Social Work Education: Radical Thought in Action

Peninah A. Chilton

Marsha R. Ellentuck

Eileen M. Gilkenson

Sharon A. Jachter

Tenley K. Stillwell

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION:
RADICAL THOUGHT IN ACTION

Peninah A. Chilton, M.S.W.
Marsha R. Ellentuck, M.S.W.
Eileen M. Gilkenson, M.S.W.
Sharon A. Jachter, M.S.W.
Tenley K. Stillwell, M.S.W.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Through the experiences of a group of social work students, this pa-
per critiques social work education and deals with two levels of the
educational experience: the oppressive atmosphere of the school and
the conceptual content of the curriculum. An alternative model is
presented, which attempts to combine radical social work theory with
a radicalized educational process and methodology.

A recent issue of <u>Social Work</u> highlighted some of the controversy
within the profession regarding the current state of social work educa-
tion.[1] Expressing dissatisfaction with the range of differences among
school curricula, leading professionals debate such topics as the mer-
its of a generic versus a specific approach, and the utility of various
clinical methodologies. None of these areas of disagreement, however,
challenge theoretical assumptions common to all the approaches or ques-
tion the accepted value base of the profession.

This article will relate how we, a group of students at a school of
social work, responded to what we identified as fundamental deficien-
cies in our educational environment by forming a student support and
study group. What follows is an account of the evolution of what has
become known as the Radical Social Work Group. Since part of our dis-
content with traditional social work education has been with philosoph-
ical abstractions that have little relation to the real dilemmas of
concrete situations, we feel it is important to ground our conceptual
framework in the context of the group process. Therefore, in writing
this article, we have consciously chosen to recount some of our group's

experiences, as well as to conceptualize the development of an analysis of social work education.

The observations and criticisms of the school which we recount are our own perceptions, which may or may not be shared by fellow students. Nevertheless, we do believe that the type of response we initiated to these perceived conditions has developed into a unique effort -- a sustained, organized attempt to develop an alternative learning experience. Many of the issues we have raised and the contradictions with which we have struggled, are common to other students in schools of social work and the profession in general. For this reason, it is our hope that our experience will further stimulate discussion about the nature of social work education and provide the beginnings of a model for restructuring and revitalizing programs of study.

CRITIQUE OF CONVENTIONAL SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Although each of us had individual reasons for becoming group members, from the outset we identified a common base of frustration. Our dissatisfaction was with both the oppressive atmosphere of the school and the content of class sessions. In the following section, we will deal first with our experience of oppression as students, and then proceed to address the deficiencies of class content.

Oppressive Atmosphere

We identified a pervasive atmosphere of rigidity at the School of Social Work as one source of our oppression. Being expected to respond to a variety of demands, we had little input into academic decisions. Our course selection, as well as field placements, were predetermined. We were confronted with a structure which delineated how virtually all our time would be spent. Thus, we were immersed in a flurry of activity, churning out voluminous assignments while also attempting to meet the requirements of the field agencies. Any attempt to question the suitability of a field agency, or any failure to meet an assignment deadline, was regarded as immature and resistant behavior inconsistent with a professional approach.

In addition to the onerous work load, there were more subtle pressures promoting conformity. One was expected to participate in class, and to do so within prescribed limits. We were required to vent our innermost feelings and attitudes. Anger was encouraged, provided we were able to "deal with the negative" and accept the "reality" of social institutions by assuming the function of the agency. The message was obedience and adaptation. Despite their pseudo-activist rhetoric, we felt pressured to passively accept the school's regime. We were conscious, moreover, of the ever-present threat of being "counseled out" for expressing inappropriate attitudes. [2]

This type of educational methodology, and the atmosphere of fear and suspicion which it engenders, is by no means unique to schools of social work. Critics of the American educational system discuss the negative effects of the socialization process to which students in general are subjected. Farber, in his controversial book Student As Nigger, notes examples of how creativity is stifled in classrooms where pupils exercise thought only within narrow limits. The "how" of learning, he asserts, is more important than the "what". [3] Similarly, Paulo Freire, a Latin American educator, rejects what he labels the "banking model of education", which assumes that knowledge is something which is given to those who

know nothing by those who know. [4] He views such domination of student by teacher as a fundamentally oppressive relationship which fosters dependency. Within this structure, one cannot learn to develop a questioning stance toward the world.[5]

Others depict American schools as institutions which socialize individuals to perpetuate authoritarian, competitive relationships and value systems essential to the maintenance of our capitalist society.[6] The schools' emphasis on "proper behavior" fosters an uncritical attitude among students, which prepares them to fit into roles and acquire job goals consistent with the demands of the labor market.

Within this context, it can be argued that schools of social work prepare students to assume their places in the work force. As Bowles and Gintis put it:

> Schools...create and reinforce patterns of social class, racial
> and sexual identification among students which allow them to
> relate "properly" to their eventual standing in the heirarchy
> of authority and status in the production process. Schools fos-
> ter types of personal development compatible with the relation-
> ships of dominance and subordinacy in the economic sphere...[7]

Though the oppressive atmosphere of schools of social work is in some respects similar to the conditions that exist at other educational institutions, there is evidence to suggest that social work schools are unique in both the types and degree of pressures to which students are subjected. Piven and Cloward discuss the extent to which students are infantilized and trained to perform agency function.[8] Others cite the maternalistic attitude adopted by the faculty and the difficulty of negotiating the necessarily conflicting demands of agency placement and school curriculum as being dilemnas particular to social work students.[9] As new students, we faced the glaring contradiction between the reality of our oppression and the school's avowed commitment to social change and the Rankian theory of maximizing human growth and development. The struggle to reconcile these discrepancies was a strong impetus for our coming together to find another way.

Deficiencies in Conceptual Frameworks

This section will deal with the nature of our discontent with the specific content of class sessions; i.e., deficiencies we perceived both in the theoretical material itself and in the manner in which the subject matter was taught. We will first make some general critical observations of the curriculum, and then relate this analysis to four key theoretical concepts: practice for social change, eradication of racism, functional social work, and systems theory.

All our courses shared the lack of a cohesive, fully developed political-economic analysis of social conditions. There was, moreover, a common tacit acceptance of capitalism and its value system. This stance is inherent in the definition of three social work values as expressed in the following Working Definition of Social Work Practice:

> The individual is the primary concern of society...An essential
> attribute of a democratic society is the realization of the full
> potential of each individual and the assumption of his social
> responsibility through active participation in society...Society
> has a responsibility to provide ways in which obstacles to this

self-realization can be overcome or prevented. [10]

This emphasis on individual self-actualization is a capitalist view of the person in society. Within this framework, ultimate societal goals are conceived of as the result of the sum of the satisfaction of many individual needs. As Gottschalk puts it, social welfare thus serves to "...encourage, promote, and maximize self sufficiency." [11] Such a perspective further implies that the capitalist system is capable of meeting these individual needs. Independent efforts, rather than cooperative acts, are stressed. This view is consistent with the capitalist concept of competition in the marketing of goods and services. There is also no suggestion of any conflict between the goals of the social system and those of the individual. On the contrary, there is the inherent assumption of a fundamental harmony of interest between the two. By failing to examine some of these underlying assumptions, our classes in effect supported, rather than challenged, the status quo.

The school's approach to the concept of social work practice for social change is one example of this dearth of analysis. From the beginning of our contact with the school, we were told that we should "be about social change." The school catalogue states:

The [M.S.W.] program places emphasis on learning professional practice for social change directed toward the achievement of distributive justice in the social services...[13]

In the course of our two years, this view of social change was not further explicated. The term itself was part of the jargon of the school, a catch-all which could encompass activities ranging from a minute change effort to a large-scale revolution. Emphasizing the complexity of this concept and its common misuse, Tropp points out the danger of uncritically advocating for change. Not all change, he asserts, is desirable and change can be oppressive as well as liberating.[13]

Besides the vagueness of the concept itself, there was little discussion of what means should be employed in change efforts. The specified goal of distributive justice was not defined. The question of whether redistribution of resources would involve a major restructuring of society was not raised. Students were left with the dilemma of how this goal could be accomplished.

Because the system itself, with its interlocking political, economic, social, and value components was not critically analyzed, discussion of change strategies was necessarily limited. Without a grasp of the total milieu in which change efforts would be attempted, and the resultant awareness of the political nature of all such efforts, the concept of social change was devoid of meaning. This narrow perspective accepted the existing social structure as given, and prevented the formulation of creative change proposals that would involve an extensive reordering of existing priorities.

We had similar problems with the manner in which the subject of racism was taught. Since the eradication of racism is identified by the school as "...a central priority and major focus for social change"[14] many of our class discussions focused on this issue. Racism was examined both in its interpersonal and institutional forms with major emphasis on formulating strategies to attack the latter.

Agreeing that racism is indeed a critical social problem, our group felt
that racism was approached from the same limited perspective as social change.
Although we did study the history of racism, it was presented as an isolated
phenomenon. Connections were not made between racist practices and the manner
in which the capitalist system has helped to perpetuate their existence. Similar-
ly, the interrelationships between racism and other forms of oppression which
serve to support the system (e.g. sexism), were not explored. On the contrary,
if the topic was raised in class discussion, the teacher would often dismiss it
with the comment that we were avoiding confronting our own racism. This stance
was conceptually naive and denied an additional dimension to the analysis of this
complex problem.

Functional social work theory, which originated at our school, is often
taught in first year practice courses. According to this theory:

> Social work ... consists of the administering of programs of
> social services, supported by society in its own interest,
> as well as the interest of the immediate clientele served. [15]

The theory emphasizes that social workers derive their sanction from society by
carrying out the function of the social work agency. Smalley states, "The primary
purpose is accomplishment of the agency's social purpose ..."[16]

Our principal criticism of this theory was that it assumed that the welfare
of the client and the function of the agency are congruent. Agencies are viewed
as benefactors. The reality of the situation is that often they are also oppres-
sors. The discrepancy between the goals of the agency and the needs of the client
often necessitates the worker's confronting the agency on behalf of the client to
obtain even minimal benefits from the agency. Piven and Cloward emphasize that
agencies operate primarily to perpetuate their own existence, and, within the frame-
work of society at large, operate as a means of social control.[17] The functional
approach, which represents the agency and worker in isolation from the impact of
outside forces, lacks a broad societal perspective. The social worker is given
tacit permission to defer to the agency function, rather than to raise questions
about the legitimacy of its existence and its ability to respond to the expressed
needs of its clientele.

Systems theory was also emphasized in our program. According to Pincus and
Minahan, the goal of this approach is to:

(1) enhance the problem-solving and coping capacities of
     people,
(2) link people with systems that provide them with re-
     sources, services, and opportunities,
(3) promote the effective and humane operation of these
     systems, and
(4) contribute to the development and improvement of
     social policy.[18]

Although this concept of a network of interlocking systems is a potentially useful
analytical tool, we found that this theory was also predicated on assumptions which
limited its perspective. The terminology which speaks of people being "linked"
with resources and "interacting" with systems presupposes that a process of ad-

justing or balancing of equal components can occur within this society. There is no distinction made between power differentials among systems. Systems are also presumed to be fundamentally humane; they are not recognized as being potentially oppressive as well. As with the other concepts, the fact that systems theory lacks a comprehensive analytic base, serves to obfuscate its underlying assumptions.[19]

ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE

Richan and Mendelsohn use the term "October Revolution" in referring to a typical reaction of new students at schools of social work who become disillusioned during the first few weeks of the school year.[20] Our response differed from this reaction in that we involved ourselves in a sustained, positive effort to create some viable alternatives to conventional social work theory, practice, and education. We were not content to direct our energies solely toward criticizing existing social work theories and educational processes. The next section of our discussion will focus first on the alternative educational process, and then on the conceptual framework, which we have developed over the past two years.

Our Collective Educational Process

In an attempt to develop an alternative learning process, we created a support group, and later an independent study course. The following paragraphs will delineate the major concepts that have emerged in our efforts to conceptualize our group process. We have recognized the key concepts as: collectivity, mutual, support and solidarity, peer supervision, dialogical relationships,and "students as the center of their own learning."

Rejecting individualism, which is rooted in capitalist ideology and manifested in the social services and social work education, we recognized collectivity as the pivotal concept in our formation of an alternative structure and process. In the beginning stages, we seemed to intuitively gravitate toward collectivity; our process was more spontaneous than consciously directed from a theoretical base. As we began to deal with what structure the group would assume, and what needs it would attempt to meet, we became more focused and conscious in our application of the principles of collectivity. We have come to make better use of collective decision-making, which does not preclude the needs of the individual. This has enabled each one of us to mesh our own needs with those of others in attempting to reach a decision which reflects the needs of the collective whole.

In contrast to the competitive and suspicion-laden atmosphere generated by our capitalist society and perpetuated through social and educational institutions, we attempted to create an atmosphere of mutual trust, support, and solidarity. The main thrust of our group process has been toward building mutual trust, without which there can be no genuine collectivity. Much of our collective energies have centered around lending support for the individual and group struggles. Through this process, we have developed a sense of solidarity, the meaning and significance of which has been noted by Freire:

> Solidarity requires that one enter into the situation of
> those with whom one is identifying; it is a radical posture.[21]

As our earlier discussion suggests, we were critical of the "banking model" of education, which encompasses teacher authority, student subordination and passivity, and a learning process devoid of mutual exchange and creativity. Acting in opposition to this stifling educational process, we attempted to apply the concepts of peer supervision, dialogical relationships, and "students as the center of their own learning" in developing an alternative learning process.

Each of us carries the responsibility for knowing when we need peer support and has brought to the group questions, issues, and trends to discuss. We see peer supervision, with its focus on fostering creativity, self-confidence, questioning and experimentation, as a way to guard against the potential impact of traditional tutorial supervision, commonly used to socialize the supervisee into a subordinate role. The perspectives of our peers serve to deepen our understanding and encourage further reflection about our work and its implications.

Through our experience as oppressed students has emerged a belief in the positive nature of dialogical relationships. Equality and reciprocity, which are the essence of the dialogical approach, are vital to any relationship which strives toward mutual trust and growth. Dialogical relationships embody both mutuality and respect for each individual's creative thought; learning must be an interdependent, rather than a dependent or solely independent process. Freire has captured this dialectic concept: "I cannot think for others or without others, nor can others think for me."[22]

In refusing to let professors and established theoreticians think for us, we met with resistance. Trying to compensate for the deficiencies in the traditional classroom approach and course content, our support group evolved into a study group and later an independent study class. From the beginning, the independent study was conceptualized as an alternative educational experience in which the students would truly be the "center of their own learning." In keeping with the collective framework, we all shared responsibilities and stressed the importance of the professor being a group participant.

Collective struggle became freeing as it empowered us to redefine the parameters of our education within a conventional M.S.W. program. Both the support group and the independent study class, which were simply different components of a total process, moved us toward building a dialectical relationship with the school -- one in which the opposing forces, school and students, would give and take.

Construction of a Radical Theory Base

Whereas the oppression we felt as students motivated us to create an alternative type of learning experience, the deficiencies we perceived in the traditional social work theories taught at school inspired us to investigate alternative

theories. As suggested earlier, we were frustrated with the gaps left by liberal ideology in accounting for the expansiveness of social problems and in offering an adequate explanation on the interrelationships between our economic, political, and social systems. Our leftist inclinations directed us to seek a more comprehensive explanation in radical thought. In the following section, we will present the radical theoretical and practice concepts which we found most meaningful in our struggle to piece together an analysis which would fill the voids in traditional social work theory.

Identifying the failure of the social services to promote human welfare as a by-product of the exploitative nature of capitalism, we realized the need to supplement our nascent analysis with some economic theory. We chose to begin our critique of the capitalist system with the study of Marxist economics rather than a more conservative economic theory, for we were seeking an analysis which would explicate the deficiencies of capitalism.

From this study we came to understand more clearly why the capitalist system is intrinsically exploitative. As an economic system based on the profit motive, capitalism is perpetuated by the profits extracted from workers' labor. These profits, which are concentrated in the hands of the few who own the means of production, are generated only by people working for wages which are less than the value of their labor. In such a system, human labor is equated with the other commodities which comprise the means of production, such as raw materials, machines, and productive equipment. Capitalism, then, is a system in which accumulation of wealth cannot occur without the degradation and alienation of human life.

From such a purely economic substructural analysis, we moved on to examine how this exploitation is manifested in other areas of society. We attempted to apply radical economic theory to an analysis of societal institutions which compose the superstructure. We learned that this superstructure both mirrors, and impacts upon, the material base of the society. Jalée describes this relationship in stating:

> ...although the superstructure originates as a reflection of
> the infrastructure (substructure) which determined it, yet it
> has a life of its own and becomes an active force which may,
> in its turn, influence the economic structure of society.[25]

This radical economic analysis led us to formulate the linkages between capitalism and racism. The oppression of the Black population in this country originated with the plantatation owners' thirst for profit. Continuing economic exploitation has buttressed the development of racist rationalizations for the blatant inequities between Black and White. Capitalism, in turn, thrives on racism, which cannot be eradicated without the elimination of capitalism. We have concluded that the abolition of capitalism is a necessary, but not singularly sufficient, precondition for the elimination of racism. Thus, we believe that the struggle against racism is imperative, but that such a struggle must be informed, in our social work practice and elsewhere, by a radical critique of the economic basis of racism.[26]

Similarly, the oppression of women is rooted in economic exploitation. With the advent of private property, the division of labor between men and women first became oppressive. Men, who had assumed primary responsibility for the procurement of food, then claimed the ownership of all the means of production in relation to these responsibilities. Women labored in breeding and raising children, and in executing household chores. However, since the material implements used in their work were minimal, women did not accumulate any considerable wealth as a result of their labor. Estranged from the means of production, women began to lose status, for wealth had become that which afforded one status.[27] Although modern women have begun to gain status in certain areas, economic factors continue to perpetuate sexual inequality. As with racism, it is in the interest of the capitalist system to preserve the existence of sexism. The high frequency of differential pay scales by sex and of unpaid domestic labor are but two examples of how the system benefits by perpetuation sexual exploitation.

In developing a radical critique of capitalism, racism, and sexism, we came to realize the significant role played by the social services with respect to these, and other forms of discrimination. The social services perpetuate inequality and exploitation. Rather than serving to equalize wealth and resources, the social services pacify oppressed people by offering them crumbs and band-aids. Thus, the social services support an exploitative system by making it appear more humane in its service of the poor. Social workers, as practioners of the social services, help preserve this veil of humaneness, which obscures the harsh and intrinsically inequitable nature of the system.

Progression to this point in our analysis gave us our first clues as to what the essential elements in a radical social work practice should be. If the social services and social work conceal the exploitative character of the economic system and blur the contradictions inherent in such a system, then the task of radical social work must be to unveil the truth through what Freire calls conscientization. This concept involves a process of "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality."[28] It is through the development of this critical consciousness that the masses will be able to transform their reality.[29]

Our studies revealed that oppression is not solely, or even mostly psychological, but rather that psychological and social distortions are a by-product of the economic reality of oppression. We realized that the radical social work response must focus on empowering people to change the oppressive reality.

Our radical analysis has inspired us with a vision of what the goal of social change should be. Our aim is for systematic structural change, including a massive redistribution of wealth and resources. It became clear that the struggle for this type of social change requires that radical social workers seek strategies for collective action. While not ignoring the particular needs of each individual, we saw the necessity of expanding the scope of social work to encompass collective conscientization and empowerment of entire client groups.

-843-

Praxis — Unity of Radical Theory and Practice

Our initial recognition of the lack of an adequate economic-political analysis in social work theory had led us eventually to piece together a radical social work theory, which incorporated elements of Marxist economics, a radical critique of the "isms" and of the social services, and a redefinition of the social work concepts and goals. Developing a more advanced analysis, however, was not our only aim. As social workers, we were painfully aware that such analysis would be of little value unless it could be utilized to inform and radicalize our practice. In a real sense, our entire process has involved our development of praxis — the unity of action and reflection, theory and practice. In this last section, we will illustrate how praxis can become the radical process which integrates and brings to life the principles of radical analysis already discussed.

In the process of coming to grips with the theory of praxis, we progressed through three distinct levels of conceptualization. In the early days of our group, we had debated whether to be an action or a study group. We did not realize then that we were asking the wrong question; we were artificially separating two activities which were part of one dialectical process. Slowly we began to incorporate this concept into our group, unconsciously at first, and later purposefully. So, in the Fall term of our second year we attempted to introduce an "action component" into our studies. We planned several activities aimed at consciousness-raising and action. However, we later realized that at this point we had only grasped a rudimentary conception of praxis. Our use of the terms "action component" and "study component" reveals that we saw the need for integration of theory and practice, but still conceptualized these as separate entities. Further study eventually helped us to understand that praxis embodies theory-practice -- a fusion rather than a dichotomization of these forms of human activity.

In the dialectics of Marx and Hegel, we found the philosophic underpinnings for our early experiential understanding of the theory-practice fusion. Marx speaks of "the significance of 'revolutionary', of practical-critical activity'."[30] It was not until our involvement in a housekeepers' strike during the Fall of our second year, however, that we moved toward solidifying our understanding of this unity.

The strike began in August of 1977, when the University of Pennsylvania fired a unionized 343-person housekeeping unit, of which the majority were Black women, and subcontracted out for this service. Our group, working alongside others, took up the cause of the victimized housekeepers. Among other activities, we organized a day-long School of Social Work moratorium and teach-in on the strike, which was attended by two hundred people. The teach-in, which fused information, analysis, strategizing, and action, represented an expression and experience in collective praxis. This experiential understanding of the theory-practice dynamic has been invaluable to us.

As we began to create a praxis which was meaningful to us, other important linkages became apparent. We combined our rudimentary understanding of praxis with our understanding of the concepts of collectivity and conscientization, and out of this emerged a more advanced synthesis of radical social work.

We have come to realize that our group cannot be the sole "owners" of praxis, for praxis only becomes viable when it is shared with others and, thus, embodies mutuality and equality. In short, praxis is meaningless without collectivity. Freire focuses on this quality of praxis when he states that:

> The revolutionary effort ... cannot designate its leaders as its
> thinkers and the oppressed as mere doers ... leaders who deny
> praxis to the oppressed thereby invalidate their own praxis.[31]

Expanding on Freire's point, it becomes clear that to be truly revolutionary, worker and client, teacher and student, organizer and community must establish relationships of equality as they explore together the experience of praxis. In the teach-in, we strove to involve faculty, students, and workers in such a collective learning and action, theory-practice experience.

Similarly, we fused our understanding of conscientization and praxis. To engage in praxis means becoming consciously political and sensitive to the implications of each political-social work action. We recognize, of course, that all social work is political. However, this does not mean that all social workers engage in praxis, for the critical consciousness of political-economic realities, which is essential to praxis, is generally lacking in conventional practice. Social work practice cannot, by the very nature of the activity, be "neutral" or "value-free". To claim that it can be so, denies that practice is inextricably bound to political theory, and, thus, negates praxis. Likewise, social work theories are never "value-free", for they are built on the experiences of people. A social worker who believes in neutrality is supporting the status quo. Addressing this point in this article "Praxis in the Human Services as a Political Act", David Gil states:

> As for the notion to politicize professional roles, I submit
> that this is not an innovation, but merely an effort to do
> consciously what happens anyway, unacknowledged, and without
> sufficient awareness. It has long been known that one latent
> function of professional practice is political stabilization
> of society, and, hence, such practice has political implications
> and consequences, whether we intend it that way or not. The
> widespread notion that professional practice is politically
> neutral is, therefore, erroneous and naive.[32]

Thus, praxis must encompass conscientization; making linkages between personal, social, political, and economic realities, exposing contradictions, and then acting in unison with others to create a more liberating reality.

The teach-in, which openly challenged the concept of professional neutrality, was a conscious political statement that emphasized: The connection between our oppression and dehumanization as students and workers, and that of the housekeepers, the solidarity that should exist between all workers (e.g. social workers and housekeeping workers), and the significance of unionization

to the protection of workers' rights. As with the teach-in, in the activities
we are currently organizing at the school, we encourage our fellow social
workers to make conscious political choices and to engage with us in a liber-
ating praxis. Using this approach, we attempt to introduce others to an analysis
and certain political choices which are generally not discussed at schools of
social work and by our profession, such as Marxist economics, socialism, radical
feminism, and worker solidarity. Thus, we are attempting to introduce others
to praxis -- to a unique form of practice, consciously infused with radical
theory.

Our group's process during the past two years has been characterized by
a positive movement from diffused frustration, a disjointed and ambiguous con-
ceptual analysis, and feelings of powerlessness, toward more focused and pur-
poseful activity, increasing conceptual clarity, a more refined political-
economic analysis, and greater consciousness and confidence in our use of
praxis and power. In the early stages, our group and radical activities were
supplementary to the traditional education program, but is has increasingly
become the center of our educational process. We have taken the school's rhetor-
ical commitment to the concept of "students as the center of their own learning",
and have made it a reality. We have consciously empowered ourselves as students
and social workers. It is our hope that others will join in this struggle, and
in so doing we will liberate ourselves, the schools of social work, and our
profession, so that we might collectively build a new society.

NOTES

[1]The issue referred to is Social Work, Vol. 22, No. 5, September,
1977. For a succinct overview of the issue see Scott Briar's, "In Summary",
p. 415.

[2]This phrase is equivalent to being forced to withdraw from the program.

[3]Jerry Farber, The Student As Nigger, (Hollywood, California: Contact
Books, 1969) p.14

[4]Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, (New York: The Seabury Press,
1970) Chapter 2.

[5]On yet another level, Freire argues that this model is antithetical
to the essential nature of man as embodied in what he explains the anthro-
pological concept of culture to be: "It clarifies the role of men in the
world and with the world as transforming rather than adaptive beings."
Freire, op. cit., p. 114

[6]For example see: Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Cap-
italist America, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976) p. 12

[7]Ibid., p. 11.

[8]Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven, "Notes Toward A Radical Social Work," in Radical Social Work, ed. by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975) p. xvi-xvii.

[9]Willard C. Richan and Allen R. Mendelsohn, Social Work, The Unloved Profession, (New York: New Viewpoints, 1973), p. 73-80

[10]Harriet M. Bartlett, The Common Base of Social Work Practice, (Washington, D. C. NASW, 1970) p.221

[11]Shimon S. Gottschalk, "Towards a Radical Reassessment of Social Work Values, Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, July, 1977, p.130

[12]University of Pennsylvania Bulletin, School of Social Work Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, July, 1976), p.17

[13]Emmanuel Tropp, "Approaching the Concept of Change in Education for Social Workers, "Journal of Education for Social Work, January, 1971, p.99.

[14]Ibid., p. 6.

[15]Ruth Elizabeth Smalley, Theory for Social Work Practice, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 102

[16]Ibid., p. 104-105

[17]Piven and Cloward, op. cit. pp. vii-xlviii.

[18]Allen Pincus and Ann Minahan, Social Work Practice: Model and Method, (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1973) p.9

[19]Peter Leonard, "Towards a Paradigm for Radical Practice," in Radical Social Work, ed. by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1975) p. 48.

[20]Richan and Mendelsohn, op. cit., p. 92

[21]Freire, op. cit., p. 34

[22]Ibid., p. 100

[23]This concept commonly referred to at the School of Social Work as well as other educational institutions.

[24]Pierre Jalee, *How Capitalism Works*, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977) p. 36

[25]For a Black Marxist critique of white colonialism see: Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1963)

[26]For a detailed discussion of this analysis see: Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, (New York: Path-finder Press, 1972), especially Chapter 2.

[27]Freire, op. cit., translator's note, p. 19

[28]For a more detailed discussion of conscientization see: Freire, op. cit., especially pp. 100-118.

[29]Karl Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach," in *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*, ed. by Loyd Easton and Kurt H. Guddat (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Anchor Books, 1967), p. 400. For further discussion of Hegel's and Marx's theory of praxis, see Richard V. Bernstein, *Praxis and Action*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971), pp. 11-83

[30]Freire, op. cit.,p.120

[31]David Gil, "Praxis in the Human Services as a Political Act," *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, March 1976, pp. 473-474.