KENNETH D. BENNE

Boston University

Continuity and Discontinuity In Educational Development

"Development" has become a god-term in the thinking and rhetoric of theorists and practitioners of the contemporary arts of politics, economics and education. It points to an area of thought and action which links theorizing and research on the one hand with needed alterations — hopefully, improvements — in economic, political, social and educational practices on the other. This mid-ground between basic and disinterested investigations of phenomena and customary and traditional arts of practice is, of course, the domain of technology and engineering. The products of developmental research are technologies, principles and strategies of making, doing and organizing which, on the one hand, are knowledge-based and also are shaped relevantly to the improvement of practice, to the better meeting of unmet or inadequately met human and social needs.

It may be a remnant of a lingering colonial mentality within us that when we project developmental activities into the economic or educational systems of non-Western nations, we tend to speak of the *development* of *underdeveloped* countries. When we think of applying knowledge in the improvement of the far from satisfactory life of our own cities, we speak of urban *redevelopment*. We may, thus, be more willing to grant that practitioners of life in our urban ghettoes are already developed, that they have a going set of rationales and theories to support their present strategies of living and technologies of survival and adaptation to environment, in short that they are already possessed of a culture. If we grant this, we, outside the ghettoes, cannot sanely develop new practices of life for ghetto dwellers, in a one-way imperialistic thrust of do-gooding, out of our own cultural frameworks, although at times we may try to do so. Their present strategies, rationales, theories, including value systems, must be jointly and collaboratively *interaccommodated* to strategies and technologies of practice which are based on scientific research and are imbued with the world views and value assumptions of the scientific enterprise and of middle class culture, if developmental changes in ghetto life are to occur at all.

I might say in passing that we tend to deal with student protests against academic culture more in the image of developing *underdeveloped* coun-

tries, rather than as a joint task of *redevelopment* through creative bargaining. Actually, I believe that all developmental work with human systems, in which the participants are more than a few months old, is *redevelopment* and needs to be approached as a collaborative transaction rather than as a one-way imperialistic thrust of do-gooding on the part of the developers. This belief will color all of the observations on developmental work in education which follow.

Why has "development" or, if I am right, "redevelopment", become a god-term in the language of contemporary managers in various institutions of social practice? It is, I think, because of a growing realization among these managers that the maintenance and stability of contemporary institutions can come, not through preventing or forestalling change but rather through more or less deliberate changing in the service of newly emergent values, along with the values inherent in institutional stability and continuity. Where *conservation* was once the figure in the manager's perceptual field and *changing* the ground, today changing is tending to become his central responsibility and stabilization a peripheral one. Continuity with past values is now, so many have come to accept, impossible to achieve without taking the risks of discontinuity with past practices, norms and patterns. *The service of continuity through planned discontinuity with past traditions is at the core of many of the difficulties in the contemporary management of change.* And it is around this theme that I wish to organize my further comments on educational development.

The centrality of "development" as a term in the current language of managers of institutions and organizations is based on a growing realization of a contemporary condition which Robert Oppenheimer has described succinctly and eloquently.

> In an important sense this world of ours is a new world, in which the unity of knowledge, the nature of human communities, the order of ideas, the very notions of society and culture have changed and will not return to what they have been in the past. What is new is new not because it has never been there before, but because it has changed in quality. One thing that is new is the prevalence of newness, the changing scale and scope of change itself, so that the world alters as we walk in it, so that the years of man's life measure not some small growth or rearrangement or moderation of what he learned in childhood, but a great upheaval. To assail the changes that have unmoored us from the past is futile, and in a deep sense, I think, it is wicked. We need to recognize the change and learn what resources we have.[1]

If each of us were to "free associate" to the word "change," along with positively affective terms like "challenge," "opportunity," "growth" and "progress," we would find "loss," "destruction," "disorder," "tension," "struggle," "conflict" coming into our minds — into the same minds into which the positively affective terms also came. We are ambivalent about "change," however fully we grant cognitively and intellectually Oppenheimer's observation that today's "world alters even as we walk in it."

---

[1]Robert Oppenheimer, "Prospects in the Arts and Sciences," *Perspectives* USA, II (Spring 1955), pp. 10-11.

And, since "development" is a synonym for "change" and "changing," most of us are affectively ambivalent about "development" too. It is true that "development" suggests a sequential pattern to be found or created in processes of personal and social change. It connotes an orderly process for maintaining continuity between the goods of the past and the actualized values of a future which, we can be sure, will also be fraught with shocks and surprises.

"Development" is thus an optimistic term for describing and analyzing changes of various sorts. There is solace for liberal optimists — and most educators are heirs of the liberal-optimistic tradition — in using the term "development." For, although they can no longer have faith rationally in the idea of inevitable progress which fathered their world view, liberals still fervently hope for the possibility of its attainment if proper plans are made and steps taken. And "development" incorporates the hope for such attainment. There is nothing wrong with using optimistic terms in discussing prospects and processes of change in our "time of troubles." In fact, there are advantages in using terms which maximize human hope. For hope is itself a factor in quickening efforts to find and nourish seeds of growth and progress within the flux of change within which we live. But hope is silly and misleading if it diverts us from facing and dealing with the contemporary realities of conflict, tension, destruction, discontinuity out of which growth and progress must emerge today, if they are to come at all.

So as we grapple with issues of educational and social development and seek to generate rationally hopeful commitments to a better future, we should recognize and accept, we should not deny, the pains elicited by change, transition and discontinuity within our own experiences — the sense of loss and grief for old loyalties, old circles of closeness and security, old friends which achievement of "progress" and "bettering ourselves," with their attendant physical and social mobilities, bring into our lives; the sense of rootlessness which moving out of provincial securities into the challenge and excitement of more cosmopolitan ways of life brings to any or all of us when we listen to our hearts or, as a "mod" organ analogue, our guts; the sense of homelessness when we discover that we talk a different language from the language of our parents or our children; the desperately sad gaiety of the class reunion; the muted rage, accompanied by self-doubt, when we discover that our reasons for our favored way of life, convincing though these may be to us, are not convincing at all to people once under our power and control but now free to strike out on their own — be these other people's children or young people or newly liberated minorities, red or black or yellow. These suggest some of the inner feelings and emotions which define the human meaning of encounter with discontinuity in change or development — feelings which we must learn to recognize, acknowledge and manage, with all due respect for the maintenance of traditional goods and values, if development is ever to become for us a way of life and education.

Alfred North Whitehead recognized more than a generation ago the ineptness of our traditional mentalities to deal wisely with a qualitatively different social world in which perforce we must live today.

> Our sociological theories, our political philosophy, our practical maxims of business, and our doctrines of education are derived from an unbroken tradition and practical examples from the age of Plato. . . . The whole of this tradition is warped by the vicious assumption that each generation will substantially live amid the conditions governing the lives of their fathers and will transmit these conditions to mold with equal force the lives of its children. We are living in the first period of human history for which this assumption is false.[2]

It is difficult to know, a generation after he wrote, how far Whitehead's "vicious assumption" still operates in efforts to plan and manage change in various institutions of Western societies, as well as in societies in which methods of scientific research and technological innovation, major dynamic elements in continuously changing and rechanging the conditions of Western life, have not taken such deep root. But it is probably fair to say that in most institutions the "vicious assumption" still operates side by side with alternative assumptions more in keeping with the image of an institution or association or society continually renewing and developing itself by creative adaptation of its forms and controls and relationships to changing external and internal environments.

Let me make this schizoid quality in the management of change, which characterizes many institutions of our society, more clear through an example. A typical industry will spend millions of dollars in support of a research and development department charged with discovering, testing and evaluating *new* products, *new* processes and *new* technologies. Yet the production department in the same industry may well be run on the basis of hierarchical prescription and control of standardized job descriptions, roles and role relationships and procedures. Deviations from prescribed and standardized ways of behaving and relating within the organization are treated as discipline problems, as breaches of "traditionally sound" ways of maintaining the social system of the industry, even though the traditions may be no older than some recent upheaval and reorganization. When new products, processes and technologies from the R & D department are introduced into such a production department, calling for new job descriptions, new role relationships, new forms of human organization, the changeover is marked by resistance, conflict and lowered morale. Finally, some new *correct* norms for operating the human system will be imposed again. And these norms will be centrally maintained and controlled with much energy going into their policing and enforcement until further notice. The technical side of change tends to be handled by methods of inquiry, testing, experimentation; the human side of change is handled by prescription, fiat, "engineered consent." This schizoid quality in managing change permeates many institutions of Western indus-

---

[2]A. N. Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p. 117.

trialized societies. We tend to assume that the latest model of automobile or household appliance is best because it has the most recent research, inquiry and applied knowledge built into it. But we tend to judge the best political constitution, laws or ways of organizing human effort by its age and precedents — the older the better — by its pedigree, and by the prestige and status of its originator or present defenders. This discontinuity between ways of dealing with conflicts, with variations from established norms, of confronting differences among groups in adjacent areas of life which are actually inter-dependent, drives wedges between persons and groups in the same institutions and blocks wholeness and sanity of response in planning for and managing our changing environments.

It is true that some industrial organizations, as well as other organizations, are now establishing R & D departments to develop and facilitate experimentation with new forms of human organization and relationships, thus moving away from the "vicious assumption" on the social and human as well as the technical side of system change. Such efforts ordinarily include opportunities for re-education and training of organization members in self-understanding and self-management, in ways of building and rebuilding groups and organizations, and in creatively managing and resolving human conflicts.

In a society where changes in roles, relationships and associations have become the expectation — rather than stability in roles, relationships and associations after adolescence, when persons have settled down — in such a society, socialization processes which shape character, value orientation and life style cannot rationally be considered complete at any chronological age. Organizational development programs such as I have described above recognize this fact. And the opportunities for continuing re-education and retraining which they provide for members of organizations are not limited to the acquisition of knowledge and skills required for mastery of new technologies and new work procedures. The training rather offers opportunities for resocialization as well. Or, what is more important, the training is designed to help persons learn how to manage their own continuing resocialization, using their own resources along with those of other persons — peers, bosses, subordinates as well as experts — in creating and recreating relationships, orientations and roles adequate to shifting and changing personal and organizational requirements. I will have more to say about the goals of organizational redevelopment later.

Actually, some industrial organizations have moved further in replacing Whitehead's "vicious assumption" with assumptions more in keeping with contemporary social and cultural realities than most educational institutions have done. An alternative assumption, as we have seen, is that education and re-education, socialization and re-socialization, are life-long processes. Persons must have access to help in creating new and adaptive responses to changing, expanding or decreasing, personal needs and powers, and to changing and novel social requirements as long as they live.

This alternative assumption has not permeated the management or organization of educational opportunities or our systems of educational practice in schools, colleges or universities. The education of children and young people is still typically seen as preparatory for life in some settled state beyond adolescence — a settled career, a settled family role, fixed and stable political and civic orientations and roles, settled aesthetic and literary tastes. In this mythical settled state, men and women will begin to make "real" choices and to act upon these, in short to do. Up to that magic time, children and young people, so far as formal education is concerned, have only been learning to do. Learning, on this view, is detached from the responsibilities of informing, guiding and humanizing ongoing choices and actions. And doing and action after formal schooling tend to be divorced from continuing learning, and indeed show only limited effects from previously crammed information and advices which were, after all, acquired not primarily for the illumination and guidance of personal and collective decisions and actions, but rather for examination purposes.

On this preparatory view of education, quite in keeping with the assumption about life which Whitehead called vicious for our time and place, teachers, parents and other adults are thought to know what children and young people will need to know and be able to do when they grow up. Actually, of course, they do not and can not know. And protesting students often sense the unconvincingness of the reasons which adults offer for the prescribed, adult-selected content which makes up the curriculum as usually defined. Students' interests tend to be seen as motivational sales points, to be manipulated, circumvented, or appeased in selling the adult-selected curriculum. They are not seen as points of potential growth in a developing person coping with a developing environment. They are not typically respected.

When interests are respected, educators and students alike see them as possible directions in the development of a growing self. Intrinsic motivations, when they are respected and handled educationally, are to be self-criticized, with the collaboration of others, including adults. Interests are to be self-tested and evaluated. If affirmed, they are to be cultivated, informed, disciplined, under the responsible management of the student, or, in most cases, of a group or community of learners, with whatever help adult resources can give. Such treatment of student interests is, unfortunately as I see it, more often advocated in textbooks in educational philosophy than practiced in actual teaching processes.

Kenneth Boulding once made a distinction between human systems which develop to support, sustain and control human life and behavior and mechanical systems which human beings set up to accomplish tasks and to achieve goals with a maximum predictability and a minimum surprise with respect to the outcomes of the operation of the system. The predictable and standardized outcome is the mark of an effective mechanical system. Human systems, when they are permitted and helped to develop, are inherently evolutionary systems. "Surprise," unpredictable

outcomes, system breaks, periods of chaos, regression and reintegration on some novel basis, characterize the histories of human systems, whether families, classrooms, industries, churches or nations. Human systems have histories. A mechanical system, if perfect enough as a mechanical system, has no history. Time, surprise, creative distortion, innovation are foreign to the ideal model of the mechanical system.[3]

Yet it is all too clear that modern men, enamored of their own invention, the mechanical system, have tried widely to impose the virtues of that system — standardized and predictable outcomes and lack of novelty and surprise — upon the organization of human effort and activity. It is ironic, and to me sad, that in the human systems where novelty, variety, surprise, should be most at home, in places nominally dedicated to the stimulation, support and facilitation of human learning, in schools, colleges and universities, this image of the mechanical system as the right model for organizing human efforts and relationships has made great headway. It is reflected not alone in the adult imposed curriculum already discussed, but in other hierarchical patterns of administrative control, in the departmentalization of instruction, in rigid age grouping for purposes of instruction and of much recreation as well, in standardized examination systems, in the impersonalization of teacher-student, student-student, and administrator-teacher-student relationships — an impersonalization which is always tending to pass over into depersonalization, in the typical treatment of atypical or surprising behavior as norm-violating behavior to be controlled and brought into line rather than as a subject for joint inquiry, as an opportunity for possible creative adaptation in which the onus for adaptation and change may rest as much with the system as with the individual or group deviants from established norms.

I fear that educational systems have much redevelopment to do in their own internal organizational patterns and relationships if they are to become laboratories in which younger and older people together can practice and learn the arts and sciences necessary to develop and redevelop other institutions and associations in our society, national and transnational.

I have already suggested that our current crisis in industrialized and urbanized societies — the crisis which prescribes the major tasks of current social redevelopment — is basically a struggle between rival principles for ordering life and learning, not a struggle between order and chaos, with defenders of the traditional social order cast as the good guys and protesters and challengers of that order cast as the bad guys. This melodramatic way of defining contemporary crisis is one which fearful reactionaries tend to embrace. I know of no more eloquent delineation of the rival principles of order now struggling for men's allegiance than

---

[3]Kenneth Boulding in *Prospective Changes in American Society by 1980 Vol. 1 of Designing Education for the future*, edited by Morphet, Edgar L. and C. O. Ryan (Denver, Colo.: Citation, 1966).

that made by W. C. Behrendt in discussing modern building and city planning. Behrendt, one of the Bauhaus designers and architects out of pre-World War II Germany, found this struggle between clashing principles of ordering in his own field of work and, by extension, in society at large.

> Our time, there is no doubt, must be characterized as a period of crisis. The fundamental change of economic conditions under the insignia of industrialization and mechanization has shaken social order to its foundations. A complete transformation of life is taking place. Wherever we look, at the state or the people, at economics or society, at science or art, fundamental changes are in process. A world of obsolete forms and institutions is coming to an end, another slowly struggles into existence. With violent concussions, that everlasting spectacle of dying and growing is taking place . . . on the stage of the world. With combat and convulsion the old forms of order are broken to pieces. With intense resistance the emancipation from traditional habits of law is carried though; emancipation from forms that once were original and full of life, but which in the course of historical evolution have lost their primary meaning and relationship to life. Reluctantly, but at last, the discussion is opened on the changed reality that forms our environment. . . .
>
> Whether regular or irregular, static or dynamic, all form is a final result of a desire for order. To build is to make a plan. To plan is to follow a definite concept of order.
>
> In building, we find . . . two different principles of order: one takes the structure of an organism; growing on its own according to the immutable law of its individual existence; adapted to its function and environment, as a plant or any other living organism grows, developing in its proper life-space. Then, in contrast to this principle, we find another idea of order taking the structure as mechanism, composed of various elements put into order according to the immutable law of a system *a priori*. Viewing these two different concepts of the problem of structure, we speak of organic order as opposed to mechanical order. . . .
>
> The disastrous conditions into which an excessive rationalism and a humiliating mechanism have forced our rational existence have awakened a new . . . desire to be nearer to the sources of life. A complete reversal of outlook on life is taking place in these times: we see another approach of man to nature, this time, however, not in the sentimental spirit of a Rousseau, but in accordance with the strict teachings of science and technique which have revealed the idea of organism, and have opened to us, in this way, the wonder of creation and life anew.[4]

I agree with Behrendt that there are signs and seeds of personal growth and social progress within the challenges to an outmoded social order which often present themselves today as confrontations and encounters, sometimes violent, always disturbing. The challenges come from people, persons and groups, who are alienated from participation in the processes which give form to the transactions of their lives, from people who are now limited in power to shape their own destinies within the limits of contemporary reality, not the reality of established status or convention, which they have come to distrust, but some more fundamental reality, the limits of which are not yet clearly defined. The protesters may batter at established forms of order, seeking in various ways to subvert or de-

---

[4]W. C. Behrendt, *Modern Building* (New York: Harcourt, 1937), pp. 11-12, 15.

potentiate these, or they may seek to drop out of the conventionally proper round of life.

It is difficult for those of us over thirty to see hope and a dynamic for redeveloping life and society in young people — students many of them — who express their distrust of us and our intentions openly and often belligerently, who label our generation hypocritical as we profess the values of peace, an abundant life for all, and democratic participation and yet support a social order which creates wars, maintains inequalities, reveres the material symbols of status above all else, and demonstrates powerlessness and/or unwillingness to redistribute power in the interest of a better life for all peoples. It is difficult for us to find hope and a dynamic for an improved future in protesting students because we are afraid — even when we grant they have a point, though overstated, in their indictment of us.

We are afraid because we see chaos outside the presently established forms of social order, not a developing alternative order to be invented, experimented with, brought into being partly through our own efforts, perhaps mainly through the efforts of those younger than we. In the not-too-clear manifestoes of protesting students, we fear discontinuity with the things and goods we genuinely cherish in the present. We fear the yawning gap of non-relationship between the generations which we have felt uneasily before but which now can not be denied. And rage gets mixed with our fears. And our rage is even greater toward the Hippie types who withdraw from encounter than with the militant student leftists who seek conflictual encounter. For conflict is a form of relationship which is less frustrating than no relationship at all. Part of our anger comes from a self-admission that in playing the game of the system, we have compromised needlessly with the needs of our own persons for growth and fulfillment. Part of our anger is thus anger against ourselves — an anger turned out against those who enact values which we have suppressed, against those who remind us of our failures and needless compromises with ourselves. The breakdown of communications across the chasm between generations represents one of the fearful discontinuities of culture which threatens the redevelopment of current institutions and associations toward more organic structures of relationship and toward more adaptive and self-renewing ways of coping with changing internal and external environments. The immediate threat to institutional redevelopment is the augmenting of unrealistic conflict between young and old — a wild growth of fantasy and stereotypy in the definition of the terms of the conflict and of each others' motivations which makes creative bargaining concerning the real differences among young and old more and more difficult to achieve. The immediate threat is greatest in institutions of education. The researches of men like James Coleman and Edgar Friedenberg and the brilliant pamphleteering of Paul Goodman show that their positing of the existence and operation of a youth sub-culture within, and inceasingly in non-communication with, adult culture, and nowhere more

apparently than in schools and colleges, is not an exaggeration of our current social reality.[5]

Only creative bargaining with respect to the realistic differences that now divide young and old in their interests and orientations can bridge this discontinuity and move the structures of educational institutions and, in turn, other institutions, toward more organic, more participative and more self-renewing forms of relationship and operation. But the feelings of fear, rage, and ingratitude, such as I have described above, must be clarified and worked through before the realistic bases of conflict can be commonly identified and mutually dealt with. This calls for joint participation by young and old in semi-therapeutic groups and communities to accomplish the clarification of feelings toward each other and to dissipate the fantasies about each other which now make common definition or effective resolution of the realistic conflicts between them virtually impossible to achieve.

I do not mean that the whole burden of change and adaptation rests with the older generation. It can not and should not be so. The building of new relationships between estranged parties calls for mutual exchange and interaccommodation between both parties. But there are good reasons to believe that adults will need to take the lead in getting processes aimed at reconciliation started. Adults usually find it harder than young people in expressing their feelings openly, in "leveling" with each other and with young people, as the latter might say it, especially when such leveling violates conventional canons of politeness and propriety. And adults are in positions of control in most institutions, including schools and colleges. The redistribution of power necessary to accomplish mutual re-education and creative bargaining and negotiation must come as a concession from adults to young people, not the other way around. These reasons perhaps justify my emphasis on adult responsibility in opening up processes of bridging the discontinuity between generational sub-cultures and in redeveloping the institutions to support continuing adult-youth communication and collaboration as a necessary condition of accomplishing this mission.

Another kind of social and cultural discontinuity which at once blocks the ready development of an organic ordering of life in contemporary urban and suburban systems and which also furnishes a point of useful tension and conflict in redeveloping the outmoded traditional order of life is, historically speaking, a remnant of a lingering colonial mentality among people of North-European origins in their relations with various minority groups. I do not know whether the term "WASP" has acquired a non-entomological usage in Canada as it has in the U.S.A. WASP is often used to refer to people of White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant origins or,

---

[5]James Coleman, *The Adolescent Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961). Edgar Friedenburg, *The Vanishing Adolescent* (New York: Dell, 1962). Paul Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Random House, 1960).

by extension, to people whose dominant reference grup is White, Anglo-Saxon-Protestant, whatever their racial, ethnic and religious origins. It is nearly as hard for WASPS to hear hope for a better social order in the current pressures of various minority groups against WASP hegemony in economic and educational affairs, as it is for beleaguered parents and teachers to hear the voice of progress in the sometimes raucous and belligerent cries of student power advocates. WASPS have been the dominant group in countries like the U.S.A. and Canada. It is WASP values and orientations which have been taken as the criterion values and orientations in judging the relevance and importance of other ways of life that have been carried by immigrants of various sorts into our polyglot cultures and societies. Although we have voiced doctrines of democratic pluralism in the past, doctrines which advocate that sub-cultural differences should be prized and honored, our dominant institutions, political, economic and educational, have been controlled by WASPS, as loosely defined above. Sub-cultural differences have been tolerated when they have remained quaint manifestations of some foreign past; and they have been frequently feared, shunned or repressed when they have threatened to make important differences in the direction and control of economic, political and educational affairs. Now that WASP hegemony has been effectively challenged, now that cultural pluralism has become a fact, the challenges are coming from fresh articulations of various sub-cultural groups seeking their places in the sun. It is hard to locate the mainstream of social and cultural life as eddies of red, yellow or black power become more visible, or comparable eddies along ethnic lines — French or Italian or Slavic (or less often along "purely" religious lines: Roman Catholic, Jewish or Muslim) — or sometimes the more traditional protests of the poor against those with adequate means, become articulated and articulate. One way of stating the question which this fact of resurgent pluralism raises for educational institutions is — whose values shall be taught in schools and colleges? The answer can not be, even though "scientistic" school men often make it, that no values will be taught. The very organization of a common effort, in schools or elsewhere, embodies values and value orientations as part of its normative system. And people who participate significantly in an organization incorporate these norms as candidate values for their allegiance, whether values become a part of the formal curriculum or not. The old answer — WASP values will be taught as natural and right — is no longer tenable. WASPS who are also liberals and democrats can not accept this answer, let alone the clamant minorities. Nor is the answer of parallel schools teaching different values to different subcultural groups, with no planned and effective linking or bridging between the parallel trends, a viable answer in the long run. The only viable answer, apart from continued fruitless and destructive struggles for domination among groups, or the desperate short-run "peace" of a police state, seems to lie in efforts to make our factual pluralism into a democratic pluralism in deed as well as in

profession. New bases of community must be hammered out jointly and collaboratively through creative resolution of conflicts among struggling groups. Again, as in the case of generational discontinuity, members of disconnected racial or ethnic or religious and economic class groups must make and use opportunities to work through the feelings and fantasies about each other which now becloud the realistic bases of their conflicts and of their possible and desirable collaboration. The common bases must be worked out through creative bargaining and problem-solving. Differences will remain but these will come to be prized as sources of strength and good rather than tolerated as unavoidable evils. In this process, more viable, more organic forms of institutional and associational life will be worked out and developed, though no golden age of non-conflict will be attained. And organizational redevelopment will remain a continuing challenge to human ingenuity. In processes of redevelopment, the availability and use of persons who sustain multiple memberships and allegiances and who can maintain integrity and autonomy, while sustaining the internal conflicts which multiple allegiances often involve them in, are extremely important. Without such bridging and linking persons, who trust themselves and who are trusted and respected by both or all sides of a conflict, the prospect of creative compromise of confronting differences and the forging of new common bases of value of orientation is dim indeed. The development of autonomous, bridging persons is a major mission of educational processes in a developing democratic pluralism.

A third set of discontinuities which poses a central and continuing problem for educational redevelopment is in the fragmentation of our contemporary knowledge-building and knowledge utilization enterprises. This fragmentation has come from the specialization of research and scholarship and the bureaucratized organization which segregates departmentalized work in modern university structures. The departmentalization and compartmentalization of disciplines and sub-disciplines has been copied organizationally by the helping professions and by the sub-professions and para-professions each of these has spawned as these have found their way into the university. As academic and professional persons have come to overinvest their personal identities in their academic and professional roles, creative compromise among disciplinary and professional persons and groups in the interest of effective and inventive uses of their resources in solving human problems becomes more and more difficult to achieve. The need for communication and collaboration among men of knowledge and for communication and collaboration among men of knowledge and men of practice and action has never been greater than at present. And the *difficulties* in accomplishing the needed communication and collaboration have never been greater. The general answer to the difficulty lies in the reorganization of the university toward the model of more organic community and away from the model of the mechanically ordered bureaucracy which now underlies the conversion of desirable specialization into non-communicating and

autistically hostile fragmentation. But where will the human dynamic for such reorganization come from? Such a dynamic usually arises from disaffected persons and groups who press for the reorganization of a society which excludes their interests and their persons from respectful recognition and which excludes them from effective participation in the shaping of their destinies. We have found such a dynamic in increasingly articulated pressures from disaffected youth and from various clamant minorities, including the poor. But where is the equivalent dynamic for organizational change among men and women of the professions and of academia?

There is no adequate substitute for reorganization of university life if education is to become an important factor in the redevelopment of society. I believe we can get help in solving the problems of society and of its institutions from more adequate computerized systems of storage and retrieval of information from various disciplines and professions. I do not reject this at all. This represents the renovation and refinement of the library system as an aid to knowledge utilization in the light of modern technology. But this is not enough. I believe that we can also develop new skills in bridging between academic and professional specializations and confronting human problems, and can educate human relations experts or change agents — call them what you will — who are skilled in linking systems of knowledge building with systems for developing knowledge into technology and with systems of institutionalized practice, and, eventually, with articulated consumer needs and demands. The mission of the Human Relations Center, where I spend a good bit of my time at Boston University, can be described in this way. But these efforts are not enough if universities and, in turn, colleges and school systems are to play their essential part in redeveloping other institutions and associations of our society toward more organic, more creatively adaptive, more self-renewing forms of life and practice. The organizational life of universities must be redeveloped in the image of community and away from the mechanical model of bureaucracy, if educational systems are to play their indispensable part in the redevelopment of contemporary societies.

Since I put so much stress on organizational development as an important key in gearing educational systems to their part in wider social redevelopment, perhaps I should be more concrete about what an organic ordering as over against a mechanical ordering of organizational life and work would be like. And, if I turn to an account of industrial organizations which are seeking to move beyond bureaucracy for my model, it is, as I have said before, because industrial organizations have often grappled more forthrightly and more vigorously with the invention of forms of organization in tune with contemporary realities than educational and service organizations have typically done. The principles developed in the redevelopment of industrial organizations apply to other organizations of human effort as well, whatever

differences their differing missions may make in the detailed forms of organization. I will draw on the work of Bennis, Shepard and Blake, as well as on my own experiences with organizations like the Aluminum Company of Canada in my characterization of an organic ordering of organization life.[6]

First, an organic structure does not locate the source of needed communication, control or decision-making at any one point in the system, particularly not at the top of a pyramidal structure. Networks of communication follow the lines wherever the linkage of resources and of needs and resources arise and where exchange of information, ideas and feelings is required. Decision-making and problem-solving take place at points in the organization where some particular concentration of resource and need can be brought together. Control is diffused and is designed to facilitate cooperation among people with special resources needed in getting the mission of the organization accomplished and organizational problems solved as they arise. Second, the cement of organic systems is mutual trust and confidence among members, rather than fixed and sanctioned authority-obedience relations. Third, the structure of the organization is not legally defined by lines of pre-assigned responsibilities attached to fixed positions in the hierarchy of the system. Structure corresponds to the networks of interdependence among members, networks which grow out of the requirements of the organization's mission or task. Within each network, interdependence is defined in terms of shared responsibility. Fourth, linkage of parts of the organization is accomplished through multiple group memberships and linking persons and roles, not through authoritative supervision vested in a fixed supervisory role in command of sanctions of reward and punishment to insure compliance with a centrally prescribed plan. Fifth, conflicts of interests and goals do not disappear from an organic structure. Rather, people are encouraged to bring their conflicts out into the open as points of potential growth and innovation in the organization. And organization members are trained to use creative bargaining and problem-solving as a way of managing and resolving their conflicts, rather than to resort to duplicity, repression, arbitration or war. Sixth, a research and development function is recognized as essential on both the human and the technical sides of the enterprise. Data are collected continually concerning existing conditions, particularly conditions relevant to issues and conflicts; scientific expertise is used in collecting and processing information, but the meaning of the data and information for changes in practice or organization is determined through shared decision-making among those concerned with the change. In this sense, development and redevelopment are not seen as periodic crisis readjustments but as a continuing way of organization life.

---

[6]Warren Bennis, *Changing Organizations* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966). Robert Blake and Herbert Shepard, "Changing Behavior through Cognitive Change," *Human Organization,* 21 (Summer, 1962).

In this view of organizational form, practice and action are not divorced from research, education and reeducation, but are linked together in an interdependent effort to make valid the judgments and choices with respect to continuity and discontinuity which are inescapable in the planning and management of change in the forms and practices of life. A self-renewing system must learn as it acts concerning the consequences of and the alternatives to its present forms of action, and it must organize or reorganize itself to act effectively on what it has learned about consequences and alternatives. I believe that an educational system whose mission is not the production of goods and services but of learning on the part of its participants, whether through research, instruction or evaluated action and practice would multiply its learning production a hundredfold if it could move from a mechanical system of organizing relationships among its members toward the kind of organic structuring just described. And participants in such educational systems would develop the orientations, skills and commitments to develop organic structures in the other associations and institutions in which they periodically went out from the educational system to live and to work.

Summary

I can summarize the rather diffuse argument implicit in my previous remarks in eight principal points.

1. Development refers to deliberate changing of the instrumentation and goals of practice and related forms of human organization through the utilization and application of valid knowledge. Development of human systems, since it involves the interaccommodation of new patterns and rationales of practice with already existing patterns and rationales is always redevelopment. Collaboration between men of knowledge, practitioners and consumers — those affected by changed modes of practice — is the method for planning redevelopment best calculated to reduce resistance and to accomplish the reeducation of persons which redevelopment always requires.

2. Since we must now assume that the conditions of human life for man will be different from those of the present and past, reality oriented education can no longer be conceived of as the transmission of the cultural heritage to the young. Education must be conceived of as a lifelong process, not complete at any age, and education must be deepened to include continuing resocialization as well as the communication of relevant new information and skills to learners. Value orientations and patterns of relationship, as well as skills and knowledge, become obsolescent in a developing society. Education for redevelopment must be conceived of as empowering, supporting and equipping men and women to invent and reinvent their own futures.

3. The fears of adopting redevelopment as a way of life center on the threats of discontinuity which change always involves — discontinuity with present and past values, with present and past securities, with present and past associations and relationships. Yet it is at points of discontinuity within culture that redevelopment efforts need most to be focused. For points of discontinuity mark areas of experience where fresh and novel continuities need to be built, rationally — by creative bargaining and problem-solving — if possible. And it is at points of discontinuity in culture where a dynamic for change, growing out of the dissatisfactions of those alienated or dispossessed by present forms of order, is available to give power to redevelopment efforts.

4. The struggle at points of conflict in our society and culture is between rival principles of ordering human efforts, human making and doing, human relationships — not a clash between order and chaos. I have called the current struggle a clash between mechanical principles for ordering human life and relationships according to the model of bureaucracy and organic principles of ordering according to the model of community. Mechanical principles of ordering learning efforts and relationships among learners have taken over the organization of most educational systems. This form of organization prevents the joining of learning and action in developing habits and expectations adequate to the management of surprise, conflict and discontinuity in humane and competent ways. The redevelopment of educational organizations according to organic principles of ordering is a necessity for an education which will contribute significantly to the continuing redevelopment of other institutions in a self-renewing society.

5. Feeling and fantasies grow in people around points of discontinuity and disease in society. Negative stereotypy of each other by parties to the conflicts which signal discontinuity makes conflicts unrealistic and prevents the rational identification of the realistic differences among conflicting parties and the joining of communication in the creative resolution of realistic conflict. Reeducative efforts which go to the depth of therapy are necessary to work through distorting feelings, fantasies and stereotypes so that conflicts can be joined realistically and adequate mutual trust generated to make creative resolution of conflict possible.

6. Several discontinuities in contemporary industrialized and urbanized societies offer appropriate points of focus in redevelopment work in educational and other social systems. There is the discontinuity between youth and adult sub-cultures signalized by student protests. There are the various discontinuities between formerly dominant WASP sub-cultures and the growing aspirations and pressures of various minorities against WASP hegemony, whether these challenges are articulated along the lines of race, ethnicity, religion or economic class. There is the fragmentation of knowledge stemming from the segregated

organization of research and professional specializations, and the isolation of disciplines and professions from people in need of the resources which research, knowledge and professional expertise can provide. These represent foci for redevelopment work in educational systems and in other institutions and associations of contemporary life as well.

7. Efforts in organizational redevelopment toward more organic principles of ordering human effort and relationships, particularly in industrial organizations, furnish models which need to be instituted in the redevelopment of universities, colleges and school systems. In brief, these efforts seek to facilitate and support innovation and experimentation through relating persons or parts of the organization in ways which advance the organization's mission through inquiry and problem-solving rather than to focus on system maintenance, often at the expense of personal growth and organizational innovation, as mechanical systems tend to do.

8. Ideally, educational systems should function as laboratories for developing and testing novel linkages between life and learning, between research, instruction and action, and should provide demonstrations of such linkages to the society surrounding the educational system. In the process, such educational systems will develop persons oriented to, skilled in and committed to the redevelopment of various institutions in the model of creative community. If you ask, where will educational systems get the time and energy to do the redevelopment work which you suggest?, I can only answer that thoughful participation in wholehearted efforts to redevelop educational systems will provide the education for children, young people and adults which is most needed today. Let the traditional programs go and get on with the redevelopment task.