

and journalists. He speaks of "two master architects" who were born around 1900. One quit school at the eighth grade to leave home and support himself in an architect's office as an office boy. The other left school at age thirteen to support his mother by working for a stone cutter. "Would these two have become architects at all," so Mr. Goodman asks, "if they were continually interrupted by high school Chemistry, Freshman Composition, Psychology 106, at a time when they didn't care about such things?" Then he adds, "But they have learned them since, nevertheless."

"Shoot If You Must . . ."

This sort of plain speaking is iconoclasm with a vengeance. But Paul Goodman isn't really advocating a return to the old world that did not require a degree before a boy could get a job as a draftsman in an architect's office. In the old world children got solid drilling in such things as phonetics in the early grades, they read literature that provided them with some background of history ("Paul Revere's Ride," "Barbara Frietchie," and so forth), and they were permitted to work at a young age without having the policemen of the child labor and minimum wage laws descend upon them. Paul Goodman, as a believer

in the doctrines of John Dewey, denounces the "Rickovers and Max Raffertys" who would restore both discipline and intellectual nourishment to the first years of schooling. This doesn't make much sense, for Max Rafferty is one of our most effective enemies of the very "life adjustment" fetish that Paul Goodman himself deplores for its accent on "conformity." It also ignores the probability that there was a definite correlation between the type of education that one got in the grammar grades in pre-Deweyan times and the great efflorescence of self-made men that, among other things, produced Paul Goodman's two favorite architects.

**Learning by Doing —
But Doing What?**

The great paradox is that the nineteenth century, which really believed in "learning by doing," got along without John Dewey (or John Dewey's far more benighted successors), while the twentieth century, which has gone in heavily for "progressive" education, is producing students who can't "do" a coherent outline in a freshman college course. The old world was better: concentration on basics for a few years, then the "learning by doing" that went with actual experience in the world of affairs.

Mr. Goodman wants to simulate that old world of affairs by big spending in the "public sector," which would provide "educational occasions" for youths who could be put to work "on town improvement, community service, or rural rehabilitation." Somehow one doubts that "public sector" experiences would help very much. Mr. Goodman himself mentions the fact that "the professor-ridden Peace Corps needs \$15,000 to get a single youngster in the field for a year, whereas the dedicated Quakers achieve almost the same end for \$3,500." And "again, when \$13 millions are allotted for a local Mobilization for Youth program, it is soon found that nearly \$12 million have gone for sociologists doing 'research,' diplomatized social workers, the N.Y. school system, and administrators, but only one million to field workers and the youths themselves."

Paul Goodman seems to be caught in a major contradiction here. He hates what the exaltation of the "official" has done to our world. Yet his cure is to hand over more money to the state, which is always "official," to provide opportunities for experience and spontaneity to youths in some ill-defined outside-of-school schooling. The contradiction mars what is otherwise a most stimulating book. ♦

► **A THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF AMERICAN HISTORY** by C. Gregg Singer, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., \$4.95, 305 pp.

Reviewed by Robert M. Thornton

SOME who read this book may not find Dr. Singer's theology entirely acceptable, but it would be hard to disagree with his statement that "it is impossible to understand completely the history of a nation apart from the philosophies and the theologies which lie at the heart of its intellectual life." These constitute the basic premises on which people act.

Dr. Singer contends that the history of this country since its early days reflects the drastic changes in its prevailing worldview from Puritanism through Deism, Transcendentalism, and Unitarianism, to Social Darwinism and the Social Gospel. Man, not God, comes to occupy the center of the universe, so it follows that man, now the master of his fate, can create a utopia here and now. The Kingdom of Heaven, brought to earth, becomes the goal of politics, and there is a growing acceptance of the belief that "government is responsible to people rather than to God and that law is little more than the embodiment or expression of the will of the majority." Hence man, for-