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SEND MANUSCRIPTS, PLEASE!

(No, not you — or you; you did send manuscripts and thank you very much indeed, even if I returned it without much encouragement.) I'm pleased to report that someone out there is reading this journal — and that I am even taken seriously enough so that people will support the Postal Service by mailing us interesting things to read. Keep those 9 x 11 envelopes coming, folks. (If you want the ms. returned, please provide envelope and postage.)

Careful readers of "Contents" pages will have noticed another facet of this journal's ever-broadening attempt to serve its audience. "Commentary On —" the tentative title for this new section, (give me better titles and I'll change it) will offer space for short dialogue about articles previously published, or about matters of general interest, or short suggestions to the readership. I do not see "Commentary On —" as a "Letters to the Editor" column, or as a "filler" section. Neither time nor facilities are available for the first, and costs are too high for the second. However, serious brief responses will be printed as resources permit — and I would like nothing better than to plead with the Executive Committee for more support because I am flooded with articles, responses, and suggestions. Try it, you'll like it.

Speaking of support, members of AGLS have already been apprised of the revised dues schedule. The inside front cover of this issue carries the revised subscription rates, as required by vote of the Executive Board. We are all aware that inflation strikes everyone and everything, and Interdisciplinary Perspectives is not exempt. (I wonder what it is like to work for a profit-making magazine or journal.)

More Manuscripts, Please

When you read Peyton Richter's "Focusing on General Education at Chicago AAHE" think about the report/commentary as the forerunner of a series of response/reports on various meetings around the country. It has been suggested that, since none of us can be at all of the potentially useful/interesting/exciting/fruitful meetings held annually, perhaps "reviews" of such gatherings would be of considerable benefit to the stay-at-homes (or stay-aways?) Your thoughts on this possibility will also be appreciated.

Mention of conferences of course reminds us all of the annual AGLS meeting at Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, October 26-28, 1978. We seem to be having successively better (and larger) conferences, and I'm sure this year's will continue the trend. If you haven't received the announcements, join AGLS, and write to Dr. Carol J. Guardo, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Drake University, Des Moines, IA 50322. If you don't want to be on the program, come anyway — you may enjoy yourself even more, as I have at the last two.

G.F.E.
What is the mission of the university: To prepare for life, or to prepare for a career? If one follows the secular press and pursues the various journals concerned with higher education, one is struck with the "either/or" nature of the articles and comments concerning the goal of a university. But should it be an "either/or" question? Can the preparation for life's work be divorced from the preparation to enjoy that life to its fullest? The whole cloth is not made from only the woof, it must also include the warp.

The purpose of a liberal education is to "liberalize," to free the intellect, to develop appreciation, to stimulate the ability to evaluate and make choices. Liberalization, however, has as a precondition the freedom from want. Basic needs must be met before the need for and the acceptance of liberalization is acknowledged. As Thoreau observed, "The gross necessaries of life for man in this climate may, accurately enough, be distributed under the several heads of Food, Shelter, Clothing and Fuel; for not till we have secured these are we prepared to entertain the true problems of life with freedom and a prospect of success." Only when the need for food and shelter is met does attention turn to the higher callings of a culture. It is difficult to liberalize an individual when his or her overpowering need is for survival and security.

On the other hand, after securing a means of assuring the basic needs, the lack of a liberalizing experience may result in the loss of a culture. Albert Speer, Hitler's Minister of War Production, is supposed to have said that he would not have been so ready to associate with Hitler had he had a more liberal education instead of his "professional" training as an architect. One of the dangers of producing a nation of "technocrats" is that the citizenry loses its ability to evaluate and influence the course of events intelligently.

In America, we have developed a multifaceted university with the characteristics of both the traditional European university and the polytechnic, combined with a sense of pragmatism and yankee ingenuity. By accident, if not by
design, we have spawned the very type of institution best suited to weave the "whole cloth" of the individual. What is happening, however, is that the university is being polarized from both inside and outside by the "either/or" nature of the question. Recent defense of the liberal arts has suffered from an attempt to polarize the question, and those who wish to mandate a "professional goal" for a university program suffer the same fault. Should not the question be asked as to what value both vocational and liberalizing dimensions have for the individual in today's society?

Our universities can influence the course of the arguments by highlighting the fact that they are in a position to point to and achieve solutions.

One of the most critical arguments to come out of this "either/or" discussion is that of the rapid obsolescence of those programs which have only a vocational or professional goal. The argument has merit; but it is fallacious to argue that, on the other hand, a good liberal education is the only education one needs in order to render to personal possession the coin of the realm. There is a need to bring into the picture new approaches to the development of professional curriculums which are responsive to the threat of obsolescence brought about by swift changes in societal needs. There is also a need for those in the liberal arts and humanities to demonstrate in a meaningful way that these disciplines are indeed relevant, not only to the quality of life, but to professional development and advancement.

One of the more interesting individuals in American letters in recent times is Eric Hoffer, a laborer-philosopher. His essays and other writings carry a refreshing flavor which reflects his contact with the world of manual labor; and his world of manual labor must be somewhat the more rewarding by virtue of his studies and contemplation.

While most of us will never be the worker-philosopher in this sense, we can certainly strive to realize that model in our present-day baccalaureate scholar. Such an effort would require each member of the university to identify those elements in our various disciplines which are alike, rather than to concentrate on those elements which are different. The popular press, ever looking for issue-oriented material, seizes upon our own internal justifications of our separate disciplines as an expression of the lack of ability of a university — or even education itself — to influence positively the method and quality of our livelihood and lives. Therefore, it behooves us to set about demonstrating our ability to weave "whole cloth" of both woof and warp.

What, then, should be the pattern of our cloth: How shall the woof and warp be woven into the whole cloth of the perfected individual? First, we, the weavers, must recognize and accept the worth of both the woof and warp in the whole cloth. We must acknowledge that a vocation contributes just as surely to the individual as does liberal education, and that one without the other suffers a significant deficit.

Second, we must examine the objectives of each and every curriculum in our university to determine whether or not it brings to the individual those elements which allow the fullest participation in life and the greatest contribution to society. Those who promote liberal education must examine curriculums with a concern for the graduate who must function in a society where minimum levels of existence require incomes that would have astounded our forefathers. Those charged with the transmittal of professional or vocational skill and knowledge must ensure in curriculums the existence of courses which teach critical evaluations of issues that would have taxed the ancient philosophers.
Third, we, collectively, must not be split apart by those who examine our curriculums, demanding the greatest return for the least dollar spent. We must ever be on guard against those who insist that quality can be quantified and that vocationalism can be weighed against liberalism on some absolute scale; that by so evaluating university curriculums, dollar values may be assigned; and either the warp or the woof will enjoy ascendancy while the other suffers exclusion.

We must, as university faculties, demonstrate and convince others that it is the concept of a liberal education that makes the vocational or professional life worthy, and that it is the professional or vocational education that makes possible the time and relief from economic stress necessary to appreciate and utilize a liberal education.
INNOVATIVE ADULT GENERAL EDUCATION: THE DETROIT EXPERIMENT

David W. Hartman
Richard T. Bohan
Otto Feinstein
Sandra Loehr
Linda Michalowski
F. Richard Place

INTRODUCTION:

Increasingly, universities have confronted a changing population of undergraduate students. They find themselves under considerable scrutiny, from legislators, taxpayers and potential students. Concurrently, the impetus to re-appraise the mission of undergraduate education, so as to insure its accommodation in our changing society, is in need of refocusing. The issue of who comes to the university, and for what end, stands foreshort in the face of faculties, administrators and elected guardians of higher education, now more than ever before. Again we are charged with providing curricula and format that are relevant enough to retain the attention of today's new student, that are salutary in the eyes of accrediting associations, conscionable in the minds of the faculty who teach it, and above reproach of the faculties' peers who are to judge it. This challenge of experimenting in undergraduate education is what the Board of Governors at Wayne State University have accepted in the creation of the College of Lifelong Learning, as its conduit for change, and University Studies and Weekend College (US/WC) as the nexus under which this change is to take place.

The US/WC Program, since 1973, has offered a baccalaureate educational
program which makes use of television, intense weekend conferences, and the well known method of discussion and lecturing as mechanisms for delivering its subject matter. By design, the curriculum seeks as its focus to offer a general education which dignifies the life experiences of a student population who return to formal education after a hiatus and shares the task of expanding their vistas and increasing the quality of their lives through study.

The US/WC Program leads to the Bachelor of General Studies Degree awarded by Wayne State University. Currently the Program has about 2,500 full time students pursuing the degree, and 73 full time faculty, 35 half time faculty, and 50 full time academic staff and clerical employees. Conceived some four-and-one-half years ago, and financed out of tuition revenues, the Program has become the largest worker oriented Program in the Atlantic industrial nations.

The primary innovation is conceptual. The working adult lives and functions in a different reality than the just out of high school college entrant, and in addition to there being a generational difference there is a cultural difference in the vast majority of cases. It is also clear that the University is presently structured on the contrary belief that there is a universal student, and that student is the just out of high school college entrant.

If our conceptual innovation is correct, then it follows that the learning environment must be based on the reality and culture of the working adult, and that the achievement of a degree in a reasonable time span is a critical element in today’s learning environment. The concept that the working adult student is basically different from what is institutionally assumed to be the universal student led us naturally to our other innovations.

Our second innovation is the conception of a system which could deliver education to the adult working student. By combining 5 existing instructional methods we developed a delivery system suited to the cultural, time, and space realities of the student.

The five existing education forms we use are: seminar/discussion groups; television courses; intensive weekend courses; independent and cooperative education; and non-credit general and special skills tutorials.

All of these forms exist across the nation, but we consciously combined them in relation to the student’s culture. This allows the working adult to be a full-time student as well. Many part-time students who had a 10-12 year road to a degree, and for whom each course had been an additional activity to family, work, and community responsibilities, now have a reasonable time horizon, and education becomes a cementing rather than a fragmenting agent in their life.

Our third innovation is a curriculum which offers the highest level of university education, meets the students’ intellectual and professional needs, and creates a true intellectual environment. In doing this we know that one of the major differences between the institutionally assumed universal student and the adult working student is experiential. The latter has a wealth of life experience waiting to be clarified by ideas, while the former has very little life experience outside of educational institutions.

With this in mind, the curriculum includes the following interdisciplinary focal points:

Social Science: Ethnic Studies; Work and Society; Conflict Studies; and Theory and Method in the Social Sciences.

Urban Humanities: Folk, Classical, and Mass Culture; The Arts of the
Imagination; The Performing Arts; Cultural History and Criticism

Science and Technology: Science and Energy; Life and Ecology; Science, Technology and Values; and Planning the Future.

A second difference, critical for curricular construction, is that the life experience of working class adults leads best to learning through strong, cooperative, peer, and group relations, while the just out of high school student has had a long experience of individual and competitive behavior in relation to learning. In addition, the nature of the extra-educational demands on the student are drastically different.

For group reinforced learning to work, it is necessary to have the time and conditions which allow a group to form. For a true intellectual environment to operate, extra-educational demands, study skills, and content have to be carefully thought through. To deal with the above we use the following educational strategy: the subject matter of each quarter and year is reinforcing, thus related. For the adult learner subject matter must be related to life experience on the one hand and very high level academic ideas on the other.

The curricular structure allows us to look at the student’s educational environment as a four or five year span, with each experience and course having a specific role. We can then build in the concepts, theories, methods, and data of the various disciplines throughout the year, and pull them together during the last academic year.

The focal points for each quarter’s study are not only interdisciplinary but are of such a nature that we can achieve our educational goals while satisfying the professional degree needs of many different groups.

Before the inception of US/WC, the average adult in the metropolitan Detroit area was virtually excluded from the academic community. Because of their 40-hour-a-week plus working schedules and the fact that most traditional institutions require attendance 3-4 days a week, 3-4 hours per day, most of these working adults found it impossible to work full time and simultaneously attend college full time. The US/WC Program caters to the needs of students in several ways: (1) workshops are scheduled in the morning, afternoon, evening, and on weekends; (2) students attend only 1 workshop a week, for 4 hours; (3) the workshops are located in places near the students’ jobs — in union locals, in schools, in community centers, in libraries, and in W.S.U.’s main campus buildings; (4) students watch a television course once a day, for 1/2 hour, either in the morning or evening, Monday through Friday; and (5) students attend weekend conferences on W.S.U.’s main campus, for 2 weekends each quarter. Thus, the Program is conveniently scheduled so that almost any working adult can attend college full time while working full time, whether his schedule be the morning shift, afternoon shift, or midnight shift.

The average profile of the Weekend College student is: male, married, father of 2 to 3 children, 30 to 35 years old, veteran, employed by an automobile or other large industrial firm.

According to a survey of 143 randomly selected students the following major demographic and personal characteristics were obtained:

1. Average age: 32
2. Marital Status: Married — 133 respondants
3. Average Number of Children: 3
4. Average Child’s Age: 9
5. Occupation: Industrial position — 100
   Non-Industrial position — 43
6. Have you always wanted to attend college? Yes — 121
7. Reasons for entering: Education — 33
   Convenience of Program — 27
   Get education and better myself — 22
   V.A. benefits — 13

As the response to Question #6 on the survey shows, a large percentage of the students have always wanted to attend college. Some of the reasons why these students have not entered college until now are: (1) marriage at an early age forced many of them to make economic decisions which overshadowed their educational concerns; (2) poor grades in high school lessened the chance for many of them to enter a traditional institution of higher education because of admissions standards; (3) after separation from the armed services many of them wanted to make as much money as possible as fast as they could and the factories offered an easy avenue for this wish; and (4) once they became enmeshed in the demands of factory or office time schedules, many of them found that traditional institutions could not cater to their needs in terms of class schedules and locations.

The Delivery System

As has been mentioned, the delivery of the basic curriculum and services depends upon old methods that have been combined into a new context. In this section, the television, conference, and workshop components are discussed in detail.

The Television Course

Each quarter a student takes an integrated core of courses which revolve around a common interdisciplinary theme. This would be similar to the traditional student who may take an urban geography, history, and sociology course simultaneously. Although each of the courses has a common focus its specific orientation is different. For instance, in one Social Science quarter a student takes a T.V. course, Culture, Community, and Identity: An Ethnic Perspective; a workshop course, Alternative Perspectives on Ethnicity; and a conference course, Urban Ethnic Groups: Problems and Prospects. The rationale for this format is that it provides an integrated, interdisciplinary, focused, and developmental sequence in which a student can struggle with ideas, concepts, and his experience within a singular, and thus less confusing, context.

Forty-five minutes of each 4 hour workshop is used to discuss the preceding week's television offering. This allows the student the opportunity to reflect with his peers on what the significance of the content was and allows for debate and discussion. It also personalizes a medium which can be a very impersonal one.

Because the television course is the basic course we also produce reading material in the form of texts and study guides to accompany the course. The study guide is a necessary companion for the viewer. The texts act to integrate individual shows and to provide examplary and additional information which is impossible to portray on the television screen.
The Weekend Conference Course

The Conference Course differs essentially from the other delivery methods used by the Program in that it meets on the University campus and is comprised of the total number of students enrolled in a divisional course, which has numbered up to thirteen hundred. This course provides an essential academic connection with the University, and personal and social association with large numbers of fellow students in a psychologically adult situation. It is designed to bring an interdisciplinary topic into contemporary perspective by providing the student contact with local and national experts in a field, exploring current research and thinking, and providing for analysis and discussion of the presented material. The basic format includes large and small lectures, panel discussions, and cultural and media presentations. These represent the conference proper and are presented to the audience as a whole. They are interspaced with small group discussions.

The conference format is especially useful to educational programs involving adults because it creates a situation and environment which is psychologically adult. For the student it is both a social adventure and a learning experience. As attendance is more open than in a smaller classroom it may also become a family experience. Also, it may be effective in reassuring adult students who lack confidence in their academic abilities or are unsure of their commitment to return to the educational environment by providing an opportunity to complete a course of study in a shortened period of time.

The conference format represents an intensification of learning experience which has important implications and influences in regard to the nature of course planning, orientation materials, instructional methods and evaluation procedures.

Intensity is the key concept underlying the Weekend Conference Course. In the planning and practice of the Conference Course intensity allows for an extensive examination of a theme and for repetition available in any traditional classroom situation. Criticisms of the technique generally beg the question of the extent to which all structured learning is intensified learning. Intensification is no more than a matter of the spacing of individual educational experiences closer together than has become traditional. If this concept is carried to the extreme we are forced to see any school experience as intensified learning, and once the value of intensity is admitted we can pursue the more realistic problem of determining what content, instructional methods and evaluation procedures are educationally effective at what degree of intensity.

Today, outside the academic environment, information is transmitted primarily through verbal and symbolic communication; it is fast-paced and depends on one-time exposure. This transmission takes place through the media and other methods that are incorporated into the conference format. In the conference experience these modes of transmission are converted into active learning experiences, that are familiar to the student but now take on a different aspect — a learning aspect.

The Workshop Course

Workshop classes are limited to 10-20 students. The rationale for such small classes goes beyond the common notion that the teacher has greater time for each student. The rationale used here is that we are creating a learning environment that in many ways resembles the kin group. The class is, theoretically,
a closed unit which interacts and is directed by a facilitator who instructs, tutors, and counsels within that setting. It is true that after 4 hours of intense interaction the unit fragments and the students return as individuals to the outside world. Ideally, however, the class is a closed interacting unit for an extended period of time once a week. Classes tend to be relatively homogeneous although this is not always the case.

The context of the learning experience is especially crucial to the students enrolled in our Program. Institutions are alien to them and they are most "at home" in settings which are reflective of their "intimate world," i.e., family and neighborhood. Paternalistic as this may appear it is a method by which alienated individuals can begin the process of adapting to a world which they often know very little about. It is then a primary responsibility of the instructor to facilitate a student's understanding of the institutions of the society which surround him.

This small group enables a student to develop a close network of individuals who then help him to generate new understanding. Only through this close and bounded network can individuals develop the confidence and skills necessary to compete in a complex institutionalized world. This is not to say that our purpose is to develop cocoons for our students and to protect them from the outside world. Instead it is to allow them access to higher education within a context which they understand and are comfortable in.

It is also well to remember that learning is an experiential process which occurs as man interacts within a specified environment and that knowledge extracted from that environment cannot be legitimized by simply institutionalizing it and calling it education. These views are expressed by Dr. Sol Tax. Dr. Tax writes:

When I am asked — as I am — to advise school people on the education of slum children, I do not say that I know nothing about education, children, or slums . . . what I do is to ask questions. What could be the problem? Man evolved from the beginning — and is still there — by successfully passing on information to the young. Why the problem in passing on our culture to the next generation? The answer comes rather quickly. Any people can pass on its culture; our problem is that we are trying to pass on the culture of the establishment to children of an alien (and alienated) culture. The difficulty comes from the assumption that ours is the only culture — theirs is a lack of culture. The consequent attitude destroys an environment in which education can proceed. (1968:15)

Education is a part of a larger general process of socialization whereby persons are prepared to fit into the community of which they are a part and into the larger external community which surround them. However, for the most part, the students whom we are involved with are peripheral to the middle and upper class oriented institutions of the society. They tend toward a suspicious view of the establishment and tend to be alienated from institutionalized ways. Many of them fit the anthropological conception of folk albeit they are urban folk.

In the workshop the student is introduced to subject matter that is relevant to his experience. For instance a discussion of Blues and Bluegrass music is a perfect tool for engendering a discussion of southern blacks and whites, their migration experiences, prejudice, discrimination, etc. The important point is that the reference point for the class must be relevant to the students' experience and concretely imaginable within that experience. In many ways this workshop philosophy derives from the same pedagogical base as Paulo Freire describes in
Although the participating and experiential nature of the US/WC Program is centered in the workshop experience the other components of the curriculum reflect this philosophy also. By this we mean that we start with the student, and where he is, and expand outward toward abstract and theoretical notions as well as academic areas which are outside the student’s previous experience. Examples of this are: science courses which begin with the student as consumer, humanities courses which begin with the notion that blue grass and country music are “legitimate” modes of cultural expression, and social science courses which begin with discussion of work, community, or household squabbles.

Conclusions:

US/WC has grown from 300 students in 1974 to its current enrollment of 2,500. The students come from many walks of life and from communities scattered throughout the metropolitan area. The Program’s success is dependent upon the integrated and highly structured curriculum in which each part is vital to the whole. That whole culminates in an intensive learning experience during the student’s senior year. Along with its off-campus delivery and its working adult student body, the curriculum is critical to an overall appreciation of the innovative aspects of the Program.

The best of any academic program is its end product. Having amassed sufficient credit hours to graduate, are its students educated? What has that program of study done for the individual involved? If education is thought of as a process rather than merely the acquisition of a body of knowledge, the ideal answer is that it has provided the students with the means to achieve intellectual self-sufficiency — to continue to educate themselves. Self-sufficiency embodies two fundamental elements. First, students should possess those skills—the ability to write and to locate the information — necessary to pursue future intellectual interests on their own. Second, they should have a sufficiently broad background to establish their specific interests within a broader context of knowledge and understanding. There is a third element, more difficult to attain, which is the desire to continue the process after they have completed their formal education. This last cannot be readily programmed, but it is more likely to come about if the students have experienced an educational situation in which something happens to them so that they see a connection and an interaction between themselves and their subject matter. If students are to be thought of as other than units of output, these goals must be maintained, and curriculum, teaching, and administrative support dedicated to their achievement.

Are we, in Marx’s words, making the workers more “fully developed human beings”? This is a difficult question, because of the meaning which might be attached to the phrase. We do know something which is going on, something we did not fully anticipate but which gives validity to our efforts. A new feeling of community is developing among our students, a feeling of solidarity which company loyalty and the union had failed to develop. Men who have worked in close company for years while barely speaking to each other are speaking now — what is more, the conversation is not about bosses or even “huntin’ and fishin’” but about class assignments, about what was discussed in the TV course that morning, about books which they are reading. Both the community
feeling which has been engendered and the fact that knowledge, systematized knowledge is being pursued by the students outside the classroom is, we think, evidence that the Program is a service to the students. For students in the Program, this new intellectual community which they have formed is the most significant aspect; and to the extent that the students are making use of, and enjoying, their intellectual abilities which the job discourages and dulls, we have indeed played a part in their becoming more fully human, which is to say more fully themselves.

The US/WC experiment is not complete. If, however, the potential of such a program is allowed to develop, a continuing analysis of the theory, the method, the techniques, and the cultural groups served must be undertaken. These analyses must not be undertaken for the purpose of standardizing a "learning program" for the "working class." Rather such analyses should generate flexible learning models which can be adapted to those situations where they are usable and provide a basis for further experiments where they are not.
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THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE, DIMENSIONS OF LOVE: AN EXPERIMENT IN INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

Patricia Ernenwein Zevin
Gene Sager
Brenda Montiel

Dedicated to the support of interdisciplinary studies as intellectually sound and academically necessary, this paper is an expanded version of the presentation made by the authors during the 17th Annual Conference of the Association of General and Liberal Studies (October 27-29, 1977, Ogden, Utah). The subject of the conference, "General Education: Diversity by Design," seemed to the Interdisciplinary Studies team at Palomar College (including, in addition to the authors, Donna Tryon, Art, Richard Peacock, Film, and Don Piche, Philosophy) to be particularly appropriate to efforts there to establish a series of interdisciplinary courses in a thematic, team-taught design focusing on the human experience. Parts 1, 2, 3 of the paper remain substantially as presented at the conference, with some updating. However, when the presentation was made at Weber State, the course was being taught for the first time and was in its academic infancy of two months. It has now been offered for a second semester and Part 4 considers the evolution of the model as the team learns by its successes and failures. Part 1 discusses the importance of interdisciplinary studies in the community college; Part 2 treats of various course models; Part 3 describes the "Dimensions of Love" course; Part 4 presents a further stage in the evolution of the model and some tentative conclusions.
1. The Importance of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Community College

There is a need at the community college level for a broad spectrum humanities course or sequence of courses, designed primarily for the non-articulating student whose education tends to be fragmented in discrete parts of carefully separated disciplines. The majority of our community college students do not go on to four year institutions. For them, the A.A. degree is terminal education, and the community college may be one of the last opportunities they will have to explore art, literature, philosophy, and other humanistic studies. Because of the rigors of technical programs of study, students cannot find the hours to take the many available courses which would provide them with a broad liberal education. The result is that we turn out students who are often impatient with, even contemptuous of, fine arts, philosophy, literature, and related fields. They may see the bits and pieces; they do not see the patterns they form, their relationships.

Our students leave our institutions with highly specialized technical skills enabling them to perform certain timely and specific behaviors. They can manipulate many quantifiable, material elements of existence for today. Since, however, the speed of our present outdates our technology as we are teaching it, it may be that the best kind of futuristic education we can help our students to acquire is that long and speculative view we inherit from the humanities.

Available in such a view is a heuristic for tackling the hard questions about our being. Up to now, in order to make sense of experience, students' education is based primarily on two questions: What is it? How does it work? We have taught the contents of our world and that everything has structure, how to take that structure apart, to lay it out and look at it, to reassemble and to operate it. They know about form and function. What they don't know and what we need to teach them is based on other questions: "Does this relate to that?"; "Why did that happen?"; and "Does it mean something?" Our students may see the parts; they need to see the relationships which give our culture meaning and dimension. A learning approach which provides an integrated view, that of interdisciplinary studies, is considered next in several model designs.

2. Some Models for Interdisciplinary Courses

Every good graduate student understands the importance of the integrity and uniqueness of his or her discipline. Much more than academic, this departmentalization is psychologically reassuring and economically secure. It becomes a way of life. In view of this feature of academic life, and in view of the need for interdisciplinary courses which deal with real human problems, the question of how to preserve the integrity of particular disciplines in truly interdisciplinary courses must be confronted. Instead of the usual "historical vs. topics" question, then, sketched here are the features of three models or concepts which raise questions about those aspects of given disciplines to be dealt with in interdisciplinary courses. These are models for individual undergraduate courses, not curricula. The models are considered separately, but this should not be taken to mean they cannot be combined in various ways.

The first may be called the Parade of Stars Model. A course based on this model will present the results/findings/conclusions/expressions of the participating disciplines on a topic or from a specified historical period. The
material presented is not selected in order to aid the student in an in-depth study of any given discipline. Simply, the significant "upshots" are presented: the philosophers' conclusions, the painters' paintings, the musicians' achievements. The instructors "parade" these before the class, noting similarities and differences that can readily be observed. Such a course is designed to develop some understanding of a topic or historical period and to stimulate further study.

Among the criticisms of the Parade of Stars Model is the view that such a course would not be truly interdisciplinary. A topic or historical period might be better understood through taking such a course, but the parade would be too much like the parade of subjects which already constitute an average disintegrated class schedule: Biology, 8:00; Philosophy, 9:00; Music, 10:00. A further criticism comes from the disciplinarian: the Parade of Stars Model seems to popularize the disciplines; it's too predigested. No understanding of the development of the discipline nor of its special methods is taught in the course.

In defense of the Parade Model, however, one can offer the point that it is at least an ordering of materials on a given topic or period so that students can notice similarities and differences in content and approach. The material does have a focus and the participating disciplines contribute to this subject. Since the focus is not any one discipline in its purity, however, it must be granted that the study of the disciplines in their purity is not accomplished.

In an attempt to give attention to the methods of particular disciplines, some teachers prefer what may be called the Focus on Methods Model. Such a course focuses on the question of method in the disciplines participating. Empiricism in psychology, sociology, and philosophy might be the methodological focus in such a course. An understanding of the disciplines can perhaps be achieved here from the "inside" by examining the tools of the trade.

The main disadvantage of the Focus on Methods Model is that it is probably too difficult for an undergraduate student. Such a course seems to presuppose more knowledge of the disciplines than most undergraduate students can be expected to bring to the course. However, it may be feasible for upper division courses.

Is there a workable Halfway House Model? Can one overcome the problems of the Parade Model, i.e., the problems of sacrificing the integrity of particular disciplines and the problem of insufficient integration of the parts of the parade? Can one do this without making the course too difficult for undergraduates?

There is probably no way to avoid the danger of sacrificing the integrity or purity of particular disciplines. A student may take away a somewhat superficial knowledge of some concept in philosophy from an interdisciplinary course in which a philosopher participates. One simply has to arrive at a commitment to the notion that integrated understanding, at whatever depth, is more important than disintegrated knowledge in greater depth.

One solution is to refine the Parade of Stars Model by allowing plenty of time for instructors to work together preparing ways to integrate materials, to discuss terminology, and to suggest similarities and differences in the approaches of the participating disciplines. One cannot overemphasize the need for sufficient time for instructors to work together on this integration. Most of us have little training and less experience in this area; graduate school does not prepare its students to teach interdisciplinary courses. Each instructor has to ascertain the technical aspects of the discipline to be sacrificed, the insights to be and to
work with the team members to ascertain the relations among approaches to the various disciplines.

Finally, another way to look at this aspect of the problem is to consider, as the St. John’s College approach does, that the existence of disciplines is not a given but something that has to be proved, and to act, therefore, as if the pursuit of a topic by means of insights gained from carefully chosen documents or works of art is valid in itself. The method, in the latter case, is the careful examination of a particular document or work of art, as it stands, an entity in itself without much buttressing from concerns of historical data or biographical matter, in order to share in the insights afforded to the examination of a particular topic. This model, which might be a Parade of Stars where the works rather than the presentations or the instructors are the stars, appears to be that evolving in the course next considered, “The Human Experience: Dimensions of Love.”

3. Course Design: The Human Experience, Dimensions of Love

“Dimensions of Love” is one of three projected Interdisciplinary Studies courses (one or two will include science as well as humanities) on different topics or themes in the overall context, The Human Experience, emphasizing meanings for people living today. It is designed as an afternoon block class, meeting for three hours each week. Need was determined three years ago by survey of the faculty and the concept was then developed by a curriculum subcommittee. Last year the IDS Curriculum Development Team, composed of five instructors (four representing the various disciplines of art, film, music, and philosophy, and one acting as coordinator and supplying a language and culture context), met weekly to organize content in three-hour modules or segments. The course has been offered for both Fall and Spring semesters for 1977-78 with good enrollment both times.

Two three-hour sessions in the current semester have been assigned to each of eight units: Romantic Love, Love of Nature, Conjugal Love, Love of God, Familial Love, Sensual Love, Love of Self, Love of Humanity. The overall topic or theme, Dimensions of Love, was chosen because it was felt that love is seldom treated in a scholarly way, and that as a strong motivating force in human life and one that is many-faceted, complex, important, and elusive, it is a subject worthy of consideration. A conceptual model (Figure 1) was developed after the dimensions above had been selected as particularly interesting to explore so that team members always know what is meant by the terms of a particular dimension and can therefore work independently while still remaining in touch with each other.

In thinking about love, it seems that each dimension relates in some way to the self and that certain relationships can be seen as closer or further from the self and as primary or secondary relationships. A functional non-moralistic direction may also be perceived; Love of Self turns inward, Love of Humanity outward, and Familial Love is reciprocal. The pattern of study (and hopefully of growth) followed during the course of the semester is circular, beginning with the less demanding dimensions of love having to do with other beings or entities known but unrelated to the self, dimensions such as Romantic Love, or Love of Nature. Study next progresses to dimensions related to the self, like Conjugal Love and Love of God, and then to those which are part of the self, Familial Love, Sensual Love, and Love of Self. A final dimension of growth is related to the last, most difficult and concluding unit, Love of Humanity, which embraces all other beings, not only those unrelated to the self but those who are
unknown as well. To guide the student through the various modules or dimensions, a text, *The Human Experience: Dimensions of Love* (Palomar College, 1977, 1978) has been developed and includes introductory essays, readings, terminology, and a review of materials for each unit.

The course focuses on several aspects of human experience often overlooked in the technical courses needed for job training, e.g. the need for aesthetic experiences which enrich the emotional side of man and the need for community sharing of common goals and life experiences rather than perpetuating the separate existences of man. To address these needs and to provide an environment for integration across disciplines, the study of the arts and philosophy proceeds to view the various dimensions of love in human existence and how philosophy and each of the arts has dealt with that subject. For example, in the unit on *Love of Humanity*, a representative selection is shown of the works of Vincent Van Gogh, Honoré Daumier, Kathe Kollwitz and Goya illustrating the feelings of the artist for humanity.

The focal point for the musical experience is Beethoven's Ninth which expresses musically the ideals of the French Revolution through the use of Schiller's poem, "Ode to Joy." The film for this unit is *Walkabout* by Nicholas Roege, a story of two children abandoned in the Australian outback who are found by a young aborigine boy and how they survive and communicate even though they can not understand one another’s language or customs. Two philosophic attempts to construct a basis for a consciousness of and the practice of the love of humanity are discussed, that of (1) Karl Marx, who focuses on ways in which capitalist institutions alienate, and of (2) Immanuel Kant, who focuses on the concept of treating humanness in others as an end in itself. During the various presentations on the Love of Humanity several contemporary questions are raised: 1) Is love of humanity an abstract ideal or can it be a practical attainment in one's life? 2) If so, how does it manifest itself?

A second example is taken from *Love of Nature*. In art, nature is shown in three manifestations: as benevolent and gracious in Roman and Cretan wall painting; as majestic, awe-inspiring, and unsullied by Romantic landscape painters of the Barbizon and Hudson River schools; as violent and destructive by Expressionist and Romantic painters. Claude Debussy's musical impressions of "The Clouds" and "The Sea" demonstrate his unique ability to create a mood or aural setting for these specific scenes of nature. The film, "High Sierra," depicts the life of John Muir in his environmental work of preserving the natural beauty of Yosemite Valley. Philosophy considers nature from both western and eastern points of view. Contemporary questions raised in discussion are several: What effect does communing with nature have upon the self? What happens when you love nature? Does it love you in return? Do trees have rights?

A last example is the unit on *Conjugal Love* where several artists are discussed in relation to their real-life experiences with their wives and/or lovers and how these experiences affect their art, e.g., Rembrandt and Saskia; Marc Chagall and Bella; Salvador Dalí and Gala. Sections from the *Marriage of Figaro* by Mozart comment on marriage and unfaithfulness. Philosophy concerns itself with Bertrand Russell's *Marriage and Morals* and questions raised by viewing Ingmar Bergman's "Scenes from a Marriage." Contemporary questions center around a critical evaluation of the institution of marriage, its strengths and weaknesses, divorce, the single person raising a family, those qualities which make for a successful marriage, contracts and special ceremonies related to marriage to-
As indicated above, one of the major problems faced in setting up an interdisciplinary program has been the fact that neither by background nor by inclination are faculties or students prepared for the necessary adjustments in academic point of view and intellectual effort required to go from the specialist's to the generalist's point of view, which requires looking at documents and works of art for the statements they make or the emotions they purvey or the patterns they form in and of themselves apart from the accustomed disciplinary matrix of associated biographical, historical, and comparative data. The best response developed by the interdisciplinary studies team to the criticism of “shallowness” when the interdisciplinary course was first proposed, was that the course is not a substitute for any disciplinary offering nor does it provide mini-courses in art, music, philosophy or film. Rather, and the team has come to this by a process of hard trial and severe errors, the interdisciplinary approach, at its best and in the model presently developing, can provide an intensive, necessarily limited in scope and time, and enlightening examination of specific materials drawn from these disciplines which apply to the discussion of one aspect of a single topic.

Related to the problem of general unfamiliarity with the interdisciplinary approach is that of student expectation. Students coming into the program aren’t sure about what to expect of the team nor what the team expects from them, and indeed, team expectations have undergone some modification. A journal was required the first semester, and, as might have been expected in a student group where proficiency in writing was not made a prerequisite to enrollment, this proved to be a source of great anxiety to students. The team felt the journal, as a locus for thoughtful student reaction to what was going on in class, was too valuable to drop, but it has been made optional. Objective quizzes used first semester proved to be going in the wrong direction, disintegrating thought into discrete particles, and have been replaced by take-home essay quizzes. A project is still required, and an essay final. The initially high level of student anxiety was not present during the second semester, partly for reasons of organizational adjustments, discussed above, which also included a reapportioning of instructor time to allow for logistical difficulties in working with a team of five persons, and partly because the student grapevine operated in our favor as the course progressed.

Team members, principally disciplinary in stance but receptive to experimentation with the interdisciplinary mode, have grown from the first stages of being careful not to tread on each other’s disciplinary toes, through directly confronting the problems inherent in changing one’s approach to a tentative third stage of trading viewpoints and responsibility for materials, and a consequent insight into their academic similarities, differences, frailties and strengths. There is a group determination to work at the course until it is right, and a willingness on the part of several members of the team to begin proselytizing colleagues for a second interdisciplinary course to involve both science and humanities. The most positive incentive to keep on came from members of that pioneer group of students who encouraged the team to develop another course so that they, the students, could continue with a second semester.

Far from having solved all its problems, the team has come a certain way. Having chosen what well may be the most difficult of all interdisciplinary
routes to follow, without the supporting confines of periodic timelines or a list of great books, the process has proved difficult, challenging, rewarding, and a matter of continuing importance and enduring delight. Fortunate indeed to be given the opportunity to continue their interdisciplinary endeavor, the members of the team present this description of work in progress to colleagues in the field of interdisciplinary studies.

**Figure 1**

**DIMENSIONS OF LOVE**

- **Sensual Love**
- **Familial Love**
- **Love of Self**
- **Love of Humanity**
- **Romantic Love**
- **Love of Nature, Homeland**
- **Conjugal Love**
- **Love of God**

A solid line indicates primary relationships.
A dotted line indicates secondary relationships.
I read with interest Michael McBride's article on the exploratory year at Whittier College. While I am sure that Whittier is satisfied with it and that it contains a number of innovative ideas, such as the "initial module" in various disciplines, I want to speak to the three assumptions upon which Professor McBride and his colleagues rejected any common interdisciplinary general education course for Whittier. I do so because the assumptions are so widely held and because Professor McBride states them so succinctly. I also speak to them as an admitted partisan of a common transdisciplinary general education core course ("Learner's Viewpoint," Perspectives, v. 7, no. 2, Fall 1975).

1) students cannot learn all there is to know;
   I should have thought that this was beyond argument. No sensible instructor expects this either in disciplinary or in general education. I will admit, however, that there are a number of senseless instructors.

2) faculty, especially with the knowledge explosion of the twentieth century, cannot determine which "package" of knowledge is essential to the educated person;
   This is utter nonsense! If we proceeded on this assumption in disciplinary education, all instruction would cease, except for those so foolish as to think that they can ever know, let alone convey to students, all the knowledge of a discipline. Every discipline must choose the "package" of knowledge which will make the educated disciplinary specialist.
   I will grant that it is more difficult to determine the essentials for a generally-educated person. However, because a thing is difficult is no reason to shrink from it, if you believe it to be valuable. Here is the real crux of the matter: our specialization-mad society simply does not really value general education.
Specialists pay lip service to the concept, because that is expected, but actually they despise it. They think general education is for dilettantes and "fuzzy-minded liberals." It isn't solid, like knowing all the Ordovician fossils, or the "inner reality" of Hemingway's *Old Man and the Sea.*

When you ask a group of faculty members, all of whom have been hired for their credentials as good representatives of some specialty, to design a general education program, you are almost always going to get something which breaks right back into disciplinary specialization. The only way to avoid this is for a college administration to find people who are willing and able to teach interdisciplinarily. Unquestionably these will be few in a world which disvalues them, but they can be found if there is a will to look for them.

After the pariahs who can teach interdisciplinarily, or, better, transdisciplinarily, have been identified, the administration must then put them in a department and a curriculum all their own. They must be made "specialists in general education." This is a paradox, admittedly, but the most important things seem to be paradoxes, and people have learned to admire them and even to respect the mystery which surrounds them. The disciplinary specialists will still hate general educationists, as they will call them, but if they are seen to be specialists in general education the disciplinary specialists will give them a grudging acceptance. After all, if there is one thing disciplinary specialists understand it is disciplinary specialization, no matter what it is in. Of course, the administration must make the program small at first, in order not to upset the specialists too much.

3) students face an increasingly complex world in which they will need to make important decisions about themselves and their future goals;

The increasing complexity of the world is all the more reason for a common transdisciplinary "package." Of course, people have always needed something to help them put the world together. The only question has been and is whether that something will be knowledgeable, kind and integrated or the opposite.

In diametric contrast to specialist education, general education should teach broad concepts. The inane drive to learn "all there is to know" is brought over from specialist education, where people are lured into thinking they can really know all there is to know about something if only they restrict their interests sufficiently. General education should try to teach the most important concepts about everything which is considered of real significance. This sounds like "all there is to know" until you remember that it is only the most important concepts of the most important topics you should be dealing with. The most important concepts implies the broadest generalizations, and when you are dealing with the broadest generalizations you take a topic from the top down, from the broadest generalization to the next less broad, etc., as time allows.

Time, however, will not allow even many broad generalizations to be explored, although you may assign a lot of credit hours to a transdisciplinary course, if you resist the virtually irresistible temptation to deluge students with too much detail. Detail is for specialists — it is their life and their love, but it is the death of general education. It is specialist detail which bores the general education students and/or presents them with technical material they can't understand.

A number of specific examples need to be used to illustrate the broad generalizations, and to give something concrete and, hopefully, interesting. However, general education students don’t need to know the details of the Westward Movement in order to understand its meaning for contemporary
American civilization, or the dynasties of China in order to understand the essence of Asian civilization, or the floor, door and window of a photon in order to be able to grasp the idea that energy and mass are somehow convertible one to another. General education students need to know principally that a thing exists — if they are interested to know how and why, they should be encouraged to take the disciplinary courses which will explain to them how and why.

If it seems too great a task for learned faculty to "integrate" disciplinary knowledge, then I don't know how ordinary undergraduates are supposed to do it after four years of exposure only to certain disciplines. And they certainly will not be the best prepared they can be to make important decisions about themselves unless they have the quintessence of knowledge their civilization can give them. It is important to remember that, especially in this interdependent world, in order to make the really important decisions which will affect not only them but others people need knowledge in breadth much more than they need knowledge in depth in one field. Therefore, it seems to me that the prime aim of general education should be to get people out of themselves, to learn about other things and other people. The entire remainder of their college career is available for specialization.

As for the idea of teaching students "how to think," I believe that is excellent, but I hardly think much time need be spent on the fundamental procedure. Broadly speaking there are two fundamental approaches human beings take toward gaining knowledge. One is the scientific method; all the others may be grouped into a class called "non-scientific methods." The scientific method requires a rigorous effort to verify speculations; the non-scientific methods do not.

It is of some value and interest to general education students to have a very general idea of how some disciplines speculate and verify (or just speculate), but again this kind of knowledge in detail is of most interest to those who are going to enter the discipline, and it will be of interest only to those very few who are going to do research in that discipline. What is valuable to most students in both disciplinary and interdisciplinary studies is knowledge (yes, "content!") with which to operate in making decisions.

The idea that students will have the time, incentive or energy in a specialization-mad world to explore widely in other fields after graduation is simply not realistic. What they need is knowledge of a series of broad concepts, in the perhaps vain but not quite so unrealistic hope that after graduation they might keep slightly in contact with a few dimensions of the world outside their own jobs and families, through such things as the newspaper, the network news and, once in a while, a public television program and a book.

If they have retained something of the broad concepts they have learned in a core course, graduates might be sensitive to the changing of some of these concepts as time passes, or to the working out, or not working out, of these concepts in life. That is all we can reasonably hope for. One of the things any good general education course should teach is that the ordinary individual, even the ordinary college graduate, will be forced into a narrow rut in order to make a living. That is why if college students are ever going to understand anything outside themselves they must be exposed to it while they are still in college. Once they get out (and even before, of course) everything will conspire to force them into a specialist shell and keep them there at least until retirement.

In regard to the eternal question of "content" in general education courses, which we brushed by a little while ago, please do not let me hear, but I know I
will, the unbelievable argument that there is no sense giving content in general education courses because in five years many of the concepts we are working with today will be outmoded. Again, if this line of argument were followed in the disciplines as it is recommended for general education, most instruction in the modern world would cease.

I would not deny that there are dangers in interdisciplinary instruction, as there are in disciplinary instruction. The danger in disciplinary instruction is that it may become too serious, too traditional and too microscopic. The danger in interdisciplinary instruction is that, if it is not properly done, it may become nebulous, unbalanced and not serious enough. In experimenting with new techniques interdisciplinary education must at all costs avoid the image of being "easy," disorganized or trivial.

Finally, lest I seem too hard on specialists, let me say that "some of my best friends are specialists!" I would never deny that the specialist has a fundamental part to play in the knowledge game. Generalists would have nothing to generalize about if they were not furnished by specialists with the knowledge that can only be gained through intensive study in a narrow field. The problem is that higher education today is almost totally dominated by specialists. Even most college general education programs are designed by calling together a committee of disciplinary specialists and saying to them, "Now design some interdisciplinary stuff." The rate of recidivism in these committees is as high as that of convicted criminals, and, to mix metaphors, Congress sees no logrolling greater than the recommendations of such committees, which usually come out with pork barrel legislation designed to give each discipline a potentially equal chance at the student pie.

With its idea of "areas of contrast" Whittier College is at least innovative in its disciplinary politics. The common device is "distribution requirements," which give the appearance of breadth while retaining the same old narrow depth. The result is spotty education, not general education, with both student and faculty cooperating to maintain their pristine ignorance of any field they haven't already studied, think they won't like, or are convinced, in their ignorance, they'll never need to know anything about. This is the normal outcome of specialist domination of academia, and it is well past time that a real balance is struck, that specialists are removed from control of the general education programs, and that people who have the talent for generalist education are, first, valued, because that is the primary need and the primary lack in academia and elsewhere today, and, second, that they are given control over the design and administration of the general education program.

Eugene Wine
Convention Report:
FOCUSING ON GENERAL EDUCATION AT CHICAGO AAHE

Peyton Richter

The spotlight during discussions of general education at the AAHE 1978 National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago (March 19-22) played back and forth upon Harvard's Dean Henry Rosovsky and the Harvard Report on the Core Curriculum. A modest but confident pragmatist, Rosovsky, as a panelist at a major session of the conference, began by reminding us that welcoming college graduates each year to the company of educated men and women makes sense only if we know what an educated person is. He and his committee, after much discussion and deliberation, had decided that an educated person: (1) must be able to think, read and write clearly and effectively; (2) should have a critical appreciation of the ways in which we gain knowledge and understanding of ourselves, our universe and our society; (3) must have some acquaintance with other cultures and other times; (4) must have some understanding of and experience in thinking about moral and ethical problems; and (5) should have some knowledge in depth. Upon these beliefs the Harvard Faculty Committee had proceeded to design a new core to replace the old general education requirements of the mid-forties ("The Red Book"). (The new plan, which, he pointed out, would put constraints on only one year of Harvard's four year undergraduate program, is described in the March 6, 1978 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education.) In Rosovsky's opinion, the core proposal would represent at least "a small step forward," although he stressed that it might have limited applicability. Neither he nor his colleagues were trying to tell anyone else what they ought to do in the unique contexts of their own institutions. To the contrary, he made it clear that he favored diversity of programs and a plurality of goals rather than some kind of nationally defined norms, standardized curricula, and bureaucratic controls for colleges.
Up on the stage sharing the linear "round table" with Dean Rosovsky were two other panelists, one of whom, Sister Joel Read, president of Alverno College and past president of AAHE, later spoke enthusiastically in support of goals similar if not identical to those set forth by Rosovsky. Her own view was that liberal/general education must emphasize two facets of human achievement: heritage and invention. Like Rosovsky, Sister Read proceeded upon the assumption that an ideal of an educated person could be formulated and ought to guide efforts in curriculum building and teaching. Also like Rosovsky she did not attempt to pontificate or proselytize. Neither she nor he was suggesting revolutionary forms or even taking positions that would provoke controversy.

But fortunately for the inner life of controversy (for, alas, there was little enough real controversy or authentic dialogue around that rectangular round table), there was another panelist who spoke between Rosovsky and Reed. This was Dr. Jesse Hiraoka, who is director of the Human Services Program and Ethnic Studies at Western Washington University. Hiraoka, in his quiet, dry (but never dull) manner succeeded, in my opinion, in cutting the ground from under the Rosovsky/Reed basically essentialist position, although it seemed that few in the audience (and no one on the stage) realized the devastating implications of his presentation.

If I understood Hiraoka correctly, he was arguing that general/liberal education, as it is usually defined, rests upon a mistake. Further, it has not yet faced up to its greatest challenge: that of trying to embrace the wider human condition with all of its disjunctions, discontinuities, irrationalities, diversities, and complexities. Its philosophy has usually been based on the concept of a coherent reality, but what if reality is not coherent? Its practitioners have usually focused on Humanity or on "the educated person" but such categories are too "vague and exclusive, almost arrogant;" they are too narrow and constraining to have existential immediacy and relevance to alienated minority groups such as blacks, women, and the aged. These groups, more often than not, are preoccupied with defining private rather than public space, with developing shared sentiments rather than understanding abstract ideas, and with re-entry and survival in an increasingly complex and disruptive society. If general/liberal education is to have significance and relevance today it must be viewed as apprenticeship, not in the career sense, but as apprenticeship in the development of sentiments, attitudes, thought and perception. It must be more concerned with stabilizing fields rather than unifying them. It must take into account the collective as well as the individual, the facts and experiences that fall outside of its disciplines along with those that can be included within them. In brief, general/liberal education, to be truly general and liberal, must broaden its discourse.

Hiraoka's brilliant iconoclastic critique — was it positivistic or existentialist in its genesis? — seemed to fall for the most part on deaf ears. Apparently the other panelists heard (or comprehended) nothing to object to in his remarks. Hiraoka, for his part, did not seem interested in waking anybody up, a la Zarathustra, by shouting in a crowded hall: "The God of General Education is Dead!" Instead of disagreeing, everyone complimented everyone else, and after a few second remarks ("As an empirical scientist," Rosovsky quipped, "I reached one conclusion — that I'm the only one that observed the time limit") and a few tame questions from the audience (I never got a chance to ask a wild one), the chair, as he was referred to on the program, the chair, who turned out to be another gracious essentialist, the Reverend Ernest Bartell, director of the
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education of HEW, pronounced the benediction and everyone sauntered out to nearby bars and restaurants. Those who went outside soon got a proper Chicago drenching.

But the Rosovsky Report later came in for critical commentary at the Conference in a small meeting called by two young educators, both deans, Thomas Maher (Siena Heights) and John Stephenson (University of Kentucky). These men, who have organized and held two previous Shakertown conversations on general education at Pleasant Hill, Kentucky (the second of which I attended) had been trying to organize a new "voice for General Education" but so far seemed to have been singing a duet. Although the Harvard Report was no \textit{bête noire} to them (at most only a \textit{bête rouge}) and they said that "Harvard's model has much to be said for it", they wanted to know why \textit{Harvard} should always be determining the direction in which general education ought to go? Why should a few of the \textit{Harvard} faculty always be firing the shot heard round the quad? (Incidentally, Fred M. Hechinger gave the answer in "Retreat from Anarchy" in the \textit{Saturday Review} of April 1, 1978 (p. 18): "When no less a figure than Harvard's dean Henry Rosovsky says bluntly, 'At Harvard, there has been no formal review of undergraduate education since 1945,' it is clear that general education, the heart and soul of undergraduate education, is in trouble — not only at this college but throughout the country. Harvard, the nation's first university, is, after all, higher education's weather vane.")

Maher and Stephenson felt the need for "a national independent association" or "invisible college" of persons "concerned about the future of a common learning." They hoped to see formed an "ongoing network of people" who could speak out with authority on the concerns of general education. Whether anything will be proclaimed by the proposed new voice remains to be seen, and of course several AGLS members wondered why the new voice couldn't join the already formed chorus. Before the conference was over the two deans seemed ready to encourage dialogue if not collaboration between the two groups, and their call for an alternative and more highly amplified voice for general education had in fact begun to stimulate new ideas beyond the Harvard Report.

If there was no new voice for general education heard at the Conference there were certainly plenty of old voices. The Core curriculum in four different campus settings — community college, four year college, independent university, and state university — was the topic of a panel sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, but as I was on a panel which had unfortunately been scheduled concurrently, I was unable to hear it. A faculty team from Boston University College of Basic Studies had been invited by AGLS to describe a team taught interdisciplinary program. The panelists who described their various interrelated domains were Robert Hayes (Psychology and Counseling), Frederick Koss (Social Science), George Estey (Rhetoric), Charles Fogg (Science), and Peyton Richter (Humanities). As the Dean of the College, Brendan Gilbane, pointed out in introducing the panel, the team was not trying to prove a case for general education as much as to explain how one program over a period of twenty-five years had been able to meet the challenges presented to a general education core curriculum, thus avoiding becoming another segment of the disaster area which supposedly general education had become. The presentation related team methodology and curriculum design to four central values which together constitute the philosophy of general education at the College of Basic Studies: (1) Personalism — the belief that persons are supreme values in the world; (2) Self-development — the belief that a college must aim at helping
every person develop more fully the resources with which he or she is endowed; (3) Cooperative effort — the joint team effort which is used in teaching and guiding students toward their maximum self-development; and (4) Wholistic approach — "We attempt," as one panelist remarked, "not only to relate and to integrate different fields of knowledge but also to help students to develop a frame of orientation and devotion (a budding Weltanschauung) within which they can continue to learn, relate, and grow."

No one may have come away from the Chicago discussions a "born-again general educator" but many must have felt afterwards, as I did, a sense of relief that the rumors of the death of general education had (as usual) been greatly exaggerated and a sense of determination to find new means of revitalizing and defending the only kind of education that can lay firmly the foundations of a "unified knowledge unifying life."

Boston University
College of Basic Studies
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