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An education which does not give promise, gives nothing. The declaration of giving facts, and facts only, is a declaration of bankruptcy. Present day teaching, in its false modesty, impresses me as a series of farewell parties to life. True education, however, enables man to survive the limitations and follies of his age and to enter the next; for this reason it tries to endow him with resilience, vision, resources, dreams -- and of course forebodings and warnings as well. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970)

We cannot let this volume close without a comment and reflection on the articles gathered here by Dr. Bruck. Dr. Bruck has brought together some very challenging and innovative articles. As we read, wordprocessed and proofread the articles in the issue we rejoiced at some of the articles and despaired at others. The first author has published in the area of Communication Education since 1972 when he gave one of the first papers in the formative sessions of the Instructional Communication Division of the International Communication Association in Atlanta (Tate, 1972; 1981a, 1981b, 1984). The communication courses taught here have been designed to utilize andragogical teaching methods (Carney, pp. 107 - 122) along with instructional strategies which permit student freedom and choice. We have learned from many teachers at various universities (especially Charles Wales, Robert Stager, Sam Postlethwait, Fred Keller, John Thompson) and been enriched by the students who pass through communication classes we have taught.

The articles in this special issue focus on teaching the critical perspective of Communication. Each calls for a type of education which helps students to explore critically the process and effects of communication. Each echoes in its own way the call to change in education made by John Gardner in 1965. The following quotation gives the essence of that challenge.

We are beginning to understand how to educate for renewal but we must deepen that understanding. If we indoctrinate the young person in an elaborate set of fixed beliefs, we are ensuring his early obsolescence. The alternative is to develop skills, habits of mind and the kinds of knowledge
and understanding that will be the instruments of continuous change on the part of the young person. Then we will have fashioned a system that provides for its own continuous renewal.

This suggests a standard in terms of which we may judge the effectiveness of all education — and so judged, much education today is monumentally ineffective. All too often we are giving our young people cut flowers when we should be teaching them to grow their own plants. We are stuffing their heads with the products of earlier innovation rather than teaching them to be innovative. We think of the mind as a storehouse to be filled when we should be thinking of it as an instrument to be used... Change is so swift that the 'latest thing' today may be old-fashioned by the time the young people enter adulthood. So they must be taught in such a way that they can learn for themselves the new things of tomorrow. And that leads us back to fundamentals.

We are moving away from teaching things that readily become outmoded, and towards things that will have the greatest longterm effect on the person's capacity to understand and perform. Increasing emphasis is being given to instruction in methods of analysis and modes of attack on problems. In many subjects this means more attention to basic principles, less to applications of immediate use. In all subjects it means teaching habits of mind that will be useful in new situations — curiosity, open-mindedness, objectivity, respect for evidence and the capacity to think critically. (pp. 21 - 23)

Research by Levine (1981) indicates that the students occupying seats in our classrooms today are distinctly different from those who were there in the sixties when many of us were undergraduates or graduate students. Today's student is optimistic about his or her own personal future but pessimistic about the future of the country and world. They are, as Levine says, "going first class on the Titanic." Yet the only thing most professors do for them is to help them rearrange the deck chairs. Students are happy with this because they want to be told what to believe and do. They like university as it is! They are too busy looking out for number one. They are not looking for relevance, challenge, or social issue concerns. They are satisfied with an education which is, as Rosenstock-Huessy so aptly put it, "farewell parties to life."

Levine (1981), Kraft (1978), Keller (1984), Tate (1981), Wales and Stager (1977), Macrorie (1974), Eble (1982; 1983) Dressel and Marcus (1982), Ingalls (1973) and others have given many suggestions for the development of university instructional strategies which will challenge and help today's students develop the critical skills necessary for life in the modern world. In this volume William Gilsdorf has defined
the critical perspective in a broader definition than most of the other authors and provided a view of various instructional strategies which train students to think critically. Thomas Carney has approached the problem, correctly we believe, by rejecting traditional pedagogy and seeking to apply andragogy to the teaching of communication. Carney has also outlined the pressures and restrictions which instructors who adopt an andragogical approach to education will work under during their years teaching. Both Gilsdorf and Carney are right when they focus on the instructional strategies which are utilized in communication classrooms. While other authors have focused on teaching a critical perspective they have overlooked the instructional strategy issue which we believe is vital to teaching critical thought.

After reading many of the articles in this volume one is left to conclude that lectures are the major instructional strategy utilized to teach a critical perspective. Brock (1977), Bligh (1972), Davis (1967), and Gage and Berliner (1975) have presented excellent overviews of the lecture as an instructional strategy. All conclude that lectures are appropriate when disseminating information which cannot be found elsewhere or consolidating information presented in readings but are inappropriate when the objective is "achieving higher level cognitive objectives like analysis, synthesis, and evaluation" (Brock, 1977). Students do not develop problem solving skills or critical patterns of thought when listening to lectures especially since most instructors approach lectures as they approach throwing the shot: "they spend all their time getting together a very heavy message and then just fling it" (Davis, 1967, 57). To the extent that the papers in this volume represent lectures as the primary instructional strategy they will fail in developing critical perspectives in students.

We have the same problem with "Teaching By Objectives" as outlined by Carney in this volume. Tate (1972) attempted to point out that when objectives are determined by the instructor there will be no critical learning by students and offered information about a course he teaches in which students set their own objectives for the course and determine methods of evaluation which will allow them to meet these objectives. I have been doing this for fifteen years now and find that it still works even though the critic of that paper in Atlanta and another distinguished Communication scholar objected to such a procedure as "letting the inmates run the penitentiary." In response to Professor Carney we would argue that learners (students) can determine their own valid objectives for any course, and indeed, will do so in opposition to the objectives set by the instructor. We would also argue that Professor Carney has been too pessimistic in his analysis of the blocks which oppose the instructor who wishes to use andragogy as a philosophical foundation for courses which teach critical perspectives on communication.

For many years the first author has placed in each course syllabus a statement of philosophy which underlies the structure of that course (see Tate, 1981a, 1981b). One of the quotations there can serve as a
focal point to begin a discussion, of what we believe to be, the central concern in this issue. In his book, The Adventure of Learning, William Pearson Tolley writes: "Learning is something we do for ourselves. Instruction is important. Experience and the voice of caution have their value. The adventure, however, is ours. The responsibility is ours. The thinking is ours. The excitement is ours. Education is a solo flight." From the perspective of andragogy as presented by Carney, Tolley is expressing a vital truth -- learning must be always and forever determined from the perspective of the individual who seeks to learn.

This is true if thought is reality. Since thought is internal to the individual student no one can help the student learn except the student him or herself. All of the major theories of Communication are built on this foundation of Aristotelian/Cartesian philosophy -- including the Marxist-Critical perspective shared by the majority of the articles in this volume. Only three seminal thinkers of this century have challenged these Cartesian assumptions. They are Martin Buber, Franz Rosenzweig, and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. These three understand that it is response/communication which is basic to life not the individual's inner thought. From this perspective Marx is as outdated as Aristotelian empirical research, and all present schools of Communication Theory and Research.

On the battlefield of Verdun, Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy realized that a revolution was occurring which was as important and life changing as the previous revolutions which have shaped Western European culture (see Rosenstock-Huessy, 1969). This revolution was the rejection of Cartesian/Aristotelian thought and the introduction of the concept of speech-thought (see explanation by Franz Rosenzweig in Glatzer, 1972). In his articles on Education Martin Buber expanded on these thoughts by stressing the mutuality of response necessary for learning (1947). Buber had set the groundwork for this unique understanding of education in his seminal book, I and Thou when he wrote:

Relation is reciprocity. My You acts on me as I act on it. Our students teach us, our works form us. The "wicked" become a revelation when they are touched by the sacred basic word. How are we educated by children, by animals! Inscrutably involved, we live in the currents of universal reciprocity. (Buber, I and Thou, Third Edition, 1970, 67.)

Learning is NOT a solo flight. It is NOT something we do ourselves separate from one another. Education is a shared mutual relationship between teacher and student, student and student, in which both learn, in which both are changed! The great teachers have always understood this and certainly the teachers who we learned the most from were ones who practiced it. Fred Keller, the father of PSI, claimed he always learned more from other people than he developed himself (Keller, 1982; Chance 1984) It is Gilsdorf in this volume who comes closest to this understanding of education. He has outlined a series
of instructional strategies which allow him to respond freely and openly to the students and the students to respond freely and openly to him. We believe that only this understanding of education will allow for the development of a critical perspective by teacher and students.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy wrote extensively on teaching (1970; 1981; 1973). We began our reflections with a quotation from one of his articles. In an interesting analysis of St. Augustine's writings on education, Rosenstock-Huessy points out that one never simply teaches a course. **Education involves a duality of teacher and student in which the teacher, who in his or her life represents the past, comes together with the student, who in his or her life represents the future, and together they create the present. In this duality of past and future, this duality of outlooks and expectations, the present is created. Teacher and student stand together on this bridge between past and future -- the present moment.**

Usually, people derive the authority of the teacher merely from his expert knowledge. When we do this -- and St. Thomas does it -- we fall into the abyss of departmentalization. When people deduce the right to teach from the "State," they fall into the abyss of propaganda and lying. It is only when teaching, when education is recognized as an original and irreducible situation between two souls that we escape the hell of 'isms,' of Inquisition and propaganda. We all need an answer to the simple question: How can people who are not contemporaries live together successfully? And Augustine's answer is: They succeed if they admit that they form a succession, if they affirm their quality of belonging to different times. If the time difference is admitted, they may build a bridge across the times, in corresponding acts. By these acts, that which is called "the present," is produced. The present, is not a given data of nature but a fruit of social effort. (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1981, 8-9)

This brings us to the largest and most interesting paradox in this series of articles. Tom Carney has drawn the distinction first made by Alexander Kapp in 1833 (Ingalls, 1973) and developed by Knowles (1970) among others, between pedagogy and andragogy. The difference is clear in these articles. In the sixth article we find Jhally discussing pedagogical practices which will help students accept the critical perspective on communication which he wants them to develop. Saunders continues this theme examining different pedagogical exercises which will cause students to examine the subtle sexism found in our culture. Straw and Mosco continue this perspective of what can the teacher do to the student to cause them to develop a critical perspective on mass communication. In these articles the perspective is pedagogical. It is the teacher's responsibility to manipulate activities in the classroom so that students accept the truth value of the Marxist/Critical perspective. Since the instructor is so much more learned and well
read in Critical Theory, he or she must develop pedagogical methods which will cause the student to accept this theoretical perspective.

Jhally's assertion that only a hegemonic pedagogy will suffice to help students accept and understand Critical Communication Theory denies the transformational power of education. Saunders, Straw and Mosco seem to agree with Jhally that the instructor is superior to students and thus uninvolved in the process of learning. The purpose of 'pedagogy' is to create ideological groupies who merely change one theoretical perspective for another as one might change from untinted glasses to tinted ones. Education should, as both Rosenstock-Huessy (1978; Tate, 1984) and Kenneth Burke (Tomkins, 1985) have argued, free students to have a vision of society which will transform society. If learning occurs, as we argue, on the narrow bridge of the present between past and future, teachers and students must move from the cursory examination of the current axis of discrimination to a development of skills which will allow for the reorientation of society in the future. Gilsdorf and Bruck have indicated a series of class activities which involve students and instructor in a transactional communication process of orientation, disorientation and reorientation (Tomkins, 1985, 126).

Professors Carney and Gilsdorf understand education differently than the other authors in this issue. Professor Carney has argued that only through the use of Andragogy -- learner centered activities in the present focused on problem solving -- can the critical perspective be awakened in people. Gilsdorf has shown us a series of course activities in which both the instructor and learner participate which enable the learner to practice a critical perspective which will then be with them as they live into the future. Carney has also suggested instructional strategies utilizing case studies, simulations, and workshops wherein learners develop their own critical perspective in dialogue with the instructor. Tate (1981a) surveyed the various instructional strategies available to professors of communication for their ability to help students develop powers of observation, problem solving, and decision making. Carney is indeed right that the simulation, over which the instructor has no control, is a powerful tool to help learners develop critical perspectives. Ruben and Budd (1975), Horn (1977), Horn and Cleaves (1980) Ruben (1978), Ruben (1973) and Ruben, Talbott, Brown and Labrie (1970) all report a series of simulations, games and exercises that can be used to give students the basic raw data from which to begin developing a critical perspective. Charles Wales and Robert Stager (1977) outline the instructional strategy of Guided Design whereby an instructor can pattern the critical process for and lead students through it until they have developed the skills on their own. We have found using simulations, Guided Design, and Audio-Tutorial (Postlethwait, 1972) instructional strategies that students can learn the critical perspective without the pedagogical strategies employed by several authors in this volume.
Dr. Bruck has brought together some fascinating and instructive articles in this volume. We hope that this issue will provoke strong discussion through the pages of the journal. We look forward to hearing your responses and publishing many of them here. This discussion is vitally necessary for the development of our discipline and our teaching. The reformation of university teaching is hard and this dialogue on teaching is vital to it. As Fred Keller observed in the Psychology Today interview: "Reforming education is like taking a wounded moose from a pack of starving wolves" (Chance, 1984, 43).
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