EDITORIAL

Education throughout history has been bedevilled by proclamations — not the least of which are proclamations about what education *is*. Education is a *process*. Education is a *social institution*. Education is a *means* to certain ends. Education is an *end in itself*. Of course, education is all of these things and more. And a journal devoted to the discussion of educational ideas must contribute to the clarification of what education is and does in specific geographic or historic contexts or when it attempts to transcend geography and history. *The Journal of Educational Thought,* as our readers know, has steadily addressed itself to this kind of clarification. We are pleased, once again, to publish in this issue five articles on whether, why and how education is a process, an institution, a means and an end.

Kenneth D. Benne's "Continuity and Discontinuity in Educational Development" is our initial exhibit. He reminds us that while the optimistism imbedded in the word "development" would be useful as a prod to mobilize our energies, it should not create a sense of euphoria in us. Development — or redevelopment as he prefers to call it — requires hard work based on new assumptions and new organizations for facilitating new human relations. His major thesis is that the "current crisis in industrialized and urban societies is basically a struggle between rival principles for ordering life and learning." This is followed by a discussion of the rival principles themselves, one of which is based on mechanical systems where "surprise" is unwelcome and minimized, and the other on organic systems where "surprise" is legitimate and indeed welcome. Benne also makes concrete suggestions for an organic ordering of organization life. His comments about student protests and protests against WASP values in North America are of topical significance.

T. H. Taylor in "Education and the Technostate" asserts that an emerging governmental and social organization has made more urgent than ever the reorganization of school curriculum. The principles he propounds — namely, breaking down haloed dualisms such as work and leisure and replacing a "bits and pieces curriculum" with a unified curriculum — are clearly derived from John Dewey. Their interpretation in the context of what Taylor calls the Technostate and the suggestion for a tri-ordinate curriculum for the general education of the citizen are thought provoking.

John Vaizey's "Education and Economic Development" comes to the readers at a time when it is fashionable for some educators to claim that economists have demonstrated the desirability of expenditures on education as investments which yield high returns. Vaizey points out

the many theoretical and empirical problems — such as separating cause and effect — in relating education and economic growth. He is also skeptical about whether manpower planning in developing countries will do much, if any, good. While one may have reservations about the structure and flow of Vaizey's arguments at specific points, one can agree with him on a rather obvious point: it is the combination of social relationships, skills and outlooks, with the managerial structure, the government and above all physical capital which together affects the rate of growth.

We have heard and read much about "law and order" in connection with the recent American elections. The issues arising from the phrase are far more complex and subtle than the phrase itself suggests. This becomes clear on reading "Rights and Education" by John Martin Rich. Using a social formulation of the principles of human dignity and the procedure of differential need, Rich discusses two issues: the right of teachers to strike and the case of student militance on university campuses. Although there are many more matters which should be considered for a more complete discussion of these issues in the context of "rights," the essay does point to the political and sociological, not to say philosophical, factors which complicate the issue of law and order.

How will teachers, professors and administrators respond to an assertion by a sociologist that the content of subject matter taught in a classroom is trivial and irrelevant when compared to other functional imperatives such as socialization training? This is precisely T. R. Young's claim in "The Sociology of Classroom Teaching: A Microfunctional Analysis." Young's view is that what goes on in the classroom is significant not because the learning of, say, history or mathematics is significant but because the classroom gives students practice in constructing, continuing and disbanding social systems. This different explanation of classroom interaction ought to provoke some spirited discussion.

Mathew Zachariah