganda triumph. It was not viewed in educational terms.[112]

2. The U.S. may have lost the race into space due to a bureaucratic foul-up and inter-service rivalry.[113]

3. The Russian space success came at a time of economic recession in the United States, thus intensifying the impact on the American people.[114]

---

[112]"Soviet Satellite Sends U.S. Into a Tizzy," Life, October 14, 1957; "The Feat"; and "Common Sense and Sputnik," Life, October 21, 1957, p. 35.

[113]Furnas, "Why Did the U.S. Lose."

[114]"Truth About Russia's Weakness."

4. Sputnik acted as a catalyst in bringing together the pre-Sputnik literature on Soviet education and the pre-Sputnik progressive-traditionalist literature.[115]

5. Life magazine in March and April of 1958 was a vehicle through which the merger was consummated and popularized.[116]

6. Initially, the merger was restricted to periodical literature.

7. Several authors argued that the reason for America's loss of the space race was the "soft pedagogy of John Dewey."[117]

8. Numerous authors wrote rejoinders to the critics of John Dewey and progressive education.[118]

9. The danger of superficial comparisons between educational systems was described. This literature was limited to professional journals.[119]

10. The Conant recommendations for the curriculum in secondary schools made their initial appearance

---

[115]This fact is self-evident with a reading of the periodical literature of the period. Perhaps its best and clearest statement was Fadiman's "The Mess in Education." Fadiman wrote, "What opened our eyes? A flying box containing a dying dog."

[116]"The Crisis In Education," Life (March 24 and 31, and April 7, 14, and 21, 1958); Sloan Wilson, "It's Time to Close Our Carnival," Life, March 24, 1958, pp. 36-37; "The Deeper Problem in Education: It Is Time to Dig Out Educationist Debris and Rediscover Learning's True Nature," Life, April 21, 1958, p. 112.

[117]The sources which document this are legion, including, of course, the five-part Life series. Other important statements of the view were Hutchins, "Khruschev's Little Red Schoolhouse," and public addresses by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover.

[118]Again, the sources are legion. Two of the best defenses of Dewey and the progressive cause were Handlin, "Rejoinder," and Elicker, "Let's Speak the Truth."

[119]Gideonse, "What Are Our Goals?"

in March, 1958. Their full impact would come in 1959 with the publication of The American High School Today.[120]

11. A blueprint for a "citizens' grand jury" takeover of the public schools was presented and skilfully advocated.[121]

12. A connection existed between Life magazine and the National Citizens Council for Better Schools, a conservative-oriented group.[122]

13. By 1959 the merger of the pre-Sputnik literature on Soviet education and the pre-Sputnik progressive-traditionalist literature reached the book press.

14. The existence of a pre-Revolutionary Russian "intelligentsia" was noted.[123]

15. By 1959 the pitfalls of superficially comparing educational systems was stressed by some professional educators in the book literature.[124]

---

[120]"Tryouts for Good Ideas"; Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Pursuit of Excellence.

[121]Keats, Schools Without Scholars; "Deeper Problem in Education."

[122]The argument for a connection between Life and the National Citizens Council for Better schools is self-evident. Life presented a scathing anti-progressive editorial authored by Sloan Wilson, former Associate Director of the NCCBS. In the editorial Wilson urged readers to obtain and study John Keats' Schools Without Scholars (1958). Keats, in turn, suggested that his readers contact the NCCBS in order to obtain help in setting up their "citizens' grand jury" and suggests they in turn "takeover" their local public school. Life, in turn, called for a crusade to wipe out the two enemies of school reform, "educationists" and their "utopian life-adjustment of the pupil." If it looks like a duck, if it walks like a duck, if it quacks like a duck, it's a duck!

[123]Counts, "The Real Challenge," Heckinger, Big Red Schoolhouse.

[124]Bienienstok and Sayers, Problems of Secondary Education; Counts, "The Real Challenge"; Heckinger, Big Red Schoolhouse.

16. James B. Conant's American High School Today was published in 1959. It rapidly became both descriptive and prescriptive, as well as the center of a periodical literature.[125]

17. Admiral Hyman G. Rickover published Education and Freedom and became a public figure.

18. The Soviet Union began the reordering of its own educational system. Ironically, they were abandoning the rigid academic secondary school and were moving in the direction of a form of schooling which stressed labor education and moral education.[126]

19. A close analysis of The Great Debate: Our Schools in Crisis (1959) and Public Education Under Criticism (1954) revealed that the criticism of American education was on the decline prior to the launching of Sputnik.

---

[125]Corey, "The Conant Report."

[126]Counts, "The Real Challenge"; Levine, "Trouble in Red Schoolhouses."

CHAPTER IV

SPUTNIK: LATER AMERICAN LITERARY REACTIONS

In this section of the dissertation, the writer will examine the later American literary reactions to Sputnik (1960-62). The initial period of literary reaction (1957-59) had been a time of near-hysteria in some quarters of this country. On the whole, this hysteria wore down during the period under consideration (1960-62). The writer shall, for the most part, proceed chronologically.

What shall the curriculum include? Mortimer Smith posed the question and an answer in "Basic Education: What Is It?" The Education Digest (March 1960). The article was a reprint from A Citizen's Manual for Public Schools, a publication of the Council for Basic Education. Smith opinioned that the purpose of education were four-fold: "(1) to teach the young how to read, write, and figure; (2) to transmit the facts about the heritage and culture of the nation; (3) in the process of (1) and (2), to train the intelligence and to stimulate the pleasures of thought; and (4) to provide that atmosphere of moral affirmation without which education is merely animal training."[1] In other words, Smith sought to make the child literate in the essential fields of human knowledge. In the

---

[1]Mortimer Smith, "Basic Education: What Is It?" The Education Digest, March 1960, p. 1.

"agonizing reappraisal since Sputnik," Smith believed that the American people were coming more and more to accept a more rigorous academic program.

James Conant presented a thoughtful article in the April 1960 issue of The North Central Association Quarterly. The title of the article was "A Comparison of Six Talents: Development of Talent in Europe and the United States." In it, Conant limited his analysis to the free nations of Europe, purposely avoiding the Soviet Union. "I will tell you frankly that I think we have heard too much about Russian education."[2] He stressed that in Europe many families and children make a tremendously important choice at approximately eleven years of age. Twenty percent of that age group are selected and enrolled in pre-university schools. Those not selected go to work at age fourteen. Meanwhile, they attend a "continuation school."

Conant went on to describe how six different talents were developed in each education system. The talents were leadership, athletic, musical, artistic, manipulative, and academic. The Europeans, he related, devoted almost no time to developing the first four talents. They concentrated their educational efforts on only the manipulative and academic talents. As already hinted, European education proceeded on a two-track system. The manipulative or craftsman talent was developed in continuation schools and apprenticeship programs. The academic talent was developed in the rigorous pre-university schools. "It was these schools that people

---

[2]Conant, "Comparison of Six Talents," p. 265.

were thinking about when they praised European schools. The people do not realize that only 20% of their children would be enrolled in such academic institutions."[3] It went without saying, Conant continued, that in the United States we attempt to develop all six talents for those individuals who desire under our elective system to develop such talents. With these facts known, he doubted Americans would opt for the European systems.

The publication of the "Conant Report" during the previous year had signaled the beginning of a lively periodical literature and the book itself quickly reached the best seller list. The publicity given The American High School Today was thought by some to be unequaled in the history of American education.[4] For months before its publication, Dr. Conant had presented its major recommendations at educational forums and conventions. Its famous twenty-one recommendations had been popularized in Life magazine (April 14, 1958). Conant's credentials and the reassuring report that "no radical change was required to make all American schools as good as the best" he had visited guaranteed wide acceptance for The American High School Today. Initially, reviews were highly favorable. Professional educators performed mental gymnastics and reported that their particular school districts had long practiced most of the policies Conant recommended. This was not difficult because Conant's recommendations were strictly in line with

---

[3]Ibid.

[4]Francis Griffith, "Another Look at the Conant Report," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 44 (October 1960): 59.

progressive education which had become the near national practice (see pages 45 and 68). After the initial acceptance, four schools of criticism developed. The first to appear was an attack on the underlying principles of the report. This attack was typified by Stephen Corey's "The Conant Report on the American High School," The Educational Forum (November 1959), as reported in the previous chapter.

A second line of attack can be illustrated by examination of Francis Griffith's "Another Look at the Conant Report" in The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (October 1960). Griffith asserted that the Conant Report suffered from serious heretofore unrecognized limitations. The first limitation, he asserted, was the limitation of Conant himself. Conant had attended a private preparatory school before he matriculated at Harvard. After graduation he was appointed assistant professor of chemistry and rapidly rose the the presidency of Harvard. "He never spent even a single day as a pupil, teacher, or administrator of a public elementary school, high school, or tax-supported college."[5] He lacked an intimate association with the institution for which he was widely regarded as an expert. Given this background, Griffith thought he found a bias in favor of science and language instruction, and only a superficial knowledge of high school curriculum and organization in the Report.

The second limitation according to Griffith was a limitation of purpose. The declared purpose was to discover whether the

---

[5]Ibid.

comprehensive high school protects the interests of its academically talented pupils. This was a restricted aim. The American High School Today thus was not, as its title implied, a study of the strengths and shortcomings of secondary education in this country. "Readers should keep Dr. Conant's restricted purpose in mind when reading his recommendations."[6]

Next Griffith argued with Conant's definition of the comprehensive high school. Griffith believed that a true comprehensive school should prepare pupils to enter employment as skilled workers. According to this definition, he found only three comprehensive schools in the entire United States.

Griffith also questioned Conant's sample. Conant had personally visited only 55 of the nation's 21,000 high schools. Further, the sample was limited to schools in which less than one-half the population was college-bound and in which the median I.Q. was between 100 and 105. Even more limiting, the sample included no high school with a graduating class of less than 100. Such schools had been recommended to be terminated without even being studied. "Obviously, the sample on which the survey is based is neither meaningful nor representative."[7]

Finally, Griffith attacked Conant on the limited content of the Report. There was no mention of classroom instruction. There was no discussion of the extra-curriculum. Further, The American High School Today ignored significant research findings such as the

---

[6]Ibid., p. 60.

[7]Ibid., p. 62.

Eight-Year Study and the possibilities of educational television and large group instruction. Acknowledging the Report's many merits, Griffith recommended that superintendents and school boards should consider its many shortcomings before they attempted to carry out its recommendations.

James D. Koerner labeled the Conant Report "a national disaster." Koerner was a former Executive Secretary of the Council for Basic Education. He made his remarks in "The Tragedy of the Conant Report," Phi Delta Kappan (December 1960). Koerner saw the Report as tragic for two reasons: (1) its findings and recommendations; and (2) the unquestioning credence given the book by school boards, parents, administrators, and teachers. "The tragedy lies in the destiny to which Mr. Conant has consigned as much as 85 percent of American youth."[8] Thus Koerner questioned Conant's education for the non-college-bound. This attack was grounded both in educational philosophy and personal experience.

> The fact that struck me in the face, that horrified me, as I read the Report was that I had had, almost perfectly, the kind of education Mr. Conant says I--perhaps 85 percent should have had. . . . Only what I had was not education. Neither was it training. Nor was it even "adjustment." It was an abomination.[9]

Korner had received his schooling in a large comprehensive high school of the type Conant endorsed. Coming from a lower class home, he had been "counseled" over his objections into a "marketable skill program." After separation from the armed forces and development of

---

[8]James D. Korner, "The Tragedy of the Conant Report," Phi Delta Kappan 42 (December 1960): 121.

[9]Ibid.

what he described as "a true intellectual hunger," he completed a doctorate and began a career in teaching. He described his secondary education as "a minus factor of formidable dimension." It was this minus factor that outraged him in The American High School Today. "If ever there was a way to create an intellectual elite, this was it."[10] Koerner advocated an academic education for all. "I would suggest to Mr. Conant that nobody has the right to assume that any student will not go to college. Nobody has the right to assume that because a student may think he will not go to college, he should not be educated. . . . That is the real tragedy of the Conant Report."[11]

Theodore Brameld questioned Conant's underlying educational philosophy in "The Proposals of Dr. Conant," Teachers College Record (December 1960). He began by noting "the task is not easy, if only because Dr. Conant has never in his several books come to grips with the philosophic underpinnings of education."[12] Brameld asserted that under close scrutiny the largest share of Dr. Conant's recommendations were centered in the doctrine that the main purpose of education was to reinforce and perpetuate the social heritage. As such, he rejected them as unsuitable to a democratic, continually reconstructing society. Inevitably, the Conant recommendations

---

[10]Ibid., p. 124.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Thedore Brameld, "The Proposals of Dr. Conant," Teachers College Record 42 (December 1960): 232.

"become a roadblock in the path of imperative reconstruction."[13] A second defect stemmed from the first; Conant supported a curriculum divorced from recent psychological and sociological research. Brameld was horrified that such philosophically based recommendations had been so uncritically received by the great majority of teachers and administrators. And he noted that the appearance of Conant's upcoming report on the junior high schools seemed likely to receive the same uncritical acceptance.

Five books on Soviet education were published in 1960: Engineering Education in Russia by Steven Timoshenko, Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher by F. Vigdorova; The Changing Soviet School, edited by George Z. F. Bereday, William Brickman, and Gerald Read; The Politics of Soviet Education, edited by George Z. F. Bereday and Joan Pennar; and Khruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education by George S. Counts.

The Counts book was divided into two parts: (1) an introductory essay called "The Reconstruction of Soviet Education" (pp. 1-23); and (2) a translation of the section on moral education from the "48 Theses" approved by the Council of Ministers as well as the Central Committee of the Communist Party in 1958. "The Reconstruction of Soviet Education" for the most part was an expanded version of Counts' "The Real Challenge of Soviet Education" which had appeared in the Educational Forum (March 1959). Counts viewed the "Theses" as the Soviet version of the "Conant Report." The "Theses" also illustrated for Counts how a totalitarian state changes its

---

[13]Ibid.

educational system. The "Theses" Counts related were a basic and essential part of the Seven-Year Plan which was designed to shape the development of the Soviet economy and culture from January 1, 1959, to December 31, 1965. The Seven-Year Plan had two ambitious goals: "(1) to overtake and surpass America," and (2) to "hasten the transition to communism."[14] Stripped to the bone, the "Theses" called for the radical reconstruction of the educational system in light of the goals of communism and the contemporary world situation.[15]

They expressed many sharp criticisms of the existing ten-year school. The central criticism was that the school was separated from life and tended toward abstraction and verbalism. The curriculum was too bookish and tended to prepare students almost exclusively for admission to higher education and membership in a privileged intelligentsia. In a word, it failed to produce the "New Soviet Man." It failed to achieve the vaunted union of theory and practice, knowledge and socially useful labor. Worst of all, it nourished an aversion to physical labor, social snobbishness, and "petit bourgeois" traits in both pupils and parents. One had to understand the ten-year school as an obstacle in the path of the Communist millennium in order to grasp the significance of the "Theses." For the central object of the "Theses" was the cultivation in the young of the elements of Communist morality.

---

[14]Counts, Khruschev and the Central Committee, p. 3.

[15]Ibid.

Counts opinioned that "the total educational system which will emerge from the 'Theses' may be far more challenging than the system which has excited so many Americans."[16] The real challenge of Soviet education was not to be found in the realm of science and technology; rather, it was to be centered in the hearts and minds of the youth of the respective nations. The Russians had a considerable advantage in this struggle. They had only to prepare their children and youth to love the Party and serve the State in accordance with their gifts and talents. America's task was infinitely more difficult and complicated. We must prepare the members of the younger generation to discharge intelligently and conscientiously all of the duties of citizens of a free society in an industrial age.

A. C. Eurich took exception to Counts' explanation for the reason the Soviets won the space race. Eurich wrote a review of Khruschev and the Central Committee in the Saturdy Review (December 12, 1959). Eurich wrote that "Counts underestimates some of the forces currently operating in Russia. . . . The basis for Soviet scientific success which Counts offers . . . is weak."[17] Counts had explained Sputnik by drawing attention to the scientists and mathematicians who had been developed in pre-1917 Russian schools, an intellectual cadre he rated as equal to anything existing in the West. Eurich granted that the scientists who literally produced Sputnik had been trained in pre-Revolutionary Russia. Nevertheless,

---

[16] Ibid., p. 12.

[17] A. C. Eurich, Review of Khruschev and the Central Committee by George S. Counts in the Saturday Review, December 12, 1959, p. 17.

he believed that Counts had underestimated the importance of the ten-year school curriculum. Eurich asserted that both the accomplishments of Soviet scientists and the ten-year school's emphasis on physics from the sixth grade had grown out of the same cultural and educational priorities.

Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher by F. Vigdorova and translated from the Russian by Rose Prokofieva was a piece of fiction in diary form. Vigdorova had written extensively on education in the Soviet Union. During the first five years of her teaching experience she kept a diary in which she set down her successes and disappointments. Out of this diary and observations she made later, Mrs. Vigdorova created the character Marina Nikolayevna, the teacher who speaks in the Diary. Through the experiences related in the Diary, the reader gained insight into Soviet classroom methods. Robert M. Hutchins who authored the introduction to the Diary was fascinated with Vigdorova's work. "The great lesson of the book," he wrote, "is that children, and by consequence education, are much the same everywhere."[18] An American reader familiar only with the writings of Admiral Rickover, Fred Heckinger, and Life magazine might have had trouble recognizing the Soviet ten-year school. "The schooling it portrays was humane and democratic."[19] And, "the social and moral goals of Mrs. Vigdorova were strikingly similar to our own."[20]

---

[18]F. Vigdorova, Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1960), p. 10.

[19]E. T. Ladd, "Review of Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher," Social Education 25 (May 1961): 260.

[20]Mirian Goldberg, "Review of Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher," Saturday Review, November 19, 1960, p. 72.

Stephen Timoshensko's Engineering Education in Russia was strikingly different from Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher. It was another of the books illustrating the "Soviet Superman Thesis." Only forty-seven pages, it was a brief description of the content and method of engineering education in the Soviet Union. Timoshensko had been educated at the Kiev Polytechnic Institute before the Russian Revolution of 1917. In 1958, after an absence of forty years and a teaching career in the United States, he returned to Russia and paid visits to leading engineering schools and collected curriculum guides. Incidentally, Timoshensko was living proof of the George Counts thesis concerning pre-Revolutionary Russian education. Timoshensko's evaluation of American education agreed with writers such as Rickover and Heckinger. Timoshensko wrote: ". . . with our poor secondary school preparation and our four year engineering school curricula, we can not possibly accomplish as much as the schools of Russia are doing today."[21]

This analysis of the year 1960 shall conclude with two readings books edited by George Z. F. Bereday and others. The Politics of Soviet Education was a collection of papers delivered at the Institute for the study of the U.S.S.R. in Munich, Germany, during a three-week seminar.[22] Among the contributors were educators, economists, linguists, sociologists, historians, and political scientists. A theme which received repeated attention was the tension which

---

[21]Stephen Timoshensko, Engineering Education in Soviet Russia (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 31.

[22]Co-editor was Jann Pennar.

existed between the ideological content of Soviet education and the increasing industrialization and bureaucratization of the Soviet economy. This tension was recognized by Soviet leaders who drew up plans for educational reform in 1957. This plan was the "48 Theses" George S. Counts described in Khruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education. Ramazan Karca (pp. 3-27) outlined a plan developed by the R.S.F.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences for the development of public education in the U.S.S.R. for the next fifteen to twenty years. He noted Khruschev's speech at the Thirteenth Congress of the All-Union Komsomol calling for educational reform. Briefly described, the measures were as follows: (1) reorganization of the secondary school so that all pupils receive both trade and general education; (2) organization of factory-VTUZs (a combination industrial plant and higher technical education institution); (3) transfer of higher and intermediate agricultural education schools from urban to rural districts; (4) the expansion of the system of intermediate and higher schools operating as evening and correspondence schools. Secondary schools were thus to become something like apprenticeship-training shops with graduates receiving a certification of labor skills in addition to a matriculation certificate. Such a plan was a near reversion to the "experimental period" of the 1920s. During the 1920s innovators had called for the "withering away of the school."

The Changing Soviet School was a companion volume to The Politics of Soviet Education.[23] It was the combined observations of seventy-one American educators who spent August and September 1958 in the Soviet Union. The book emphasized the "practical courses" which were simultaneously being criticized in the American school and introduced in the Soviet school. In a second parallel, the creation of an intellectual elite was being hotly debated. In their introduction, the editors termed 1958 "a significant watershed." During that year the reform movement for the "polytechnicalization" of Soviet schools received national sanction in legislative form.[24] The book was written according to a three-part plan. Part one was a summary of the philosophical, social, and historical antecedents of the present Soviet system. Part two described the Soviet school in its formal organization with emphasis on the secondary school. Part three surveyed selected issues in Soviet education with emphasis on character and moral education in a collectivist society.

Both of the Bereday edited volumes were readable, well documented, and presented their material in objective fashion. The weakness of both volumes was inherent in the fact they were the product of eighty-three authors and six editors.

Perhaps the most comprehensive book on Soviet education to appear during the post-Sputnik period was Nicholas DeWitt's well

---

[23]Co-editors were William Brickman, Gerald Read, and Ina Schlesinger.

[24]George Z. F. Bereday, William Brickman, and Gerald Read, eds., The Changing Soviet School (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), p. ix.

documented Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R. (1961). The book was prepared for the National Science Foundation. DeWitt outlined the study as having two main objectives in mind. The first aim was to present the most up-to-date information in regard to the educational system of the Soviet Union. The second objective was to describe the relationship between the Soviet Union's educational system. Actually, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R. was more comprehensive than these two objectives.

DeWitt noted that recent Soviet developments (1955-1958) were unique in many respects. The second half of 1955 marked the beginning of a period in relations with the West known as the "thaw." The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party witnessed Khruschev's denunciation of Stalin. A considerable number of economic and administrative reforms had been introduced. The Hungarian revolt and unrest in other European satellites marked the end of this period of limited liberalization. The fall of 1957 witnessed the scrapping of the Sixth Five-Year Plan and a torrential debate on the reordering of the economy and the educational system. The successful launching of Sputnik I and subsequent Soviet space achievements submerged these developments.

A major portion of Education and Professional Employment described the Soviet periodical literature surrounding the 1958 educational reforms. The crux of the Soviet debate was the existence of a "new class" or "new Soviet intelligentsia." Reformers declared that contrary to the Marxist vision of growing equalitarianism, Soviet education was responsible for the existence of the "new

class." The reforms sought to remedy this condition by sharply increasing the labor content of education. They sought to make the capacity to perform productive tasks, instead of academic proficiency alone, the criterion of advancement. Some Soviet writers had hailed the reforms as a move to return Soviet schools to the only correct path--the path of the labor education of youth. The memory and theories of Lenin had been invoked to legitimatize the reforms. Some reformers went so far as to suggest that secondary education had outlived its usefulness, and that the primary objective of educational reform should be to abandon traditional schools and to train youth in vocational schools, correspondence schools, and on the job.[25] The Government organ Izvestia remarked on July 28, 1958, that "there has not been a more exciting discussion in many years than is now going on about our schools."[26]

According to DeWitt's analysis, the reforms were in part designed to correct the imbalance caused because of the overproduction of ten-year school graduates. What was needed was more people to support the already more than adequate supply of highly trained specialists. In a Western economy the solution would have been found in the price mechanism. This was impossible under Soviet conditions. In Russia the educational system had to be adjusted by administrative action. Academic schooling would have to be curtailed

---

[25]Nicholas DeWitt, Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R., the National Science Foundation, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, 1961, p. 9.

[26]Ibid.

in order to accelerate the preparation of Soviet youth to fill the productive jobs required by the first Soviet Seven-Year Plan (1959-1965). The Seven-Year Plan and its education corollaries were related to demographic trends set in motion by the staggering human losses suffered by the Soviets during World War II. The size of the 18-25 year-old age group during the period of the plan would be one-third smaller than it normally would have been. Severe labor shortages were envisioned unless there was a shift in the output of the educational system.[27] The demographic trend and the corresponding shift in the secondary school curriculum illustrated DeWitt's contention that "Soviet educational policy, however, strong its ideological orientation, has also responded to exceedingly pragmatic considerations."[28] As V. N. Stoleton, R.S.F.S.R. Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, stated in August 1959: "The system of education should provide the national economy with cadres in requisite numbers and with the necessary qualification to enable the economy to develop in full accordance with the Seven-Year Plan."[29]

In addition to the place of labor education in the secondary curriculum, there were significant secondary issues raised in Soviet publications. The issues DeWitt reported were (1) the education of gifted children; (2) the language of instruction; (3) multi-track

---

[27]Ibid., pp. 14-16.

[28]Ibid., p. 6. Emphasis mine.

[29]Ibid., p. 15.

education and electives; (4) school entrance age; (5) the length of compulsory schooling; and (6) methods for combining study and work training.

The idea of establishing special school facilities for gifted students was among the most revolutionary proposals advanced by Khruschev. Such a concept was heretical to the social and educational philosophy professed since the Revolution. It was even more surprising considering Khruschev's attack on the ten-year school as fostering a "new class." At the December 1958 session of the Supreme Soviet it was announced that special education for the gifted would receive further study. DeWitt indicated that experiments were being conducted in Moscow and other sections of the Soviet Union. Because of the multi-national character of the U.S.S.R., discussions over the language of instruction inevitably became embroiled in educational discussions. DeWitt noted a pronounced tendency on the part of parents to accept Russification as a stepping stone to social advancement. The most commonly advanced plan for a multi-track system in the secondary school had three streams: (1) mathematics-physical sciences-industrial skills; (2) chemistry-biology-agricultural skills; (3) social sciences-humanities-clerical and business. This three-track system, DeWitt cautioned, should not be confused with the American free elective system. It was a choice of three required programs.[30] A modification of lowering the school entry age from seven to six years was not accepted. Under the reform plan the

---

[30]Ibid., pp. 19-20.

number of compulsory attendance years was dropped from ten to eight. However, a new eleven-year school was to be made available in all areas. The Reform also called for students in the upper grades to spend two days per week during the school year and several weeks during the summer in on-the-job training. "Uchenie i trud vmeste idut," the Soviets termed it ("Study and work go hand in hand").[31] An excellent two-page diagram illustrated the pre- and post-Reform education systems. As an example of the heavy documentation in the book, the Appendix ran from page 535 to page 813. It contained many excellent charts, graphs, and tables.

In his "Postscript," DeWitt reminded the reader that Soviet education was but a means to an end, "to maximize the economic and political power of the Soviet regime and to strengthen thereby its international position in the struggle to establish communism throughout the world." He wrote on to place Soviet education in a philosophical perspective. He noted that in the Soviet Union the development of professional competence and technical rationality was deliberately divorced from the acquisition of broad humanistic values. Thus, their education was both a failure and a success.

> If the aim of education is to develop a creative intellect critical of society and its values, then Soviet education is an obvious failure. If its aim is to develop applied professional skills enabling the individual to perform specialized, functional tasks, then Soviet higher education is unquestioningly a success, posing not only a temporary challenge, but a major threat in the long-run struggle between democracy and totalitarianism.[32]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 20. A slogan coined by Khruschev.

[32] Ibid., pp. 547-48.

Many of these same points appeared in journal form in Nicholas DeWitt, "Soviet Science Education and the School Reform," School and Society (Summer 1960).

Raymond P. Harris defended American education against the Sputnik-inspired charge of a "soft curriculum" in American Education: Facts, Fancies, and Folklore. He noted that the launching of Sputnik had spawned "an orgy of recrimination." He outlined the scenario as follows. Within hours after the launching of Sputnik I the schools were the object of an orgy of recrimination. Somebody had to be the culprit. And, almost immediately, even among prominent people, this painful role was assigned to public education.[33] The recriminating barrage of words was quickly taken up by the mass media.[34] Interestingly, the largest part of the much publicized quotations and paraphrases came from a rather small number of persons--a handful of college professors, novelists, and an admiral.[35] This vociferous group had gained wider credence across the nation than 1,300,000 certified professionals who staffed the public schools.[36]

Harris criticized the critics on two points. For several years, he asserted, a trend toward science and mathematics in the curriculum was evidenced in the schools. Impetus for the awakening

---

[33]This substantially agrees with the views of Admiral Rickover and Robert M. Hutchins.

[34]Life magazine, CBS "Special," and numerous television shows.

[35]Paul Woodring, Fred Heckinger, Sloan Wilson, Admiral Hyman Rickover.

[36]Harris was an administrator for the Mount Vernon, New York, Public Schools.

of interest in science and mathematics came from the demands of modern warfare and the need for scientists, engineers, and technicians in the expanding post-war economy. These facts had been ignored by the critics of American education. Clear evidence, Harris maintained, that none of them were very well acquainted with the schools they were attacking. Harris's second point was that the real test for concern about the quality of American education was much larger budgets. Uncertain of such budgets, he concluded, "Perhaps the national excitement generated by the news of Sputnik I is to be dissipated in scapegoating rather than translated into serious efforts to raise the material standards of education."[37]

The year 1962 witnessed the publication of several interesting books either on Soviet education or American education in the light of disclosures concerning Soviet education. One of the more interesting was Soviet Education: Anton Makarenko and the Years of Experiment by James Bowen. Unknown in the West, "Anton Makarenko was to Soviet education what John Dewey was to education in America."[38] Each was "The Philosopher" to his respective disciples. Each believed education to be a group process, but each placed a different interpretation upon the individual's role in society.

> Dewey emphasized the importance of the diversity of the individual's interests as necessary to strengthening society's growth. Makarenko felt that the individual's role

---

[37]Raymond P. Harris, American Education: Facts, Fancies, and Folklore (New York: Random House, 1961), p. 274.

[38]James Bowen, Soviet Education: Anton Makarenko and the Years of Experiment (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1962), book jacket.

> should be subordinate to the collective needs of the group. He sought to educate the child according to environmental psychology in which social conditioning and habituation play a prominent part.[39]

Professor Bowen's book was separated into three sections: (1) Anton Makarenko's career seeking to rehabilitate Russia's post-War and post-Revolutionary waifs and delinquents; (2) synoptic and analytic accounts of Anton Makarenko's chief writings; and (3) an assessment of Anton Makarenko as an educational philosopher and practitioner.

Immediately after the First World War and the Bolshevik Revolution, one of Russia's many grave problems was the situation of displaced and orphaned children. Leading lives marked by crime, vice and depravity, they roamed the streets of the major Russian cities in such hordes that they were called the "wild boys." Makarenko was an obscure Ukranian school teacher who took up the challenge to redeem these lost youth. During his work with the "wild boys," he came to question and then to oppose the then current Soviet educational policy which was patterned on American progressive education. His theories were published in three books: The Road to Life, Learning to Live, and A Book for Parents. They earned for him the Order of the Red Banner of Labor for literary achievement in 1939. His ideas, summarized in a key passage below, became under Stalin the orthodoxies of Soviet educational theory and practice.

> I had ventured to question the correctness of the generally accepted theory of those days, that punishment of any sort is degrading, that it is essential to give the fullest possible scope to the sacred creative impulses of the child and that the great thing is to rely solely upon self-organization and self-discipline. I had also ventured to

---

[39]Ibid.

> advance the theory, to me incontrovertible, that, so long as the collective, and the organs of the collective, had not been created, so long as no traditions existed, and no elementary labor and cultural habits had been formed, the teacher was entitled--nay, was bound!--to use compulsion. I also maintained that it was impossible to base the whole of education on the child's interests, that the cultivation of a sense of duty frequently runs counter to them, especially as these present themselves to the child himself. I called for the education of a strong, toughened individual, capable of performing work that may be both unpleasant and tedious should the interests of the collective require it.[40]

So much for anarchy and nihilism. So much for the withering away of the school. So much for progressive education. Enter the rigid curriculum and discipline of the ten-year school.

Helen B. Redl translated and edited contributions from various Soviet writers to produce Soviet Educators on Soviet Education. The volume was primarily a source book on the theory and practice of child rearing in the Soviet Union. It was the outcome of a Ford Foundation-sponsored visit to Soviet Russia by Mrs. Redl and her husband Fritz. The editor-translator brought together a representative selection of old and new materials dealing with both education and child rearing. "Soviet educators," she wrote, "make a clear distinction between the two processes."[41] Soviet Educators on Soviet Education was divided into two sections. One group of selections dealt with the philosophy underlying Soviet child rearing and the other group of selections focused on literature describing actual Soviet practice. The table of contents included selections entitled:

---

[40]Ibid.

[41]Helen B. Redl, Soviet Educators on Soviet Education (New York: Free Press, 1962), p. vii.

"Heredity and Upbringing; Self-Discipline in Adolescents; Sex Education; The Family in Soviet Society; Reward and Punishment of Children in the Family; Fathers and Children: Decree Regarding School Internats; School Internats After Five Years"; and "Young Pioneers." The volume neatly fits the category of descriptive literature. It outlined no Soviet challenge, no educational crisis, and no Sputnik.

Two other books published in 1962 clearly were Soviet challenge literature. They were What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't by Arthur Trace and Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better by Admiral Hyman Rickover. What Ivan Knows attacked American education on a heretofore quiet front. Trace charged that not only were American schools woefully inferior to Soviet schools in the teaching of mathematics and science, but also in the humanities. And this inferiority was not true only according to Soviet standards. American schools were inferior by any standard.[42]

In his first ten pages Trace disposed of all but his own technique for comparison between school systems. He introduced the idea of basing comparison solely upon an examination of textbooks used in the two school systems. He stated:

> If a student's textbooks are excellent he may be able to get an excellent education indeed if he has good teachers and studies hard; but if his textbooks are poor, his education is bound to be correspondingly poor no matter how excellent his teacher may be or how hard he studies.[43]

---

[42]Arthur Trace, What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't (New York: Random House, 1962), pp. 1-3.

[43]Ibid., p. 7.

In comparing Soviet and American basal readers, Trace considered the most salient fact to be the far larger vocabulary of the Russian readers. "Whereas the fourth-grade Rodnaya Rech reader has a vocabulary approaching 10,000 words, most American fourth-grade readers have a vocabulary of well under 1,800 words."[44] Trace was of the view that no elementary school child's reading vocabulary could exceed the vocabulary of his basal reader. It was this superiority in basal readers that was the underpinning of the Soviet thrust into humanities--chiefly, literature, history, and foreign languages.

Trace went into considerable detail to compare the contents of Russian readers with those of American readers and found the contents of the Russian far superior. He found that Soviet readers contained four main types of selections: (1) There were many selections which are obviously designed to indoctrinate Communist ideas and ideals. (2) There were also many selections with moralistic or character-building intent. (3) There was a great deal of informational material, especially in the areas of science and social studies. (4) There were a great many poems and literary selections, both from Russian and other national literatures. Trace pointed out that most American readers simply do not contain this type of material and are passing up opportunities in this area.

In his final chapter, Trace made some recommendations for improving reading instruction in this country. He wanted the vocabulary of basal readers greatly increased, the sheer amount of content enlarged, and the literary quality greatly improved. To teach

---

[44]Ibid., p. 11.

American students to read at a higher rate he assumed to be neither impossible nor even difficult. Trace pointed out that British students learn at the same rate as the Soviets. And, "The McGuffey readers of the last century assumed that students read at least as quickly as I have suggested, and the fifth and sixth grade McGuffey readers assumed that they can learn to read much faster."[45] As a corollary he recommended increased dosages of required literature, history, and foreign language courses at both the junior and senior high school levels.

Trace's charges were challenged by Albert J. Harris in "Ivan and Johnny--A Critical Review," The Reading Teacher (December 1962). Harris found What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't "so unreliable that even those of Trace's criticisms that may have a sound basis become suspect."[46] To begin with, Harris questioned Trace's method of comparing school systems with reference only to textbooks. He endorses some of the methods Trace had rejected. Also, he questioned why Trace had not compared the outcomes of the Soviet and American educational systems with reference to reading achievement tests. Or why not use the percentage of graduates of the secondary schools capable of entering higher education institutions. He questioned most of Trace's underlying thesis. He said: "Actually, Dr. Trace's main contention seems to be the more one exposes a child to, the better the outcome must be. He does not carry this to the logical extreme

---

[45]Ibid., p. 190.

[46]Albert J. Harris, "Ivan and Johnny--A Critical Review," The Reading Teacher 16, No. 3 (December 1962): 151.

of advocating the use of adult encyclopedias in the first grade, but his general point of view is clear."[47]

Furthermore, Harris questioned Trace's estimates of vocabularies in Russian and American readers. The Groff (5) third-grade reader contained 1,469 words. This was fifty percent higher than Trace's estimate. The Scott-Foresman series fourth-grade reader contained a vocabulary of 2,742 words, not the 1,500 estimate of Trace. Similarly, embedded in the comparison of the basal readers was a comparison of the American and Russian languages. Russian is a highly inflected language in which a word takes many shades of meaning as one or another of many endings are attached to it. If these inflected or derived forms were counted as separate words the vocabulary count would rise considerably. Thus, if one counted American inflected or derived forms our vocabulary count would similarly rise. The endings in s, d, ed, ing, er, est, n, en; possesives; words beginning with prefixes dis, im, un, or numerals; words ending in eleven common suffixes; contractions; compounds made of known words; homographs; etc., would raise the American fourth-grade reader vocabulary count to 4,000 words. This total is comparable to the Soviet Rodnaya Rech reader used by Dr. Trace.

It was a shock to Harris that Trace never examined how reading was actually taught in either the Russian or the American schools.[48] Trace nowhere mentioned the fact of the less exact correspondence between sound and printed symbols in English than in

---

[47] Ibid., p. 153.

[48] Ibid., p. 152.

Russian. Also, Trace seemed to lack the information that American schools employed separate textbooks for science and social studies instruction. Or the fact that American reading teachers employ a highly individualized approach to reading instruction, making little or no use of basal readers. Most depressing of all to Harris was Trace's total disregard of the principles of child development and individual differences in both his descriptions and prescriptions. Harris summarized the book as "depressing."

Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better by Admiral Hyman Rickover was a retelling of Education and Freedom (1959). The book was billed as a "no-holds barred study of education in a European democratic country, Switzerland, and of how the lessons learned there can be applied here."[49] The Admiral described how the Swiss, in his view, had achieved the integration of both mass and academic education. Rickover stressed the Swiss school was a place of work: both a longer school day and a longer school year (240 days compared with 180 days in the United States). Using charts listing units of credit in academic subjects and reproducing academic examinations, he argued that American educational standards were both quantitatively and qualitatively inferior to European systems and were thus totally out of step with the needs of modern society.

After giving his analysis of the Swiss system, the Admiral gave suggestions for America in the light of Swiss experience. We should begin by improving the training of teachers and administrative

---

[49]Admiral Hyman C. Rickover, Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (New York: Little, Brown & Co., 1962), book jacket.

personnel. The greatest need, he felt, was the lack of a nationally determined standard of course programs, so that there will be greater uniformity of requirements for secondary diplomas and college degrees. The Admiral greatly longed for the Swiss Maturity Diploma. Rickover outlined in more detail how to achieve national standards in American Education--A National Failure: The Problem of Our Schools and What We Can Learn From England (1963). Rickover was fascinated with the European national examination system, particularly the English. He recommended the establishment of a National Standards Committee whose function would be to draw up examinations for high school students who desire to enter various post-secondary training institutions. No one would be required to take such examinations, but those who passed them successfully would obtain a national certificate with the notation N.S.--National Scholar--stamped on regular diplomas or degrees. Everyone, the Admiral believed, would benefit from such a system. "At one stroke it does away with misleading educational labels so that any layman has the means to judge whether a school or college is doing its job properly."[50]

A review of the literature during the period under consideration appears to yield the following generalizations:

1. The periodical literature surrounding the publication of James B. Conant's American High School Today continued.[51]

---

[50]Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, American Education--A National Failure: The Problems of Our Schools and What We Can Learn From England (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1963), p. 317.

[51]Griffith, "Another Look"; Koerner, "The Tragedy"; Brameld, "Proposals of Dr. Conant."

2. The European educational systems' concentrated development of academic and manipulative talents to the exclusion of other talents was well documented.[52]

3. A widespread literature described the reconstruction of Soviet secondary education and pointed to the introduction of "practical" courses and a deemphasis of academics.[53]

4. The human aspects of Soviet education were examined and revealed a school radically at odds with the stern academic regime outlined by some commentators over the previous three years.[54]

5. The "real challenge of Soviet education," in the opinion of some writers, did not lie in the area of science and mathematics, but rather in the area of character and morals.[55]

6. American readers had detailed descriptions of Soviet education.

7. American readers had a well ordered counter argument to "Rickover-type" critics.

8. American readers should have been aware that demands for science and mathematics education were the outgrowth of trends within the larger American culture, not the least of which was the price

---

[52]Conant, "A Comparison of Six Talents."

[53]Counts, Khruschev and the Central Committee; Bereday et al., The Changing Soviet School; and George Z. F. Bereday and Joan Pennar, eds., The Politics of Soviet Education (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1960).

[54]Vigdorova, Diary.

[55]Counts, Khruschev and the Central Committee.

mechanism demanding technicians, engineers, and scientists for the post-war economic expansion. Sputnik accelerated the already existing demand.

9. Both the American and the Soviet educational systems were undergoing changes demanded by their respective demographic and economic bases.

10. Americans were introduced to the author of the Soviet educational orthodoxies of the Stalinist period, Anton Makarenko.[56]

11. Americans received an updating on Soviet child rearing practices.[57]

12. A controversy over methods of reading instruction began with the Soviets alleged to have not only bigger rockets and bigger bombs, but also bigger vocabularies.[58]

13. Admiral Hyman Rickover restated many of his points from Education and Freedom (1959) in a new book, Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better.

14. The number of articles and books on Soviet education or American education in the light of disclosures concerning Soviet practice had been falling off for two years.

---

[56]Bowen, Soviet Education.

[57]Redl, Soviet Educators.

[58]Trace, What Ivan Knows; Harris, "Ivan and Johnny."

CHAPTER V

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

To be sure, the launching of Sputnik I and subsequent Soviet space achievements were a shock to the American ego, producing much wringing of the hands over the state of the American school system and lending apparent support to school critics. The popular view holds that the curriculum reform movement was a response to Sputnik.[1] Among other places, this conventional wisdom is enshrined in Patterns of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1970-71, Department of Health, Education, and Welare Publication (OE) 73-11400. The publication says, in part:

> In the late 1950s, in consequence of the Soviet Union's launching of the first Sputnik, school authorities in the United States began to place greater emphasis on improving the mathematics and natural science curriculums of this Nation's schools. Under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation, new methods of instruction such as SMSG (School Mathematics Study Group) mathematics and BSCS (Biological Sciences Curriculum Study) biology were developed.[2]

This interpretation, so deeply rooted as to be almost unextinguishable, does not set with the actual unfolding of events. At the beginning of 1957, the Carnegie Foundation had persuaded Dr. James B. Conant to conduct a series of studies of American public education.

---

[1] Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, p. 169.

[2] U.S.D.H.E.W., Patterns of Course Offerings, p. 6.

These studies became the famous "Conant Reports" of the post-Sputnik period.[3] The University of Illinois Committee on School Mathematics had begun its revision of the secondary mathematics curriculum as early as 1952.[4] The Physical Sciences Study Committee's development of a new high school physics course began in 1956.[5] These beginnings of curriculum reform had been preceded by a decade of philosophical wrangling. Sputnik accelerated an ongoing development, generated widespread public support, and as we shall see, fostered federal funding for science and mathematics education.

Certainly, Sputnik sparked increased interest in Soviet education. The immediate effect was to bring together two divergent streams of educational literature. For despite the publication of fifteen books on Russian education since the Bolshevik Revolution, Americans apparently were only dimly aware of what was to be termed "the challenge of Soviet education." Sputnik would launch a fierce periodical and book literature. Whereas the period from 1917 to 1957 had produced fifteen books, the period from 1958 to 1962 produced at least twenty books on Soviet education, an output of three-tenths of a book per year as compared to four books per year. The figures below demonstrate the direct relationship between the height of Soviet space achievements and American interest in Soviet education. The numbers given are the number of articles per volume

---

[3]Jennings, "Educational Reform," p. 96.

[4]Goodlad, "A Janus Look," p. 169.

[5]Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, p. 169.

of Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature under the heading, "Education--Russia."

May 1945 to April 1947	-- 9
May 1947 to April 1949	-- 10
May 1949 to March 1951	-- 5
April 1951 to March 1953	-- 6
April 1953 to February 1955	-- 8
March 1955 to February 1957	-- 41
March 1957 to February 1958	-- 76
March 1959 to February 1961	-- 50
March 1961 to February 1963	-- 27
March 1963 to February 1965	-- 12
March 1965 to February 1966	-- 4
March 1966 to February 1967	-- 6
March 1967 to February 1968	-- 8
March 1968 to February 1969	-- 4
March 1969 to February 1970	-- 1

The average number of entries for the years 1945 to 1955 and 1965 to 1970 was six. The average number of entries for the years 1955 to 1965 was forty-three. American interest in Soviet education waxed and waned in direct relationship with the waxing and waning of Soviet space successes.

Several commentators have opinioned that American education was ripe for change in October of 1957.[6] They stated that for ten years and more the schools had been undergoing a vigorous reassessment at the hands of the American people and their intellectual leaders. In fact, educational criticism had peaked and subsided in the years prior to Sputnik. As measured by the number of entries in the Education Index under the heading of "Public Schools--Criticism," times were not ripe for change.

---

[6]Heckinger, Big Red Schoolhouse; Rickover, Education and Freedom; Fadiman, "The Mess in Education."

1942 -- 3	1950 -- 12
1943 -- 5	1951 -- 35
1944 -- 8	1952 -- 49
1945 -- 7	1953 -- 25
1946 -- 6	1954 -- 30
1947 -- 10	1955 -- 14
1948 -- 7	1956 -- 9
1949 -- 13	1957 -- 6

Clearly, pre-Sputnik criticism had peaked in the 1951-1952 period. Criticism was actually on the decline at the time of the Soviet space launching. Sputnik inaugurated a whole new wave of criticism. This new wave was not only in terms of number but also in terms of substance. During the pre-Sputnik period criticism did not reflect comparisons with Soviet education. As indicated earlier, critics were largely unaware of educational developments in the Soviet Union. Also, much of the 1950 to 1954 criticism reflected a widespread popular concern with subversion and subversives in the public schools.

A case can be made that the launching of Sputnik was responsible for the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Swiftly following the launching, various remedial proposals promptly appeared in Congress. Following extensive hearings on the various bills, a compromise measure (H.R. 13247), to improve and strengthen U.S. education, especially instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, was finally passed. It was approved by the President on September 2, 1958. The main provisions of the law authorized loans to college students, fellowships and financial

assistance to state educational agencies for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.[7]

A good measure of the influence of Sputnik on the success of the bill is an analysis of the House debate surrounding the inclusion or deletion of the so-called "Powell Amendment" in education bills. The "Powell Amendment," named for Representative Adam Clayton Powell, was a frequently attached rider to school aid bills. The amendment provided that "there shall be no federal funds allocated or transferred to any state which fails to comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court."[8] The amendment was inspired by Southern resistance to the Brown v. Board of Education decision of 1954. The inclusion of the "Powell Amendment" was generally credited with being fatal to school aid bills because it cost proponents of the legislation support from Southern Congressmen.[9] Such was the fate of school construction bills in both 1956 and 1957. The amendment was not attached to the Library Services Act in 1956 and that bill passed.[10] On April 14, 1958, Congressman Powell, who was Chairman of the House General Sub-Committee on Education, agreed to withhold his amendment denying federal aid to racially segregated schools. This move guaranteed passage of what became the National Defense Education Act of

---

[7] Congressional Digest, Vol. 37, Nos. 8 and 9 (August-September 1958), p. 194.

[8] Congressional Digest, Vol. 38, Nos. 6 and 7 (June-July 1959), p. 165.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

1958. At a news conference, Powell stated: "The Russian challenge to the United States in space is now so great that no one can afford to do anything that would slow up Federal aid to education of all levels."[11]

Sputnik also spawned a new type of educational literature. Prior to October 4, 1957, literature focusing on Soviet education was descriptive in nature. Its authorship was narrowly restricted to professional educators. None of the authorities criticized American educational theory and practice based on information gained about Soviet education. The most competent authority was George S. Counts who wrote several comprehensive accounts of Russian education prior to Sputnik: The Soviet Challenge to America (1931); I Want to Be Like Stalin (1947); and The Challenge of Soviet Education: The Study of Education As a Weapon (1957). Americans, however, were only dimly aware about Soviet education prior to 1957. America's educational energies were absorbed in controversies over life adjustment and charges of subversion in the schools. The subversion charges were largely laid to rest in the period following the Korean War. But the launching of Sputnik and subsequent Soviet space achievements acted as a catalyst to picture an idealized version of a tough academic Soviet curriculum and a correspondingly soft American curriculum. As one author styled it: What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't.[12] Another phrased it thus: "What opened our eyes?

---

[11] Congressional Digest, Vol. 40, Nos. 8 and 9 (August-September 1961), p. 200.

[12] Arthur Trace (1962).

A flying box containing a dying dog. We were going to reform American education . . . because we were scared stiff."[13]

While the new literature was rather short lived (1958-1962), its proponents engaged in an orgy of recrimination. Many writers possessed only the sketchiest information about either Soviet or American schools. Many suggested the importation of Soviet or European educational practices. Some rekindled ancient grudges against John Dewey and progressive eduation. Life magazine played a key role in the dissemination and legitimatization of such ideas.[14] The barrage of words was taken up by the mass media, yet a large part of the much publicized charges came from a rather small number of persons--a handful of college professors, professional writers, and an admiral.[15] These critics were apparently unaware that the Soviets were abandoning the very educational practices they sought to emulate. As early as 1959, professional educators wrote descriptions of the 1958 Soviet educational reforms.[16] Certainly, by 1961 knowledgeable readers were aware of the Soviet reforms. The new literature collapsed along with the failure of the Soviet space program to keep pace with the American space program. And with two or three notable exceptions, book literature by 1960 tended to return to the descriptive mode of the pre-1958 period.

---

[13]Fadiman, "The Mess in Education."

[14]"Crisis In Education," Life (March 24, 31, and April 7, 14, and 21, 1958).

[15]Harris, American Education.

[16]Counts, "The Real Challenge."

As measured by educational expenditures compared with gross national product (GNP), no discernible relationship can be established with Sputnik. Table 1 measures American efforts to support education since 1929-30 by comparing expenditures with the gross national product. The GNP, which is calculated by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, represents the total national output of goods and services at market prices. It measures this output in terms of the actual expenditures by which the goods and

TABLE 1.--The percentages of gross national product which went for educational purposes over the past forty years.

Calendar Year	School Year	Expenditures for Education As a Percentate of GNP
1929	1929-30	3.1
1931	1931-32	3.9
1933	1933-34	4.1
1935	1935-36	3.7
1937	1937-38	3.3
1939	1939-40	3.5
1941	1941-42	2.6
1943	1943-44	1.8
1945	1945-46	2.0
1947	1947-48	2.8
1949	1949-50	3.4
1951	1951-52	3.4
1953	1953-54	3.8
1955	1955-56	4.2
1957	1957-58	4.8
1959	1959-60	5.1
1961	1961-62	5.6
1963	1963-64	6.1
1965	1965-66	6.6
1967	1967-68	7.2
1969	1969-70	7.6
1970	1970-71	8.0

services are acquired. Thus GNP constitutes a convenient means by which to appraise the level of educational expenditures.[17]

The percentage of gross national product which went for educational purposes has varied widely over the past forty years. Educational expenditures were relatively high in the mid-1930s, exceeding four percent of the gross national product in 1933-34. They then declined to a low point of one and eight-tenths percent during the height of the Second World War in 1943-44. Except for a brief decline during the Korean conflict, when annual investment in education tended to remain stable, there has been a steady increase in the proportion of gross national product spent for education. When viewed against this background, the rise in educational expenditures during the years 1957-1962 takes on no special significance. Rather than being attributable to Sputnik, the rise in educational expenditures during 1957-62 was part of a long established trend since the Depression and the Second World War.

An analysis of the results of public school bond elections in the period 1957-1970 yields similar results to the gross national product analysis. Table 2 illustrates the percentage of public school bond elections approved both on the number of issues and the dollar value of issues.[18] Close observation of the figures yields mixed results. In 1958-59, the first year to measure the impact of Sputnik on the electorate, an approval rate based on dollar value

---

[17]DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-45, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1971 Edition, p. 21.

[18]Ibid., p. 54.

TABLE 2.--The percentage of public school bonding elections approved both on the number of issues and the dollar value of issues.

Fiscal Year	Percent Approved Based on Number	Percent Approved Based on Dollar Value
1957-58	Data not available	72.8
1958-59	Data not available	79.6
1959-60	Data not available	67.1
1960-61	Data not available	75.9
1961-62	72.2	68.9
1962-63	72.4	69.6
1963-64	72.5	71.1
1964-65	74.7	79.4
1965-66	72.5	74.5
1966-57	66.6	69.2
1967-68	67.6	62.5
1968-69	56.8	43.6
1969-70	52.3	49.5

of 79.6 percent was witnessed. This represents an increase of 7.2 percent over the previous year. But in 1959-60 the percentage approved, based on dollar value, was only 67.1 percent. This represents a decrease of 5.7 percent from 1957-58 and a 12.5 decrease from 1958-59. The average percent approved, based on dollar value during the first five-year period, was 72.8. The average for 1958-59 and 1959-60 was 73.3 percent. The significance of a deviation from the average of .5 percent is unclear, especially when 1959-60 was 5.7 percent below the five-year average of 72.8 percent. On the other hand, a marked decrease both in number and dollar value percentages took place in 1968-69 and 1969-70. Both of these were unrelated to Sputnik. Thus, as measured by public school bonding elections, no influence upon education by Sputnik can be established.

An analysis of actual enrollment in science and mathematics courses in public high schools from 1948-49 to 1962-63 also illustrates no discernible relationship with Sputnik. Table 3 illustrates the percentage of enrollment in selected science and mathematics courses compared with total enrollment in grades 9-12.

TABLE 3.--The percentage of enrollment in selected science and mathematics courses compared with total enrollment in grades 9-12.

Item	Enrollment by Year			
	1948-49	1954-55	1958-59	1962-63
All science courses	55	Data not available.	59	60
All math courses	54	Data not available.	65	70
Biology	18.6	19.6	21.3	24.7
Physics	5.4	4.6	4.8	3.9
Chemistry	7.6	7.3	8.3	8.5
Plane Geometry	11	10	12.4	14.4
Solid Gemoetry	1.7	2.2	1.3	.7
Trigonometry	2	2.5	2.8	2.0

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Publication OE-10024-69, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1969 Edition, p. 32. The percentage figures were obtained by dividing actual enrollment statistics by total enrollment statistics given in Table 39 of the DHEW publication.

Again, close observation of the data yields mixed results. In all but one category, Solid Geometry, the 1958-59 figures illustrate an increase in percentage of enrollment over 1954-55. However, on close observation a pattern of increase in all science courses and all mathematics courses is evident since 1948-49. Also, in Physics,

Solid Geometry, and Trigonometry, significant decreases in enrollment exist in 1962-63 as compared to 1958-59. These higher science and mathematics courses were a major focus of the curriculum reform advocates of the post-Sputnik period. The figures do not indicate a lasting effect in increased enrollment over 1954-55. When viewed against this background, the rise in percentage of enrollment figures during 1958-59 take on no special significance. Rather than being a function of Sputnik, the rise in enrollments in science and mathematics courses during 1958-59 and 1962-63 were part of an established trend.

That these enrollment increases were not a function of Sputnik is also evident when one examines actual enrollment in the new science and mathematics curriculums. A U.S. Office of Education survey of enrollments in public high school science courses in the 1964-65 school year revealed that only twenty percent of the students taking introductory physics were using the PSSC course. Only twenty-five percent of those taking the College Board achievement test in biology in the 1965-66 school year had used any of the three courses prepared by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study. And less than twenty percent of those taking the chemistry achievement test that year had followed either of the available chemistry curriculum revisions. Certainly the new curriculums were used far less frequently than the scholars who developed them and the commentators who favored them had hoped.[19]

---

[19]Raymond G. Thompson, A Survey of the Teaching of Physics in Secondary Schools; William Kastrinos, A Survey of the Teaching of Biology in Secondary Schools; Frank J. Fornoff, A Survey of the

The data would seem to indicate that the popular view that Sputnik fostered a significant change in American educational theory and practice is not warranted. The so-called "new" curriculums were inaugurated prior to the Soviet space achievements and, as measured by actual enrollment figures, no direct influence by Sputnik can be demonstrated. Such is also the case for statistical information on expenditures for education as a percentage of gross national product and the results of public school bonding elections.

On the other hand, Sputnik was not without some influence upon American education. The Soviet space achievements aided the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The popular furor influenced Representative Adam Clayton Powell to withdraw his crippling "Powell Amendment." Informed commentators viewed the inclusion of the "Powell Amendment" as fatal to aid to education bills. And certainly Sputnik sparked an increased interest in Soviet education. This interest can be demonstrated in the significant increase in book and periodical literature on Russian education after the launching of the Soviet satellite. Also, the character and authorship of the literature changed. Prior to Sputnik educational literature concerning the Soviet Union was descriptive in nature and was the almost exclusive work of professional educators. After Sputnik commentators used disclosures concerning Soviet education to criticize American education. Many of the post-Sputnik authors

---

Teaching of Chemistry in Secondary Schools; all published in Princeton, New Jersey, by the Educational Testing Service in 1969.

were not professional educators. This new wave of Russian educational literature was rather short lived. It rose and fell with the rise and fall of Russian space leadership.

Judged on the whole, no significant change in American educational theory and practice can be directly related to Sputnik and subsequent Soviet space achievements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources*

Books

Benton, William. This Is the Challenge: The Benton Reports of 1956-1958 on the Nature of the Soviet Threat. New York: Associated College Presses, 1958.

Counts, George S. I Want to Be Like Stalin. [From Pedagogy by B. P. Yesipov and N. K. Goncharov.] New York: The John Day Company, 1947.

_____. Khruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1960.

Pinkevitch, Albert Petrovich. The New Education in the Soviet Republic. New York: John Day Company, 1929.

_____. Science and Education in the U.S.S.R. London: V. Gollancz Ltd., 1935.

Redl, Helen B. Soviet Educators on Soviet Education. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Rickover, Admiral Hyman G. Education and Freedom. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1959.

Government Publications

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Publication (OE) 73-11400. Patterns of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1970-71. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

---

*In historiography, a primary source is distinguished from a secondary source by the fact that the former gives the words of the witnesses or first recorders of an event. The historian, using a number of such sources, produces a secondary source. In "Sputnik and American Education," the major focus was an examination of educational literature during the period 1957-1962. Normally, such literature would be considered secondary. In what follows, however, a number of such sources are classified as primary inasmuch as they illustrate the literary reactions to the launching of Sputnik I.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1969 Edition (OE-10024-69). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

_____. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1971 Edition (OE 72-45). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Office of Education. Education in the U.S.S.R., Bulletin 1957, Number 14. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957.

Periodicals

Benton, William. "Soviet Education: More Ominous Than the Hydrogen Bomb?" Education Digest, 21, No. 9 (May 1956): 4-8.

Berman, Harold J. "The Devil and Soviet Russia." The American Scholar 27 (Spring 1958): 147-52.

"Common Sense and Sputnik: Let Us Remind Us That Goals Are Reached by Hard Effort." Life, October 21, 1957, p. 35.

Congressional Digest, Vol. 37, Nos. 8 and 9 (August-September 1958), pp. 193-224; Vol. 38, Nos. 6 and 7 (June-July 1959), pp. 161-92; Vol. 40, Nos. 8 and 9 (August-September 1961), pp. 193-224.

"Crisis In Education." Life, March 24, 1958, pp. 25-37; March 31, 1948, pp. 93-101; April 7, 1958, pp. 89-97; April 14, 1958, pp. 117-25; April 21, 1958, pp. 103-111.

"The Deeper Problem in Education: It's Time to Dig Out Educationist Debris and Rediscover Learning's True Nature." Life, April 21, 1958, p. 112.

Fadiman, Clifton. "The Mess in Education--Who Is Responsible?" Holiday, August 1958, pp. 8-11, 14.

"The Feat That Shook the Earth." Life, October 21, 1957, pp. 19-30.

Furnas, C. C. "Why Did U.S. Lose the Race? Critics Speak Up." Life, October 21, 1957, pp. 22-23.

O'Neil, Paul. "Changes of Mind: New Survey Shows Surprisingly Fast Switches in Public Ideas About Space, Schools, Spending." Life, March 3, 1958, pp. 91-100.

Pinkevitch, Albert Petrovich. "Methods of Work in Higher Education Institutions in Soviet Russia." School and Society 32, No. 822 (September 27, 1930): 425-27.

"Soviet Satellite Sends U.S. Into a Tizzy." Life, October 14, 1957, pp. 34-37.

"The Truth About Russia's Weakness." U.S. News and World Report, April 11, 1958, pp. 46-54.

"What U.S. Thinks About Its Schools." Life, October 16, 1950, pp. 11-18.

Wilson, Sloan. "It's Time to Close Our Carnival." Life, March 24, 1958, pp. 36-37.

Secondary Sources

Books

Adler, Irving. What We Want of Our Schools: Plain Talk on Education, From Theory to Budgets. New York: John Day Co., 1957.

Bell, Bernard Iddings. Crisis in Education: A Challenge to American Complacency. New York: Whittlesey House, 1949.

Bereday, Geroge Z. F.; Brickman, William; and Read, Gerald, eds. The Changing Soviet School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960.

Bereday, George Z. F., and Pennar, Joan, eds. The Politics of Soviet Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1960.

Bestor, Arthur. Educational Wastelands. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

_____. The Restoration of Learning. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Bienienstok, Theodore, and Sayers, William. Problems of Secondary Education in International Perspective: A Comparison of American, Soviet, and European Educational Systems. The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department Division of Research, February, 1959.

Bowen, James. Soviet Education: Anton Makarenko and the Years of Experiment. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1962.

Conant, James B. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

_____. Education and Liberty. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Conant, James B. Education in a Divided World: The Function of the Schools in Our Unique Society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Conrad, Earl. Public School Scandal: A Documented Exposé. New York: J. Day Co., 1951.

Counts, George S. The Challenge of Soviet Education: The Study of Education As a Weapon. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

_____. The Soviet Challenge to America. New York: The John Day Co., 1931.

Cremin, Lawrence. The Transformation of the School. New York: Knopf, 1961.

Dewey, John. The Authoritarian Attempt to Capture Education. Conference on the Scientific Spirit and Democratic Faith Papers, 1944.

_____. Experience and Education. New York: Collier, 1938.

_____. Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World: Mexico, China, Turkey. New York: New Republic, Inc., 1929.

DeWitt, Nicholas. Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R. The National Science Foundation, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, 1961.

_____. Soviet Professional Manpower. Washington: National Science Foundation, 1955.

Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. Education for All American Children. 1948.

_____. Educational Services for Young Children. 1945.

_____. Education for All American Youth. 1944.

Fine, Benjamin. Our Children Are Cheated: Crisis in American Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1950.

Flesh, Rudolf. Why Johnny Can't Read. New York: Harpers, 1953.

Fornoff, Frank J. A Survey of the Teaching of Chemistry in Secondary Schools. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Harnwell, Gaylord P. Russian Diary. Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959.

Harper, Samuel Northrup. Civic Training in Soviet Russia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Harris, Raymond. American Education: Facts, Fancies, and Folklore. New York: Random House, 1961.

Heckinger, Fred M. The Big Red Schoolhouse. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1959.

Hill, Patty Smith, and Fedeaevskia, Vera Mikhailovna. Nursery School and Parent Education in Soviet Russia. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1936.

Hulburd, David. This Happened in Pasadena. New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper, 1953.

_____. The Higher Learnings in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Johnson, William E. Russia's Educational Heritage. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1950.

Kastrinos, William. A Survey of the Teaching of Biology in Secondary Schools. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Keats, John. Schools Without Scholars. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.

King, Beatrice. Changing Man: The Educational System in the U.S.S.R. New York: Viking Press, 1937.

Kline, George Louis, ed. Soviet Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Korol, Alexander. Soviet Education for Science and Technology. Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957.

Levin, Deana. Soviet Education Today. New York: J. DeGraff, 1959.

Levine, Irving R. Mainstreet U.S.S.R. Garden City: Doubleday, 1959.

Lynd, Albert. Quackery in the Public Schools. Boston: Little Brown, 1953.

Nearing, Scott. Education in Soviet Russia. New York: International Publishers, 1926.

Rickover, Admiral Hyman G. American Education, A National Failure: The Problem of Our Schools and What We Can Learn From England. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1963.

_____. Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better. New York: Little, Brown & Co., 1962.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund for Education. The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958.

Sanford, Charles Wilson, ed. The Schools and National Security: Recommendations for Elementary and Secondary Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Scott, C. Winfield; Hill, Clyde M.; and Burns, Hobert; eds. The Great Debate: Our Schools in Crisis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Scott, C. Winfield, and Hill, Clyde M., eds. Public Education Under Criticism. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

Shore, Maurice Joseph. Soviet Education: Its Psychology and Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1947.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1971.

Smith, Mortimer. And Madly Teach: A Layman Looks at Public School Education. Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1949.

_____. The Diminished Mind: A Study of Planned Mediocrity in Our Public Schools. Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1953.

Thayer, V. T. Public Education and Its Critics. New York: Macmillan, 1954.

Thompson, Raymond E. A Survey of the Teaching of Physics in Secondary Schools. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Timoshenko, Stephen. Engineering Education in Russia. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Trace, Arthur. What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't. New York: Random House, 1962.

Trow, Clark, ed., and Kalachov, Paul D., trans. Character Education in Soviet Russia. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Press, 1935.

Vigdorova, F. Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1960.

Wilson, Lucy Langdon Williams. The New Schools of New Russia. New York: Vanguard Press, 1928.

Woodring, Paul. A Fourth of a Nation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

_____. Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Woody, Thomas. New Minds: New Men? The Emergence of the Soviet Citizen. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.

Government Publications

U.S. Office of Education. Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth. A Look Ahead in Secondary Education: Report of the Second Commission on Life-Adjustment Education for Youth. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1954.

_____. Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth. Life-Adjustment Education for Every Youth. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, no date.

_____. Commision on Life Adjustment Education for Youth. Vitalizing Secondary Education: Report of the First Commission on Life-Adjustment Education for Youth. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1951.

Television Broadcast

"Meet Comrade Student." American Broadcasting-Paramount Theatres, Inc., September 28, 1962.

Periodicals

Anderson, Archibald W. "The Cloak of Respectability: The Attackers and Their Methods." Progressive Education 29, No. 3 (January 1952): 66-81.

Bell, Bernard Iddings. "Know How vs. Know Why: Canon Bell Finds Our System Superficial and Undisciplined." Life, October 16, 1950, pp. 89-98.

Brameld, Theodore. "The Proposals of Dr. Conant." Teachers College Record 62 (December 1960): 232-41.

Caswell, Hollis L. "The Great Reappraisal of Public Education." Teachers College Record 54, No. 1 (October 1952): 12-22.

Conant, James B. "A Comparison of Six Talents: Development of Talent in Europe and the United States." The North Central Association Quarterly 34 (April 1960): 265-72.

_____. "The Superintendent Was the Target." New York Times Book Review, April 29, 1951, pp. 1, 27.

_____. "Twenty-One Recommendations for Improving Public Secondary Education." Education Digest 24, No. 8 (April 1959): 1-6.

Corey, Stephen. "The Conant Report on the American High School." The Educational Forum 24 (November 1959): 7-9.

Counts, George S. "Recent Tendencies in Soviet Education." American Teacher 32 (November 1947): 16-19.

_____. "The Real Challenge of Soviet Education." The Educational Forum 23 (March 1959): 261-69.

_____. "Soviet Education and Soviet Power." Teachers College Record 58 (March 1957): 293-300.

"Education for All the Children of All the People." Time, September 14, 1959, pp. 70-79.

Elicker, Paul E. "Let's Speak the Truth About Our Schools." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 42, No. 20 (October 1958): 1-10.

Gatherer, W. A. "The Teaching of History in Russian Schools: In All Ages--Class Struggle." Education Digest 36 (November 13, 1953): 698-99.

Gideonse, Harry D. "What Are Our Goals? European Education and American Education." The Educational Record 39 (July 1958): 213-21.

"A Good High School: New Trier Illustrates a U.S. Speciality." Life, October 16, 1950, pp. 101-6.

Goodlad, John L. "Curriculum: A Janus Look." Teachers College Record 70, No. 2 (November 1968): 95-107.

Griffith, Francis. "Another Look at the Conant Report." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 44 (October 1960): 59-62.

Handlin, Oscar. "Rejoinder to the Critics of John Dewey." New York Times Magazine, June 15, 1958, pp. 19-20.

Harris, Albert J. "Ivan and Johnny--A Critical Review." The Reading Teacher 16, No. 3 (December 1962): 151-57.

Henzlek, Frank E. "The Conant Report: A Critique." The School Executive 79 (October 1959): 19-21.

Hutchins, Robert M. "The Lessons of Khruschev's Little Red Schoolhouse." Esquire, June 1958, pp. 85-87.

Jennings, Frank G. "Educational Reform 1957-1967: It Didn't Start With Sputnik." Saturday Review, September 16, 1967, pp. 77-79, 95-97.

Kandel, I. L. "The Soviet Challenge and Secondary Education in the United States." The Educational Forum 21 (November 1956): 27-37.

Kinlock, John L. "Education in the U.S.S.R." Education Digest 38 (June 10, 1955): 389-90.

Koerner, James D. "The Tragedy of the Conant Report." Phi Delta Kappan 42 (December 1960): 121-24.

Levine, Irving R. "Trouble in Red Schoolhouses," The New Leader, June 8, 1959. Reprinted in Reader's Digest, July 1959, pp. 55-58.

Lynd, Albert. "Who Wants Progressive Education: The Influence of John Dewey on the Public Schools." The Atlantic Monthly, April 1953. Reprinted in Reginald D. Archambault, ed., Dewey on Education: Appraisals. New York: Random House, 1966.

"Russians Cram to Beat U.S. in Science." Popular Science Magazine, November 1954, pp. 104-7, 262, 264.

"Russians Push Training Scientists and Engineers." Science News Letter 62, No. 21 (November 22, 1952): 329.

Smith, Mortimer. "Basic Education: What Is It?" The Education Digest (March 1960): 10-13. Reprinted from A Citizens Manual for Public Schools: A Guide for School Board Members and Other Laymen. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1959.

"Tryouts for New Ideas: The Nation Stirs With New Interest in Science, New Plans for Schools." Life, April 14, 1958, p. 117.

Wilson, Lucy Langdon Williams. "New Education in New Russia." National Education Association Journal 17 (January 1928): 15-17.

_____. "Russian Pioneers." National Education Association Journal 17 (November 1928): 267-68.

Book Reviews

Chamberlin, W. H. Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in Chicago Sunday Tribune, June 15, 1958, p. 2.

_____. Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in Foreign Affairs 37 (October 1958): 175.

Dewey, John. Review of New Minds: New Men? by Thomas Woody in Review of Reviews 71 (March 1932): 104.

Eurich, A. C. Review of Khruschev and the Central Committee Speak on Education by George S. Counts, in Saturday Review, December 22, 1959, p. 17.

Ferrer, Terry. Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in New York Herald Tribune, June 22, 1958, p. 9.

Fine, Benjamin. Review of Public School Scandal by Earl Conrad in New York Times, April 15, 1951, p. 26.

Fisher, Louis. Review of The Soviet Challenge to America by George S. Counts in the Boston Transcript, May 7, 1931, p. 7. (Reprinted in Book Review Digest.)

Goldberg, Miriam. Review of Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher by E. Vigdorova in the Saturday Review, November 1960, p. 72.

Guilford, Kelsey. Review of Public School Scandal by Earl Conrad in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, April 29, 1951, p. 8.

Hansen, Harry. Review of the Soviet Challenge to America by George S. Counts in New York World, February 7, 1931, p. 11. (Reprinted in Book Review Digest.)

Heckinger, Fred M. Review of Public School Scandal by Earl Conrad in The Saturday Review of Literature, June 30, 1951, p. 15.

Ladd, E. T. Review of Diary of a Russian Schoolteacher by F. Vigdorova in Social Education 25 (May 1961): 260.

Neatby, Helda. Review of Soviet Education by George Louis Kline in Canadian Forum 38 (June 1958): 68. (Reprinted in the Book Review Digest.)

Rogger, Hans. Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in the New Republic, August 18, 1958, p. 28.

Scholtz, Karl. Review of The Soviet Challenge to Education by George S. Counts in Annals of the American Academy 156 (July 1931): 159.

Shimkin, D. B. Review of Soviet Education for Science and Technology by Alexander Korol in the American Journal of Sociology 64 (November 1958): 332.

Shorre, Daniel. Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in the Saturday Review, June 21, 1958, p. 19.

Woody, Thomas. Review of Changing Man by Beatrice King in Annals of the American Academy 194 (November 1937): 221.

Review of The Soviet Challenge to America by George S. Counts in American Economic Review 21 (December 1931): 720.

Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in Booklist, September 1, 1958, p. 10.

Review of This Is the Challenge by William Benton in Kirkus 26 (June 1, 1958): 397. (Reprinted in Book Review Digest.)