

1961

Some Relations of School and Family in American Culture

Robert F. Spencer

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas>



Part of the [Educational Sociology Commons](#), and the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Spencer, R. F. (1961). Some Relations of School and Family in American Culture. *Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science*, Vol. 29 No.1, 128-139.

Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas/vol29/iss1/14>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science by an authorized editor of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

SYMPOSIUM: A SCHOOL IS TO LEARN . . .

SOME RELATIONS OF SCHOOL AND FAMILY IN AMERICAN CULTURE *

ROBERT F. SPENCER
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Virtually any statement made about the contemporary American system of education can be subjected to infinite documentation. What the school should accomplish, what it has accomplished, what its curricula ought to be, how far it should or has become a kind of surrogate for the family, church or other institution, emerge as vital questions for the professional educators, questions, clearly, for which there is no single answer. Judgments become normative, ameliorative, critical, and certainly, nearly always fraught with overtones of emotionalism. This leaves the non-specialist who attempts to gain an over-view of the nature and image of the educator and his field in the dilemma of adequately finding his way. Still, the school is a social institution. As such, it can be subjected to analysis in quite the same behavioral terms as any other human group activity. Rather, therefore, than to move into the areas of the ideal—what a school and the system associated with it ought to be—it may be possible to consider the educational institutions in terms of their structure and function, thereby analyzing the interrelations between school system and other institutional facets of contemporary society.

This paper is written from the point of view of the behavioral sciences, specifically, from the vantage point of the anthropologist whose concern lies in the comparison of the various aspects of human behavior at all times and places. For indeed, if a society seeks to learn about itself, it gains perspective only through an observation of alternative solutions to human problems which have been reached by human groups possessing different historical backgrounds and whose view of man, his nature and destiny, is couched in fundamental assumptions and premises different from those of *Homo americanus*.

Further, the anthropologist is accustomed to see a society and its associated culture in holistic terms, arguing that all aspects of behavior in a historically conditioned and determined context are intimately interrelated, that they interact with each other and are so systematically fashioned as to support one another. In other words, any facet of behavior in a society has a function, the end of which

*Based on a paper read at the meetings of the National Conference of Social Work, Minneapolis, May, 1961. The writer is indebted to Prof. Jesse D. Jennings, Department of Anthropology, University of Utah, for comments and suggestions.

is to maintain and perpetuate the whole. From comparative studies of other peoples, whether civilized or so-called primitives, the anthropologist affirms the essential dynamically functional nature of any institution in society. This can never exist in a vacuum but becomes an integral element in a complex system. By this reasoning, it is rank error to divorce the educational institution of this or any other human society from the total social matrix.

But to speak of a total American society and culture poses an almost insurmountable problem for some investigators. Ours is, it is true, a vastly proliferated system what with its many interest groups, its varied ethnic backgrounds, its abundant organizations, or its geographical and ecological diversity. Yet a failure to admit the organic integrity of American culture and society is to ignore the forest. Indeed, there is enough of a uniformity in contemporary American society to suggest that size does not necessarily make for complexity and that the concept of complexity is stressed far too much. In this paper, I submit that there is an American culture, that the school system is a vital part of the total society, and that, in interacting with other social institutions, e.g., the family, the school functions to affirm and preserve not only ideological and ideational norms, but more pointedly, aspects of behavior which promote the maintenance of the totality of American society as we know it.

The anthropologist is aware at once that the analytic points he makes are not necessarily reflective of popular consensus or wish. A question which nearly always confronts him at once relates to the applications of what he and his fellow behavioral scientists have to say. This is, in fact, a recognizable pattern in American culture, one which demands constantly applications of any line of scientific inquiry. A point which must be left open here is that respecting science itself. Even if science is a vital part of contemporary culture, something which seems to offer a panacea to modern man, scientific values are not necessarily social values. Indeed, one may ask if science, taken as an entity essentially super-cultural, can ever be normative. Theoretically, of course, it should not be. A description of the physiological function of the pancreas is not the same as a course of treatment prescribed for diabetes. In this paper, I seek to do no more than call attention, on the basis of what is empirically known about American society and culture, to some of the existing interrelationships between school system, family, and society. I should wish respectfully to leave to the investigator whose interest is application the solutions to the specific problems which arise out of culture pattern and human behavior.

It is possible to make a series of statements, a summary of propositions which reflect an empirically derived scientific commitment to the problem at hand. These are, in effect, to "call the shots" as one sees them; they are not to define solutions. They are:

(1) There is a total system definable as American culture and society.

THE MINNESOTA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

(2) This system, tightly bound in some areas, extremely loosely in others, depends on essentially ephemeral human relationships.

(3) The ephemeral quality of the human relationship is an outgrowth of the primary cultural definition of the worth of the individual.

(4) On the significant formative level, i.e., that of socialization, making the individual one with his culture and society, family and school function together to produce a desired result.

It may thus be affirmed that the family and the system of contemporary American education meet in the area of a dynamic social cross-fertilization. If the ensuing processes are examined functionally, a picture reflecting the vitality of institutional relations can be proffered.

AMERICAN CULTURE AND SOCIETY. To say that contemporary America constitutes not one, but a series of diffuse sub-cultures is to do violence to the anthropological concept of culture. To identify, as some sociologists do, a depressed urban area where crime is rampant as a criminal sub-culture fails to take into account the fact that even deviant behavior is structured and patterned according to the norms of the so-called majority. Sub-culture as concept is not only unfortunate but is dangerous in presenting a distortion of existing uniformity. One need not move into the psychoanalytic formulations of national character as has been done for America by Margaret Mead of Geoffrey Gorer to recognize that there is an essential structural sameness to American life. Into this, individuals and groups, whether in the form of the Sons of Erin, the Sons of Hermann, or the Japanese-American Citizens' League, are inextricably drawn. An ethnic minority is a separate cultural segment only if it refuses to be assimilated into the prevailing modes of the majority, such as may be the case of the traditional Chinatown. Here, however, one is not dealing with a Chinese sub-culture but rather with a segment of Chinese culture encysted within the larger body. When the minority of whatever kind comes to act within the majority group and framework it has forfeited its distinctness. Thus in the fieldwork experience of the writer, it is noted that the Buddhist temple of Japan, when transplanted to America, possesses the organization of the Christian churches. It has a minister, an order of service, a Sunday School, a board of deacons or elders, a hymnology, and so on. There is every indication that the aspirations of American life, indeed, the problem of survival itself, are met by conformity. If one considers merely that the individual is confronted with a value system, a legal system, a uniform pattern of aims, aspirations, and goals, there is an organic integrity and wholeness to American culture.

The concept of culture as employed by anthropologists has been subject to some rather unfortunate misunderstandings on the part of other social scientists, whether objective or applied. For culture is not necessarily behavior, however much the terms society and culture are confused. In the concept of culture one may understand

the definitions which lie behind action and behavior. In other words, men act because they hold certain truths to be self-evident. It is the ostensibly self-evident truth with which one is concerned in the culture concept; it is the definition of the situation, the evaluation of the relations between man and man, between man and the supernatural, between man and the universe. The line between culture and values is admittedly difficult to draw. But culture and values are not the same things; given the definition of the situation, men proceed to build systems of values on the basis of truths which they consider to be fundamental and intrinsic. Values, as a result, can only be viewed as relative, never as absolutes. But it is in culture that there lies a basis of prediction, not of the course of specific events, but rather of what the individual will do in a given circumstance. If I remark to my small boy—"but boys don't cry", I have not only indicated that such behavior falls short of the expected, i.e., the predictable, but I have also gone far to enculturate. I have not only informed the child of the behavior expected of him but I have succeeded in some measure in internalizing in the child the beginnings of self-image in the male role in this culture.

It is often said that society precedes culture. Men, in other words, must live together before they can establish the ground rules necessary to further living together. It is here that the comparative knowledge brought out by the anthropological approach is of assistance. One may consider, for example, the case of the Apache Indians for whom the anthropologist Morris Opler notes: "Childhood is not an end in itself, but a period of preparation for adulthood". This statement is significant only when American and Apache norms are compared. Clearly, in American culture of today, childhood is viewed, however implicitly, as an end in itself. One has merely to consider the vast array of items designed to preoccupy children—the school itself, the toy industry, television programs, Santa Claus, the Easter Rabbit, and Disneyland with its complex associations. It is evident also that the transition from childhood to adulthood, given this cultural definition among ourselves, can be traumatic and result in the storm and stress of adolescence. As Margaret Mead has shown, the Samoans, with a different cultural definition of childhood, never experience the griefs of transition.

Or one might go further down the line and consider other cultural premises as they affect man in modern society in the United States. American action, for example, clearly rests on the premise that the world and the nature of man are inherently good and improvable. This means, of course, that contemporary society accepts the view that man can triumph over nature and that man can and does rise to new heights of progress. This premise rests, one may be sure, in the history of Western civilization and in the Judeo-Christian ideology of the triumph of good over evil. But whatever the origins of the concept, behavior among ourselves is couched in terms of these fundamental assumptions, so much so, in fact, that individuals are not only not capable of verbalizing them, but tend to start in alarm

THE MINNESOTA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

when the question of their validity is raised. American culture welcomes change, technological change especially, forgetting that this may have marked repercussions for the total social structure, the way in which the individual relates to his fellows, and to the place occupied by him. On the sociological level, this is the time-honored example of the cultural lag: the disparity between material achievement and the solution to the problem of living socially with it.

It is scarcely necessary to call attention to the corollaries of the fundamental assumptions of American culture. With the sociologist, for example, one can point to the changing composition of rural populations, to the fact that they no longer exist as such but are, by virtue of increased communications and mobility, drawn into the urban orbit. Or one may show how urbanism in the traditional sense is gone, being replaced by the burdens of an industrialized society with its decentralization of industry and its growing pattern of suburban living. Again, one can point to the whole problem of mobility as an important factor in the fragmentation of human relationships, as for example, in the increasing nucleation of the family, the breakdown of deeper, more permanent, and supportive relationships with both kinsmen and friends.

Here is obviously not the place to consider at length the area of individuation and the essential isolation of the person as features characteristic of American society. One may consider Weber's view, as well as that of Tawney, of the individualized capitalistic Protestant ethic, go with Max Lerner into his analysis of the distinctive attributes of American culture, or hold with Riesman and Whyte in respect to mass society and its nature. Regardless of prophecies of doom, one can be objective. There does seem to be a loss, as a result of individualized separateness, of some of the features which characterized the frontier or which anthropologists find diagnostic of peasant or folk societies. Such a loss is seemingly a concomitant of our cultural surroundings and is perhaps a reflection of industrialization and its effects on social living. The Soviet Union, for all its vaunted collectivism, obviously faces the same kind of problem. Nor does totalitarian control do other than shift men's loyalties away from the organic society to the artificially conceived state. While American society has not done this, and happily never will, it still pays a price for increasing industrialization, a price measured in the gradual departure from the deep roots of tradition. If there is regarded as desirable in human activity a sense of support, a deeply founded series of expressions relating to dependence between man and man rather than independence, (points which are of course debatable) American society has tended to lose in depth in favor of momentary fulfillment. Such statements, it is true, could not be made were it not for the data collected from other cultures which make comparison possible. Nor is this to say that American society and culture are found wanting. It is merely to note that there are alternative solutions to the problems of human living. If American society can be viewed

with greater objectivity, some of the issues which confront the social worker and the educator might more readily be resolved.

THE AMERICAN FAMILY. It is axiomatic that no society can operate effectively without the family. This is the primary institution, the instrument of procreation, the agent of socialization. One need examine only a fraction of the extensive literature on the family, that produced by the professional sociologist, to gain the impression that in American life today the family and its associated kinship system have taken on a special coloring. The sense of personal independence and autonomy relates closely to family aspirations with the result that the extended kinship unit of the past is in eclipse. Perhaps, as family size increases, and we are told that this is a trend, the individualism which is fostered by the present system will to some degree fade. But in these present decades the notion that the young married couple should forage for itself, set up its independent household, raise its children independently of the grandparental generation or the extended family, find its social outlets in a peer group of like age, retain the most casual relations with the extended kindred of both, and so on through a host of isolating features like these remains uppermost. It is significant that the cultural premises of American life create a situation in which the unmarried person creates a problem; his status both socially and psychologically remains in doubt. This may, in fact, be an important factor in reducing the age of marriage in American society. It is curious that a society which stresses so heavily a moral tone should find it easier to accommodate the divorced person than the bachelor. But it is also significant that the primary function of the family, that of socializing the young, is not materially altered. Conceptually, at least, in legalistic terms, in terms of societal expectations, the family assumes a responsibility at this level. What has changed is the depth and extent of the view of the family as a socializing agent. At what point, it may be asked, does family responsibility for a child come to be shared with the total society itself?

The above suggests then that there are some quite specific functions of the family in American society. This is a tightly structured society in its quite limited prescription of the ways in which a child may be handled and the extent of freedom accorded the parent. One has only to consider the overview of American culture and society which comes from the pen of Dr. Benjamin Spock and his imitators or from the accurate predictive analysis of Gesell and Ilg. Conversely, however, the parent has certain alternative ways of acceptable action open to him. Both parents may be employed and the very young child farmed out to the sitter or the nursery school. There is marked mobility in American culture with the result that the nucleated family may move at random to any part of the geographical limits of the society. These are elements which suggest a looseness of organization and which point to an important aspect of modern American life—the family must operate within quite precisely defined vertical

THE MINNESOTA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

limits, even if these are not wholly deeply rooted, but it is free to expand horizontally. On the level of child rearing, and bearing generally help from an extended kinship group, this means that the society must utilize institutions other than the family to enhance the socialization process. It is here that there is a functional and structural reason for the school and the educational institutions generally. A school is not to learn. It is in large measure to substitute for the socializing and social institutions which in the European ethnic backgrounds out of which most Americans come were of another kind.

One should anticipate some disagreement with these remarks on the part both of the social worker and the educator. In answer, attention may be called to a discussion based on social system, on the issue of how the American family exists as an entity different from the family of the Japanese, the Arabs, or various of the modern Europeans. Because of the nature of the social system of which the American family forms a part, it can be asserted that there is actually little latitude in behavior or choice for individuals. This is not to say that freedom of choice is wholly precluded. But such freedom is meaningful only with defined limits. The polygynous family, for example, cannot exist. Or one may learn from the sociologist that there may be differences in expectations on the parts of persons coming from different backgrounds. And there is a profuse and consistent body of information on matters of this kind. Not only is the nature of the American child rearing process known in some detail, but the expectations and goals of varying elements in the society are also understood. Thus the differences as between social classes, that defined on the basis of economic status as well as educational attainment, are further reflected in attitudes toward child rearing, toward goals in education, and in respect to the achievement and expectation of success. These are important and meaningful on certain levels. In the end, however, they become minutiae when viewed against individualized, competitive, and isolating elements characteristic of the total social fabric.

How does the family in American society act as a socializing agent? Students of personality as related to socio-cultural systems have repeatedly demonstrated how the socializing elements resident in social systems reach the individual, are channeled, integrated, intensified, internalized, so as to produce a personality oriented in a specific direction. Ego strength, development of the super-ego, the severity or laxness of pressure in one or another direction have their bearing on the development of the adult personality and its relations to the values systems which become characteristic of any cultural milieu. Thus as one anthropologist has pointed out, there are those cultures which stress sanctions of shame as against those which concern themselves more deeply with an internalized sense of guilt. Or similarly, the whole problem of integrated anxiety or of any other aspect of covert development is involved here. Since it is generally regarded as axiomatic that the child is father to the man,

socialization, enculturation, the fixing of values and personality patterns occur at the earliest age levels.

Clearly, in American society, the moral role attributed to the family in inculcating the value systems of American life suggests that the family is by no means becoming blurred in its functional outlines. That it has changed in composition is unquestionable. The days are clearly gone when the socializing agency might lie in alternate generations, such as between grandparent and grandchild. The parent himself in the nucleated family system of today is obliged to assume a good many socializing roles, more indeed than would have been the case among pioneer and rural families of tradition, and certainly more than is true of other Western areas, such as in Europe. The child learns at home, from his peer groups, through mass media, and through the recognized moral institution of the church, the latter especially becoming a surrogate for the family and implementing and complementing the school system. Not only does the family in American society fix the primary personality patterns, those which reflect the unconscious orientations leading to the formation of a modal personality type, but regardless of social class and background, the child learns certain kinds of information. His orientations toward the world, his views about acceptable and unacceptable behavior, his basic moral code, i.e., the total "good" and "bad" pattern, folkways and folklore are imparted through the socializing agencies relating to the very young, to the infant and child whose world the culture itself must define. But more than this, learning involves initially language, it relates to the formation of the major motor responses, and it does not omit such aspects as food preferences, manner of sleeping, postures, gestures, and a host of related psycho-biological features. Thus when the child finally comes to school, he has already been patterned, his likes and dislikes are defined, his moral sense is on the way to realization, and it is to all these that the educational institutions give additional enforcement. The child, in short, approaches the school system as a functioning member of society.

What has been said here of the enculturative process is of course true of all societies. Differences lie not only in the varying kinds of information imparted and the kind of personality system developed, but also in the depth or intensity of the processes of internalization and learning. It has been so often remarked of contemporary society and culture that its variations preclude any generalizations. From what has been noted above this criticism is scarcely applicable. When social class, for example, is viewed as an independent variable influencing the enculturative process among ourselves, as a good many studies have attempted to show, there is a corresponding lack of attention to differences or variations in the consequent personality type. The demands of the culture, in spite of conceptual pluralism, create an American personality mode, one operative within the framework of individualized competitiveness but at the same time one which must accommodate itself to the demands of mass society. This paradox creates a modern problem. It is a problem which be-

THE MINNESOTA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

comes vital in regard to the interrelations of school and society or family in American life and it reflects the great difficulty of defining the functions of school and family and their respective allocation. If the age of school attendance is reduced, and clearly this seems to be happening, then some of the traditional functions of the family are being arrogated by impersonal social institutions.

THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS—MANIFEST AND LATENT FUNCTIONS. Traditionally, "a school is to learn . . ." This means, of course, that in the history of Western culture, especially as it has unfolded since the Protestant Reformation, the emphasis on individual responsibility and achievement has grown over the centuries, reaching a kind of apogee in the scientism of the nineteenth century. Since then, learning for learning's sake has tended to be refocused. A Ph.D., that degree reflective of German pedantry and ostensibly pointless investigation, tends now to require that the holder occupy a position of service in society, at least, that his researches find some ultimate or, more likely, some immediate application. These views stand in sharp contrast to the old-fashioned view that the person be learned and cultured and that this is the primary of education.

In terms of the concepts which underlie education in modern society the mere idea that only academic skills are to be acquired is clouded by the multi-pronged aims of the school. Philosophies of education do, it is true, differ from community to community, but the pendulum seems to swing gradually away from an orthodox Deweyism. Despite marked variation in approach, at least as they are seen and defended by vocal protagonists, the problems of the educator, as indeed of the social worker, appear to arise in the contrast between training for individual attainment and achievement for the ends of society. "Helping people to help themselves", the cliché of the social worker, a view implicit in professional education, poses paradox in pitting social desiderata against individual realization. The resolution at present seems to lie at varying points on a complex continuum. But the issue, as seen by the social analyst, is not which method is better but rather how the educational institutions function to stabilize the total social fabric.

The school, in addition to the problem of imparting knowledge and skills, is confronted with wholly new issues. One can readily sympathize with the educator whose task is to fashion a frame of reference in which to resolve them. What the school does, therefore, is not a cause of the disharmonies in the social body; it is apparent that education must come to grips with a change in the total configuration and patterning of American social behavior and values. On the manifest level, with the increasing nucleation of the family over the past five decades, the school has the task of molding sound character and enhancing the formation of a wholesome personality. Inevitably, it is faced with the problem of creating a sound social adjustment for those entrusted to its care, a fact which is probably borne out in the "conformist" tendencies of the modern teen-ager.

Similarly, in effecting preparation for life, the school becomes the guardian of the culture, being left with the necessity for instilling the sense of democratic citizenship and of spiritual and moral values. Add to this the concerns with vocational skills and their inculcation, the problem of helping the individual "discover himself", and the task is endless. It is small wonder that points of view differ and that the spirit of individualism should conflict with the ends of the social aggregate.

But of course these are areas in which the educator as professional has been vitally concerned. He is aware of the problems but finds difficulty in drawing the lines of definition. Whether he does so in terms of the so-called "child-centered school" or whether he moves into a more conservative area, he is still operating in terms of the overt, in the area of the socio-cultural commonality of understanding which assigns manifest functions to the school system. In other words, while there may be disagreement in detail and implementation, the concept that the "school is to learn" continues to underlie any concept of education.

From a strictly objective viewpoint, however, one which attempts to utilize the methods of science without associated value judgments, any institution has latent functions. There are aspects of institutional organization of which those involved, whether in a participant or directive capacity, are not necessarily wholly aware. To take a crass example, while all of us, as citizens, welcome the changing social status of the Negro in America and applaud the legal edicts which have made this so, we may also, as scientists, recognize that racial tensions, particularly in the Deep South, reflect a stability of social institutions, that the scapegoat psychology directed toward the Negro may have a function in channeling the aggressive and hostile drives of some individuals and groups. To modify these by legislation is not wholly to resolve the problem. In other words, racial tensions as they have existed among ourselves, however much we as individuals may dislike them, have to be seen objectively as serving some kind of purpose and function. Hearts may, it is true, bleed for the Negro; this does not alleviate the hatred, the hostility, or indeed the anxiety arising because of the appearance of certain kinds of disreputable conservatism.

Thus, if the school has taken over all the manifest functions noted above, what is left? What does the educational institution do covertly in maintaining the social whole and how does it interfunction with other segments of the society? Because institutions interact, it may be affirmed that the changing functions of the family cause the school to assume a greater share of the burden of socialization than was formerly the case. Are the schools creating a longer and longer day for the child because the parent wishes to be free of the obligations of parenthood? Or conversely, is there talk of reducing vacation time because the school believes that its sphere of influence is being intruded upon? This is not a "chicken and egg" proposition but rather one which is reflective of an interaction between school and family.

THE MINNESOTA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

The effects, in any case, are clear; the child is removed more and more from his family group. The number of people who formerly would be thrown into closest contact with children becomes increasingly reduced. This takes place not only through the general length of the school day but also through the group aims of the educational system and its ancillary elements.

If one considers that the child in America of today has a long school day, one realizes that his activities are highly diffuse and that he is put in the position of interacting with a host of people and groups. Monday through Friday, involved in the day itself, a period of hours, it may be noted, far longer than is the case in the school system of the various countries of Europe, the child becomes further involved in a mass of extra-curricular activities. In American life today, urbanized as it is, Saturday calls for still further activity ranging from the involvements of the various voluntary associations, participation in spectator or consumer activities and sports, the cinema, the television medium, while Sunday is frequently given to yet another aspect of education in church and Sunday School, and otherwise follows the pattern of Saturday. The total result, one which even the most dedicated of educators in the American system must recognize, is the shift toward greater impersonality. Time is simply lacking to pause, to assess personal achievement, or to formulate depth in human relationships. There is, as the folklorists have shown, a great change in levels of participation—the spontaneous games which some of us knew as children are on the way out, being replaced by play engineered by institutional authority—and the end is worth spelling out. It is loss of creativity and a lessening dependence on the rich traditions of the culture.

The constant push to be occupied, the “busyness” of which American culture makes so much, unquestionably has its effects on the formation of the value system of the child. The idealized adult tends less to be a family member and more to involve an impersonal associate of the society at large—a teacher, a minister, a scoutmaster. This means that images become inconsistent, undependable, and that the cultural traditions take on a diffuse quality. Where formerly an authoritarian grandparental figure might emerge, one predictable in terms of his strengths or weaknesses, but wholly predictable also in terms of enforcing cultural norms, the child of today can readily transfer his allegiance and find his ideal in a host of vaguely defined figures. The end result is that the skill of the child in interacting with other individuals is in itself changed. He is not necessarily less efficient nor yet less able but he lives in a society which accords worth to horizontal human relationships and tends to veer away from those reflecting emotional depth. By the same token, he is trained and socialized to accept essentially ephemeral human relationships. This is no more than affirmation of the fact that the cultural traditions are not deeply set. It is here that a real problem lies. It is expressed pointedly in a recent evaluation of the views of James B. Conant.

There is strong evidence that our ideal of classless middle-class society

PROCEEDINGS, VOLUME TWENTY-NINE, 1961

has been translated to mean that children must be molded into so-called democratic "look-alikes," if not "think-alikes." Our experience in two world wars has done much to encourage the idea of national society in uniform and in lock-step. There is a possibility that in a society influenced so greatly by the media of mass communication the individual, as an individual, can be lost. . . . We may be in a new crisis in which it is necessary to defend the right of the individual as a scholar, as an artist, as a person, to discover himself and to express himself.¹

The educational institutions are confronted with the dilemma of substituting in some measure, indeed, extensively, for the family, of reaching the individual at a younger and younger age. The school has been concerned with the "needs" of the individual in his development but finds difficulty in defining these needs as against those of the society itself. The end result is makeshift. Our culture is confronted with the dilemma of abhorring the collective and yet at the same time of realizing the Judeo-Christian ethic of the responsibility of man for man. Progressive education did not resolve the issue nor does a return to the rigid disciplining of pure subject matter curricula seem to hold much promise. What is indeed more practical is a recognition on the part of the educational system of its specific function in the whole society, an awareness that ours is a cultural tradition worth imparting and worth preserving both in its historic past and in its changing present.

¹Roy G. Francis and David W. Noble, *Historical Perspectives on the Comprehensive High School, Perspectives on the Conant Report*, (Social Science Research Center, University of Minnesota, 1960, pp. 17-23.) (Quoted by permission.)

A Note on Sources: The topic approached here is so vast that single points of documentation can scarcely be produced. Anthropologists who have concerned themselves with the patterning of American culture are indeed many, having done so in spite of adverse criticism. Mention is made of Mead and Gorer's efforts to assay the nature of American socio-culture, while Max Lerner's *America as Civilization* (1958), offers a number of interesting ideas. Admittedly, this paper has been influenced by the works of Riesman and Whyte. These essentially humanistic studies, however, are complemented by such analyses as those of George Spindler (*Anthropology and Education*, 1958), while the general view of anthropological concerns is summarized in Bernard Siegel's *Biennial Review of Anthropology* (1959). The perspective on personality is of course orthodox and derives from Kardiner, Linton, and DuBois. The problems of education loom large for the uninitiated. Especially helpful were J. Barzun's *Teacher in America*, W. B. Brookover's *A Sociology of Education*, H. O. Dahlke's *Values in Culture and Classroom*, Havighurst and Neugarten's *Society and Education*, R. E. Mason's *Educational Ideals in American Society*, N. G. McCluskey's *Public Schools and Moral Education*, and M. W. Rodehaver's *The Sociology of the School*. This is a selection only and from the point of view of the anthropologist, highly unsatisfactory, the fact being that the writers cited assume the immutable quality of contemporary educational institutions and are oblivious of the issue of cultural norms. Mention is made in the text of the *Perspectives on the Conant Report* (q.v.).