

A DEMOCRATIC-REFLECTIVE APPROACH TO MORAL
INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL,
WITH ILLUSTRATIVE UNITS

by

Richard W. Hahn

B.S., Central Missouri State College, 1954

Submitted to the Department of Education
and the Faculty of the Graduate School of
the University of Kansas in partial ful-
fillment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Science in Education.

June, 1963

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to take this opportunity to express his appreciation to his advisor, Dr. Ernest E. Bayles, not alone for the guidance and counsel given while writing this paper, but for the constant challenge to think clearly, and for the patient encouragement and inspiration to help meet the challenge.

R. W. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.iii
CHAPTER	
I. ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING THE NATURE OF MORALITY.	1
II. ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING THE NATURE OF MORAL INSTRUCTION . .	10
III. TEACHING UNITS.	27
Introduction to Unit One.	29
Unit One: Dignity and Worth of the Individual.	29
Student Bibliography.	36
Introduction to Unit Two.	40
Unit Two: Honesty.	40
Personal Experiences with the Unit.	46
Student Bibliography.	49
Introduction to Unit Three.	51
Unit Three: Sexual Behavior in the United States	51
Personal Experiences with the Unit.	63
Student Bibliography.	65
Introduction to Unit Four	69
Unit Four: The Negro in the United States.	69
Personal Experiences with the Unit.	75
Student Bibliography.	78
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

CHAPTER I

ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING THE NATURE OF MORALITY

John Dewey says that "the moral responsibility of the school and of those who conduct it, is to society."¹ In other words, it is society that is to make the basic decision as to the nature of the public schools' moral responsibilities. Let us take notice then of the decision that society has made.

Early in the history of our nation the principle of separation of church and state was adopted. As applied to education this means that the schools are to be completely independent from the support and control of any particular religious group. Rather, they are to be supported by taxation and controlled by taxpayers through their duly elected representatives.

However, teaching moral and ethical values in the public schools would in no way violate this principle. The public schools of the United States, like the government of the United States, stand firmly for freedom of religious opinions and partial to none. They are non-denominational, and faithfully reflect the religious diversity and tolerance which have helped make our nation strong. The public schools, in fact, guard this religious freedom and tolerance by teaching the laws

¹John Dewey. Moral Principles in Education. Houghton, Mifflin Co., New York, 1909, p. 7.

of the land concerning religion and by upholding these laws in the administration of the school.

Nevertheless, the principle of separation of church and state in public education does have a definite implication for the teaching of moral values. It means that these values must be taught from a non-denominational, or better still, a non-religious orientation. Many claim this is impossible. They argue that morality cannot be separated from religion. It is precisely this attitude, in the author's opinion, that has kept the public schools from making more progress in the field of moral education than has been made. Moreover, society has said, or implied by their adoption of the principle of separation of church and state that, impossible or not, right or wrong, wise or unwise, the teaching of moral values, if it takes place in the public schools, must be completely independent from any religious orientation. The author believes that this can and should be done.

We must assume at the outset, then, that moral values are man-made; that they do not have their origin and development outside of human experience. They are not imported into life ready-made from some supernatural realm. Conversely, they are contrived by individual human beings as they see they have need for them at various times and places, and under varying conditions and circumstances. They grow out of everyday experiences in the lives of people. If values are taken to be of supernatural origin, then the implication is that they are above and beyond man's creative ability. They are far superior to any values that might be humanly contrived. Therefore, it would logically follow that man should not question these values, imposed upon him by the

supernatural forces of the universe. On the contrary, man's chief aim in life would be to seek to discover these values and then, having found them, live his life in accordance with them. In so doing, man will achieve the best life of which he is capable.

These supernaturally determined values, it follows, would be absolutistic. That is, they would be fixed and changeless; set once and for all as guides to human beings in living the most worthwhile life. Any attempt by man to alter these "eternal" values would be foolhardy since it would only result in a set of values that would be less than the best, and consequently, ineffective in leading to the good life.

Thus, if we assume moral values to be man-made, we must also assume them to be relative rather than absolute. There will be nothing fixed nor changeless about the values that we hold. As times, places, and circumstances change it may become necessary to reconstruct our system of values. H. F. N. Horsburgh² suggests that there are three levels of morality. The lowest he refers to as the "self respect" level of moral standards and defines this as "that below which we will not stoop." The intermediate level he calls "aspirational" and these moral standards are those which "we set up as goals." The highest is termed "inspirational" because this is the level of morality "which we accept under inspiration." This appears to be a reasonable distinction and it is conceivable that an individual's behavior could first typify one level and then another according to changes in his moods, environ-

²H. F. N. Horsburgh. "The Plurality of Moral Standards." Philosophy, 29 (October, 1954) 332-333.

ment, goals, insight, etc. As a person seeks to achieve his goals (those matters which he values most), other values appear and are incorporated in his present value hierarchy, or work toward its alteration. It is only expected that, as we grow and develop and mature in life, our values will grow and mature also.

As the foregoing implies, values are relative to the individual personality. They are subjective in nature and unique for each individual. It is rather improbable for two different persons, regardless of how many things they have in common, to have the same hierarchy of values or behave on the same level of morality. However, if moral values are to be vital and moving in the lives of people, this subjective nature of morality is to be greatly desired. Only personalized and experienced values possess enough appeal to an individual to become genuinely dynamic forces for action.

We need to emphasize the full import of the preceding paragraph. It would imply that values are whatever individuals are willing to settle for. Some would undoubtedly be willing to settle for the attainment of short-term, narrow, immediate ends (commonly referred to as "selfish"). Others would probably want to judge these "selfish" aims in terms of broader, long-range--although still basically selfish (in the altruistic sense)--goals. This latter approach would cause one to proceed cautiously in planning his pattern of action in any given situation. It might even cause one to suffer immediate hardship if it will lead to satisfaction of long-range goals. It would demand and promote emotional and social maturity.

This "enlightened self-interest" is quite different from what is ordinarily meant by the term "selfishness." An enlightened self-

interest is

. . . one which makes for a generous, outgoing self; one which takes pause in order to differentiate between the "desired" and the "desirable"; one which is disciplined to take into account more remote and more inclusive interests while reaching decisions on what to do about presently desired enjoyments; one which is able to discern whether and when the self is better served by foregoing immediate, short-term gains for the self alone in favor of longer-term gains for one's entire group.³

Max Otto says essentially the same thing.

At bottom the difference between the moral and the immoral . . . attitude [or situation] is the presence in the former, and its absence from the latter, of scrutiny and appraisal of desires with regard to their effect upon what [may be] called all-over satisfactoriness. Satisfactoriness may of course be envisaged broadly or narrowly; may be restricted to pleasurable excitement, physical convenience, social prominence, the exercise of power, or include appreciation of art, music, literature, religion, philosophy. It may be bounded by the welfare of the self or the family, or be touched by interests as wide as the world.⁴

Moral values, then, must not only carry over into behavior, but should do so in terms of enlightened self-interest or over-all satisfactoriness. In this way they are more likely to accomplish what Dewey says they must, if they are to be considered moral--that is, "improve it [behavior], make it better than it otherwise would be."⁵ Dewey explains that values "which show themselves in making behavior worse than it would otherwise be" are immoral values; and those which

³Ernest E. Bayles. Democratic Educational Theory. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960, p. 105.

⁴Max Otto. Science and the Moral Life. The New American Library, New York, 1949, pp. 162-163.

⁵John Dewey. op. cit., p. 1.

"leave conduct uninfluenced for either the better or worse" are non-moral values. He is here emphasizing the point that, if values do not become working, motivating, and controlling forces in behavior, they have nothing whatsoever to do with morality. What is more important, he has provided us with criteria by which to judge actions, either individual or social, as to their "moralness" or the lack of it.

Moral values, then, are taken to be something different from "ideas about morality." Moral values are those that play a recognizable part in improving behavior. Ideas about morality may be dead, inert, and affect behavior not at all, or affect it only to a degree that is unnoticeable. Beliefs, faiths, creeds, allegiances, and dogmatic tenets do not automatically transfer into good nature or good behavior. Ideas, if they do not carry over into conduct, are non-moral or amoral.

We see, then, that moral values are formulated by making wise decisions (in terms of enlightened self-interest) which result in improved behavior. High standards of morality, however, involve more than simply choosing between right and wrong. Hunt and Metcalf present an enlightening discussion of moral choosing, in which they say:

Almost daily people are called upon to make moral decisions. It is generally assumed that morality is a matter of learning the difference between right and wrong and always practicing the former. . . . People sometimes list desirable traits of character--self-reliance, spirituality, respect, and dignity--and tell children that no worthy individual ever deliberately chooses to be dishonest, disloyal, unkind, uncooperative, dependent, materialistic, disrespectful, and undignified. Parents and church leaders also spend a good deal of time trying to get children to distinguish right from wrong.

If the difficult decisions of life involved only choices between good and evil, where would be the problem? Who would deliberately choose evil? Unfortunately, moral choice is not this simple. It never involves

merely distinguishing between right and wrong. For a person making a choice, moral decision requires distinguishing between two or more good things. It is when at least two desired courses of action come into conflict that moral choice becomes necessary.

. . . . Confused and contradictory thinking will always exist in the area of values so long as we teach that moral problems involve choices between good and evil rather than between two or more goods. The felt moral problems of our culture arise when people find it desirable to follow two cherished but incompatible ends at the same time.⁶

Dewey says about the same thing when he defines a moral situation as

. . . one in which judgment and choice are required antecedently to overt action. The practical meaning of the situation--that is to say, the action needed to satisfy it--is not self-evident. It has to be searched for. There are conflicting desires and alternative apparent goods. What is needed is to find the right course of action, the right good.⁷

Otto points out that moral choices are relative to circumstances and, more important, to the presence of other persons.

Anything a person wants he wants because it appears good. That is why he wants it. . . . If he believed them bad to have he would not want them. However, every one soon finds out, and finds out again and again, that the wanted, the good, cannot be isolated from antecedents and consequences. The antecedents and consequences may in certain cases not be wanted at all. And sometimes upon reflection the not-wanted aspect so outweighs the wanted that the offering as a whole fails to appeal and so is not regarded as good. And every person soon finds out that his own wants and the wants of others overlap in ways to further or to thwart each other. It turns out, moreover, that every individual is interested in wants of other individuals, wanting some of them satisfied and some not. Thus the wanted and the not-wanted

⁶M. P. Hunt and L. E. Metcalf. Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955, pp. 93-96.

⁷John Dewey. Reconstruction in Philosophy. The New American Library, New York, 1954 (5th printing), p. 133.

are frequently tied up in one package.⁸

From the foregoing, we can see that a choice would be morally wrong or bad if the results of our choice should be harmful, either to ourselves or others. And they could be if we ignore unwanted "antecedents and consequences." Unfortunately, however, many individuals refuse to be intelligent when it comes to making moral choices. This, in the author's opinion, is what Dewey meant when he said, "The separation of warm emotion and cool intelligence is the great moral tragedy."⁹

Thus far we have said that moral values are those that carry over into behavior and improve it. They are man-made values created when individuals choose between right and wrong or between two rights. They are relative to time, place, circumstance, and individuals.

The thing

. . . we need in education is a genuine faith in the existence of moral principles which are capable of effective application. We believe, so far as the mass of children are concerned, that if we keep at them long enough we can teach reading and writing and figuring. We are practically, even if consciously, skeptical as to the possibility of anything like the same assurance in morals. We believe in moral laws and rules, to be sure, but they are in the air. They are something set off by themselves. They are so very "moral" that they have no working contact with the average affairs of everyday life. These moral principles need to be brought down to the ground through their statement in social and in psychological terms.¹⁰

⁸Otto. op. cit., pp. 161-162.

⁹John Dewey. Human Nature and Conduct. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1922, p. 258.

¹⁰Dewey. Moral Principles in Education. Pp. 57-58.

Teachers and educators should see that any and all ideas are acquired by students in such a way that they carry over into conduct and work toward its improvement. This, we realize, is a very broad statement. However, moral education should not be thought of in narrow terms. This has been too long the problem. It does not apply to the specifically labeled virtues and to nothing else. It does not apply to standards of sexual morality alone. Too often it has been associated with teaching "about" sex, religion, virtue, etc. It has been wishy-washy; it has been goody-goody, not good.

There appears to be one basic aim of moral education then--the improvement of behavior because of enlightened self-interest. The kind of person we hope to build through moral instruction is one who not only has good intentions, but who insists on carrying them out. This should be the aim of all school work. It is one thing to recognize this, but quite another to accomplish it. The problem of how to accomplish the aim we have set before ourselves will be dealt with in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING THE NATURE OF MORAL INSTRUCTION

In Chapter I we dealt with the "what" of moral education. We made assumptions having to do with the origin of morals; the nature of morality and of moral choice; and the aim of moral education. It is intended that these shall be working assumptions that will have definite implications upon the teaching of morals in the public schools. That is--these assumptions will help to determine the method of teaching used. It is to this task of outlining the "how" of moral education that we now give attention.

If moral instruction is to be fruitful and meaningful, it would seem that it should fit into the total, over-all purposes of American education. What is our fundamental educational purpose? What should it be? The latter, of course, is the more significant question because the answer to it would provide us with a basis for judging the purpose or purposes assumed to be currently in operation. Therefore, let us attempt to answer it.

If we assume that the educational enterprise in the United States has been established and continued to achieve some specific purpose, then we should be able to gain some insight into the nature of this purpose by examining our commitments as a nation. What have we chosen to be essential in our way of life?

Our basic commitments seem to be two in number. First, we have chosen democracy as our governmental system so that we might peacefully make decisions that are necessary to solve the problems that exist in our modern, complex society. Secondly, we have accepted the scientific method as the best possible source of reliable information with which to attempt to solve these problems. In order to see a little more clearly the educational implications of these commitments, let us examine each of these a little closer.

What shall we take democracy to mean? Let us assume that it means equality of opportunity to participate in making group decisions and equality of obligation to abide by them. This definition is assumed essentially because it differentiates between anarchy on the one hand and autocracy on the other. Anarchy implies complete or unlimited freedom to do as one pleases regardless of group wishes. This, obviously, is not the case where there is obligation to abide by group decisions. Autocracy, like democracy, implies limited freedom. But autocracy limits the freedom to participate in making decisions and the obligation to abide by the decisions made unequally. As our definition implies, democracy requires equality.

Defined in this way, democracy places the responsibility for making decisions, whether they be wise or unwise, squarely upon the shoulders of the citizenry as a whole. The democracy will be no better than the decisions that are made, and the decisions that are made will be no better than the individuals who participate in making them. Therefore, it would seem that education in a democracy should (1) constantly remind citizens of their responsibility to help in making

necessary decisions, and (2) teach them how to make wise decisions. In other words, the school must not only encourage individuals to think, but must teach them how to think. They must seek to produce intellectual independence in each individual citizen.

Let us now examine what seems to be a second commitment that we, as a nation, have and its educational implications. Our society as a whole, generally speaking, accepts the scientific method as the best way to solve the problems of everyday life. What shall we take the scientific method to be?

Science is most fruitful when it is defined as method--as a particular way of dealing with material or subject matter, whatever this subject matter might be. Science has been so defined by Max Otto.

Stated in the fewest possible words, it is a way of investigation which relies, and relies solely, on disciplined empirical observation and rigorously exact proof. Its aim is objective verification. And by objective verification is meant, first, that the investigator's wishes and wants, his aesthetic, moral, or religious predilections, his faith in or desire for a particular conclusion, have been carefully eliminated as determining factors; and second, that proof extends beyond inner or personal conviction, to outer or public demonstration. The extent to which this can be done depends upon the matter to be investigated. But whatever the problem may be, it is possible to devise a technique which assures the highest attainable degree of objectivity as just defined; and whenever this is honestly attempted the investigation is scientific in the comprehensive meaning of the term. The significance of objectivity sought in terms of method instead of subject matter is obviously farreaching.¹

¹Max Otto. Science and the Moral Life. The New American Library, New York, 1949, pp. 96-97.

The above observations about science imply that personal desires, ambitions, or goals, are not to determine the scope or direction of the study. Special treatment for certain ideas cannot be tolerated. Any and all hypotheses that are suggested as possible solutions to a problem must be considered. Likewise, these personal elements must not influence the collection of information to be used in testing these hypotheses.

How can we know, as we proceed in our attempt to solve problems scientifically, that we are actually doing so? It would seem in order, at this point, to suggest criteria by which this can be accomplished. Bayles suggests that

A scientific solution to a problem should perhaps be taken to be a thought pattern which, first, takes into account all obtainable information (data) pertinent to the problem, and, second, causes those data to become apparently harmonious or compatible with one another.²

The study must be a broad, inclusive study which takes into account all of the information that can possibly be obtained, and one which results in all of the information fitting together into one basic pattern or outlook. If the study is not farreaching enough or inclusive enough, or, if there are data that do not fit in with the total pattern of things, then either (barring human error) we lack sufficient information upon which to base an intelligent conclusion or our hypothesis was a false one. We can see, then, that there are primarily two criteria of the scientific method--namely, adequacy and harmony, Therefore, patterns of thought, or outlooks on life, which are far-

²Ernest E. Bayles. Democratic Educational Theory. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960, p. 207.

reaching enough (that is, they include most, if not all, of the known ramifications of a problem), and are consistent (that is, they do not contain any self-contradictions within them) can be said to be scientific.

We are now ready to answer the question with which our discussion in this chapter began; that is, "What should be our educational purpose or purposes in the United States?" If we may assume that our society has committed itself to democracy as a governmental system and to science as the best way to solve problems, in light of our discussion ensuing we can now say that our educational purpose in the United States should be

. . . to promote development of more adequate and more harmonious student outlooks on the life of which they are a part, and heightened capacity to reconstruct outlooks independently.³

Our democratic commitment, since it places heavy responsibility upon citizens to share in making the decisions of the nation, would seem to require, on the part of the citizens, the ability to size up situations independently. Our scientific commitment would seem to require that situations be sized up accurately--that is, adequately and harmoniously in light of obtainable data. While stated much more thoroughly and perhaps in different terms, our purpose (as stated here) essentially agrees with the aim of moral education as stated at the close of Chapter I. Could it be that moral education, and education that is democratically and scientifically conducted, are one and the same? This is what we are proposing.

³Ibid., p. 208.

The only part of our above stated educational purpose that has not yet been discussed would be the part that reads "on the life of which they are a part." Of what significance is this statement? Since it is the student who is to receive the education, then it must be student outlooks that must be the beginning and ending points of the educative process. Learning is most fruitful when it occurs in terms of the students' own ideas, attitudes, understandings, and appreciations of his world. A student outlook, then, might be defined as how a student sees his world of effect; or, in other words, the insight that he has into how his life is influenced by the world that pushes and pulls upon him. It is presumed that these outlooks will need to be increased or broadened, and done so in such a way as to "hang together." American education should foster adequate and harmonious outlooks on the life of which students are a part.

The educational program to be followed in the United States grows out of our statement of purpose. It is "to promote reflective studies of problems which represent not only inadequacies but also disharmonies in student outlooks on the life of which they are a part."⁴ Adequate outlooks on life grow out of inadequate or less adequate ones; harmonious outlooks out of inharmonious or inconsistent ones; and the independent reconstruction of outlooks (through reflection) can only be promoted by seeing that students get experience in studying problems reflectively.

Let us now turn our attention to the educational implications of democracy and science as they have just been outlined. Democracy,

⁴Ibid., p. 209.

we have just seen, requires reflective studies. Reflective teaching is thoughtful rather than impulsive. This type of teaching differs from memory-level teaching wherein the emphasis is placed upon students reciting and being able to repeat ideas presented to them by the author of a textbook or their teacher. It also differs from understanding-level teaching wherein students are required not to memorize but to demonstrate their ability to use what they have learned in new situations. Reflective studies go beyond both of these. Alternatives are considered and compared, and consequently, a clearer picture is received by the student. Students come to know what a thing is and also what it is not; what a thing will do, and also what it will not do. In reflective teaching, students begin with an I-don't know situation and work and think the matter through to a conclusion. The teacher will help by giving information, or pointing out good thinking from poor thinking, but the actual development of the thought-line and the conclusion reached should be the students'. In this way real intellectual independence is promoted.

A question that needs to be considered in connection with the foregoing is, "How can we democratically guide students' thinking without dogmatically controlling their thoughts?" This is significant because, when dogmatism exists, democracy does not. To avoid thought control and have true thought guidance it is necessary that, when we point out that a student is thinking well or poorly, we must have some previously agreed-upon basis for judgment. This would indicate the setting up of criteria other than agreement with the teacher. It is entirely possible that students sometimes out-think teachers or text-

book authors. Previously-agreed-upon criteria should be the basis for judging when students are thinking well and when they are thinking poorly. If these criteria are rigidly applied until consciously or overtly altered, there will be actually no opportunity for indoctrination to take place. All thinking, even the teacher's, will be judged on the basis of the selected criteria. This represents equality of obligation to live up to an adopted decision.

Democracy, it seems then, implies that our educational purposes shall be to (1) keep citizens aware of their responsibility to help make necessary decisions, and (2) to help them learn how to make wise decisions independently. The latter of these two purposes necessitates (1) reflective teaching, and (2) democratic thought-guidance (rather than indoctrination or thought control) wherein criteria, to be used in judging whether and when thinking is good or bad, are honored by teacher and students jointly.

What are the implications that science holds for the teaching of moral values? Can the scientific method be used in dealing with problems of morality? Unfortunately, it is when we are dealing with values that science usually receives a cold shoulder. Science is not expected to throw light on problems of right or wrong, good or bad. We gladly accept from men of science the progress that has been made concerning our material culture and our physical well being. At the same time, however, we refuse to apply the method that has made all this progress possible to the social and moral problems of our day. Is it possible that scientists are not concerned about social conditions? Is it possible that the scientific method will not work when applied to

social problems?

There may be no doubt that the most conspicuous of past successes of science have been in industry, warfare, and perhaps medicine. But does this imply that it cannot work in non-material fields as well? These same successes present some of the strongest arguments why science should be applied in the realm of values. We are only suggesting that the method which has proven to be the best for bringing progress in terms of our material culture should be adopted to bring progress and security in our value-systems. Science has been too often defined in terms of the subject matter that is under investigation. But we have defined science in terms of method. Let's see whether it might be applicable in dealing with problems of values. Positive values, it was pointed out in Chapter I, are what people are willing to settle for. They are what an individual considers important--important enough to be sought after. They are what is desired. They are personal. They may or may not be founded upon enlightened self-interest. They may be long-lived, or short-lived. But in the final analysis, they are merely human preferences. Hence, they are subject to scientific investigation or treatment only to a limited extent. Some values might not promote an individual's welfare but still be desired by him. Science cannot force an individual to decide what he actually prefers or desires. It cannot force him to decide what he is willing to settle for. This is a purely personal decision. Wherein are the merits of science, then, in dealing with values?

In the preceding paragraph we were considering intrinsic or end values--those that are taken in a given instance to possess worth in

and of themselves. It is quite possible that the individual, at some time or other, may shift these end values around. That is, at one time a particular value may take precedence over all others, and at other times might not even be considered. Or perhaps an individual would value, in a given instance, something for itself, while in another situation it might be valued because it helps him to get something he wants more. It is precisely in these two situations where science can be of tremendous aid in helping an individual to arrive at the values he would choose to hold. In other words, science is useful when we are dealing with extrinsic or instrumental values (those that lead to attainment of an end value), or when we are dealing with a conflict among end values. Science will help us find answers to the question, "Are the things we desire (prefer) actually desirable (good for our welfare)?" by helping us to see the antecedents and consequences of that which we desire and wherein, and to what extent, this particular desire agrees or disagrees with other desires we have. This is merely an application of two criteria involved in scientific study--namely, adequacy and harmony of outlook or conclusion.

It can be said, then, that science is of relatively little value in helping an individual decide what he prefers or desires. What a person is willing to settle for is largely a personal matter. Once our end values are hypothetically set up, however, science can make a significant contribution toward their evaluation and subsequent determination. It can help an individual to determine whether his values, if carried into action, will be beneficial or detrimental to himself and/or society. It can also help him to see whether and where-

in two or more chosen values might result in mutually obstructive behavior.

At this point, a summary of what has been said thus far would seem in order. In Chapter I, moral values were assumed to be man-made--relative to time, place, circumstance, and individual. They are arrived at when man chooses between right and wrong or between two goods that appear to be of equal rightness. These values, really to be considered moral, must carry over into individual or group behavior and improve it. Thus far in this chapter, we have seen that our commitments as a nation--to democracy and science--would indicate a method of teaching moral values that would be reflective and one that would indicate criteria to be used when making choices concerning values. Now let us see exactly what the roles of teacher and student would be when the relativistic--democratic--scientific orientation is taken.

The teacher's task would be simplified if her orientation were an absolutistic-autocratic-authoritarian one or an absolutistic-anarchistic-agnostic one. In the first approach there is an ultimate right that is to be taught which would be decided by the state. Humanly determined values have no standing. The teacher would be the authoritative representative of the state in the classroom and would teach only the state system of values and would allow no others to enter the discussion. Thought control (indoctrination), rather than thought guidance, would exist. In the latter approach, although ultimate right exists, there is no way for man to come to know it. If this be true then the teacher could not logically teach any value system to the students. Complete tolerance of values without any thought guidance

would exist. The teacher could not help or guide students since she is no better off than they are concerning knowledge of ultimate right.

In the relativistic-democratic-scientific approach no ultimate right is assumed. Moral values are assumed to be man-made and relative to time, place, circumstances, and person. They are not absolute. This would mean, of course, that the teacher could not justifiably teach a pre-fixed set of morals because there are as many sets as there are individual persons. Which or whose would she teach? And even if she could find a set that was generally accepted, would it apply to every time, place, set of circumstances, and to all individuals? Nor could the teacher assume that, since she is in command of the class and is a more mature, better educated, and wiser person than the students, she is at liberty to teach those morals which she accepts as valid. The more logical approach to make in the classroom would be to begin with the posing of a problem which represents either an inadequacy or a disharmony in student outlook--preferably both. Any and all ideas as to what is right or good, or best to do in this particular problem situation, or any idea in any way related to the problem or its solution, should be accepted for discussion. Opportunity should be given to each person in the classroom to express his or her ideas, or ideas in the assigned reading. It would be the teacher's responsibility to encourage as many students as are willing to participate and to act as discussion leader and moderator--but this is not all. It would be her responsibility, also, as a more mature, better educated person, to see that a good variety of ideas is offered even if she must suggest them herself or bring in ideas of historical figures. In this way, rather

than getting ideas that represent only one set of values, ideas that represent several would be introduced. These ideas will probably represent values not only of different individuals, but also of different times, places, and circumstances.

With regard to our assumption that moral or immoral ideas are those which lead to and show themselves in action and behavior rather than beliefs, it would be the teacher's responsibility in the class discussion to see that each of the ideas presented would be carried to what it logically implies in action or behavior. This could be accomplished by asking for examples or explanations of ideas presented. The teacher might ask, "How was this idea, or how could it be, carried into action?" or "How would this idea affect the behavior of a person?" Again we must stress the point that at this stage no preference should be shown to certain types of behavior or action suggested as results of the ideas presented.

The ideas related to the problem and their implications as to action are now before the group. Another responsibility of the teacher is related to our assumption that moral choices are not simply choices between right or wrong, good or bad, but are choices among what is available or under consideration. This should be in the back of the teacher's mind continuously as the ideas and their resulting actions are presented in the discussion. Questions should be raised concerning the relationships between the problem and ideas having a bearing upon it. The teacher should be careful to point out to the class that the ideas presented may oppose or conflict with one another. It is the teacher's responsibility to help the class see whether and wherein they do.

The foregoing is not only in harmony with our assumption regarding the nature of morality, but it is also putting democracy to practical use in the classroom. Democracy implies that there should be no special privilege for certain individuals or for their ideas, but that freedom of expression should exist equally for all persons; and, therefore, all ideas should be given equal hearing. This brings us face to face with a situation that has great potential for helping students reach moral decisions intelligently. Many ideas, together with implied behavior, have been suggested as solutions to the problem posed. Some of these appear (at least to some students) to be beneficial to self and/or society and some appear to be just as clearly detrimental. And some suggested solutions do not appear to be one way or the other.

It is precisely at this point that great possibilities for high-quality moral instruction exist. It is also at this point where many teachers fail in assuming their responsibility. Having reached this point in a discussion, some teachers would give their opinion as to the right choice but add that, because of the moral nature of the situation, "each person has to make up his own mind," and let it go at that. Still others would presume to give the correct answer to the class.

It is apparent that now, when we are faced with a genuine moral situation, enlightenment as to procedure is badly needed. What would be the best method to use? To use the first one suggested in the previous paragraph is to frustrate students in their attempt to learn. To present the problem, as we have suggested, in terms of conflicting ideas but do nothing at all to help students resolve the problem will

result in little, if any, learning. They do not know how to go about solving the problem any more now than they did when the discussion started. This is precisely the time when they need able, albeit democratic, guidance from the teacher. To use the second method suggested in the previous paragraph, in which the teacher gives the correct answer, would be to give special privilege to the teacher's ideas. This would be dictation rather than democratic guidance, and might even foster student revolt. Both of these procedures would be undemocratic. The first would be anarchistic in that no attention is given to possible solutions--therefore, the conclusion seemingly implied is that each or any solution is as good as the next one. The second would be autocratic or authoritarian in that the teacher sets herself as the ruling authority and therefore the only one capable of seeing the so-called "true" solution. Both would be premature in the learning process--that is, conclusions would be drawn before the suggestions are tested.

As an alternative to these two kinds of procedure, we suggest continuing the democratic approach that was used in setting up the problem in the first place--that is, teacher and students working together toward a solution to the problem. Teacher guidance, needed at this point, might be given by raising a question or two. "How are we to decide which actions are good and which bad; which desirable and which undesirable?" "Can we set up any standards or criteria by which to judge goodness and badness that will help us?" Students and teacher alike will be free to suggest various criteria, but, once a criterion is agreed upon, it should remain the basis for judgment until changed by the group. It is not always necessary to suggest or adopt the

scientific criteria of adequacy and harmony in order to make the study democratic and reflective. It would be necessary if our aim is to reach more adequate and more harmonious student outlooks. However, in the final selection of criteria, by which to judge the relative goodness or badness of ideas and their resulting actions, the adopted criteria must be honored. And it becomes the teacher's responsibility to see that this is done.

There now exists a basis for democratic criticism of ideas. All ideas--students' and teacher's alike--must be judged in terms of the selected criteria. It will be necessary for the students and for the teacher to point out those that will or will not stand up under criticism. Those that do not hold up under democratic criticism will be considered to be immoral or at least less than the best on the basis of the criteria selected.

It is hoped that at an appropriate point in the study the criteria themselves may be challenged, by a class member or the teacher, as to their value as standards of criticism. Then new criteria can be selected and new conclusions drawn. This will tend to increase the scope of the study.

We have seen in this chapter then, that there are several basic factors, the implications of which must be taken into account, in moral instruction. They are the nature of democracy, the nature of morality, and the nature of science. We have discussed each of these very briefly hoping to make clear their effect upon classroom teaching. It would appear that the only reasons we have not seen much progress in studying moral values is that, generally speaking, the approach has not

reflective nor has there been recognition or employment of the function of adopted criteria on which to base evaluation. In the author's opinion, it is time that these approaches should be made and we shall attempt to show that they are not only possible, but that they can be successful. We trust that the units to follow in Chapter III will further illustrate and thus further clarify effectiveness in the classroom situation.

CHAPTER III

TEACHING UNITS

The following units are intended for use in the high school social studies curriculum. However, they would not necessarily be limited to this subject-matter area. Some of the units could be used, wholly or in part or perhaps with some modification, in other courses or in extra-curricular activities. The units are not introduced as the last words on moral teaching concerning the various unit-topics. They are merely presented as examples of what might be done to incorporate moral teaching in the public school curriculum. Although the units have been developed to be used in their entirety, each of them could be divided and sub-divided into smaller units; and, by the same token, they could be enlarged, expanded, or combined with other units to form entire courses of study.

The units are not intended to be iron-clad in their organization. Although a particular pattern of procedure is outlined in each unit presented, it is intended that this pattern be flexible. The development of the unit should always be adapted to the interests and the maturity of the students.

Attached to each unit, in the form of addendums, are the author's personal experiences with the unit (none is included for Unit One, due to the absence of such experience) and a bibliography of student references. These may be of help to individuals who would

attempt to make use of the units in classroom situations.

Moral teaching should take place at all age levels in the schools. There are some facts, however, which seem to indicate that moral teaching can be especially significant on the high school level. The first of these is that adolescents tend to be idealistic in outlook and tend to be troubled by apparent faults in the adult world. This would suggest that there is need for, and readiness to accept, examination of these faults. Secondly, adolescents are trying to emancipate themselves from parents' apron strings and are in need of mature guidance in helping them to choose which of their home teachings to accept and which to reject in favor of ideas commonly held by their peers.

With these brief notations, the units are presented for readers' consideration.

Introduction to Unit One

The following unit could well be taught in courses such as government, history, civics, economics, sociology, psychology, and probably others. It could be taught in its entirety (as it here appears), or its component parts could be expanded and taught in the course suggested by the various headings with the unit. In either case, the same method or procedure can be followed.

Unit One: Dignity and Worth of the Individual

One of the outstanding qualities of Western democracy is its insistence that the individual is the all-important unit of society. Government is looked upon as an implementing agency, a means to the end of guaranteeing and protecting individual rights. The state is not an end in itself, as totalitarianism proclaims. The rights which democratic government sustains include life with a minimum of limitations on freedom. (The term "limited" is used because in a democracy freedom and responsibility go hand in hand.) If this be true, then, in his relations with other men, the individual should look for the essential worth and dignity of each. Individual worth and dignity might be defined as that which entitles a person to respect and consideration from his fellowmen and to the rights and privileges extended him by the various groups to which he belongs. But, in looking for this quality, he may find that some men appear to have little worth and no dignity. Upon what basis should this be determined? In other words, when does a person possess worth and dignity? Where does the idea that all individuals possess worth and dignity stem from? With

these thoughts and questions in mind, the unit is begun.

It has been said by many that human life is sacred. How and where did this idea originate? What does it mean? Does a belief in the sacredness of human life carry with it a belief that men were "endowed with certain unalienable rights?" What does unalienable mean? What are some examples of unalienable rights? Do we possess any? Explain.

Political Aspects of the Unit

When governments were established, were any of these unalienable rights surrendered? Which? Do unalienable rights in a democracy differ from those in an autocratic or an anarchistic framework? Where can we find these rights listed?

A study of the English Bill of Rights, the American Declaration of Independence, the American Bill of Rights, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens, the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights would be in order; comparisons to be made.

Do any of these nations appear to be more interested in the worth of individuals than others? How can we tell? To what extent are the ideas embodied in these documents realized? What seem to be the reasons supporting the stand of each nation taking into account both theory and practice?

Do any of these nations offer citizens protection against certain actions by government? What does this indicate? What do these nations require of their citizens in return for the various privileges extended to them? Does the fact that nations guarantee or deny rights to citizens have any effect upon individual citizens' behavior? How?

It is to be expected that, during this part of the unit, additional time will be given to discussion of practices and conditions within the United States.

Historical Aspects of the Unit

What did the ancient Greeks and Hebrews believe (pro and con) about the dignity and worth of the individual? Down through history as the idea grew, it suffered repeated threats and reversals. Give some examples. What was the immediate background of the emergence of the "middle class" of people? Did the concept of individual worth and dignity have anything to do with it? Explain. Give some examples of actions or speeches that seem to support or deny the belief in the worth of an individual, as America grew from infancy to maturity. On the positive side, the cases of Peter Zenger, the Boston Tea Party, Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" speech, organizations fighting for women's rights, frontier individualism, equal rights for native-born and naturalized immigrants, as well as others, will probably be mentioned. How would these occurrences affect an individual's sense of personal worth and dignity? On the negative side, slavery, prejudice against immigrants, persecution of religious minorities, discrimination against non-property owners and women, are likely to be cited. How would these affect him? Give some examples that seem to be representative of the feelings and sentiments of American society today.

Economic Aspects of the Unit

The economic system in the United States is known as a private-enterprize system, wherein each person has freedom to compete with his fellow citizens in economic pursuits. Does this imply complete freedom?

Are there rules to follow? What are some? It has been charged that the impersonality of the factory system which has flourished has reduced workers to mere units-of-labor and has stripped them of all pride of workmanship. To what extent may this be true? What about seniority? Have there been any attempts on the part of our society to offset or overcome these conditions?

Are all lines of economic endeavor considered of mutually equal significance and therefore worthy of respect? On what basis do economic classes exist? How do these affect the dignity and worth that an individual is supposed to possess?

Have labor unions helped or hindered individuals to feel worthwhile and dignified on the job? How? Right to work laws? Management? Government agencies and policies?

At this point perhaps a brief comparison of the three basic economic systems of modern times--capitalism, socialism, communism--would be profitable.

Social Aspects of the Unit

Many programs have been established, supported by public and/or private funds to provide special services for the handicapped in our nation. What might this indicate? To what extent have we done as much as we could have? What does this show?

There has been a shift in emphasis in penology, from punishment to rehabilitation. Has this shift been in theory, in practice, or in both? Give examples and show their implications.

In the United States, titles of nobility are prohibited by the Constitution. Why? Social classes based on heredity have never flour-

ished in the United States. Why not? What does this indicate? Instead of a strict caste-system, a fluid class-system exists in the United States in which there is considerable social mobility. Explain. Give examples. Is this desirable or undesirable?

On the other hand, the wealth in our nation is concentrated in the hands of a few. Prevalent in the United States today are stereotypes and prejudices concerning social classes, occupational groups, minority groups. Urbanization has increased the impersonality and homogeneity of society. What do these conditions imply? How do they affect the individual?

Personal Aspects of the Unit

What does all this mean to the individual in his daily life? How should it affect him? Does it mean that each person must fight (figuratively speaking) in behalf of the rights of others? Must respect be given to those who abuse their rights or perhaps abuse the rights of others? If so, in what way? To what extent? Must respect be given equally to all individuals, regardless of race, religion, nationality, occupation, wealth, education, appearance, etc.? If so, why? If not, why not? Must respect be given to those who do not actually deserve it or desire it? Give examples.

Is it true that along with the bad, there is some good in each one of us? Give examples. Suppose the good is not apparent. Is there an obligation to seek it out? Why? Isn't it possible that some individuals are completely void of worth and dignity? What should be our attitude or behavior toward them?

Does recognition of individual worth and dignity imply more than "respect"? If so, what? Perhaps it means that an individual would be worthy of the constructive criticism, kindness, tolerance, loyalty, consideration, encouragement, friendliness, cheerfulness, sympathy, understanding, gratitude, generosity, courtesy, justice, and fraternity of others. Do the opinions of others toward us affect us? What effect do the above listed attitudes, held by others toward us, have upon us? How would they make us feel? Would they help or hinder us to grow and develop in life? Explain. What effect would qualities opposite to these have upon us? Would the effects in either case always be desirable, or always undesirable?

After consideration has been given to the various phases of the question, and ample discussion-time allowed, the teacher should bring the class back to the original question under consideration ("When does a person possess worth and dignity?"). It is now appropriate for standards or criteria to be established by the class, under the guidance of the teacher, by which to answer this question. Our discussion thus far has shown that an individual's worth or dignity (if he possesses them) will show itself in all phases of his life. The class might choose several different criteria suggested by the different aspects of life discussed in the unit; that is, criteria reflecting the political, social, economic, or personal nature of a problem situation. The question could be raised as to whether an individual could be judged to have dignity and worth on the basis of one criterion and judged to be void of these qualities (or partially so) on the basis of another. Many problem situations would involve an overlapping of these factors

and would therefore warrant an attempt toward combining the several criteria into one of broader scope, if the class could be challenged to do so. This would indeed be a challenge for the class (perhaps a frustrating one) since inconsistencies in our judgments, when varying or various criteria are at work, are likely to occur. Recognizing these, the teacher should then attempt to guide the class toward further clarification and understanding of the problems involved in determining the dignity and worth of individuals.

Summary and Conclusion

On the basis of our study, is the chosen definition of individual dignity and worth, viz., "that which entitles a person to respect and consideration from his fellowmen and to the rights and privileges extended him by the various groups to which he belongs," a proper one? It would appear to be. Are we clearly committed to the idea that all individuals possess worth and dignity? If so, on what basis and to what extent? As we examine our political and economic commitments, as we see the attempts that have been made to aid individuals with their problems, as we recognize the struggles of man to better his lot in life, and as we recognize the effect that recognition and respect by his fellowman has upon an individual, we can probably conclude that, generally speaking, we do assume that each individual, on occasion, has some dignity and worth. Taking into account the many different situations that have bearing on the matter and trying to recognize the many apparent conflicting practices in our society our conclusions, at least in part, might be that an individual should be judged to possess dignity and worth (1) when he assumes the obligations that democratic

government requires of him; (2) when he seeks economic survival in accordance with the rules that are set up by society, insofar as they are in accord with democratic principles; (3) when he willingly aids in the fight against forces that would bring oppression and ruin to society; (4) when he seeks to aid those less fortunate than he; and (5) when he is tolerant in his judgment of those with whom he does not agree.

These conclusions may require clarification or revision as further questions are raised. Are there any noticeable confusions or contradictions present? If so, what are they? What can be done to resolve them? Are there alternative ways of determining when an individual possesses dignity and worth and when not? What circumstances might require these alternatives to be used?

Student Bibliography

General Textbooks

Barnes, Harry Elmer. Society in Transition. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1952.

Excellent reference book on the social ills in our society and our attempts to treat them.

Flick, Oka Stanton and Smith, Henry L. Government in the United States. Laidlaw Brothers, New York, 1953.

Section One of the text gives an excellent overview of the growth of the idea and purpose of democracy, discussing the many documents down through the ages in which they were expressed. Good discussion of inalienable rights.

Landis, Judson T. and Landis, Mary G. Building Your Life. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1954.

Chapters 17, 18, 23, and 24 have specifically to do with qualities of personality that evolve from basic nature of individual life and existence.

Young, Kimball and Mock, Raymond W. Sociology and Social Life. American Book Company, New York, 1959.

Chapters 10, 11, 12 and 13 provide a good discussion of social class structure and mobility and what it means in the life of the individual.

Non-Fiction

Kennedy, John F. Profiles in Courage. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1956.

This is a series of biographies of United States senators, illustrating how integrity and self-respect won out against political gain and expediency in motivating these men to act in behalf of the welfare of their country.

Ortega y Gasset, Jose. Revolt of the Masses. W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York, 1932.

This is an essay on political science which attempts to describe the "mass man" of the Western liberal democracies, his powers, his problems, his frustrations, and his failures.

Differentiates two types of "mass men"--the superior man who makes demands of himself and the common man who is content to be what he is.

Overstreet, H. A. The Mature Mind. W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.,
New York, 1949.

A psychological approach which discusses dignity in terms of developed maturity. The last chapter is particularly significant in that it defines human dignity, 20th century style, and what an individual can do to enhance his worth and dignity for himself and his society.

Fiction

There are many excellent novels that concern themselves with man's search for worthwhile qualities within himself. In fact, sometimes novels, present a much more provocative discussion of moral issues than scientific and academic literature. The following novels are listed only as examples of the many that are available.

The following three measure the worth of man against ultra-futuristic societies:

Brave New World by Aldous Huxley.

Nineteen Eighty-Four by George Orwell.

On the Beach by Nevil Shute.

Other novels that involve a search for the meaning of human dignity in situations or under conditions that seem to be devoid of it all:

Democracy by Henry Adams.

Oliver Twist by Charles Dickens.

Magnificent Obsession by Lloyd C. Douglas.

Advise and Consent by Allen Drury.

The Return of the Native by Thomas Hardy.

The Scarlet Letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne.

For Whom the Bell Tolls by Ernest Hemingway.

Old Man and the Sea by Ernest Hemingway.

Main Street by Sinclair Lewis.

Of Human Bondage by W. Somerset Maugham.

Introduction to Unit Two

This unit on honesty, as it appears, would probably be difficult to fit into many courses in the high school curriculum. But it would seem that, in part at least and incidentally, it could be used in almost any course. At any rate, it is included here to illustrate how the subject of honesty could be dealt with in a democratic-scientific atmosphere.

Unit Two: Honesty

The unit could be initiated with a few questions. Is honesty the best policy? What causes one individual's "sense of honesty" to differ from that of another? Is it possible for a person to be honest or dishonest without being conscious of it? Why are some persons deliberately dishonest? Does dishonesty have any merits? These few introductory questions might serve to stimulate interest and would probably raise the question, "What is honesty?"

Honesty may refer either to the act of telling the truth or to the act of not stealing property from another. If, for purposes of illustration, the meaning is limited to the matter of telling the truth, the definition of honesty still remains difficult. The following questions would have to be considered. Does honesty require telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Does it mean that one must possess all the facts before he can be honest? Does it mean that every fact must be entirely correct? If so, an honest human being is rarely to be found; indeed, perhaps there is none. Does it mean merely telling what one has seen, or telling what one believes to be true? Would a person be honest who told something wrong because of his

own carelessness, even though he thought he was right? Is a person dishonest who lies in court to save the life of an innocent person? Is a parent dishonest who teaches his children that Santa Claus is a real, live person who lives at the North Pole? Many such questions might be asked. In each case, the decision seems more or less clear, yet an exact and practical definition of honesty remains difficult to state.

If the meaning of honesty refers to the act of not stealing another's property, there are similar questions to be considered. Is a woman dishonest who takes a hairpin from a friend's dressing table without asking permission? Is a person dishonest who accidentally finds property, then keeps it without making an attempt to learn the identity of the owner? Is a man a thief who takes food to keep his family from starving? If a man knows he is purchasing stolen goods, is he being dishonest to complete the purchase? Is it thievery to operate an automobile without purchasing a license?

Honesty is much talked about and encouraged and most persons could probably give a general definition of it, but many become confused when pressed for a practical definition. Perhaps honesty takes on meaning as we come to know and understand the values of a particular group. Standards of honesty seem to involve group approval or disapproval of an individual's judgments and/or actions. What are some indications that, in general, our society approves of and encourages honest behavior? What are some indications to the contrary? Since there are many smaller groups in the United States with conflicting ideas about honesty, which group's standards should receive the approval

of an individual? Is it to be left up to individual preference? Suppose an individual chooses to follow the standards of honesty accepted by a criminal group? To what extent is he free to do so? What do criminals believe about honesty? What is "an honest thief"? Do groups sometimes permit violation of their own standards? Examples of these, such as April Fool's Day, Halloween, Mardi Gras, etc., can be discussed. When an individual belongs to more than one group, each accepting different standards, the problem of choosing to which group to be loyal becomes even more complex. Could it possibly be that, not wanting to be disloyal to any group yet wanting the approval of all, a person is actually driven to be deceitful?

A question that has been hinted at thus far must now be brought out very pointedly. What should a person do when honesty comes in conflict with another equally admirable trait? For example: A hostess asks her guest's son how he likes the soup. Johnny, if he is honest, might say that it is the worst he has tasted. However, should Johnny be kind and thoughtful (or polite) to his hostess and be dishonest?

The story is told of a secretary who sought advice from the editor of a lovelorn column in a local newspaper. The secretary wrote that she was working for a man for whom she had developed strong feelings of loyalty. He had raised her salary several times, provided liberal vacations, furnished good working conditions, and even helped to finance the medical care of her aged mother. The secretary, in sharing many of her employer's business secrets, had learned that he was embezzling large sums of money from the corporation. She wanted to know whether she should be loyal and keep quiet or be honest and report his crime to the police authorities. The columnist advised her that a moral person is always both honest and loyal!¹

¹Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf. Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955, p. 95.

Should a person be honest with a sick friend whom he is visiting? Should he tell his friend he looks fine and perhaps improved, when this is not true? Is it possible that by telling a lie he might help his friend recover? Is it also possible that by telling the truth he might contribute to his friend's death? Suppose death would be better than recovery. Then would telling the lie have more merit than telling the truth? Are there many individuals who would do this? Why or why not?

Perhaps it is possible to refrain from telling the truth and yet not tell a lie. How might this be done? When might it be desirable? Would following this standard still constitute being honest? What are some results of this conflict between honesty and other desirable traits? Do individuals worry about contradictions in their beliefs and actions or between the two? Explain. Are we consciously aware of being hypo-critical? If so, or if not, what might this indicate?

Could conflict between two traits lead to further deceit or hypocrisy, or perhaps secrecy, crime, mental illness, etc.? Explain. Could conflict between two traits result in the acquisition of other desirable traits such as flexibility, tolerance, humility, etc.? Explain.

Is it possible to be unaware of these conflicts and contradictions in our beliefs and actions or between the two? Would this be desirable? Explain. What can we do to resolve these conflicts?

So far, we have assumed honesty to be desirable. If this is true there should be some supporting arguments. Does being honest have

any eternal or immortal significance? That is, does it help us to obtain salvation? Salvation from what? To what? Does being honest help us to get along with others? In what ways? But haven't we already illustrated that sometimes being dishonest also helps us in getting along with others?

What is intellectual honesty? Does being honest with yourself have any merits? Could it make us feel confident, dependable, worthwhile, etc.? Could it contribute to the feeling that we lack these and other qualities? Explain. How can we become intellectually honest? Are there any prerequisites?

It would be possible to insert at this point, discussion concerning a particular subject that the class has previously studied or will study in the near future. Honesty studied in relation to friendships, family, school, community, business, politics, religion, etc. would tend to broaden the unit and help illustrate how it could be very practical when used.

Summary and Conclusion

In summarizing the unit, it can probably be stated that honesty is both desirable and undesirable depending upon circumstances and upon individuals and groups involved. If the unit helps to recognize these ideas, and has challenged the students to think further on the subject, it has probably helped. But it has done little (if anything at all) to clarify when honesty is desirable and when not. Before conclusions can be reached, this must be done.

As this question is posed to the class, different criteria to be used in arriving at an answer will probably be suggested. Self-

respect might be one suggestion as the standard by which to judge the matter. In this case, it would be desirable to be honest only when it contributed to an individual's respect for himself. If being honest meant that he would have to admit being incompetent, inefficient, and negligent, this might conceivably detract from his feeling of self-respect, and thus make honesty undesirable. Or perhaps attainment of immediate personal goals would be suggested as a basis for settlement of the problem. This criterion implies that honesty would only be desirable when it would benefit us in some way. If it would not, then it would be considered undesirable. Or perhaps honesty would be considered desirable when it did not work to the detriment of self. However, this only states the preceding criterion negatively. Possibly failure to work to the detriment of others should be the criterion chosen. Would this indicate that honesty always must work to the good of others? If so, then honesty that harms others would be undesirable. Still other criteria might be suggested by the class or by the teacher. Two or more of those suggested might be combined to form a single, more inclusive one.

Standards of honesty, it would seem, grow out of social situations and vary according to the group concerned. Dishonesty not only occurs frequently but seems not to be considered undesirable in many instances. It would also appear that honest behavior on some occasions is undesirable. Generally speaking, at least in theory, society approves of: (1) honesty that does not harm innocent parties; (2) honesty that might bring punishment to the guilty; (3) dishonesty that is unintentional--that which is due to human error; and, (4) dishonesty we assume

to be permissible or that we ourselves would permit, such as taking a hairpin from the dresser of a friend. Society disapproves of: (1) unscrupulous honesty that harms innocent parties, such as when we tell our sick friend he looks terrible, or our hostess that we disliked the soup; and, (2) dishonesty that is illegal or selfish, such as when we steal or lie to avoid deserved punishment.

However, there would be exceptions to every one of these general guides as to when honesty or dishonesty would be approved or disapproved. It seems as if, in each isolated case, the approval or disapproval would depend upon (as Otto puts it--see page 7, this paper) the antecedents and consequences of the honest or dishonest behavior. While this conclusion may not be as definite as might be desired, nevertheless, it is in harmony with the line and scope of our study and it should serve adequately as a challenge and basis for further study on the part of the class and/or individual students.

Personal Experiences with the Unit

The preceding unit on honesty has been used several times by the author in a senior high school course in Sociology. Although it was not presented exactly as it appears here, the material and procedure involved were essentially the same. In order to relate the unit more closely to school life, additional questions were discussed concerning cheating on examinations, stealing books, and lying in order to obtain excused admits to class.

The unit was introduced in connection with a study of how society controls its members, under the heading of "Control through Folkways and Mores." Folkways and mores are the simple, unwritten

social customs of any society that govern much of an individual's daily behavior as a member of society. Folkways have to do with behavior that society considers acceptable but not necessarily right or wrong. Mores have to do with moral behavior (that which society considers right) and taboos (negative mores) have to do with immoral behavior (that which society considers wrong). Folkways and mores seem to be generally understood but can be stated as formal rules only with great difficulty. As an illustration of this point, the unit on honesty was introduced into the discussion.

There was considerable interest shown by the students in the discussion. This, in the author's opinion was because it dealt with what appeared to their minds as a conflict between the generally accepted rule of society that "honesty is the best policy" and the many forms of dishonest behavior that are seemingly accepted by society.

Another factor that created interest was the fact that the discussion was conducted in a democratic way. When the students realized that the discussion was not "rigged" with standard arguments that aimed at pre-arranged conclusions, they participated eagerly and frankly. On one occasion, in order to convince the students that such was the case, the author stated in almost a boastful way, that on many occasions he had deliberately lied and was proud of it. Some of the students were shocked to hear such a statement from their teacher, but the desired end was accomplished--lively and honest participation by many students who otherwise would probably have remained quiet. Some students even expressed themselves as believing "that dishonesty was okay as long as you could get by with it, barring illegal things like stealing," or

"everyone is dishonest in some way, so why shouldn't we be?"

Criteria by which to determine when honesty and dishonesty were desirable and when not were always difficult to agree on because of the many different suggestions made by the students. Most often, however, general agreement was reached that "harmful effects of honesty or dishonesty on one's self or others" should be the criterion by which to distinguish between the two. On this basis, our conclusions were then drawn.

Some students, however, would continue to voice their opinions that dishonesty was okay as long as you could get by with it, and others would not alter their beliefs that one should always be honest, regardless of consequences. These students recognized that sometimes there were desirable and undesirable effects of being either honest or dishonest, but were not disposed to use this knowledge to alter their opinions.

The author is satisfied that the discussions were worthwhile and beneficial to the students because of the respect that was shown for their opinions and their thinking whether or not it agreed with the thinking of the teacher or of the class as a group. On one occasion, at the conclusion of the unit, one student stopped at the author's desk and remarked, "I still think that one should be honest at all times." When asked, "Even if it meant harm or sorrow to an innocent person?" she replied, "I don't know." The author would be willing to wager that this student has done some subsequent thinking on the subject which is a part of our educational purpose as stated in Chapter II.

Student Bibliography

Non-Fiction

Barrett, Edward W. Truth is Our Weapon. Funk and Wagnalls Company,
New York, 1953.

Discusses truth and untruth as it is found in the United States and U.S.S.R. foreign policies and the consequences.

Very concrete illustrations.

Clark, Thaddeous B. What is Honesty? Science Research Associates, Inc.,
Chicago, 1952.

This is a life adjustment booklet and gives complete coverage of the subject. Also includes a discussion of lying, cheating, and stealing and the motives that prompt this type of behavior.

Quinn, James A. and Repke, Arthur. Living in the Social World. J. B. Lippencott Company, Chicago, 1956.

Unit 3 in this introductory sociology textbook deals with the explanation of everyday social relations including several discussions of honesty and dishonesty.

Periodicals

Brean, Herbert. "Everybody is Dishonest." Life, 45 (November 24, 1958),
pp. 70 ff.

This article discusses how dishonesty is detected by an expert in the field. Also justifies dishonesty in many instances. Tells differences between males and females with reference to dishonest behavior.

James, T. F. "Be Honest with Yourself." The American Weekly, April 23, 1961.

Discussion of intellectual honesty and how we can achieve it and how it can help us.

Lawrence, David. "Code of Codes." U. S. News and World Report, 47 (December 28, 1959) p. 90.

What intellectual honesty on the part of the average citizen, businessman and congressman would reveal.

Stolley, Richard B. "Belated Cheer for Honest Act." Life, 50 (May 12, 1961) pp. 97 ff.

The experience of a Negro family who found \$240,000 and returned it.

Fiction

Les Miserables by Victor Hugo.

Nothing but the Truth (a play) by James Montgomery.

The Other Wise Man by Henry VanDyke.

Introduction to Unit Three

The following unit on sexual behavior in the United States would probably fit best into a family relations course, but might also be used, wholly or in part, in courses such as home economics, psychology, personal hygiene, and health. The unit is not intended to be one on "sex education." That is, it is not constructed to give facts about sex, reproduction, etc. The assumption is that high-school students already possess these basic "facts of life." The unit is designed to examine ideas and standards of sexual behavior, how the ideas and standards were developed, conflicts that may exist--all with a view toward clarifying the issues and pointing to resolution of problems that exist in the minds of the students. Since the unit is intended for use at the high school level, it will deal primarily with premarital sexual morality.

Unit Three: Sexual Behavior in the United States

The unit could well be divided into five parts; namely, (1) introduction, (2) historical background, (3) conflicts in modern society, (4) how to meet the conflicts, and (5) summary and conclusions.

Introduction

It would be well, if at all possible, to make students aware, at least in a general way, of the type of unit to be studied. This could be done through a reading assignment or perhaps the showing of a film related to dating behavior. To arouse interest and get responses on the part of the students, a discussion based on the following questions could initiate the unit. What changes have taken place in the last one hundred fifty to two hundred years in the United States with respect to moral behavior? Before answering this question, however,

another should be raised, either by students or by teacher. What do we mean by moral behavior? Answers likely to be given are that it is good, or right, or proper behavior. Immoral behavior, then, would be that which is bad, or wrong, or improper. Are there any more specific meanings that might be given? What interpretation would likely be made of the original question by the average person? That sexual morality would be the common interpretation is likely to be agreed. Before proceeding, however, brief discussion, explanation, and illustration of changes in moral behavior in the last two hundred years in the United States (in the non-sexual sense) might be beneficial to the class members.

How have ideas and practices concerning sex changed since grandma's (or great grandma's) day? Ideas like "they had chaperones," "a boy couldn't kiss his girl until they were engaged," "the punishment or criticism for immoral behavior was much more severe then, than it is now," "they frowned on divorce more than we do," and others will be brought out. The practice of bundling, common in frontier America, should be discussed.

Why have ideas and customs changed? What effect has religion, urbanization, and greater freedom for women, had on moral standards? Other questions will arise to stimulate further investigation into background and development of our modern ideas and practices about sexual behavior. Where did the early colonists (or our great grandmas) get their ideas about sex? Where do our ideas come from today? Have moral standards risen or have they been lowered in the last two hundred years? Are there problems of a moral (sexual) nature that exist in the United States today? What are they? How can these problems be handled?

These questions serve to give direction to the remainder of the unit.

Background

This part of the unit can be handled through written assignments, special reports, or lecture.

Many traditional attitudes toward sex have come down to us from the ancient Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and early Christians. What were the basic Hebrew contributions? Discussion of monogamy and the levirate would follow and perhaps contrasting forms of marriage customs. What did the Hebrews believe about chastity and adultery? Was the basic motivation for marrying emotional, social, economic, or religious? Or were marriages based on romantic love? What was the status of women? What did they believe about the double standard? How did this appear in their society?

How were the ideas and customs of the Greeks and Romans different from those of the Hebrews? How were they alike?

What influence did the early Christians have on the development of modern moral codes? Asceticism should be discussed, with examples given. How did their belief in spiritual perfection affect their own moral code? How long did these early codes prevail? When was the idea of romantic love introduced into the picture? How did this come about? How did this affect the choosing of mates?

How did the Industrial Revolution cause moral standards to change? Were there any specific inventions that were especially significant?

What were the moral standards that prevailed at the time of the colonization of America? How did greater economic, religious, and

political freedom affect them? Give examples.

What were the "roaring twenties"? How was this period significant in the evolution of moral codes? Were standards altered by the two world wars? How?

At this point in the discussion, it becomes clear that our society has accepted some conflicting ideas that have grown out of the past. Which groups in our society seem to support the codes of the Hebrews and early Christians? Which groups seem to support the more modern, permissive attitudes toward sex?

The conflicting moral codes might be summarized as follows:

Traditional Code	versus	Permissive Code
1. Sex is evil and sinful		1. Sex is natural and wholesome
2. Religious orientation		2. Secular orientation
3. Many restrictions		3. Few restrictions

What percentage of people in the United States accept either one or the other of these two extreme positions? What do the remainder believe? Is it possible that some persons might accept one code in theory but another in practice? Or a combination of the two? How?

The foregoing material should be discussed long enough and thoroughly enough that the students have a clear understanding of the conflict in our society and how it developed.

Conflicts in Modern Society

Having this understanding of the basic conflict in our society should enable the students to see the practical implications of such a conflict. However, these conflicts should be clearly drawn and labeled. Some would appear as follows:

Conflict Number One

*Purity before marriage versus **premarital sexual experience.

Supporting Ideas

*Men prefer to marry girls who are chaste. Men lose respect for girls with loose morals. Abstinence is not harmful. Premarital experiences lead to adultery after marriage.

**Premarital experiences are good preparation for marriage. Premarital experiences can help to prove or disprove sexual compatibility. Wild oats should be sown before marriage (we are by nature polygamous). Release of pent-up tensions is desirable.

Conflict Number Two

*Maintaining chastity to gain society's approval versus **gaining status with peer group.

Supporting Ideas

*Society doesn't approve of premarital pregnancy. Society doesn't approve of abortions. Society makes birth-control information difficult to obtain. Society doesn't approve of forced marriages.

**There is strong motivation among teenagers to prove seductive ability (girls lead boys on; boys attempt seduction). Adolescents' need to act experienced is strong. Shows up in dress, speech, actions, etc. Chaperones have been abandoned. Many conditions exist that encourage intimacy.

Conflict Number Three

*Mental cleanliness by avoiding sex versus **natural interest in sex.

Supporting Ideas

*Censorship prevails to insure clean minds--especially in youth. Literature and art are sometimes branded as obscene or indecent. Jokes with a sex angle are called "dirty jokes." A person who dwells on sex has his "mind in the gutter."

**Sexual feelings are always potentially present. Mass media are full of sex (advertising, romantic movies, stories). Men talk openly and freely about conquests, jokes, etc. Women are not as open and free with their interest in sex.

Conflict Number Four

*Nice girl versus **good sport.

Supporting Ideas

*A nice girl maintains high standards at all times. A nice girl feels guilty or embarrassed when engaging in intimacies or sex talk. A nice girl uses approved technical terms when talking about sex.

**A good sport demands equal privileges with men. She rejects the double standard. A good sport is not shocked by sex or sex talk. A good sport is more likely to drink and smoke. A good sport draws no lines with respect to sexual behavior although she is not promiscuous.

Conflict Number Five

*Demand for modesty versus **desire for sex appeal.

Supporting Ideas

*Lack of modesty is not approved. Human body is indecent when unclothed. United States society disapproves, generally, of the bikini, nudist camps, strip-tease artists.

**Great emphasis placed on being attractive. Clothing is designed to emphasize sex characteristics. Cosmetic industry appeals to our desire to attract and please opposite sex.

As these conflicts in attitude and practice are shown and the students "see" them, they should be able to supply some of the supporting ideas that are listed and perhaps others that have not been listed. Also, they should be able to give illustrations and examples. Other conflict-posing questions can probably be raised. Are there any real differences between sex with love and sex without love? Between sex in marriage and sex outside of marriage? What do married persons say about sex in and out of marriage?

This discussion of conflicts, as they exist practically in life, should give rise to other searching questions. Does sex have the same meaning for all persons? What are some different motives for sexual activity? Social pressure, curiosity, quest for satisfaction, rebellion, desire for emotional unity, desire to express love might be a few of the motives discussed. Which of these seem to be accepted and which unaccepted? On what basis? Which are healthy and which unhealthy? Why? Which lead to desirable ends and which to undesirable ones? Explain.

Perhaps out of this discussion the class might arrive at some agreement as to which of these meanings or motives seem preferable. Using these as standards, can any conclusions be drawn about the way in which United States society is attempting to deal with the conflicts mentioned? Do there appear to be any noticeable trends?

As the discussion proceeds and students express their ideas, these will need to be dealt with. Some will need clarification or illustration. Some will need to be questioned as to their accuracy when compared with generally accepted facts of the matter. Some of the ideas that were used to support a particular side of a conflict also need to be questioned to see whether they are generally accepted as true. Which are accepted as true and which are not? Accepted by whom? How can this be done? What basis for judgment should be used? Who can say which ideas are true and which false in a society that itself accepts contradicting standards and beliefs?

How to Meet the Conflicts

To the extent that the conflicts outlined have been understood, the students are better qualified to work out their own moral standards. However, they would be much better qualified if they could obtain information that would help them to separate false ideas from those which are in harmony with generally accepted facts. Where can such information be obtained?

Social scientists know enough about sex, and what happens under certain circumstances, to be of some help at this point. Some commonly held, but false ideas about sex, and the facts concerning them are included here:

Fallacy Number One

Sex is essentially beautiful and good, or sex is essentially nasty and vulgar.

Fact

Sexual experiences occur at different levels. They can be beautiful and good or neurotic and vicious. They can be delightful, or unpleasant and boring. The kind of sex experiences we have depends on the kind of person we are, the kind of person we want to be, the kind of family relationships we want, and the kind of society we want to live in.

Fallacy Number Two

Sexual relations is a need of all persons who are normal.

Fact

Release of sexual tensions is a need for all normal males--but this is provided for by the body itself, through nocturnal emissions. An over-powering sex drive is usually emotional rather than biological in nature. A majority of women have little natural desire for sex relations.

Fallacy Number Three

A person who is really in love will not be sexually attracted to anyone else.

Fact

Most men and many women are polyerotic--that is, they are physically attracted by many members of the opposite sex, even after marriage.

Fallacy Number Four

It is practically impossible for a young person to avoid sex relations before marriage.

Fact

Premarital sex is often the exception rather than the rule. Thirty-six studies made between 1915 and 1959 show premarital relationships among men to be as low as 32% and as high as 73%; among women they were as low as 7% and as high as 47%.

Fallacy Number Five

Intelligent persons can protect themselves from venereal disease and pregnancy.

Fact

Both are more common than supposed. Venereal disease is the second most widespread class of disease in the United States and is still increasing. Between 1950 and 1957 the increase in illegitimate births was more than twice as great as for legitimate births. It is estimated that up to a million abortions are performed each year in the United States.

Fallacy Number Six

Sex relations are private affairs.

Fact

Sex relations are rarely private affairs. They affect the general public through the tax burden, health departments, families of the couple, the marriage, and the child. Sexual affairs outside of marriage sooner or later become known by associates of those involved.

Fallacy Number Seven

The girl who refuses to give in to her boy friend may lose him.

Fact

The girl who gives in decreases, rather than increases, her chances for a good marriage. Boys brag. Boys question her previous behavior. Guilt feelings may break the relationship. Why marry, when you can be satisfied without marriage? Fear of pregnancy and forced marriage may break the relationship.

Fallacy Number Eight

The success of marriage depends on the achievement of satisfactory sex relationships.

Fact

In many successful marriages, satisfactory sexual adjustments are achieved late or not at all. Studies by Terman, Landis, and Krueger support this idea. Sex is not a substitute for maturity, character, mental health, and basic agreement on fundamental issues.

This is only one way of presenting what social scientists have to contribute in the way of factual material and it may not be as complete or as objective as we would like it to be. Therefore, these "facts" should be scrutinized, questioned, expanded, and investigated according to the interests of the students.

Summary and Conclusion

As the class moves into the concluding phases of the unit, it would be well to note some of the trends. Are our traditional sex standards definitely on the way out? Are these standards violated in the United States more, or less, than other moral standards? How do violations compare with traffic violations, for example? The traditional code of chastity has been questioned and the double standard

has been challenged. What are being suggested as substitutes to replace these standards? Standards accepted in theory are not upheld in practice. What does this indicate? Are there any forces which might tend to counteract the liberalization of our sex codes? How? How does the United States' situation compare with sex problems in other countries? What are they doing? What are the various alternatives open to a young person trying to look at the situation objectively and set his or her own standards of moral behavior?

Before drawing our conclusions, criteria must be chosen, as a basis for these conclusions. This should be a cooperative endeavor between students and teacher. The students' ideas should be respected, and help should be given them to the end that they can come to reasonable agreement concerning the criteria to be selected. Once agreed upon, conclusions should be reached on this basis until the class chooses other criteria. The following conclusions might be drawn. Standards pertaining to sexual morality have been changing over a long period of time and still are. One basic conflict--sex as evil versus sex as natural--seems to have developed over the centuries. Other conflicts that show themselves in everyday life can be derived from the major one. There seem to be many supporting arguments, some reliable and some unreliable, when compared to scientific facts that are available. Sex has different meanings for different individuals, some of which are desirable and some of which are undesirable when judged in light of how they affect the welfare of the individual and/or society.

Personal Experiences with the Unit

This unit, essentially as it appears here, has been handled several times by the author in a co-educational Family Relations course for seniors in high school. It was introduced in connection with a Chapter in the text entitled "Standards of Behavior" which dealt with such topics as expressing affection on dates, why standards are important, and reasons for the existence of moral codes.

The author usually opened the unit with a question. For instance, "What is the central subject of this chapter?" or "What do we mean by standards of behavior?" Then by carefully guiding the discussion, such terms as "sex," "sexual," "sex relations," "necking and petting" were introduced either by students or teacher (preferably by the students). This type of approach served three basic purposes, viz., to insure a controlled introduction of these words into the discussion (which the author assured the students were perfectly good, natural, appropriate and even nice words that they should feel free to use) to be certain that all students had a clear idea of the subject to be discussed and to set the example and pattern of frankness which was to characterize the discussion to follow. Needless, to say, the unit aroused interest.

The above-mentioned approach seems to have been successful because, as the discussion progressed, the students became less and less reluctant to express viewpoints and to ask questions. In fact, on several occasions, the author had to caution the students to keep the discussion on an impersonal basis. Care was exercised to prevent the discussion from degenerating into a testimonial meeting or a "brag" session.

The author found that one of the most valuable requirements of one who acts as chairman of such a discussion is a mature sense of humor. Many things of a "touchy" nature can be said with a twinge of humor that could never be said in all seriousness. However, care needs to be exercised that a "silly-giddy" type of humor is avoided, lest the serious effect of the unit be lost.

The author found no dearth of material available locally to be used for reference reading or reports. However, many of the students, from their own varied reading sources, had a fair general knowledge of all phases of the unit except Part IV, "How to Meet the Conflicts." Only the more mature and academically talented students seemed to possess any knowledge as outlined therein. Therefore, this part of the unit seemed to be the most challenging and most useful to the students, although the rest of the unit seemed to bring clarification and insights to nearly all in the class.

Setting up criteria and reaching conclusions always seemed to present a problem for the class. This task seemed to be met with blank expressions as if it were thrust upon them before all the discussion material had been sufficiently assimilated. Students were clear on the behavior that was implied by the two extreme value systems; viz., traditional and permissive. And they also recognized that small segments of our society either approve or disapprove of one extreme or the other and the reasons therefor. The matter that they had real difficulty grasping was why the major part of society, since it did not approve either extreme viewpoint, had not worked out a neat, clear-cut compromise for the guidance of the younger generation. This, of

course, reflects the confusion that exists among the adult members of society concerning premarital sexual codes. The students needed to see that, although society generally agrees that a compromise between the two extreme standards is desirable, it is not agreed on the nature of the compromise. For this reason, the author found it most beneficial to make a written assignment calling for development of a compromise standard which the student believed society would approve. This seemed to help prepare students for an oral discussion in which criteria were set up and conclusions drawn. Specific criteria were established and subsequent conclusions reached. The variety of both criteria and conclusions reflected almost as many compromise standards as there were students in the class. However, the over-all conclusion of the written and oral discussions was that, since society has not chosen to work out a clearly stated compromise, it is up to each individual to do so, and to do it in such a way as to gain society's approval. Although this conclusion left some students rather frustrated--trying to please a society that was not exactly clear on what it wanted--it at least let them know what society expected of them.

The writer is convinced that, whether or not his students accepted the responsibilities placed upon them by society, they at least recognized them. And he is convinced that the discussions were helpful in providing them with the broad view necessary to render the conclusions usable, if they desired to do so.

Student Bibliography

General Textbooks

Duvall, Evelyn Millis and Hill, Reuben. When You Marry. D. C. Heath

and Company, Boston, 1945.

Chapters 7 and 8 are especially related to the subjects of sex and morality before marriage.

Divall, Evelyn Millis. Facts of Life and Love for Teen-Agers. Popular Library, New York, 1953.

This book written especially for teen-agers answers all the questions of their imagination on a very practical and useful level.

Fromme, Allan. The Psychologist Looks at Sex and Marriage. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1950.

Chapters 1 through 4. Chapter 4 is on the "Psychology of Sex" and in it the author discusses various attitudes toward sex, their validity, their affects on behavior.

Landis, Judson T. and Landis, Mary G. Personal Adjustment Marriage and Family Living. Prentice-Hall Inc., New York, 1960.

Chapter Six discusses standards of behavior. Describes acceptable and unacceptable behavior and answers such questions as why standards are important and reasons for basic moral codes.

Lewinsohn, Richard. A History of Sexual Customs. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1958.

A work which shows the origin of many of our present-day ideas about the nature of sex and sex standards.

Patai, Raphael. Sex and Family in the Bible and Middle East. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1959.

This book shows the source of many modern-day ideas about sex based on scriptural references, and cultural histories of

the Jews and the Middle East.

Skidmore, Rex A. and Cannon, Anthon S. Building Your Marriage. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1951.

Chapter 12. Questions that are almost blunt are raised and then answered thoroughly.

Suehsdorf, Adie, Editor. What to Tell Your Children About Sex. The Child Study Association of America, Permabooks, New York, 1954.

Questions frequently asked of parents together with answers. For instance, "Should teen-agers neck or pet?" "Is it wrong to have premarital intercourse?" Answers are realistic.

Pamphlets and Articles

Caprio, Frank S. "The Six Most Common Fallacies About Sex and Love." Pageant, (April, 1961).

Clarke, Edwin Leavitt. Petting, Wise or Otherwise. Association Press, New York, 1938.

Davall, Sylvanus M. "Sex Fictions and Facts." Look, 24 (April 12, 1960) pp. 47-48.

Scientific evidence to support facts is given. Statistics pertaining to premarital sex.

Eckert, Ralph G. So You Think It's Love. Public Affairs Pamphlet, 1950.

Lobsenz, Norman M. "The Dilemma of Sex Before Marriage." Redbook, (October, 1959).

Contrasts men's and women's views of sex before marriage and also describes an evolving morality.

McKinney, Betsy Marvin. "Is the Double Standard Out of Date?" Ladies'

Home Journal, 47 (May, 1961) pp. 10 ff.

Upholds chastity for women.

Reiss, Ira L. "Our Changing Premarital Standards." Coronet, 49

(December, 1960) pp. 51-56.

Historical changes in sex standards.

Teens Today, 1 (April, 1959) Macfadden Publications, Inc., New York.

Boys' opinions expressed candidly in bull-session style on subjects such as necking, love, engagements, all of which reveal their ideas about premarital sex standards.

Whitman, Howard. "Science Takes a New Look at Sex in America." This

Week Magazine, (October 25, 1959).

Describes a revolt against Victorian morality which is moving toward "sane and mature attitudes toward sex."

"Your New Emotions." Seventeen Magazine, Triangle Publications, Inc., 1949.

Introduction to Unit Four

The following unit on the Negro in the United States today could be taught as an integral part of courses such as sociology, problems of democracy, American or world history, and perhaps even civics. It could also be taught, either in whole or in part, in almost any course in high school because it is a subject of interest to teenagers and many times they are responsible for initiating the discussion.

From the moral viewpoint, the unit could be given other titles, such as "The Brotherhood of Man" or "Prejudice." The major points of concern in the unit are an examination of prejudice, race, and conditions of the Negro in the United States.

Unit Four: The Negro in the United States

Unless questions are brought up by students--in which case the development of the unit would follow their line of questioning--the historical approach would be well suited to introduce the unit. When and where were Negroes first introduced in America? Were they slaves? How were they treated? What were some of the conditions that led to growth and development of Negro slavery in the United States? What were some of the advantages and disadvantages of slavery as it existed in the early South? Were there any advantages for the Negro? What was the relationship, if any, between slavery and the Civil War?

This brief introduction will probably raise other questions for discussion. Was the Negroes' beginning in America in keeping with our concept of freedom? Was slavery entirely unjustified? Various opinions will probably be voiced by students concerning the rightness

or wrongness of early American attitudes and practices. Commonly held prejudices will probably be introduced into the discussion. Among those mentioned would probably be the ideas that "the white race is the only pure race left," "the Negro lacks ability to achieve high culture," "integration will lead to intermarriage," "Negroes are less intelligent than white people," and that "Negroes inherently have low morals." These should be handled in such a way by the teacher that they become as impersonal as possible. How might this be done? One suggestion would be that the teacher might side-track the discussion temporarily and talk about the nature of prejudice.

What is prejudice? The class should work toward agreement on a definition such as "preconceived ideas" or "ideas assumed to be true before relevant facts are known," and then proceed to the following questions. In light of the definition, are prejudices desirable or undesirable? Can prejudices be harmful sometimes and harmless at others? Are harmless prejudices of any consequence? Are prejudices ever unrecognized as such? How can we recognize and evaluate prejudices?

Are prejudices innate (inborn) or do we acquire them? What are some factors that might contribute to growth of prejudice? Do prejudices serve a purpose? If so, what? (In connection with this question, the teacher should be familiar with Sir Arthur Keith's arguments in favor of prejudice.) Should we try to eliminate prejudice? Is it all right to hold prejudices as long as they are recognized as such and do not "rule" us? How could prejudices "rule" a person?

It might be expected from the foregoing line of reasoning that students would begin to see the value in distinguishing between prejudices and ideas that are supported by evidence, and thus be in a better position to analyze and improve their own ideas and thinking.

Reverting back to the original discussion, which ideas about Negroes and their relationship to white Americans are factual and which are prejudices? Before this can be determined, more information will probably be necessary. What is race? What is not race? How do races differ from one another? How did these differences come about? Have there always been distinct races? Are there races existing today that are considered pure? Are racial differences increasing or decreasing? Are races mixing more today than they have mixed in the past? How are races similar to one another? Is it true that races can be distinguished from one another according to racial odor? Do all races have the same kind of blood?

How do races compare mentally? What do I.Q. tests show? What are some problems encountered when trying to measure intelligence? Are tests the only way to determine racial mentality? Have African Negroes made any significant contributions to the development of civilization? Have they, themselves, ever produced any advanced civilization? Has the "white man's culture" always been superior? Have there been any misrepresentation or omissions made when we teach about the Negroes?

As scientific and historically accurate information is gathered in an attempt to answer these questions, a basis for deciding whether the "commonly-held prejudices" (introduced earlier in the unit) are fact or fiction can be established. Would it be possible to continue

to hold prejudices that seem to be based on false ideas? Explain. How might racial prejudices influence our everyday life? They might prevent marriages between whites and Negroes from taking place. Is this desirable? On what basis should we decide? Prejudices might require persons of different colored skin to eat, play, learn and worship apart from one another. Is this desirable? On what basis?

On the basis of what has been covered thus far in the unit concerning race and prejudice, the class ought to be able to arrive at some tentative conclusions about the criteria by which to judge prejudice and the results of prejudice. The two suggested were historical accuracy and scientifically obtained information. Perhaps other criteria can be established as the unit progresses.

How prevalent is prejudice and its results today? For our answer let us consider the conditions of the Negro in the United States from the Civil War until now. A good point of departure would be a study of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the federal Constitution. What political rights are guaranteed to the Negro by the Constitution? Perhaps these could be established as criteria to judge the Negroes' treatment in the United States. To what extent have these rights been secured or denied? The ensuing discussion should touch on Negro carpetbaggers, the "grandfather clause," the poll tax, primary "clubs" or "associations." Any pertinent federal court decisions, such as the 1954 school-integration order, should be noted.

How have Negroes been discriminated against socially? Has segregation always worked against the Negro? The Ku Klux Klan, the Black Codes, and "Jim Crow" laws should be discussed. What are some of

the results of segregation in housing, education, transportation, the armed forces? Are these to be desired? How and to what extent are conditions changing?

Are Negroes discriminated against economically? How are vocational opportunities limited? Why? Where given equal economic opportunity, what have been the results? Have labor unions helped the Negro to gain more economic equality with whites? State laws? Federal laws? How?

Does Negro economic status have any effect upon living conditions? How many Negroes own their own homes? What relationship does housing have to health? Delinquency? Immorality? What effects do the conditions under which Negroes live have upon their individual lives? Upon their goals? Motives? Attitudes? Emotions? Thoughts? Opportunities? What types of action are likely to result?

Are Negroes increasing in number in the United States? In percentage of population? Have there been any Negro migrations in the United States? When? In what directions? Why have Negroes seen fit to make these moves? What have been the results of these for Negroes and for the nation?

How much racial mixing exists in the United States? (Some authorities contend that there is less now than there was in slave days.) Does intermarriage help to foster better relationships between the races? Would intermarriage eventually eliminate races? Is there likely to be any significant change in the proportions of race in the United States in the foreseeable future? What are the advantages or disadvantages of hybridization of races? Would these be social or

biological?

What has the American Negro been doing to help himself? A discussion of Negro organizations, their aims, accomplishments, and failures should follow. Are these organizations justified in their purposes?

What contributions have been made in United States society by the Negro? What does this indicate? Has the Negro race produced any outstanding individuals? Who? In what fields? What does this indicate?

In view of the above historical data, what seems to have been the position or "place" of the Negro in United States society. How was this "place" determined? On what basis? How does the Negro feel about his position? A discussion of the role conflict within the American Negro should be discussed at this point. The equal-citizen role (guaranteed by the Constitution) seems to conflict with the inferior-Negro role (expected by members of society). Does this help to explain the behavior of Negroes either individually or as a race? How can the Negro overcome this role conflict?

Summary and Conclusion

Looking at the Negro problem in the United States as a whole, what has been its major cause or causes? Does the cause of the problem still exist? What changes in the nature of the problem can we expect in the future? Should there be any attempts made to bring conditions of the Negro more in harmony with our belief as a nation practicing equality? Does our knowledge of race and prejudice suggest any solutions? Are there alternative ways of dealing with the problem? If these attempts to improve conditions were to be made, who should engineer them? Is success insured? Upon what does it hinge?

Since the treatment of the subject of this unit is rather broad in scope, and since both theory and practice are discussed, several criteria upon which to base conclusions concerning the nature and solution of the problem could be selected by the group. One approach would be to compare commonly held ideas to data of known validity and reliability. Another would be to view the problem in terms of our espoused political enactments about equal rights. Still another criterion might be the insights growing out of an understanding of Negro feelings and attitudes about themselves, their race, and the problems they face.

Conclusions based on the above criteria would likely show that prejudices held are causing many problems of a racial nature to exist. If these prejudices could be eliminated, some of the problems would disappear. These unsupported ideas even interfere with the implementation of basic principles of our government as found in the federal Constitution. The Negro, although trying to help himself, is fighting an inner conflict which seems to resemble the actual outward conflict in society (inferior Negro versus American citizen). Although science has furnished our society with reliable information to eliminate prejudices and our courts have attempted to apply the basic law, some of our societal members do not seem disposed to use these avenues to help solve the problems.

Personal Experiences with the Unit

The materials in this unit have been used by the author on several occasions to supplement a chapter entitled "Nature and Importance of Race" in a sociology course being taught to high school seniors. The unit was well received by the students; that is, they were eager

and willing to discuss the material presented, even that which seemed to them to be slanted one way or the other. However, they were not all eager to admit that many conditions of the Negro in the United States today are deplorable and neither were they eager to admit that something constructive needed to be done to improve these conditions.

The high school was located in an all-white residential suburb of a large mid-western city that was attempting to comply completely and swiftly with the 1954 integration ruling of the United States Supreme Court. There were a considerable number of families who, in order to escape sending their children to integrated schools, moved into the all-white suburban school districts. Some of these students were enrolled in the present writer's classes. They made no bones about why their families moved to the suburbs; neither did they offer apologies for the bitterness (and occasional cruelty) that crept into expressions of their opinions and feelings. This type of situation might by some be considered advantageous and by others disadvantageous. Whichever was the case, it certainly was a beautiful illustration of one phase of the problem and the fact that it touched the daily lives of many seemingly uninvolved persons.

It was relatively easy to discuss race and racial differences, and even prejudices that were based upon biological (mental and physical) qualities. The major difficulties were encountered when the discussion turned to cultural and historical aspects of race and racial development and when racial prejudices were based upon cultural differences. It was difficult to convince students that the true cultural history of the Negro in Africa is not told in most of our history textbooks. This

continued to be a problem, even after the anthropological and sociological facts of the matter were introduced. The information seemed to be so new to many, and even so startling to some, that these did not know quite how to react to it. However, while this was the most difficult part of the unit to handle, it seemed to be the most successful in getting students to see some of the injustices that have occurred in presenting the story of the Negro to the public in general, and to public school students in particular.

During the discussion of prejudices, most students would admit being prejudiced, but at the same time would try to rationalize by saying that their beliefs and behavior were common. It was difficult to convince them that what was common was not necessarily either desirable or helpful in improving the situation, even when recognizing that some commonly held "prejudices" were not actually prejudices, but were well-established facts.

The high point in the unit, as the author sees it, is the part just preceding the summary and conclusion, concerning the conflict that exists within most American Negroes. It is demanded of them that they play two conflicting social roles--that of equal citizen and that of inferior Negro. Having covered all the other phases of the unit and having gained new information and viewpoints, the students, in this writer's opinion, needed this one last major insight. He labored diligently to help students to "see" and "feel" the way the average American Negro does. Whether his feelings are justified or not, we must know and understand them if progress is to be made in improving the situation.

The author readily admits that the unit might have required different handling had he been teaching in an integrated school or classroom. Wisdom may have dictated additions or deletions to the material because of school policies, classroom exigencies, or perhaps even personality sensitivities. An altogether different approach may have been needed. It would undoubtedly be the proof of the pudding, as far as moral education is concerned, to teach such a unit in an integrated situation.

Student Bibliography

Non-Fiction

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Beacon Press, Boston, 1954.

This book is written in simplified fashion for both student and lay reader, but still maintains scientific foundations.

Most comprehensive, it discusses the causes of, nature of, and how to reduce prejudice.

Boutemps, Arna. One Hundred Years of Negro Freedom. Dodd, Mead, and Company, New York, 1961.

A history of the Negroes' efforts through the past century to realize the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Furnas, J. C. Goodbye to Uncle Tom. William Sloan Associates, New York, 1956.

Decries Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin as the origin of many prejudices about the Negro and the number one stumbling block to needed improvement.

*Hughes, Langston and Meltzer, Milton. A Pictorial History of the Negro in America. Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, 1956.

This publication is the only one of its kind available. It shows, through pictures and narrative, the Negro in all phases of his life in America; social, political, and economic. It shows him as a slave and freeman; his struggle for freedom; the discrimination against him; his supporters; his progress; and his contributions to the American way of life.

Keith, Sir Arthur. The Place of Prejudice in Modern Civilization. Day, New York, 1931.

This book defends race prejudice and conflicts as a dynamic force in history. The author claims it would go against the laws of nature if race prejudice would be stamped out.

Moon, Bucklin, Editor. Primer for White Folks. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1946.

An anthology of short stories and articles by many different authors reviewing the background of the Negro, his relationships with whites, his real desires in the United States.

Moon, Henry Lee. Balance of Power: The Negro Vote. Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1948.

This book illustrates the power of the Negro vote block and how it is being used to achieve equality and eliminate Jim Crow in the United States.

*Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1944.

This is probably the most comprehensive work on the Negro problem anywhere to be found. It is scientifically objective, and while using technical terms when needed, is written in

common sense language that would make it suitable for use by high school students.

Warren, Robert Penn. Segregation. Random House, New York, 1956.

A sociological essay on the various viewpoints of segregation and integration in the South. It does an excellent job of bringing to light the inner conflicts and desires of the souther white person.

White, Walter. How Far the Promised Land. The Viking Press, New York, 1956.

This book is written by the executive secretary of the N.A.A.C.P. from 1931-1955 depicting the positive gains against prejudice, discrimination, segregation and exploitation, that were made by that organization from 1940 to 1955.

*These two references are encyclopedic in nature, covering virtually all phases of the Negro in the United States.

Pamphlets

Alpenfels, Ethel. Sense and Nonsense About Race. Friendship Press, New York, 1946.

A very simple, yet scientific presentation of the facts about race.

Hirsh, Selma. Fear and Prejudice. Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York, 1957.

Explains the relationship between prejudice and fear.

Clearly tells how prejudices start, how they grow and most important, how we can recognize and reduce them in our lives.

Price, Margaret, The Negro Voter in the South. Southern Regional

Council, Atlanta, Georgia, 1957.

Analysis of Negro vote in South with references to registration, discrimination, intimidation, and actual voting performance. Also shows the influence of social and economic factors on Negro registration.

Sprigle, Ray. "I was a Negro in the South for 30 Days." Pittsburg Post-Gazette, 1948, and "The Other Side of Jim Crow" (reply to Mr. Sprigle) by Hodding Carter, The Providence Journal, 1948. Both of these articles reprinted in one pamphlet give two sides to the conditions of the Negro in the South.

Fiction

Much of the emotion of the Negro problem in the United States does not show itself in the scientific studies that have been published. For a down-to-earth, lively description of the feelings involved in this problem situation, qualified novelists have set their hands. The following are examples of the results. All books listed portray the Negro's struggle to improve his lot and/or the dramatization of his frustrated way of life.

Chariot in the Sky by Arna Bontemps.

Intruder in the Dust by William Faulkner.

Reprisal by Arthur Gordon.

To Kill a Mockingbird by Harper Lee.

Fear in the Night (Every Man His Sword) by Irving Schwartz.

Black Boy by Richard Wright.

Native Son by Richard Wright.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The task of achieving socially accepted moral values and standards is probably more difficult for the individual in modern American society than ever before. However, it is not impossible. The welfare of society depends on the degree to which the masses of people are able to accomplish this task; for today even more than in earlier, less complex ages, democracy places the responsibility of ethical and moral decisions ultimately upon the individual.

The most common method of teaching socially accepted moral behavior is for adults to decide which forms of behavior are "good" or "right" and to teach these non-reflectively. Teaching these usually consists of telling or showing students what is right and wrong, rewarding them when they do right, and punishing them when they do wrong.

Such teaching is largely futile because it ignores the nature of moral problems. It assumes that moral choice is always a question of choosing good and rejecting evil. When students face conflicts of good versus good, they become confused and troubled. If their moral education has neglected to give them a method of choosing between two "goods," they are unable to face the conflict intelligently.

Consequently, as far as the author is concerned, there is only one way of teaching moral values and moral behavior. It is not by

indoctrination of uncritical attitudes toward conventional moral standards, but rather by teaching how choices may be made when confronted with conflicting attitudes and values. We cannot help students except as we confront them with these conflicts and encourage them to work out independent, considered solutions. This we have tried to do; presenting conflicts, some of which are of personal import and others which affect our culture as a whole.

Each of these units possesses certain elements of procedure that are common to all the other units. In each unit, one or more conflicts is presented, either at the outset or within the body of the unit. Secondly, questions are raised to stimulate thinking on the part of the students with a view toward resolving the conflict. The cards are not stacked; preconceived conclusions are not aimed at. Questions are raised in an attempt to get students to consider alternative viewpoints and alternative ways of resolving the conflicts. Thirdly, as conclusions are about to be drawn, criteria to be used in judging the various ideas and resolutions presented are suggested. And fourthly, conclusions, although generally stated, are arrived at in terms of unit material and selected criteria.

Let us look at each unit a little more closely.

In Unit One, the basic conflict concerns the dignity and worth of the individual. Democracy assumes that each individual possesses some worth and dignity. At the same time, some individuals appear not to possess these qualities. As the unit is developed, the conflict is illustrated in terms of our political, economic, social, and personal life in the United States. Conclusions are drawn in terms of the five

different aspects of the unit in such a way as to hang together in a pattern of thought developed in terms of enlightened self-interest.

In Unit Two, on honesty, questions are raised that point to conflicts that are likely to exist when honesty refers to telling the truth or when it refers to stealing. Confusion concerning the real value of honesty in everyday social relationships is pointed out. Questions are raised about our society's feelings about honesty. What happens when honesty conflicts with other desirable values is discussed. In this particular unit, several possible criteria are established and conclusions indicated, to show those possible and perhaps likely to occur. Although these might be questioned, and should be, they are seemingly in harmony with the unit presentation.

Unit Three, on sexual behavior, begins with a brief paragraph on the general aspect of morality before giving attention to the more specialized problem. To arouse interest, a few more recent changes in moral standards are noted, leading into an investigation of their origin. In getting historical perspective, the growth and development of a basic conflict in our modern society today is uncovered. After being clearly presented, this is broken down into more specific conflicts in behavior. Supporting arguments are presented, other questions are raised concerning meaning and motives of sex that could be helpful in judging some of these arguments. As a result of social-science research, the most reliable information available is presented in connection with commonly held false ideas. Conclusions are then drawn in terms of material presented in the unit.

Unit Four, the Negro in the United States today, begins with the Negroes' introduction into America and then leads into a discussion of prejudice and race. The various examples of prejudice at work in the United States since Civil War days are discussed together with the problems that are involved. Conclusions are then drawn on the basis of the study that should lead to improved outlooks on the problem and how it can be overcome.

Since we are dealing with problems on value in these units, conclusions cannot be nearly as objective or as specific as we would like them to be. It must be stressed that the conclusions should always be those of the students. However, students need the guidance of the teacher in making conclusions that are reached in light of the study made and on the basis of selected criteria. The criteria, once agreed upon must be rigidly (but fairly) held to as the basis for all conclusions until the group chooses to alter the criteria.

We are not offering this paper as a fool-proof way of teaching moral values to students, because the success of these units and this over-all method depends so much on the students' responses. We fully expect that some students will not give up faulty, though conventional, ideas. There will be others who, although they can see the more adequate outlooks that result from the study of the unit, will not be disposed to act on them. There is never any guarantee that what is learned will be carried over into conduct.

We are suggesting, however, that clinging to conventional ideas that are shown to be inadequate, and being indisposed to act on ideas that seem to be more adequate, will exist to a lesser degree if the

plan of this paper is followed. The accuracy of this statement can only be verified by those who see fit to use the assumptions made in Chapter ~~III~~ and Chapter ~~III~~ as a basis for teaching moral values, in whose hands we have to leave this task.

It is the writer's deep conviction that the plan of approach to unit-teaching presented in this paper is a sound and fruitful one. Its use has more than repaid him for whatever efforts he has put into the development of these and other units. Out of it has grown a fuller appreciation of the task to be accomplished in the classroom, together with a greater enthusiasm to be about that task--of helping students extend their present insights into their world. Out of it has grown a deeper respect for the intellectual abilities and honesty of his students; which respect, incidentally, was returned to him by them. The satisfaction of seeing students repeatedly "sit up and take notice," rather than evincing that sullen, bored look and attitude which so often accompany the frustration of students' attempts to learn, has often been experienced. Students, seemingly miraculously, have come to life and taken renewed interest in discussions and in seeking well-thought-out answers to difficult questions. And, to say the least, there has come to the writer expanded insights and fresh interpretations of his own values, which, of course, has enriched his teaching. We are not here claiming that this approach to teaching is the only rewarding one. Neither are we saying that it is a panacea for the myriad ills that beset the common classroom situation. We are simply stating what the outcomes of this approach have been in our teaching experience. And we firmly believe that these accomplishments are but a token of what can

and should be accomplished as our skills to develop and handle such units improve.

We would hasten to add that development and use of reflective teaching units is not something to be employed only by a "special breed" of teacher. The feasibility of teaching reflectively is something that seemingly needs to be recognized by all teachers, regardless of what they teach. What more is required than to develop the unit, rather extensively, prior to going into the classroom, in such a way as to stimulate student initiative to ask and answer questions of consequence, rather than to participate in superficial, albeit contemporary, recitation? Then, after entering the classroom, student discussion should be encouraged, yet expertly guided in such a way so as to outstrip the prepared unit. This can be done by simply allowing the abilities of thought and expression available to have free play and free reign over the subject under discussion. (An extensive treatment of how to make teaching reflective is presented in Chapter III.) Any teacher who is competent to be a teacher is qualified to create and use reflective teaching units.

We desire to leave one major challenge to the public schools of our day; namely, to help and encourage students to live and participate effectively in a democracy and to enhance their ability to do so. Achievement of these goals can never be through indoctrination. Indoctrinated loyalty is almost sure to be a non-reflective one. It will be a "pat-answer" type of loyalty, which will not withstand careful and persistent scrutiny. The democratic-reflective approach to teaching avoids indoctrination through a deliberate attempt to unleash latent student abilities in a classroom situation where, although guidance is available, they are stimulated and encouraged to practice the art of

making enlightened decisions and reaching tenable conclusions, independently. This type of teaching, in the writer's opinion, will meet such a challenge to teachers of our day by actually encouraging continuous and rigorous re-examination of our understandings and loyalties with a view toward improving them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- ad hoc Committees on Concepts and Values. A Guide to Content in the Social Studies. National Council for the Social Studies, NEA, Washington, D. C., 1957.
- Bayles, Ernest E. Democratic Educational Theory. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960.
- _____. Theory and Practice of Teaching. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1950.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer. Society in Transition. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1952.
- Bode, Boyd Henry. How We Learn. D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1940.
- Bowers, William C. Moral and Spiritual Values in Education. University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, Kentucky, 1952.
- Childs, John L. Education and Morals. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1950.
- Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1916.
- _____. Human Nature and Conduct. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1922.
- _____. Moral Principles in Education. Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1909.
- _____. Reconstruction in Philosophy. The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., New York, 1954 (5th printing).
- Eby, Frederick. The Development of Modern Education. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1952, pp. 678-683.
- Educational Policies Commission. Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools. NEA of United States and American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C., 100 pages, 1951.

Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Lawrence E. Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955.

Otto, Max. Science and the Moral Life. The New American Library, New York, 1949.

Quinn, James A. and Repke, Arthur. Living in the Social World. J. B. Lippencott Company, Chicago, 1956.

Periodicals

Horsburgh, H. F. N. "The Plurality of Moral Standards." Journal of the Royal Institute of Philosophy, Artical IV (October, 1954).