McGILL UNIVERSITY

EDUCATION AS A CONVIVIAL TOOL

An Examination of Ivan Illich's Theory of Conviviality and Ways and Means of Realizing that Theory in Educational Practice.

July, 1975

A Research Report Submitted to

The School of Social Work
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for

The Master's Degree in Social Work

by

Michael R. Crelinsten

Montreal, October, 1975

ABSTRACT

Master of Social Work
McGill University School of Social Work

Michael R. Crelinsten
'Education as a Convivial Tool'
An Examination of Ivan Illich's
Theory of Conviviality and
Ways and Means of Realizing that
Theory in Educational Practice.

This paper addresses itself to an analysis of public education by applying the conceptual prism of Ivan Illich's theory of conviviality.

This study presents and analyzes Illich's theory of conviviality in terms of its theoretical and practical implications for the field of education. It criticizes the impracticality of Illich's radical proposals in light of social and political realities. It does, as well, research and demonstrate possibilities for applying practical alternatives which emanate from, yet fall short of 'deschooling', while providing vehicles for the implementation of convivial principles in education.

Illich's theory of tools for conviviality is presented as follows: Conviviality allows for creative and autonomous intercourse among people. The overriding dictum of conviviality is - personal energy under personal control. Tools are all rationally designed instruments. A tool is convivial, therefore, when it serves the above two ends.

Education as a convivial tool, as Illich sees it, is called a learning web. It allows the individual, through an intricate communication process, to interact freely with those about him so as to be able to

learn anything from, or teach something to, anyone at any time. In that the learning web allows this to occur, theoretically, it is a convivial tool.

Examining the educational statutes of Quebec leads to a description of education as a singularly unconvivial tool. Comparing this to Illich's views, and recognizing the potential in his proposals, Chapter 3 examines five separate attempts at integrating convivial features within the realm of contemporary education.

If convivial education can be presented as possessing three fundamental principles, those being self-actualization, personal relevance in curriculum content and equal, non-hierarchical 'teacher-student' relationships, then the relative presence of these three principles will determine the relative conviviality of a given educational process. Such a test was applied to the works of Paulo Freire, Jonathon Kozol, A.S. Neill, Herbert Kohl and Carl Rogers. Their educational aims are as diverse as the socio-economic and geographic milieus in which they worked.

The conclusions are as follows: Firstly, without the need for the cultural, structural and political inversion that is inherent to Illich's proposal, the elements of convivial education can be realized in practice in diverse and unique settings with the constant application of these three principles.

Secondly, these relatively 'schooled' and 'deschooled' processes provide a practical flexibility that Illich's learning web cannot. It is argued that this flexibility is necessary if convivial educational practice is to remain congruent with its own inner logic, and if it is to be realizable in diverse contemporary educational systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank my advisor Jim Torczyner, for his tenacious conviviality and my friend Guy Béliveau for his persistent lack of it.

M.R.C., Montreal, 1975

"When I think of all the crap I learned in high school,
it's a wonder I can think at all.
And although my life of education hasn't hurt me none,
I can read the writin' on the wall."

- Paul Simon, Kodachrome -

"Life has proceeded under the guidance of religion, science, morality and economics; it has proceeded under the capricious direction of art or pleasure; the one expediant that has never been essayed is that of living intentionally under the guidance of life. Fortunately, mankind has always more or less lived in this way, but such living has been unintentional; as soon as men saw what they were doing they repented and experienced a mysterious remorse."

- Jose Ortega y Gasset - *

---

* From The Modern Theme, Jose Ortega y Gasset, Harper Torchbook, N.Y., 1961, p. 61.

I knew the mass of men concealed,
Their thoughts, for fear that if revealed
They would by other men be met
With blank indifference, or with blame reproved;
I knew they lived and moved
Tricked in disguises, alien to the rest
Of men, and alien to themselves . . .

- Matthew Arnold "The Buried Life" -

Traditions are a splendid thing; but we should create traditions, not live by them.

- Franz Marc -

People often take prejudice of habit for truth and in that feel no discomfort, but if they once realize that their truth is nonsense, the game is up. From then on it is only by force that a man can be compelled to do what he considers absurd.

- Alexander Kerzen (circa 1850) -

It would be difficult to conceive of any phase of mental experience less representative of health, growth and conscious evolution than "normality".

- Trigant Burrow - *

---

* Preconscious Foundations of Human Experience, Trigant Burrow, Basic Books Inc., New York, 1964, p. 30.

Best not to worry about direction at all. Just be. Direction is already there.

- from a term paper by Jim Fiddes - a junior college sophmore - *

---

* Quoted in Person to Person, Rodgers and Stevens, Real People Press, California, 1967, p. 235.

"No man can reveal to you aught but that which already lies half asleep in the dawning of your knowledge . . .

And even as each one of you stands alone in God's knowledge, so must each one of you be alone in his knowledge of God and in his understanding of the earth."

- Kahil Gibran, The Prophet -

Life can only be understood backwards; but it must be lived forwards.

- Soren Kierkegaard -

Your children are not your children.
They are the sons and daughters of Life's longing for itself.
They come through you but not from you,
And though they are with you yet they belong not to you.

- Kahil Gibran, The Prophet -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. ILLICH: THE CONCEPT OF CONVIVIALITY 6

Conclusion

II. QUEBEC, MODEL FOR UNCONVIVIALITY 37

The Statutes

III. MODELS FOR CONVIVIALITY 50

Self-Actualization
Curriculum Relevance
Convivial Student-Teacher Relations
Conclusion

BIBLIOGRAPHY 79

INTRODUCTION

Working in a high school last year, I was struck by the levels of fear and authoritarianism that still persist a decade after I completed my term in one; this despite the highly touted changes that have occured in the interim period. It seems that these changes have been structural and cosmetic-subject promotion, relaxation of dress codes and the like. They have been positive changes, but as so much else today in the area of social change, they miss the point, dealing with the problem symptomatically. We speak of an awareness of problems and incorporate some hint of progress, but the changes, like a skipping stone, skim the surface of the water leaving the lake unchanged.

In schools today the problem is that the majority of students are alienated from the content and process of school learning; they quite simply do not want to be there. The average reaction (and rationalization) to this arguement is that this is typical of "kids", but that they need the structure to be able to cope with later life. Our culture is replete with amusing, if poignant anecdotes about truants, their tactics and ultimate capture. We argue that, in the final analysis, young people must be in school and must behave "properly". The "fear and loathing" in our schools is there to serve that end.

The ostensible aim of public education is to provide young people with the opportunity to study and learn skills that will be of use to them in later life. Also recognized as a legitimate function of school is the process of teaching people what are popularly perceived of as democratic values and traditions which constitute the hallmark of a "good citizen". What actually happens in schools is that the students are exposed to a process of compulsory coercive socialization. While learning certain skills, young people are cajoled, threatened, on occasion pummelled and generally "schooled" into adopting a particular set of values reflected in an "acceptable" mode of behaviour. The real end of school comes to be one of creating people who subscribe to an established value system, who see education as a commodity to be consumed and who come to consider the public school process as the only legitimate means of learning.

Ivan Illich, in 'Tools for Conviviality' and 'Deschooling Society' critically examines the issue of school reform from a more fundamental point of view than is typical of most educational critiques. Rather than asking how the institution should be changed, he is asking whether the institution should exist at all. Rather than exploring the possibility of change within the school system, or even alternative schools, Illich proposes creating a network which would allow learning and education without schools, as we know them, at all.

He argues, in capsule, that a good educational process should have three purposes:

1. "It should provide all who want to learn with access to available resources at any time in their lives.
2. ....empower all who want to share what they know to find those who want to learn it from them.
3. ....furnish all who want to present an issue to the public with the opportunity to make their challenge known."[1]

---

[1] Illich, I., Deschooling Society, Harper and Row, New York, p. 75.

Illich, therefore, is arguing for a process by which the individual could determine what he wants to learn and when; that one's own values determine what is important to know. These values, in springing from a non-institutional environment would decrease reliance upon institutions and increase reliance upon oneself for both teaching and learning thus giving one more control over one's life and the tools used to pursue one's goals. This Illich calls a convivial process, and the tools one uses are convivial tools.

In the first section of this paper, I intend to examine Illich's theory of conviviality and to then discuss 'deschooling' as a manifestation of this theory as it applies to schools and the educational process.

The second section will examine the legal statutes of the contemporary educational ethos in Quebec. In so doing it will become apparent that, as typically indicative of most public school systems, the legal statutes which reflect its ethos reflect a singular lack of conviviality in public education.

The third section of the paper will examine how a number of educational theorists and practioners have managed to effect a number of the features of Illich's concept of convivial learning, without the necessity for Illich's radical and absolute deschooling. The convivial, deschooled system that Illich describes is a theoretical proposal. The political inversion that is inherent to it is also extremely theoretical. It shall be the contention of chapter three, however, that it is possible within the reality of something less than a total deschooling of contemporary educational systems, to achieve in practice many of the convivial features which stem from Illich's deschooled construct; and this without the necessity for the incumbent revolution in value priorities for which Illich argues.

Illich himself recognizes that a totally convivial society is a Utopian dream that is not realistically conceivable. He speaks of a balance between convivial and unconvivial tools and institutions. Although, at times Illich seems to forget himself in his zeal, I believe that it is this balance which represents the valuable aspect of the convivial argument. It is apparent that we are not about to realize a radical deschooling of society; nor would such an event be a necessarily positive occurrence. It is possible, however, that a number of the elements of Illich's deschooling theory can be extracted and applied within traditional and alternative school frameworks to achieve conviviality in school processes. It is also possible that 'alternative' schools could, to an even higher degree than some now do, incorporate conviviality as a guiding educational principle. If public school systems and alternative schools could realize these two possibilities, if they could be supplemented by a deschooled alternative such as Illich describes, and if attendance could be a matter of personal choice, then a more equitable balance between convivial and unconvivial educational processes could be achieved. In that the educational process is a major force in the socialization of individuals, to convivialize the educational process is, ultimately, to convivialize society. It is the work of such educators as will be discussed in Chapter three that can demonstrate the means by which we can begin to move towards a more convivialized educational system and so begin to extricate ourselves from the contemporary quagmire in schools of plummeting attendance and soaring anomie.

CHAPTER 1

ILLICH: THE CONCEPT OF CONVIVIALITY

Illich's discussion of deschooling finds its theoretical base in Tools for Conviviality. His version of education and learning is a convivial one, the opposite of a process which is industrially motivated and inherently designed to imbue the recipients with a consumer-based value framework wherein students are being marketed as much as they are being educated.

In this discussion I shall attempt to delineate the major ideas which form the backbone of the theory of conviviality. It is a theoretical overview in which the concept of deschooling can be better understood.

For Illich tools are ". . . all rationally designed devices be they artifacts or rules, codes or operations". Convivial is ". . . a technical term to designate a modern society of responsibly limited tools".

He writes:

> I chose the term 'conviviality' to designate the opposite of industrial productivity. I intend it to mean autonomous and creative intercourse among persons, and the intercourse of persons with their environment; and this in contrast with the conditioned response of persons to the demands made upon them by others, and by a man-made environment. I consider conviviality to be individual freedom realized in personal interdependence and, as such, an intrinsic ethical value. I believe that, in any society, as conviviality is reduced below a certain level, no amount of industrial productivity can effectively satisfy the needs it creates among society's members.[2]

---

[2] Illich, I., Tools for Conviviality, Harper and Row, New York, 1973, p. 11.

To read Illich's work is to enter a realm of revolutionary thought which opens the mind to perceive the endless possibilities of man's creativity. He is not talking here about reallocation of resources, redistribution of power, revolutions in access to commodities, all of which are traditional revolutionary themes. He is arguing for a cultural revolution that bespeaks of a major re-orientation in the scheme of Western values, priorities, social and political traditions and in particular the glorification of professionalism, the ethos of escalating materialism, and the deifacation of institutions. New vistas appear and the invitation is to break through the narrow confines of modern, traditionally anti-traditional thought and experience a 'celebration of awareness'.

He evokes the words of Blake:

"If the doors of perception were cleansed,
Everything would appear to man as it is,
Infinite.
For man has closed himself up,
Till he sees all things through the narrow chinks of his cavern."

Illich is aware of the immense discipline and will required to reverse the end result of an entrenched socialization process. Yet this is what cultural revolutions imply. Graeme Edge of the Moody Blues, in a song called "The Balance" writes:

And while he rested, he took to himself an orange, and he tasted it,
And it was good!
And he felt the earth to his spine,
And he asked, and he saw the trees above him, and the stars,
And the veins in the leaf, and the light,
And the balance,
And he saw magnificent perfection,
Whereon he thought of himself in balance,
And he knew he was.

Illich is demanding a return to an alternative set of values inherent in the song, but it is important to realize before moving into a discussion of the main points of the theory, that he has a finely tuned sense of balance vis ā vis his convivial society. He is not offering an either-or proposition, rather a re-ordering of priorities.

> What is fundamental to a convivial society is not the absence of manipulative institutions and addictive goods and services, but the balance between those tools which create the specific demands they are specialized to satisfy and those complimentary enabling tools which foster self-realization. The first set of tools produces according to abstract plans for men in general; the other set enhances the ability of people to pursue their own goals in their unique way.[3]

Illich argues that all major institutions reach two turning points, which he labels watersheds. Through them they pass from conviviality to unconviviality. At first new knowledge is applied to the solution of a clearly stated problem and scientific measuring sticks are applied to account for new efficiency. At a second point, however, a second watershed is reached.

> . . . the progress demonstrated in a previous achievement is used as a rationale for the exploitation of society as a whole in the service of a value which is determined and constantly revised by an element of society, by one of its self-certifying elites.[4]

The intense growth ethos of North America and the social and corporately induced need for more and bigger of virtually every commodity we produce has resulted in our passing the second 'watershed' wherein the enterprise frustrates and denies the original end for which it was intended and, Illich argues, it becomes a threat to the society which it originally intended to serve.

---

[3] Illich, I., Tools for Conviviality, op. ~~cit~~., p. 24.

[4] Illich, ibid., p. 7.

> Schools are losing their effectiveness to educate, cars have ceased to be effective tools for effective mass transportation, the assembly line has ceased to be an acceptable mode of production.
>
> The characteristic reaction of the sixties to the growing frustration was further technological and bureaucratic escalation.[5]

This applies as much to education as it did to pollution. School developed as a response to the needs of a population by providing home training and exposure to emerging knowledge. It was not compulsory and began as an adjunct to the education that one acquired through living.

It transcended its second watershed by eliminating the value of self determined learning through living and becoming a compulsory process for providing education as a commodity. Education was perceived of as being valuable only as a function of schooling. Schools began to teach dependance upon the institution and the goods purchased therein. Education came to be a commodity to be consumed like anything else, and necessarily, in ever increasing amounts. The commodity consumed became a value system which the times and powers that were defined considered acceptable.

Illich responds to this crisis not by arguing for modification and restructuring of existing power structures. He argues for value re-orientation through institutional revolution and inversion, and an immediate halt to this escalatory growth. He cites the People's Republic of China and their success vis à vis institutionalized medicine through the emergence of barefoot doctors who demystified the profession of medicine. The underlying shift in values in terms of how people perceive medicine and the professional high-priests who practice is implicit. The People's Republic has demonstrated the possibility of institutional inversion once political inversion has occurred. The crux of the change is that our goal changes from being one of certification of an elite professionalism servicing a minority (and incidently creating a morass of unforeseen iatrogenic problems) to being one of offering equal voluntary, free access to the fundamental requirements of basic necessities, be it health care, transportation, education or whatever. As such, any one of these institutions becomes the convivial tool of Illich's description.

---

[5] Illich, ibid., p. 8.

The central evaluatory criteria for tools should be the degree of conviviality. This means ensuring that the scope of tools must adequately protect three values: survival, justice, and self-defined work. We must come to understand at what point a given tool loses its effectiveness and begins to destructively dominate man. Illich is not proposing a Rousseauian return to an ideal state of nature, nor is he anti-technology. He is an exponent of balance. We are not in our present straits because of scientific discovery and innovation. The problem is quite literally a question of balance. We are where we are as a result of an intense prejudice in favour of an expansion of an industrial mode of production.

> It has become fashionable to say that where science and technology have created problems, it is only more scientific understanding and better technology that can carry us past them . . . The pooling of stores of information, the building up of a knowledge stock, the attempt to overwhelm problems by the production of more science is the ultimate attempt to solve a crisis by escalation.[6]

If this is the fundamental dynamic of unconviviality, then the critical response to creating a convivial alternative must be as follows:

---

[6] Illich, ibid., pp. 8-9.

> . . . that modern science and technology can be used to endow human activity with unprecedented effectiveness. This reversal would permit the evolution of a life style and of a political system which give priority to the protection, the maximum use and the enjoyment of one resource that is almost equally distributed among all people: personal energy under personal control . . . For this purpose we need procedures to insure that the controls over the tools of society are established and governed by political process rather than decisions (solely) by experts.[7]

This is Illich's conception of a just society, wherein one persons ability to express oneself in work will not be predicated upon the enforced labour, learning or consumption of another.

Politics in a post-industrial society must concern itself primarily with design criteria for tools rather than the present preoccupation with production and profit goals. The present imbalance which we are experiencing threatens life on earth and only a political inversion can rectify the situation.

We are no longer in a situation where it is realistic to believe that if everyone could achieve Western materialism, all would be set right. First of all the gap between the haves and have-nots is widening within our society as well as without. Collectively, even the haves are plagued by alienation, lack of purpose and a sense of absurd futility in their work. This, in part, is a function of material production-consumption oriented values which are fundamental to the process of school socialization. The upshot is our contemporary upward spiral of material consumption. We have seen that the consumer society is possessed of an insatiable appetite. In any case, we also must realize that the 'spaceship earth' cannot possibly support all of its peoples, at present

---

[7] Illich, ibid., p. 11 (emphasis mine)

Western industrialized levels; that, in fact, it cannot possibly support even Western people at their present material levels. Tuberculosis was once known as consumption. It was well named. The unconvivial society has wrought the same havoc on its host, the planet earth.

This, then, is the essence of the concept of the convivial tool and conviviality. It is a reaction against professionalism and the ethos of consumption, reinforced by the dictates of that same professionalism.

A common criticism of Illich is that he reflects a Jesuit format of thinking. He offers statements as being self-evident truths that are not necessarily so. Much of his arguement is a product of his own philosophical assumptions. Illich understands his own conception of freedom and presupposes that it will be accepted without further elaboration or clarification. There is a congruency, however, in the arguement of a man who decries certification in that it leads to a mistrust of one's own evidence and thus, presents a theory totally of his own evidence, witness the absence of footnotes, references or the like.

Any discussion of education or any social process bears a particular culture bias. As Reinhold Niebuhr has pointed out:

> . . . the opinions which men hold of each other and the judgments which they pass upon their common problems are notoriously interested and unobjective. While the ideological taint upon all social judgments is most apparent in the practical conflicts of politics, it is equally discernable, upon close scrutiny (in the social sciences).[8]

Illich's concept of conviviality bears a particular value bias. It is not my intention here to deny this. Man is inextricably linked to the "fear, ambitions and anxieties of his own individual existence . . ."[9] One cannot negate what is a human reality. To recognize and delineate the nature of one's value bias is the most that can be done. I have attempted to outline the theoretical framework and value bias out of which Illich operates in this discussion of the theory of Tools for Conviviality. It is natural that his view can be unique from other views. These differences should not be erased, but recognized and understood. As Meehan writes:

---

[8] Niebuhr, R., "Christian Realism and Political Problems", in Davis Coon (eds), Reinhold Niebuhr on Politics, Charles Scribners & Sons, N.Y., 1960, p. 44.

> Men clearly must learn to act with awareness of one another and in active co-operation, to give and take, to indulge the self . . . [10]

Tools for Conviviality deals with critical contemporary problems. Its intention is to make people pause and think, to allow creative imagination to face itself from an industrial mode of thought. It is true that it is not a 'modern' book. For centuries men have grappled with the issues that are brought into relief by Illich's analysis of the effects of the industrial mode of production. They have long been central issues of ontology, ethics and political philosophy. Illich's premises are pre-industrial philosophical premises, but he goes beyond Locke. MacPherson writes of twentieth century technology:

> The problems raised by possessive individualism have shrunk; they can perhaps now be brought to manageable proportions, but only if they are clearly identified and accurately related to the actual changes in social facts. Those changes have driven us again to a Hobbesian insecurity, at a new level. The question now is whether,

---

[9] Niebuhr, ibid., p. 14.

[10] Meehan, E., Value Judgements and Social Science, The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Ill., 1965, p. 153.

> in the new setting, Hobbes can again be amended, this time more clearly than he was by Locke.[11]

And;

> There is an overriding demand, even among the most Hobbesian of thinkers, as Overton writes, for the preservation of '. . . humane society, co-habitation or being . . . above all earthly things must be maintained.'[12]

Illich has described the nature of an unconvivial society. Its members are produced by a number of singularly unconvivial institutions; the school is a prime example. Whatever the arguments for or against Illich's social schemata, the unconvivial school is a nightmarish experience. Most of its recipients long for nothing more than to escape it. If parallels can be drawn to the unconvivial society, then Illich's convivial alternative is worthy of serious consideration. If it is to be achieved, then our schools, primary socializing tools, must themselves become more convivial.

It is to this issue of the convivialization of schools that Illich turns his attention in his book 'Deschooling Society'. He applies his macro-social values to the micro level and describes his vision of an alternative schooling system. This would arise, in practice, through a process that Illich labels the 'deschooling' of society. He believes that, rather than adjusting our present school networks, we must replace them with an alternative and more convivial system. This deschooled system stems from and is philosophically consonant with his theory of tools for conviviality. He believes that the school, as such, would be a more human and humane structure. It would also, of course, enable the attainment of those convivial goals that Illich argues institutional tools must now orient themselves towards.

---

[11] MacPherson, C.B., The Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke, Oxford University Press, London, 1964, p. 277.

[12] MacPherson, ibid., p. 277. (156)

An eloquent expression of the current unconvivial state of our schools is found in Edgar Friedenberg's 'The Vanishing Adolescent'. In 1969 he wrote:

> I had no adequate idea of the detailed physical intrusiveness and vulgarity of the high school. I knew it was constrictive but I didn't know that it was so presumptuous: the corrider passes, the wrangling over smoking, the dress regulations, the ill-tempered belligerent little men and enormous aggrieved women detached from their teaching duties to scream at the students in the corrider for quite literally getting out of line. It is the details that matter and these one cannot possibly imagine until one has seen them: the librarians who refuse to admit a student to the library unless he is wearing a belt; the youngsters crouched in the corrider like see-no-evil monkeys during compulsory civil defence drills, the blatting joculatory and pompous patriotism that comes over the public address system into every corner. I had also not grasped the fact that high school students have no refuge or surcease from it; being used to colleges and college students, it just didn't occur to me that high school students have no unscheduled time whatever during the school day and cannot even go to the library period without a special pass; that they have no clubroom of their own or any place where they can be themselves. The whole experience of secondary education, I came to realize, is set up in such a way as to insure that individual adolescents will become alienated from their own inner life; they are given no opportunity to examine it, and are punished if they permit it to direct their actions. The high school is even more Orwellian than in my vision of it had been; and as with Orwell, it is the little things, the endless specifics, each petty in itself, that really make up the effect. Nineteen sixty-four? We are certainly running well ahead of schedule.[13]

Written in 1969 this description reflects a common public school experience. In 1975, a virtually identical situation exists. In discussing some of these issues with high school principals, I have found the general response to be that, while the overall picture is often as

---

[13] Friedenberg, E., The Vanishing Adolescent, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969, p. xii.

Friedenberg describes it, this is, in fact, a functional aspect of the educational process for this is what students will face in the non-academic world which they must prepare for now. The implied sequence is not a totally accurate picture for it is the nature of the contemporary educational system that, if it did not initiate, it certainly perpetuates a profound sense of malaise in our society spawned through the inculcation of a set of values which recognizes material wealth, production, consumption and physical growth over imagination, creativity, love and self-actualization. To argue that schools merely react to this already existing set of value priorities is simplistic. They play a major role in maintaining the imbalance as it is. They need not necessarily be mutually exclusive but the imbalance in our schools today makes it so. As Henry writes in Culture Against Man:

> In a society where competition for the basic cultural goods is a pivot of action, people cannot be taught to love one another. It thus becomes necessary for the school to teach children how to hate and without appearing to do so for our culture cannot tolerate the idea that babes should hate each other.[14]

According to Illich it is this "institutionalization of values (which leads) to physical pollution, social polarization and psychological impotence".[15]

To get to this state of unconviviality, schools had to pass through two watersheds. They passed through their first age as a response, in part, to the nature of the industrial revolution. As we became more liberally enlightened and horrified by the concept and practice of child labour, the emerging middle class developed a concept of a social moratorium wherein children would be 'protected' while subjected to compulsory education up to a certain age. It was intended that this should keep the child out of the exploitative factories and this, along with child labour laws, it accomplished. Marx opposed the end of child labour because he saw it as the only way that children could get a worldly education. As he understood the word, the greatest fruit of man's labour is the education he receives from it and the opportunity to initiate the education of others. It was the beginning of a process wherein "Education became unworldly and the world became non-educational."[16]

---

[14] Henry, V., Culture Against Man, in Laing RD., 'The Politics of Experience, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1967, p. 58.

[15] Illich, I., Deschooling Society, Harper & Row, New York, p. 1.

The second watershed was reached when education became a business vocation of a professional entity known as the school. Rather than serving its student constituency, the students, in effect, came to be dominated by the educators. School became a socializing process designed to inculcate the many with the values of the few who controlled economics and political power.

The uniformity was perpetuated by a rigid screening process through which those who wished to become teachers were filtered. They in turn emerged as a self certifying elite committed to the same educational attitudes as the economic elites of the school boards for which they would work.

The students became subservient to the school and its policies, socially and politically controlled by it. The school defined itself as the only creditable source of education and fostered a set of values to formalize that claim, actualize the values and make economic survival difficult for those who did not submit to the school process. Two major illusions therefore emerged: the first was that equal education would give every person an equal chance when, in fact, all it did, and still does, is create an elite whose rank is determined by length of service in the educational system. The second illusion was that most learning was the result of formal teaching. Learning has become defined and effectively recognized as the end result of an exposure to a tool which is most unconvivial, controlled by others, for which consumption is compulsory, and for which credibility depends upon a certificate.

---

[16] Illich, ibid., p. 10.

Illich argues that, in fact, as a result of this process, schools have virtually become religious institutions.

> They perform the threefold function common to powerful churches throughout history. It is at the same time the repository of society's myth; the institutionalization of that myth's contradictions; and the locus of the ritual which reproduces and veils the desparities between the myth and reality.[17]

Illich argues that "We cannot go beyond the consumer society unless we first understand that obligatory public schools inevitably reproduce such a society, no matter what is taught in them."[18]

Our sense of values is such that we are culturally hand-cuffed to the school and the concept of professional training as the only valuable method of learning. In learning processes, whatever they be geared to deal with, the emphasis and concern seems to revolve around professional skills. It is not really believed that effective and valuable learning can take place outside the physical confines and, of itself, credentially valid in-school training. Curriculums reflect limitations on what a person can "usefully" explore. We limit what a person can expose himself to, so as to be consistent with what functions we know must be filled within our social structure. We rigidly prevent the effective possibility of self-actualization. The rationalization is that you won't be allowed that level of freedom in "the real world", so you may as well get used to it now. As Laing puts it:

---

[17] Illich, _ibid_., p. 57.

[18] Illich, _ibid_., p. 21.

> In order to rationalize our military-industrial complex we have to destroy our capacity, both to see clearly any more what is in front of, and to imagine what is beyond our noses. Long before thermonuclear war can come about, we have to lay waste to our own sanity. We begin with the children. It is imperative to catch them in time. Without the most thorough brainwashing their dirty minds would see through our dirty tricks. Children are not yet fools, but we shall turn them into imbeciles like ourselves, with high I.Q.'s if possible . . . By the time the new human being is fifteen or so, we are left with a being like ourselves. A half-crazed creature more or less adjusted to a mad world. This is normality in our present age . . .[19]

It is this last section which is critical to our understanding of our current school system as an unconvivial tool. As a training ground for future "citizens" its nature is determined by a social group whose age, personal experiences, goals and values are separated by anywhere from 15-45 years from the recipients of the experience. The end result is that these adults are dictating curriculum to a group of people who have lived an entirely different life experience and are, or could be, orienting themselves in substantially different social, political and personal directions. It is no wonder that the clash is so resounding. It creates the antithesis of the "autonomous and creative persons interacting with their environment" of whom Illich speaks in his definition of conviviality.

---

[19] Laing, Politics of Experience, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

We live in a situation where our ideals, often convivial in nature, are, within the public school system in particular, looked upon by men who have become cynical and resigned with age, as "merely" youthful romanticizing. They are tolerated, perhaps envied through a certain chronological age after which point we are expected to be effectively socialized, that is, to have grown up. Continuing adherence to such values, at this time, comes to be seen as naivité, immaturity, irresponsibility or the legally ominous deviancy, in descending order.

> Consumer pupils are taught to make their desires conform to marketed values. Thus they are made to feel guilty if they do not behave according to the predictions of consumer research by getting grades and certificates that will place them in the job category that they have been led to expect.[20]

The use of the concept of 'consumer pupil' raises the issue of role definitions as they are imposed in schools. Illich speaks of a convivial milieu which allows for creative intercourse among people as opposed to " . . . the conditioned responses of persons to the demands made upon them by others, and by a man-made environment . . . " Berger, in discussing Parson's pattern variables, distinguishes between particularism and universalism. Particularism is a feature of traditional societies. Berger writes of particularism;

> I find myself in situations where I'm dealt with in terms of my own particular, perhaps unique characteristics . . . In some situation I figure as a very concrete individual.

---

[20] Illich, I., op. cit., Deschooling, p. 22.

and of universalism:

> . . . in other situations . . . I'm treated in terms of criteria that are very abstract, formal and generally applicable . . . I'm dealt with anonomously.[21]

It is this latter modern (Parson's) and unconvivial (Illich) set which describes the nature of human relationships in schools. Just as one has the uncanny feeling of déja vu in most modern high schools such is the architectural conformity, so the educational system seems bent on creating a similar psychological conformity in the minds of the students. The aim is to create 'good citizens' by passing on the established values and skills of the past, rather than allowing to the development of creative and unique individuals. The girl who spends two months trying Home Economics at the request of a vice-principal who said she could change later if she so desired, is denied a request for transfer to Biology because he knows that it will be better for her in the context of his understanding of what constitutes an acceptable female role. Friedenberg's words, written in 1964, still ring true, "that individual adolescents will become alienated from their own inner life; they are given no opportunity to examine it and are punished if they permit it to direct their actions."

The destructive nature of role assignments is further ~~i~~llucidated in Berger's discussion of Parson's concept of functional diffusiveness and functional specificity. The former is the traditional, convivial alternative; the latter the modern, unconvivial alternative. Berger describes them respectively as follows:

---

[21] Berger, P., "The Liberal as a Fall Guy", Center Magazine, July 1972, p. 40.

> There are groups to which I belong where my participation covers a lot of ground and is very difficult to pinpoint in terms of codified obligations or to groups where I'm expected to do one thing and one thing only, with my expectations of the group similarly limited.[22]

In the public school system there is a tight functional specificity with rigidly defined roles - teacher, student and administrator. The determining feature, of the first two in particular, is primarily fear. Teachers are hampered by curriculum, deadlines, schedules, exams and the like. They are overwhelmed by the size of their classrooms and respond by 'teaching' only and removing themselves from the building at the final nerve-jangling bell. Contact beyond that role is minimal and the human problems that are inevitably present are usually referred to other role-defined specialists, the guidance counsellors, or are dealt with authoritatively and symptomatically. As long as one does not manifest visible 'deviance' the situation is considered "to be under control" and acceptable; that is, as long as the student 'behaves'. This outward calm is maintained by the imposing of rigid rules enforced through fear. The student does not see the teacher as a human being who is, in fact, struggling as well as the student, to negotiate a difficult and dehumanizing system; rather he or she sees the person as a 'teacher' who can control, reward and punish. Leonard writes:

> The invention of reason, for example, was an ingenious way of internalizing the whip, for the concept comes into being only as separate from and opposed to feelings, emotion and impulse. Too often, indeed, such terms as 'conscience', 'dignity', 'stoicism', 'heroism', 'honor', or even 'glory', have constituted ultimately indefinable vocations or a single theme: man's endeavour to act and

---

[22] Berger, *ibid.*, p. 40.

> speak in a manner aversive to him without the prod of external punishment.[23]

The ramifications, Mumford points out, are "total submission to a central authority, forced labour, lifetime specialization, inflexible regimentation, one-way communication and a readiness for war."[24] In most schools, when the internal whip fails to produce the desired behaviour, the external whip is still available. The teachers role becomes, in no small part, enforcement of the threat of that whip. Large portions of the classroom time are given up to classroom control. This demand makes functional diffusiveness an impossibility and so they reinforce their specific role-images with a lexicon of jargon;

> A way of talking that lets them forget their problems. What cannot be solved is named. Once it is named it does not need a solution so urgently - perhaps never. James 'acts out' (he is mad as hell at his teacher).[25]

So the teacher is a teacher who basically controls his/her students, who are students responding through various levels of fear. The authoritarianism arising from the supremacy of roles in this functional specificity has produced a backlash.

> Resistance (to schooling is due) to the fundamental approach common to all schools - the idea that one person's judgement should determine what and when another person should learn.[26]

Laing puts the same issue in another way:

---

[23] Leonard, E.B., Education And Ecstacy, Delta, 1968, p. 76.

[24] Leonard, ibid., p. 76.

[25] Leonard, ibid., p. 2.

[26] Illich, I., Schooling: The Rival of Progress. New York Review of Books, Dec. 3, 1970, p. 22.

> Having at one and the same time lost our SELVES and developed the illusion that we are autonomous EGO's, we are expected to comply by inner consent with external constraints to an almost unbelievable extent . . . The others have become installed in our hearts and we call them ourselves. Each person not being himself, either to himself or the other, just as the other is not being himself either to himself or to us, in being another for another, neither recognizes himself in the other, nor the other in himself. Hence, being at least a double absence, haunted by the ghost of his own murdered self, no wonder modern man is addicted to other persons and the more addicted, the less satisfied, the more lonely.[27]

Illich sees education as an industrial tool. It is a system wherein the consumer has no say whatever as to what is being offered for consumption either in terms of content or the goals which it pursues. As in the Church:

> Man has become the engineer of his own Messiah (consumerism) and promises unlimited rewards of science to those who submit to progressive engineering for his reign. (Those of the flock who wander are excommunicated from the material heaven. The church is housed in our schools and prayer is compulsory) . . . salvation is to those who accumulate wealth; we can now observe that grace is reserved for those who accumulate years in school.[28]

It is difficult to avoid being unconvivially socialized in a 'modern' (Parson's) set of values, for they are imposed from without.

If this, then, is the nature of unconvivial educational systems and, if it is the result of such things as rigid structures, lack of freedom, compulsory attendance, externally imposed compulsory curriculums, professionalism, coercion and more, the obvious rejoinder is - what alternative systems and/or methods does one propose?

It is now left, then, in this discussion of Illich's Deschooling Society, to examine an alternative educational structure which Illich describes as "Learning Webs". While not the definitive answer or singular possible mechanism for his and other ideas, it does provide a cohesive example of how his philosophy of education as a convivial tool might be realized. The radical implications for society as a whole, were it to become more convivial, will be apparent.

---

[27] Laing, Politics of Experience, op. cit., p. 62.

[28] Illich, I., Schooling, The Rival of Progress, op. cit., p. 24.

Illich's post-industrial convivial tool would allow -

> . . . all its members the most autonomous action by means of tools least controlled by others, since people feel joy (as opposed to mere pleasure) to the extent that they are creative.[29]

> The alternative to dependance on schools is not the use of public resources for some new device which 'makes' people learn; rather it is the creation of a new style of educational relationship between man and his environment . . .
>
> A good educational system should have three purposes: it should provide all who want to learn with access to available resources at any time in their lives; empower all who want to share what they know to find those who want to learn it from them; and finally, furnish all who want to present an issue to the public with the opportunity to make their challenge known.[30]

It is a key feature of Illich's schemata that the initiative emerges from the consumer rather than an educational system or government vis à vis consumption of education. Learners are not forced to submit to an imposed curriculum. There is no compulsory education. In addition, to consumer freedom in this system, the public would not be forced to subsidize an intricate and cumbersome educational structure.

Most contemporary educational systems base their approach to educational philosophy and facilities on the question "What should someone learn?" Illich asks, rather, "What kinds of things and people might learners want to be in contact with in order to learn?" The initiation for curriculum moves away from the 'educator' to the learner.

---

[29] Illich, I., Growth, Myth and Reality, A.P.D.O., Cuernevaca, Mexico, p. 2.

[30] Illich, I., Deschooling Society, op. cit., p. 75.

The structure which Illich proposes as an effective response to that question, he describes as a Learning Web. It consists of four 'networks' which facilitate the "obtaining of information and "critical response to its use from somebody else".

The first of these he describes as "Reference Services to Educational Objects". By educational objects Illich means "things or processes used by formal learning". The situation at present is characterized by Illich as follows:

> Children born into the age of plastics and efficiency experts must penetrate two barriers which obstruct their understanding; one built into and the other around institutions. Industrial design creates a world of things that resist insight into their nature, and schools shut the learner out of the world of things in a meaningful setting.[31]

The point is well taken. IBM Selectrics, telephones and other tools of an industrial society are not generally available for dissection. Our man-made environment is "as inscrutable as nature is for the primitive". School removes things from the environment of everyday use "by labelling (and professionalizing them and creating vertical distance and status) them as educational tools."

Illich argues that if we are to deschool:

> The genuine physical environment must be made more accessible and those physical learning resources which have been reduced to teaching instruments (or esoteric industrial production tools) must become generally available for self-directed learning.[32]

---

[31] Illich, ibid., p. 79.

[32] Illich, ibid., pp. 79-80.

The simplicity of educational things is highlighted by simple games such as Wiff 'n Proof. Such games are a special form of liberating education and embody the base of Illich's argument. Their use is voluntary and simple. Anyone can teach anyone how to play. As Illich describes an experience in Mexico wherein a friend of his showed the game to a group of children:

> Within a few hours of playfully conducting formal logical proofs, some children are capable of introducing others to the fundamental proofs of propositional logic. The others just walk away.[33]

Illich recognizes that to change the nature of intricate, modern, industrial "things" would be difficult but "in the third world we must insist on built-in educational qualities". The switch, for example, from tubes to transistors was a remarkable technological achievement but we must begin to ask ourselves if, in balance, it is worth the dehumanizing side effects that indiscriminate technological advance is creating. We must begin to examine gains versus losses through technological advancement. The knee-jerk reflexive attitude that technology is progress can no longer be seen as an inherent truth. There is no way a transistor can be explored and serve as a learning tool in the way that a tube can. The process of learning has been removed from the hands of the individual as technological artifacts have become more and more inscrutable.

Compounding this problem is the fact that the process of teaching has taken the same road for the most part; not only is access to educational artifacts and self-education a rare thing and beyond the reach of the individual, but the process as well has been taken from him.

---

[33] Illich, ibid., p. 81.

The individual becomes separated from means for self-learning, in part through technology, and what is learned is only creditable if it occurs through accepted procedures in accredited institutions. One learns to be dependant upon institutions and to lose respect for oneself and self-learning.

Illich argues against this development, pointing out that,

> If the goals of learning were no longer dominated by school and school-teachers, the market for learners would be much more various and the definition of 'educational artifacts' would be less restrictive.[34]

Responding to this reality, he describes a second network, that of skill exchanges. Having discussed the issue of educational objects, he goes on to examine the educational process of school training and certification.

Illich points out that -

> What makes skills scarce on the present educational market is the institutional requirement that those who can demonstrate them may not do so unless they are given public trust, through a certificate.[35]

This is carried to the point of rank professionalism in school where the professional is demanded so as to be able to identify learning difficulties and motivate. As A.S. Neill has discovered in the Summerhill experiment, and as Illich points out, this is essentially a straw-man. They only need to be externally motivated to learn a skill which they do not want to, but have been told they must by those who, through curriculum, have decided that they know best what a good productive citizen must know in order that he or she may fulfill an assigned role in their image of the good life. Professional certification becomes a means of assuring further socialization of a group of people who are to become essentially coercers of reluctant students.

---

[34] Illich, ibid., p. 84.

[35] Illich, ibid., p. 88.

> The public is indoctrinated to believe that skills are valuable and reliable only if they are the result of formal schooling.[36]

In this way the perpetuation of a particular value-bias is ensured.

Illich's alternative is to make skills available by creating skill centers and educational currency to use at these centers. There would exist what amounts to skill banks. One would be given credits to learn skills and earn more credits by teaching your skills, thereby earning education by sharing it. People in this scheme, would be tested according to skill levels, not educational pedigree. Illich does not elaborate as to how this would be accomplished but performance on the job might well prove the ultimate measure as well as pre-employment testing in the specific area of work. This latter process could be adaptable to virtually any type of work, although just who would set the tests and what their content would be is unclear.

The fact that Illich does not discuss the details or mechanics of this and other proposals is cause for criticism. It is also the underlying reason for this paper. Illich, as a man of Jesuit training, implies certain assumptions about the nature of man which flow logically from that background. He fails, however, to acknowledge his subjectivity and his subjectivity extends to his theoretical formulations; the 'skill bank' is a good example. The idea is theoretically sound, but practical application presents many problems which he neglects to discuss. The same argument can be made of the deschooling principle in general. It is precisely for this reason that this paper will examine, in Chapter 3, the means by which, without the need for total deschooling, which is a remote possibility at present, we can still achieve some of deschooling convivial features within contemporary educational structures. Hopefully, these examples will indicate the way to greater deschooled conviviality in the future. The third and fourth networks that Illich describes, for example, offer such possibilities.

---

[36] Illich, ibid., p. 89.

The third network is that of peer matching:

> A desirable educational system would let each person specify the activity for which he sought a peer.
>
> School does offer children the opportunity to escape their homes and meet new friends. But, at the same time, this process indoctrinates children with the idea that they should select their friends from among those with whom they are put together.[37]

Flowing from this arrangement, Illich points out that -

> In a deschooled society professionals could no longer claim the trust of their clients on the basis of their curricular pedigree, or ensure their standing by simply referring their clients to other professionals who approved of their schooling. Instead of placing trust in professionals, it should be possible at any time, for any potential client to consult with other experienced clients of a professional about their satisfaction with him by means of a peer network easily set up by computer, or a number of other means.[38]

Illich is arguing, and my own experience has borne this out, that "non-professionals" can and do provide as effective a service (or more so) than professionals in many areas of endeavour, both theoretical and practical. The street clinic successes of the late 60's and early 70's are good examples. Once again, the issue is not one replacing this group with that, rather it is a question of reducing the rigidity of 'experience' requirements so as to allow people with different types of learning background to supplement each others' backgrounds.

---

[37] Illich, ibid., p. 92.

[38] Illich, ibid., p. 96.

As Illich points out, such a development would:

> . . . first restrict, and later eliminate, the (absolute) disenfranchisement of the young and permit a boy of twelve to become a man fully responsible for his participation in the life of a community. Many "school-age" people know more about their neighborhood than social workers or councilmen. Of course, they also ask more embarassing questions and propose solutions which threaten the bureaucracy.[39]

The fourth network that Illich describes is that of what I call Reference Services to Educators-at-Large. Illich calls them professional educators. His professionals should 1) operate the networks he describes and 2) guide students and parents in the use of these networks. The first would be educational administrators; the second group would provide intellectual leadership in all other fields of knowledge.

> Today's educational administrators are concerned with controlling teachers and students to the satisfaction of others - trustees, legislatures and corporate executives. Network builders and administrators would have to demonstrate genius at keeping themselves, and others, out of people's way, at facilitating encounters among students, skill models, educational leaders and educational objects. Many people now attracted to teaching are profoundly authoritarian and would not be able to assume this task: building educational exchanges would mean making it easy for people - especially the young - to pursue goals which might contradict the ideals of the traffic manager who makes the pursuit possible.[40]

---

[39] Illich, ibid., p. 85.

[40] Illich, ibid., pp. 98-99.

The dramatic implications for the nature of role definitions and relationships are apparent for students and teachers and, in fact, society in general.

> We must first construct a society in which personal acts themselves reacquire a value higher than that of making things and manufacturing people. In such a society exploratory, inventive, creative teaching would logically be counted among the most desirable forms of leisurely "unemployment" . . . Even now one of the most important consequences of deschooling and the establishment of peer-matching facilities would be the initiative which "masters" could take to assemble congenial disciples. It would also . . . provide ample opportunity for potential disciples to shape information or to select a master.[41]

The concepts of peer-matching and educational facilitation imply relationships that are realizable within school systems today if not in totality, then certainly to the extent of ameliorating our contemporary state of unconviviality. There is much that traditional educational methodology has to offer when a student freely desires it, but there is a critical need for more convivial methods as well. The ways and means by which some of Illich's theories, such as the above networks, have been or can be realized in practice, will be the subject of Chapter 3 of this paper.

---

[41] Illich, ibid., p. 101.

CONCLUSION

Having outlined the underlying features and arguments in Illich's concept of convivial deschooling, it is now left to reiterate the main criticisms that he makes of the contemporary school system, and then to delineate the major features of his alternative educational network.

Illich sees the contemporary school system as "intellectually emasculating and socially polarizing".[42] It has created a dependency upon the school for learning versus a sense of self-reliance and self-learning. In doing so it creates a more general mentality of institutional dependency. If we accept the need of schooling for learning we will accept the need for other institutions to do for us what we could otherwise do for ourselves.

Schools have created a dependency upon the professional teacher as the only valid source of learning. The teacher, through his/her own schooling process, as a professional, becomes the custodian guiding the pupil through a socializing ritual and inculcating the student with the correct roles and procedures of observance. The teacher is a moralist indoctrinating the student into the acceptable norms of right and wrong, in loco parentis, and is a therapist who will behaviour-modify and "domesticate the student's vision of truth and what is right."[43]

---

[42] Illich, ibid., p. 16.

[43] Illich, ibid., p. 31.

Schools now have created a mentality of measured consumerism. Everything can be measured. Advancement through school is determined by consumption of certain pre-packaged quantum of pre-determined curricula. All other forms of creative inner and spontaneous growth are robbed of their credibility. All values, including citizenship can be graded and compared. Schools invite compulsive repetitive behaviour and discourage alternative behaviours and approaches to problem solving.

Schools have created, through compulsory attendance, a polarization of society. "Countries (as individuals) are rated like castes whose education is determined by the average number of years of schooling of its citizens."[44]

In summation, Illich characterizes contemporary schools as creating a dependency upon institutions versus self-reliance, teaching versus spontaneous and/or self-learning, imposed curriculum versus self-actualization, an imposition of social values versus self-realization, and through obligatory attendance, a loss of the fundamental human rights of self-direction and self-actualization.

If these are the features that Illich ascribes to the contemporary common school system, he argues that a better school system would do the following: allow those who wish to learn with access to the appropriate resources at any time in their lives, with the timing and methology determined by the individual. This implies an end to compulsory attendance and obligatory curriculum. All those who wish to share what they know, Illich argues, should be made able to find those who wish to learn it from them. This puts the initiative back into the hands of the individual and ends the discrimination that emerges from the institution for a diploma or certificate.

---

[44] Illich, ibid., p. 9.

Convivial systems recognize the total environment and process of living as educationally valid. In Becker's words, the individual is dealt with as an individual in terms of his own particular, unique characteristics - Parson's particularism. The individual's participation covers much ground and is difficult to pinpoint in terms of codified obligations - Parson's functional diffusiveness.

Illich argues against technocratic control of education and for an alternative which is "an educational web for the autonomous assembly of resources under the personal control of each learner".[45] The teacher/person plays an important role BUT at the initiation of the learner; the process is based upon skill, not merely certificate, and is a reciprocal bilateral relationship. It is not based upon a role defined, unilateral, authoritarian relationship. Integral to Illich's scheme is the recognition of the value of learning through being. The individual is left free to use the educational resources, if at all, at his own discretion.

The proposal focuses upon the convivial alternative of personal control as opposed to unconvivial system of technologically and institutionally imposed education and engineered values.

Illich sees these changes as part of a Utopian vision, the convivial society. Its advent is founded upon certain assumptions as to the nature of man. He gives these assumptions such implicit authority that he comes dangerously close to the caveat of Daniel Bell that he alludes to,

---

[45] Illich, ibid., p. 70.

> . . . that our epoch is characterized by an extreme disjunction between cultural and social structures, the one being devoted to apocalyptic attitudes, the other to technocratic decision-making . . . [46]

Illich seems to vacillate between for the extreme of a deschooled convivial society on the one hand, and a balance between convivial and unconvivial tools and institutional features on the other.

After looking at Quebec as an example of an educational structure that incorporates a number of unconvivial features, this paper will go on to demonstrate that the latter argument above for a balance is desirable in theory, and has been realized to varying degrees in practice by a number of contemporary educators.

It seems possible that a balance in schools more heavily weighted in the direction of conviviality co-existing with a convivial deschooled network as an educational alternative, would provide a flexible total educational resource.

[46] Illich, ibid., p. 50.

CHAPTER 2

QUEBEC, MODEL FOR UNCONVIVIALITY

No people are uninteresting
Their fate is like the chronicle of planets

Nothing in them is not particular
And planet is dissimilar from planet

To each his world is private
And in that world one excellent minute
And in that world one tragic minute
These are private.*

---

*Yevtushenko, Yevgeny, Selected Poems, EP Dutton & Co., 1962, in Illich, I., Deschooling Society, op. cit., pp. 115-116.

The public school system in Quebec finds its expression in the compilation of statutes on education and the philosophy expressed therein. It is singularly unconvivial. The governing attitudes are essentially paternalistic, and, having evolved from a recent era of church-dominated education, they still reflect an ecclesiastic tone that is in keeping with Illich's description of the public school as a modern church. The Government of Quebec, having assumed the responsibility for public education through sections 91 and 92 of the Canadian Constitution, has created a pyramidal, authoritarian bureaucracy. It is designed to maintain "public order and good morals", and, equally, to preserve the contemporary socio-economic status quo. The government, in interpreting its political mandate, transmits a particular social, moral and political order which it preserves as it socializes youth into the same. It does this through a set of rules that define precisely who maintains authority over who in the pyramid of educational bureaucracy.

Solomon, in discussing the works of Everett Hughes, writes of the concept of moral order inherent to a working bureaucracy:

> Behaviour in the work situation becomes at least partly structured by rules and expectations of behaviour which order the process of interaction . . . There is a social division of labour manifested in the rules and expectations of behaviour (which) he refers to as the moral order, in the sense that interaction is to some degree ordered by a set of moral imperatives, of varying force or rigidity which tend to routinize the interaction.[47]

This ordered behaviour is inherent to most bureaucracies and school boards are no exception. Its ramifications for the individual are such that he comes to serve the need for institutional order. As this is something which the student will encounter outside the formal educational process, it is seen as necessary to teach that behaviour to him while he is in school.

---

[47] Solomon, D.N., Sociological Perspectives on Occupations in Becker, Geer, Riesman, Wess, Institutions And The Person, Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1968, p. 10.

This bureaucratic process is very much present in public education in Quebec. Dr. R.E. Lavery describes the Montreal Catholic School Commission, of which he is a director, as:

> . . . (suffering from an) advanced case of arterio-sclerosis . . . (it) is the largest board in Canada and far and away the most bureaucratic by all current definitions of the word.[48]

The purpose of this chapter, then, will be to examine how the educational statutes which embody educational philosophy in Quebec, in reflecting the bureaucratic dynamic described by Solomon and Hughes, demonstrates just how far a typical public school system can veer from principles of conviviality. Given the unconvivial nature of public education, as described in this chapter, the third chapter will examine how a number of educators have achieved many convivial features within schooling processes.

The Statutes

In this examination of the statutes, I intend to demonstrate how a number of key articles and sub-sections in the Quebec Compilation of Statutes on Education (C.S.E.) legally codify all of the major features of an unconvivial educational system as Illich describes such a system. An unconvivial system authoritatively determines to what educational material a student may be exposed. The vehicles for this process are generalized compulsory exams, compulsory texts, rigid scheduling and accompanying time restrictions.

---

[48] Lavery, Dr. R.E., Montreal Catholic School Commission In-Service Programme, Oct. 9, 1974, Montreal, p. 3.

Article 17 states:

> The minister shall approve the text-books, maps, globes, models, or other articles for use in schools, and when he thinks fit withdraw such approval.[49]

This centralized power exerted over curriculum by the government is further illucidated in Section 15, Article 203, sub-section 5.

> It shall be the duty of school boards:
> (5) to require that no books be used in the schools under their control other than those authorized, which must be the same for all schools in the municipality.[50]

What emerges in this discussion of books is that the central authority assumes a determining role in the decision as to what literature and ideas students will be exposed to during the course of their public education.

These statutes are clear indications of education as a coercive socializing process. They also allude to another feature of unconviviality wherein education becomes a consumptive act. One consumes prepackaged amounts of material and emerges with accreditation, bestowed from without, in areas of endeavour that one plays little role in choosing.

In addition to authoritative determination of intellectual content, the C.S.E. codifies a statement concerning general behaviour of students in school. It legally allows for discretionary punitive behaviour on the part of school officials. Again one is reminded of the phrase 'coercive socializing'.

---

[49] Government of Quebec, Compilation of Statutes on Education, Nov. 1, 1970, p. 28.

[50] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 73.

Article 203 states:

> It shall be the duty of boards:
> (16) to dismiss from the school any pupil who is habitually insubordinate or whose conduct is immoral in either word or deed.[51]

Inherent in Article 203 are restrictions as to what is appropriate for debate and discussion in general directed activity. Implied is the unconvivial feature of coercive, rigidly role defined interactions between individuals, with 'acceptable' behaviour being extensively controlled by external authorities. One of the most critical features of an unconvivial educational system is compulsory attendance. Nothing is more coercive or potentially sinister. Nothing detracts more from the right to self-determination.

Article 272 states:

> Every child must attend school every day in each year, on which the public schools are open in accordance with the regulations made by proper authority from the beginning of the school year following the day on which he attains the age of 6 years until the end of the school year in which he attains the age of fifteen.[52]

The code legally obligates the parents as well, in Article 277:

> The father, mother, tutor or guardian of every child obligated to attend school under this division shall see that such child complies with such obligation every school day.[53]

Article 286 creates the position of attendance officer with powers broad enough to ensure that those children delinquent in their observance of Article 272 will answer for it.

---

[51] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 74.

[52] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 98.

[53] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 99.

Article 286 states:

> For purposes of this discussion every attendance officer shall have the powers of a constable. He may, without warrant, enter industrial or commercial establishments, places of amusement or playgrounds, where any child obliged by this division to attend school may be employed or assembled, and may, without a warrant apprehend and take to school any child obliged to attend school who is absent therefrom.[54]

Having established effective control over the school life of the student, the code also addresses itself specifically to the position of the teacher. Again, in an unconvivial context there are explicit role barriers - people are looked at through the prism of Parson's universalism and functional specificity. As well teachers must go through an accredited training process. Just as with students, teachers skills are seen as valuable only if they are the result of a formal schooling process. Teachers are subjected to legal controls of behaviour that are similar to the corresponding codes for students (although with teachers, there is more attention given to the 'proper' procedures for potential punitive action). These controls over accreditation and behaviour are found in the following articles:

Article 217 ensures a 'watchdog' role to the government vis ã vis the training process of teachers. It enables the inclusion of a minimum of courses and other requirements for study by a student teacher through government accreditation powers over the diplomas granted upon successful completion of a professional teachers course of study.

---

[54] Government of Quebec, _ibid._, p. 100.

Article 217 states:

> Except in cases specified in the regulations, school commissioners or trustees shall employ to hold a pedagogical or educational position only those persons who are provided with diplomas awarded or recognized by the Minister.[55]

Thus enabled of exerting important control over the process of entry into the profession, the Minister, in Article 18, is given important judicial power over the conduct of those who are actually practicing professionals.

Article 18 (1) states:

> Upon receipt of a complaint in writing and under oath, accusing a teacher of bad conduct, immorality, drunkeness or grave neglect of duty, the Minister shall cause the substance of the complaint to be served by a bailiff upon the teacher in person with an order enjoining him to declare within 15 days, whether he admits or denies the charge.
>
> The Minister may also, if he deems it necessary, order the school board employing such a teacher to relieve him temporarily of his duties.[56]

Article 18 (6) further outlines the judicial role of the Minister:

> When the investigation is completed, the committee shall transmit its report to the Minister. If the Minister decides that the charge is not proved he shall dismiss it. If the teacher admits the charge or if the Minister finds the charge is proved, he shall revoke the diploma of such teacher, and cause his name to be struck from the book containing the names of teachers.
>
> Nevertheless, the Minister may, owing to extenuating circumstances and the teacher's previous record, defer his decision upon conditions as he may determine. If such conditions are not complied with the Minister may revoke the teacher's diploma and cause his name to be struck from the book containing the names of teachers.[57]

Having dealt with students and teachers, the code continues on up the pyramid of authority and power in the hierarchical bureaucracy of education in its attempt to legislate acceptable behaviour. Section 19 gives to the Minister similar powers over school inspectors that sections 18 and 203 give him over teachers and students respectively.

---

[55] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 79.

[56] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 29.

[57] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 30.

Section 19 states:

> The Minister may also, for any cause mentioned in Section 18, after observing insofar as applicable the formalities prescribed in said section, hold or cause to be held, an inquiry into the conduct of any school inspector, and after such inquiry, shall, if need be, forward all documents to the Lieutenant-Governor, recommending the cancellation of his commission.
>
> The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may then cancel such commission and no inspector so dismissed may afterwards hold such office.[58]

The power of the government, for purposes of administration, is delegated to local school boards for the initiation of proceedings in any of the actions inherent in the preceeding articles. This, theoretically, brings control closer to the community.

Article 203 states:

> It shall be the duty of the school board;
>
> (2) After mature deliberation at a meeting called for that purpose, to cancel the engagements of persons holding pedagogical or educational positions on account of incapacity, negligence in the performance of their duties, insubordination, misconduct or immorality.[59]

The government, however, retains broad discretionary powers which place few limits on its 'Big Brother' potential and enable it to effectively initiate action in any area in which the statutes are legally enabling.

Article 20 states that:

> The Minister shall be a visitor of every school of the Province.[60]

---

[58] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 31.

[59] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 72.

[60] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 31.

Subsequently, Article 24 states that:

> School visitors shall be entitled to have communication of all regulations and all other documents relative to each school, and to obtain any information concerning it.[61]

In summation, the statutes delineate the following educational features which together represent every major point that Illich raises in his discussion of unconvivial educational systems: Attendance, generalized exams, schedules and curriculum are all compulsory. The student consumer, for education becomes a consumptive act, plays no role in determining any of the above features. In Parson's terms the individual is treated in a particularistic and functionally specific manner (See Chapter 1, pages 17 & 18).

Teachers are carefully accredited and their learning, as well as that of students, is seen as valuable only to the extent that it is the result of formal schooling.

It is true that the government perceives a mandate which it is obliged to fulfill. It is responsible for preserving an educational system which will 'develop' young men and women who are able to meet the current traditional criteria of 'good citizens'. Wilds and Lottich[62] characterize such a philosophy as social traditionalism.

Wilds and Lottich delineate three slightly varying educational objectives all of which more or less reflect the implicit direction and attitudes of the codes discussed above.

---

[61] Government of Quebec, ibid., p. 31.

[62] Wilds & Lottich, The Foundations of Modern Education, Holt Rhinehart and Winston, Toronto, 1969.

1) Education should prepare for the status-quo, for social life and institutions as they now exist, by integrating the pupils into the established order and indoctrinating them in the accepted traditions of their inherited culture. (Compulsory education Articles 272 and 277 structurally enable this).

2) Education should attempt to anticipate the changed social conditions that come about through a natural drift along paths of least resistance, and prepare the pupils for these anticipated new needs. (272 and 277 again, and, more specifically, Statutes 17 and 203 (5) dealing with curriculum content reflect a desire to centrally control and determine the drift).

3) Education should accept the vision of a new social order in all its details, mold the pupil for this preconceived society, and, through propaganda, help bring about this preconceived society.[63]

The tendency of this philosophy is towards establishing a procedure for inculcating the individual with a particular value framework which will enable him to function constructively and supportively within a particular social milieu. This philosophy, as reflected in the statutes, demonstrates a concern with maintaining an order and setting parameters within which socialization of the individual occurs.

The role of the teacher, accordingly, is important and the statutes recognize the need to be able to exert control over the teacher both as regards professional and moral behaviour. (Statutes 18 (1, 6); 217 and 203 (2)). These controls are necessary in a philosophy of social traditionalism for the teachers, as well as being able to articulate and teach a particular point of view to the students, must themselves be socialized to a certain set of values. The system is designed to ensure that these values, within certain parameters, will be maintained in practice.

---

[63] Wilds & Lottich, _ibid._, p. 355.

Wilds and Lottich point out:

> Teachers have little difficulty in perfecting a technique for the development of social virtues. The difficulty is in determining what social virtues are. The social traditionalist is inclined to be overzealous in the preservation of the social heritage; he is likely to try to standardize children in the commonly accepted social patterns. Their immaturity and the authoritative position of the teacher make the method of domination over social activity much easier than guidance in social choice. The plasticity of youth stimulates the methods of indoctrination and coercion. The direction of the teacher which is necessary in the rapid and accurate formation of the integrating skills, is often carried over into the realms of alternatives and controversial issues . . . the youth is not encouraged to examine critically into the approved social order.[64]

The prime function of education has come to be the production of the 'good' citizen, the 'educated' person. The questions being asked now by educators, however, revolve around whether this approach constitutes useful and valuable education. P.H. Coombs points out, for example, that relative to simple efficiency in transmitting knowledge, such a system is obsolete. He speaks of a barrier between students and knowledge.

> What seeps through, usually tardily, comes mainly through two knowledge conduits - text-books and teachers. (Students themselves, of course, are an important third conduit of knowledge into the classroom, but the knowledge they bring often does not conform to what the official curriculum calls for.) In an age when the quantity of human knowledge is doubling every decade, the text-book and the teacher, for all too familiar reasons, inevitably become purveyors of obsolete knowledge.[65]

Where the contemporary emphasis in Quebec and elsewhere is to produce the 'educated' person who has consumed certain amounts of prepackaged information, and in doing so, has been socialized-educated to a particular ethical code, mode of behavioural parameters and perceptions of reality and morality, Coombs and others argue that;

---

[64] Wilds & Lottich, ibid., p. 365.

[65] Coombs, P.H., The World Educational Crisis, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 109.

> The new stress (in education) must be not so much on producing an educated person as on producing an educable person who can learn and adapt himself efficiently all through his life to an environment that is ceaselessly changing. If an educational system itself is not adaptable to changing environmental conditions, how can it be expected to produce people who are?[66]

Brian Ash, former principal of Keith School in LaSalle, Montreal, Quebec, in an article in the Montreal Star on real change in education was quoted as follows:

> If we believe our function is to hand down yesterday's culture to today's children (the defining feature of social traditionalism and the educational approach of Quebec's and many other public school boards), then we truly do not believe in change.[67]

It is not, however, a purely Machiavellian strategy that leads governments to approach education from the point of view of developing the 'educated' person. The government's electors embody the prevailing set of traditions and values, as do most government members themselves. Governments are elected to represent the prevailing body of public opinion, or else they coercively take it upon themselves to represent their perception of such. Whichever, due to this dynamic, it is unrealistic to believe that the advent of radical deschooling is possible, short of total political inversion - and perhaps not even then. The learning web process, however, incorporates convivial features, many of which are realizable within some form of 'schooling' process. Innovative alternatives to contemporary education, in association with a system of complete learning webs, might result in two co-existing systems which could reinforce each other. If attendance within one system or the other were a matter of personal choice, the true balance between convivial and unconvivial tools, for which Illich argues, might be closer to realization.

---

[66] Coombs, ibid., p. 109.

[67] Cohen, S., Is The School System Ready for 'Real' Change?, News & Review, Montreal, February 16, 1974.

The following chapter will look at the attempts of a number of well-known educators to deal in theory and practice with the contemporary educational processes and to provide alternative educational methodologies which in effect support and foster the development of just such a balance. Their innovative methodologies will be seen to be convivial tools that foster institutional conviviality and the development of Coombs 'educable' man.

CHAPTER 3

MODELS FOR CONVIVIALTY

This chapter will demonstrate that the process of absolute deschooling for which Illich argues is neither necessary nor practical for the achievement of educational conviviality. Alternative methods which, to varying degrees, integrate themselves within 'schooling' processes, do in fact achieve convivial practices and are necessary if conviviality is to be widely realized in education.

Through the examination of the statutes in the previous chapter there emerged indications of the presence or absence of certain principles, discussed in Chapter 1 which constitute the major points in Illich's theory of a convivial 'deschooled' system. The degree to which they are the guiding principles in the workings of an educational process will determine the extent to which that process can be called convivial; that is, the relative presence of conviviality and freedom as determining themes.

These points can be distilled into three major areas and they can be labelled as follows:

1. Self-actualization - the degree to which an individual may respond to his or her inner motivations by pursuing their own goals at their own rate, in this instance in the educational stream (Illich's concept of personal energy under personal control).

2. Curriculum Relevance - the degree to which content decisions

are flexible and produce curricula which are responsive to the needs, emotions and personal life experiences of the individual.

3. Student-Teacher roles - the presence of conviviality in these relationships; that is, to what extent do the relationships between 'students' and 'teachers' reflect, on the one hand, lack of rigid role definitions and coercive methodology, and, on the other hand, the presence of a sense of mutual cooperation, learning and freedom that is inherent implicitly and explicitly in a convivial system.

Operating on the assumption that convivial educational practices are desirable and that they can be characterized through the three areas delineated above, it is the purpose of this paper to examine, in Dennison's words "the way in which peoples' lives do and must modify the abstractions of political theory."[68] Accordingly, this third chapter will demonstrate that five authors, whose experience in education is socially, politically and geographically diverse, have all based their approach on the concept of convivial tools and achieved that end in ways that are effectively convivial without the necessity for the political inversion and structural-technological revolution that must be a prerequisite to Illich's learning web proposal.

The structure will be such that the first two sections will examine the theories and perceptions that the five authors possess and use in their particular understandings of the concepts of self-actualization and curriculum relevance. The third section will examine the individual theories and practices concerning student-teacher relationships and demonstrate that through convivial interaction, the first two principles are applied and realized.

---

[68] Dennison, G., Critical Review in Kozol, J., Free Schools, Bantam, N.Y., 1972.

Paulo Freire has worked the principles of convivial education in rural Brazil realizing what Illich himself calls "truly revolutionary pedagogy".[69] Jonathon Kozol and A.S. Neill provide examples of alternative school structures which, while dealing with profoundly different socio-economic communities, and thus producing very different schools, still both will be seen to proceed from assumptions about learning that are deeply grounded in convivial theory. Herbert Kohl demonstrates that, in spite of the inherent limitations and frustrations of such a task, the principles of conviviality can be effectively realized even within the confines of the public school classroom. Finally, Carl Rogers' work, based in psychotherapy, systematically describes certain perceptions about the way people are that perhaps best explains why conviviality can and must be a universal phenomenon.

Not only will it be shown that it is possible for conviviality to be flexible in its application, but, in fact, that it is necessary if the theory is to be congruent with its own inner logic. It can be realized in a diversity of environments and still be responsive to the needs of unique populations.

Self-Actualization

For Paulo Freire, self-actualization emerges as a philosophical underpinning to his entire argument. It is a social and economic goal, the major motivating force of his work and a passionate political ideology. If there is a major theme in his work then it is the pursuit of freedom which enables the individual to be himself; to liberate the individual from oppression. In his attempt to do so, Freire adopts an educational policy which is entirely dependent upon the emotions and personal goals of the people with whom he works. He writes:

---

[69] Freire, P., Pedagogy of the Oppressed, The Seabury Press, N.Y., 1970.

> Attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in the act of liberation is to treat them as objects which must be saved from a burning building; it is to lead them into the populist pitfall and transform them into massess which can be manipulated.[70]

Freire is profoundly concerned with the state of man as subject or object. As object he is acted upon by others and the domination occurs fundamentally in the educational process where individuals are acted upon in a manner such that;

> Education . . . functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of men and women into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it.[71]

Freire seeks to transform the individual from object to subject through an educational process that he calls "conscientização". This demands working with the individual as opposed to working for him. Freire seeks to evoke peoples' perceptions of their environment, give some order to expressions of personal concerns and then, using symbols that are relevant to that experience, give the same people the tools to become aware of and act as subjects upon their social conditions and pursue their goals as they define them. In doing so, Freire is trying to give people the tools they need, through an educational process aimed at diminishing illiteracy, so that they can have an impact on their society and the way in which it affects their lives. As he writes in Cultural Action for Freedom:

---

[70] Freire, ibid., p. 52.

[71] Schaull, R., in Foreward to Freire, ibid., p. 15.

> Learning to read and write ought to be an opportunity to know what speaking the word really means; a human act implying reflection and action. As such it is a primordial human right and not the privilege of a few. Speaking the word is not a true act if it is not at the same time associated with the right of self-expression, of creating, of deciding and choosing and ultimately participating in societies historical process.[72]

The tool of literacy, as such, is a tool for conviviality, and the process is one of convivial education with self-actualization as its innermost goal.

In Freire's attempt to offer people an educational process which is entirely responsive to their needs as they define them, and which attempts to give them the tools to act in pursuit of self-defined goals, he is seeking in a South American rural milieu what Jonathon Kozol has subsequently attempted in a North American urban context. Kozol began working in the Boston Public School System and the oppression he saw there is essentially the same as that against which Freire has struggled. What Kozol encountered was the student being acted upon as object. He saw the teachers around him as dedicated to a process which was -

> . . . an extension of their own personalties (the aim of which was) the perpetuation of their own values in the hearts and minds of children.[73]

---

[72] Freire, P., Cultural Action for Freedom, Harvard Educational Review, Monograph Series, No. 1, 1970, p. 12.

[73] Kozol, J., Death at an Early Age, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1967, p. 207.

Kozol emerged from that system to propose an educational process which would enable students to act as subject upon their environment. This would give to the participants the means by which to attain the goals they established for themselves as a function of their own life experiences. His book on free schools is more a manual for action than a purely theoretical work but the assumptions which underlie his work are easily discernable. Seeking a method to provide for self-actualization, he writes:

> Parent committees formed and made decisions on specific matters of procedure. A lawyer was found to draw up corporation papers. Parents went home and sat up late at night writing up a set of statements on the kinds of things that they would like to see in a new school. We worked out all the separate pieces of writing into one consistent body of short term intentions and long term goals and we typed it up and had it duplicated. It became our manifesto.[74]

The people who determined the goals of the school were those whom it was to serve and so the congruency between the education and the lives of the people involved became inevitable. The process of self-actualization is actively implicit; the entire educational experience is, as in Freire, designed to provide tools for the accomplishment of personally defined ends. Kozol avoided the situation he criticized in the Boston school system by recognizing that inner city people define different goals resulting from different life experiences. They have different needs than do members of the suburban middle class. He speaks sensitively and eloquently to this point when he writes:

> It is a bitter pill for many white people to accept, but in a large number of cases those rewards, skills and areas of expertise which many of us consider rotten and corrupt and hopelessly contaminated remain

---

[74] Kozol, J., Free Schools, Bantam Books, New York, 1972, p. 2.

> attractive and, in certain situations, irresistable to the poor. It is, moreover, often a case not of material greed but of material survival.[75]

Where Kozol accordingly remains sensitive to the needs for self-actualization on the part of an urban ghetto community, it is naturally true, as he insinuates above, that the needs of those who come from different backgrounds will be perceived as different by them. A.S. Neill, in his Summerhill experiment, provided a milieu very different from that of Kozol's school, however the motivating factor was similarly the convivial desire to provide a medium which enables self-actualization for the community. Responding to a more affluent community than that which Kozol worked with, he set up a school which offered freedom to learn what one wanted to and to do so at ones own pace. Neill operated from a principle of faith in children and he allowed them to be children, not as adults think they should be, but as they really are. He writes:

> When my wife and I began the school, we had one main idea: to make the school fit the child instead of making the child fit the school.
>
> . . . my view is that the child is innately wise and realistic. If left to himself, he will develop as far as he is capable of developing.[76]

Accordingly, he provided a milieu of freedom for self-definition and the tools for self-actualization that would flow from that definition. He believed that if we miss the strength of our own inner motivation and must be coerced perhaps it is because our own education socialized us to need coercion. As Freire and Kozol have argued, it is that very inner motivation which is the prerequisite for real learning and freedom. All three educators are reflected in Neill's words when he writes:

---

[75] Kozol, ibid., p. 38.

[76] Neill, A.S., Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing, Hart Publishing, N.Y., 1960, p. 4.

> . . . unfree education results in a life that cannot be lived fully. Such an education almost entirely ignores the emotions of life; and because these emotions are dynamic, their lack of opportunity for expression must and does result in cheapness, and ugliness and hatefulness.[77]

Neill, Kozol and Freire, recognizing the need for inner motivation as the key to convivial education all chose to apply their principles outside the boundaries of traditional educational system and felt that it was necessary to do so. Herbert Kohl, espousing principles of convivial education, attempted to apply those principles, with some success, in a classroom of the quite traditional educational system of New York City. As Freire, Kohl is very concerned with the use of words as symbols of self-expression and freedom or as coercive socialization. He wrote of these perceptions of words and his students understanding of them;

> The idea that words were complex phenomena with long and compelling histories was never presented to the children. I doubt many teachers entertained it. The canons of the schools pretend that a small pre-selected segment of language of the moment is an eternally correct and all inclusive form. This form is embodied in basic word lists and controlled vocabulary readers, as if the mastery of language consists of learning a list of fifty or a hundred words by rote. The use of language in human life is continually avoided or ignored, as if it poses too great a threat to 'correctness' and 'rightness'. No wonder then that the children showed persistently and ingeniously how much they feared and avoided the language of the schools.[78]

As Freire, Kohl recognized language as the key to self-actualization, and self-actualization as the key to freedom and true learning.

> The emphasis on language and words opened the children to the whole process of verbal communication. Things that they had been struggling to express, or worse, had felt, only they in their

---

[77] Neill, ibid., p. 100.

[78] Kohl, H., 36 Children, New American Library, N.Y., 1967, p. 32.

> isolation, had thought about, became social and shareable. Speaking of things, inferiority and ambiguity, or irony and obsession, brought relief, and perhaps for the first time gave the children a sense that there were meaningful human creations that one could discuss in the classroom.[79]

The theoretical symmetry between Freire and Kohl in milieus as diverse as the Brazilian countryside and the Harlem ghetto is stark and precise. To both, education is a total process and, in its elements, a means to self-expression, actualization and human communication. It reinforces the argument that the underlying principles of conviviality can be universal and have the potential to be universally liberating.

Rogers perhaps best exemplifies this idea in that, while his arguments about education stem more from general principles of his biases in psychotherapy and are applied through a prism of theory on interpersonal relationships in general, still, it is apparent that the precepts of conviviality still prevail. In this instance the principle is self-actualization and Rogers' words appropriately evoke the educational practice experience of Kohl, Kozol, Neill and Freire. Their practice experience reflects the self-directed theories of Rogers. He writes of the necessary role of education that it must -

> . . . Leave the student as a self-respecting, self-motivating person, free to choose whether he wished to put forth effort . . . (the process) refrains from forcing him into conformity, from sacrificing his creativity and from causing him to live his life in terms of the standards of others.[80]

What is apparent to this point is that while practicing in widely divergant milieus these different educators have adopted the convivial principal of self-actualization as the principal motivating factor for allowing people to acquire personally relevant educational experiences.

---

[79] Kohl, ibid., p. 38.

[80] Rogers, C., On Becoming a Person, Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1961, p. 19.

Curriculum Relevance

If self-actualization is the axiom of education as a convivial tool and is the unifying theoretical end to which convivial education directs itself in diverse and idiosyncratic contexts, then flowing from that axiom is the corollary of a curriculum content which is meaningful and relevant to the emotions and personal histories of the participants in the process. It is the necessary medium through which such a process must be realized. It will be seen that the second principle of convivial education is a guide for all five theorists. It appropriately realizes itself in different forms which are responsive to their different working communities.

For Paulo Freire, education exists as a means, the end of which is the exploration of and action upon one's personal environment. The content of an educational program emerges only after intensive dialogue with the population who will participate in the programme. Freire believes, and the words are reminiscent of Neill, that, with increased awareness man will act upon his environment to increase humanity and humaneness. Freire sought to work with people to develop their skills and give to them tools to increase their awareness of those issues which they have indicated are of concern to them.

In a process of dialogue (which will be looked at more closely in the section on student-teacher relations) Freire and his colleagues attempt to discern the major themes of concern to a given population. Subsequent literacy enables the people, therefore, to act upon these self-defined themes in a systematic and productive manner.

Reflecting the convivial necessity of studying that which is personally relevant, Freire writes -

> For the dialogical, problem posing teacher-student, the program is neither a gift nor an imposition--bits of information to be deposited in the students--but rather the organized systematized and developed 'representation' to individuals of the things about which they want to know more.[81]

The process of education is one of dialogue on a basis of equality between all participants. The aim of the program becomes one wherein-

> The learners, rather than receive information about this or that fact, analyze their own existential experience.[82]

The dependance upon the people for content and the assurance that the education will not occur according to what the "educators" decide is best for "their" students is clearly defined in 'Pedagogy of the Oppressed'.

> In a long conversation with Malraux, Mao Tse-Tung declared, 'You know I've proclaimed for a long time: We must teach the masses clearly what we have received from them confusedly.'[83]

Responding to this the curriculum in Freire's pedagogy therefore, is necessarily relevant to the population with which he is working - it emerges from them.

In the discussion of self-actualization and its role in Jonathon Kozol's work it was apparent, in the manner in which the working manifesto developed, that similar principles were being applied to Boston's

---

[81] Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, op. cit., p. 82.

[82] Freire, Cultural Action for Freedom, op. cit., p. 15.

[83] Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, op. cit., p. 82.

Roxbury ghetto community. Kozol argues passionately that the curriculum in his free school must respond to the self-defined needs of its population irrespective of how inappropriate it may seem to other value frameworks. The link between self-actualization and curriculum relevance is tightly forged. One is not possible without the other and Kozol, like Freire (and others it will be seen) insists upon a curriculum which adheres closely to the value priorities of the population using it. Accordingly the curriculum must arise from their experience. Alluding to Freire, he writes:

> The heart of his (Freire's) approach, however, has to do with the recognition and identification - on the part of the learner - of a body of words which are associated with the existence and potentially explosive needs and yearnings of his own existence.[84]

The underlying principle is transferred from Brazil to Boston and it is apparent that Kozol sees himself as both student and teacher and that he must learn about the ghetto values and desires and then implement an educational process which will facilitate their realization. Coming from a Jewish middle-class background Kozol shows the ability to separate out enough to respond to the very different ghetto mentality and respond productively;

> The basic point I am trying to establish in this book is the distinction between the life-style 'revolution' of rich people which transpires at all times within the safe and non-political context of the white, the privileged, the whimsical, the not-in-need and the real life revolution of those who are in great pain or in grave danger - whether they might be black or white or Spanish speaking - and who, as a consequence, are locked in a non-stop struggle for survival. The first pertains to individual transformations, better relations between those who are already given access to the proceeds of an unjust and unequal social order, a more meaningful and

---

[84] Kozol, Free Schools, op. cit., p. 41.

> more inspiring experience of what life has to offer to those who have already all they need for physical health and material well-being; the second to matters of power, cash, oppression, exploitation, confrontation and control.[85]

In applying that principle of curriculum relevance to the Roxbury ghetto, a process emerged which began to enable people to take control of their lives; to act as subjects. They moved towards traditional places of employment in a technological society for no other reason other than that it was what they sought for themselves.

Curriculum relevance allows for natural diversity of endeavour that can lead to all the different things that self-actualization can mean for different people. The differences between Kozol's free school and A.S. Neill's Summerhill demonstrate this diversity in pursuit of the same principle. At times producing virtually antithetical results, the principle of conviviality still holds true. Neill writes:

> The function of the child is to live his own life--not the life that his anxious parents think he should live, nor the life according to the educator who thinks he knows what is best. All this interference and guidance on the part of adults only produces a generation of robots.
>
> You cannot make children learn music or anything else without to some extent converting them into will-less adults. You fashion them into acceptors of the _status-quo_ . . . the scared to death conformist.[86]

Both Neill and Kozol are offering processes that respond to the individual needs of a community as the community defines them. Content is different. Courses are different in method. Implicit in both, however, is the absence of coercion. Compulsory attendance is anathema. It is also unnecessary for people to be forced to undergo a process that they themselves have designed.

---

[85] Kozol, _ibid._, p. 44.

[86] Neill, _Summerhill_, op. cit., p. 12.

It is true, however, that compulsory attendance is a reality in most educational contexts. It is a predominant theme in public education. Herbert Kohl tried to introduce the theme of curriculum relevance into just such a context - a classroom in the Harlem ghetto 'served' by the New York Public Educational System. Kohl was responding to an awareness that, as a fundamentally middle-class institution, the pre-packaged material to which the ghetto students were being coercively exposed was irrelevant to their existential experience. If he was not able to offer culturally relevant courses that alternative schools could, then he was going to try and make the content of the compulsory courses more real and immediate. Accordingly, for example, he would work Math through the medium of the Patterson-Liston fight statistics, - ancillary rights, percentages of the take and odds on favourites. All these mathematical functions were dealt with in a context that was relevant and emotionally charged. The principle is poignantly similar to Kozol's work in Roxbury where people came to examine their own lives through such men as Langston Hughes and his poem 'The Landlord'; in both cases it was content that managed to be emotionally and culturally relevant because it touched upon the individuals life experience. Of the necessity for this feature in education, Kohl wrote;

> As usual, the children led me. I have found one of the most valuable qualities a teacher can have is the ability to perceive and build upon the needs of his pupils struggle to articulate through their every reaction. For this he needs antennae and must constantly work upon attuning himself to the ambience of the classroom. To the mastery of observation of children must be added the more difficult skill of observing his own effect upon the class, something only partially done at best. But if the easy guides of the standard

> curriculum and authoritarian stance are to be discarded, any clues from actual experience (of the Children) are welcome.[87]

The principle of dialogue, of responding to a communities emotional and personal experience is evident, even when the context is one of compulsory attendance in a classroom. There are grave problems in terms of where people would go once they would move by Kohl's grade, but it is apparent that, with desire and skills, a teacher, even in the context of the New York Public School System, could, in relative isolation, apply the convivial principle of responsive and relevant content in curriculum.

Rogers, again speaking in terms of general principles of human interaction, summarizes this section in his statement on the necessity for curriculum relevancy vis à vis any person's existence. If, in psychotherapeutic learning, the individual must deal with a problem that he perceives of as serious and meaningful, he will therefore be eager to learn, then, the

> . . . implication for education might well be that we permit the student, at any level, to be in real contact with the relevant problems of his existence, so that he perceives problems and issues that he wishes to resolve.[88]

This seems to be the common denominator for the area of curriculum relevance. What is evident to this point then, is that a convivial system must pursue an ideology of self-actualization through a dialogical process of curriculum relevance. This convivial activity can be seen to be essentially applicable in a diversity of working milieus. That the concept is realized in different forms with different results in terms of human endeavour only reinforces the logical conclusion that education, as a convivial tool, in responding effectively to a mosaic of personalities will produce an equivalent mosaic of human endeavour.

---

[87] Kohl, 36 Children, op. cit. p. 43.

[88] Rogers, On Becoming a Person, op. cit., p. 286.

Convivial Teacher-Student Relations

It remains now to examine what, in practical terms, proves to be the most critical area. If self-actualization is to be a sought after goal, and curriculum relevance is, in a sense, the medium, then the process of interaction between the participants becomes the final and determining link in the chain of education as a convivial tool. These relationships must adhere to convivial practice if the theoretical ends have any chance of realization.

This section will examine in greater detail, therefore, the nature of these relationships that until now have only been implied.

Roger's expression "becoming" best describes Freire's idea of exactly what it is that education is trying to facilitate. Joao da Veiga Coutenho, in his preface to Freire's monograph on Cultural Action for Freedom, describes mans vocation as one of "being more"-

> . . . mans vocation is to be more - more, that is, than what he is at any given time and place. There are thus no developed men except in a biological sense. The essence of the human being is to be in continual non-natural process. In other words, the characteristic of the human species is its repeatedly demonstrated capacity for transcending what is merely given, what is purely determined . . . Education is either for domestication or freedom.[89]

Freire's pedagogy, as with the other people discussed in this section, is for freedom; is a convivial tool. The human interaction of the process reflects this in theory and practice.

---

[89] da Veiga Coutenho, J., Preface to Freire, P., Cultural Action for Freedom, op. cit., p. vi.

In practice he works through adult literacy programmes. Relevant themes are identified and 'coded' linguistically in generative words and syllables that evoke the individuals emotion and experience. The aim of the programme is to enable the individual to act as subject upon his environment. The method is dialogue.

For Freire the essential feature of the student-teacher relationship is that all those who are involved are both "teachers" and "students". The process between them is dialogical - a problem-posing examination of each others experience. He speaks of what he calls 'co-intentional' education:

> Teachers and students . . . co-intent upon reality, are both subjects not only in the task of unveiling that reality and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of recreating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as its permanent recreators.[90]

The process of learning develops around realities that are important to both 'teachers and students'. The process is one of sharing impressions, ideas and desires for action. The process is not a static bestowal of material. Rather than being narrative with the 'teacher' (subject) acting upon the 'student' (object), it becomes a dynamic mutual activity with all participants acting as subjects. In a relationship of dialogue people meander through, explore, refine and define their existence together. Hierarchical role definitions which create vertical distance between teachers and students dissolve into horizontal common initiative and enterprise. Teachers and students teach, they both learn, they both think, they believe that they both 'know' things, they both have choice, they both talk and listen. The community is the medium and the message.

---

[90] Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, op. cit., p. 56.

> Through dialogue the 'teacher-of-the-students' and the 'student-of-the-teacher' cease to exist and a new term emerges: Teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer the one who teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who, in turn, while being taught, also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which they both grow.[91]

Where Freire, responding to his environment, used literacy training as a means to personal freedom, other environments demand other tools but the horizontal dialogical process will be seen to be a constant.

Jonathon Kozol, similarly sought a way to enable the individual to act as subject upon his environment. The medium he developed was that of the free school, which, in existing outside of the traditional school system, was free of the kind of unconvivial constraints described in Chapter 2 of this paper. In its isolation such a school had to scramble to exist and thus the dialogical process with and mutual committment to the community in which it worked, developed. Both the school and the community were 'deviants' struggling to survive and they served each other and grew together - as such they became one. As Kozol writes:

> 'Relevance' and 'urban-oriented' are the twin curricular code phrases in the nation, at the present time, for the ritual experience of looking into the mirror at the battle being waged behind our back while walking rapidly away from it. The free school that shatters the mirror and turns to face the flames is the one that will not lose its consciousness of struggle or its capability for a continual process of regeneration.[92]

The notion of "becoming" through common struggle is apparent.

It is natural that the relationship between the student and teacher should reflect this togetherness. Just as with Freire, the struggle is to, through dialogue, determine what skills are necessary, what convivial tools, and then to work together to develop them for action on one's own behalf. The community decision in Kozol's case, as with many other free schools, was to work towards developing technological skills, so as to enable struggle an equal footing with an industrial society that so far has oppressed and used the labours of communities like Roxbury while bestowing little of the rewards upon them. In speaking of this technological expertise, Kozol writes:

---

[91] Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, op. cit., p. 67.

[92] Kozol, Free Schools, op. cit., p. 13.

> The poor and black, the beaten and despised, cannot survive the technological nightmare of the next ten years if they do not have this kind of expertise in their ranks.[93]

The common struggle for that awareness, accordingly developed and demanded a convivial working relationship in the educational process. Kozol's own words in describing the free school of a colleague exemplify the kind of relationships that are necessary. The experiences of Freire in Brazil and Neill in England spring to mind.

> The young men who began the whole thing in the first place, his seven co-workers, and their parent allies operate the free school as an honest common straightforward and unique endeavour of their own creation with little apparent need to look for sanction on the outside . . . There is a strong, emphatic and charming atmosphere of trust, of shared endeavour and of conspiratorial exhilaration between children and adults -- a sense of trust which builds at all times on the recognition of the unjust and intolerable conditions that surround their school and of the physical and psychological dangers which exist for each and every one of them on the outside.[94]

The words, for the most part, could be transposed to or from A.S. Neill's description of Summerhill. The methodology is quite different for they reflect a more economically affluent middle class lifestyle. The goals of the process and the human relationships through which those goals are pursued are, however, in principle the same. Neill built the school on the assumption that it would be a place where people would explore themselves in a non-coercive and optionally academic context. They would develop personal control over their ability to have an impact upon the world around them in personally significant ways. Unlike Kozol, the curriculum was not as skill-oriented in an academic, technological sense. The opportunity existed to immerse oneself in crafts, constructive leisure, or to do 'nothing' at all that could be construed of as 'studying'. The fact is, as Neill stated, that most of the people at Summerhill did go to classes and managed to acquire the skills they needed quickly when the motivation came from within. The sense of siege and urgency of the ghetto did not exist at Summerhill -- the sense of inner motivation, freedom, equality and sharing did.

---

[93] Kozol. ibid., p. 74.

[94] Kozol, ibid., p. 89. (my emphasis)

The sharing emerged and developed through a process of dialogue, which, at Summerhill occured on a community level through a process called "Self-Government" -- a forum that determined the goal and procedures of the community. Everyone from Neill through the youngest child had one vote. Being voluntary and self-motivated it was successful in its congruency with the desires of the community. It offered a medium for political self-control.

> At Summerhill we have proved, I believe, that self-government works. In fact, the school that has no self-government should not be called a progressive school. It is a compromise school. You cannot have freedom unless children feel free to govern their own

social life. When there is a boss, there is not real freedom.[95]

Summerhill is structured in a way so as to allow the individual to explore and choose. The relationship between teachers and students, accordingly breaks down from any vertical authoritarian nature. The staff and students live together in their community and have a common commitment to it; they have a sense of élan, of belonging and of shared endeavour. As a convivial tool, it naturally develops that 'teacher-student' relationships manifest the convivial features which we have already seen with Kozol and Freire. Neill writes with satisfaction -

> The most frequent remark that visitors make is that they cannot tell who is staff and who is pupil. It is true: the feeling of unity is that strong . . . there's no deference to the teacher as teacher. Staff and pupils . . . obey the same community laws.[96]

The resources available to Summerhill people and the goals they pursue differ greatly from other areas that have been examined but the principle of the exercise as a convivial tool remains and the relationships between 'staff' and 'students' implicitly and explicitly bear this out.

In moving on to consider the work of Herbert Kohl, one returns to the world of the ghetto and the configurations of hopes and dreams that characterize such a community. The aspirations of the children he worked with in Harlem are logically similar in many aspects to those with which Kozol worked in Roxbury. The inherent limitations of the unconvivial system in which Kohl worked placed constraints and limits upon what he could do outside his classroom; nor was there an airtight seal around the class that could negate the unconvivial influence of the public school board from coming in. Within these limitations, however, he strove to achieve a process of conviviality in his own class. The elements of struggle, community, dialogue and mutual learning, were all present within the isolated microcosm of the class and, accordingly, the relationship between his students and himself was a typically convivial working relationship as it has been described to this point. Kohl's description of his perception of his working relationship with his students was such that -

---

[95] Neill, Summerhill, op. cit., p. 52.

[96] Neill, ibid., pp. 11-12.

> . . . The role of the teacher is not to control his students but rather to enable them to make choices and pursue what interests them. In an open classroom, a pupil functions according to his sense of himself rather than what he is expected to be.[97]

Kohl's contact with his community was limited, but within those limitations, he sought to achieve what were essentially convivial goals of involvement with the people with whom he worked and the concerns of their lives. This was realized in interaction which spilled over into the issues and concerns of the general community--unsafe streets, "no-good cops", "junkies" and "cut-up" friends. If Kohl believed that it was necessary to involve himself in the life of the community, it is also true that his aim was self-learning, and his methodology was dialogue. He writes:

> I also realized that any successful classroom has to be based upon a dialogue between students and teachers, both teaching and being

---

[97] Kohl, H., The Open Classroom, Random House, New York, 1969, p. 20.

taught, both able to acknowledge that fact.[98]

It is necessary to mention here that, in spite of the congruency between the work outside the system of Kozol, Freire and Neill, and what Kohl accomplished within the classroom, Kohl came to the conclusion that, while what he had done was not insignificant, real change would have to occur from without. Applying the principle of conviviality in dialogue, content and motivation might get by in one classroom, but, if it emerged beyond those walls, an unconvivial system would quickly move to squelch the activity. Towards the end of "36 Children" he writes of a conversation he had with the kids in his class:

> The system, I had to tell them - it was the system of which I was an insignificant and powerless part that had to be changed. My choice was to remain within the system and work with the children, or leave and try to change it from without. I stayed, though now I am convinced that that system which masquerades as educational but in Harlem produces no education except in bitterness, rejection and failure can only be changed from without.[99]

In the end, though, the principles and methods that others sought and achieved outside were, for a moment sought after and achieved inside as well.

Samuel Tenenbaum, discussing Carl Rogers' theory of non-directed teaching self-directed learning wrote:

> Rogers expressed the belief almost from the outset of the course that no one can teach anyone anything. But thinking . . . begins at the fork in the road, the famed dilemma set up by Dewey. As we reach the fork in the road, we do not know which road to take if we are to reach our destination; and then we begin to examine the situation. Thinking starts at that point.[100]

---

[98] Kohl, ibid., p. 20.

[99] Kohl, 36 Children, op. cit., p. 163.

[100] Tenenbaum, S., Carl Rogers & Non-Directive Teaching in Rogers, On Becoming a Person, op. cit., p. 303.

Rogers sees this process as one in which students-teachers share in mutual facilitation. A number of qualities are required to do this. People must have the ability to be real and genuine. They must be willing to express themselves honestly if they are to demand the same of others. One must be able to allow the other to possess his own feelings in his own way and to feel a sensitive empathy towards those feelings and their expression. One must allow the other to explore himself in freedom without an accompanying moralistic evaluation. All these characteristics are necessary, Rogers argues, to a helping relationship; to any relationship.

As a general set of codes on the process of 'teaching' and the incumbent relationships, Rogers writes:

> I realize that I am only interested in learning which significantly influences behaviour . . .
>
> I have come to feel that the only learning which significantly influences behaviour is self-discovered, self-appropriated learning.
>
> Such self-discovered learning (is) truth that has been personally appropriated and assimilated in experience . . .
>
> I realize that I am . . . interested in being a learner, preferably learning things that matter, that have some significant influence on my behaviour . . .
>
> I find that one of the best, but most difficult ways for me to learn is to drop my own defensiveness, . . . and to try and understand the way in which his experience seems and feels to the other person.[101]

This section of teacher-student relations has seen a variety of milieus, methodologies and educational structures but it is apparent that:

1. the above set of principles is purely convivial in the sense in which the word has been used in this paper and,

2. the above set of principles effectively defines the fundamental nature of the working human relationship in the educational works of

---

[101] Rogers, On Becoming a Person, op. cit., pp. 267-268.

Freire, Kozol, Neill and Kohl.

These convivial principles provide the conceptual glue, that, as a guide to "teacher-student" relations in pursuit of a convivial educational process binds these educators together in common purpose.

CONCLUSION

Ivan Illich has argued that any process which falls short of deschooling cannot be an effective convivial tool. He has proposed a revolutionary scheme which is a process of "deschooling" realized through the medium of the learning web process -- concepts discussed in Chapter 1. These webs would be, he argues, convivial learning tools.

Of learning webs, one must ask oneself three fundamental questions -- is such a structure realizable? If so, will it truly serve the individual and consequently be flexible enough to allow the convivial dictum of "personal energy under personal control"[102] to be realized in diverse milieus? Thirdly, can educational reform successfully occur in isolation from other social realities? In short, does the deschooled learning web realize in theory and practice the principles of conviviality? These questions, of course, are the fundamental criticisms around which this paper has revolved.

Illich has failed in his practical proposals, to bridge the gap between the present and the future; he has provided for a system that will inherently be denied to a majority of people. He treats education in a vacuum somehow believing that reform in that area will magically have a profound impact upon society.

Robert Urquhart writes:

> . . . although Illich is very precise in his analysis of the present and as precise as may be expected in his projection for the future, he gives us very little in between, to the extent that it

---

[102] Illich, Deschooling Society, op. cit., p. 11.

> becomes most unclear as to what his aims are, and just whose lives he sees as being opened up by the new state of affairs . . . he maintains the state of education in isolation as though it were some kind of absolute: a key to all problems, a change in which will necessarily bring with it the rest of society in whatever direction it goes . . . Even taking only the changes that Illich proposes for the acquiring and dissemination of knowledge, these are without question, in extreme contradiction to the present power structure, inadmissible in terms of the interest of the ruling class, if they are understood to affect the whole population. If, on the other hand, they are understood to be intended only for a new intellectual elite, then it is possible to see that they might well be acceptable to the present ruling class. And this is the trouble; if we take education in isolation . . . it is imaginable that certain of Illich's proposals may be put into effect, but in such a way as to exclude the majority of people from benefitting from them.[103]

In response to these criticisms, this paper has attempted to demonstrate, and the experiences discussed in Chapter 3 would bear out, the following. Assuming conviviality as self-actualization, curriculum relevancy and convivial human relationships to be desirable goal then, as such, it can be realized outside of Illich's strategum for deschooling. Freire, Kozol, Kohl, Neill and Rogers have demonstrated that conviviality is realizable in contemporary non-deschooled forms of educational practice. They serve the individual religiously in terms of personal energy under personal control. Content and process emerge from the individual. Conviviality can be a flexible process capable of being realized in diverse socio-economic and geographic and structural settings. It is also evident for all five educators, that education is not being treated in isolation from the remainder of society; rather it is integrally related to the individual's existence in his total living situation and is designed to enable the individual to have effective personal impact upon his life and relationship in society. As Rogers indicated, principles of educational conviviality are relevant to human relationships and interactions in general.

---

[103] Urquhart, R., Implications of the Supreme Court Decision in the Case of Griggs et al. vs. Duke Power Company, CIDOC, Document A/E, 71/326, Cuernavaca, Mexico, 1971, p. 7.

In achieving convivial principles in practice and in demonstrating its de facto methodological flexibility which makes it a personally relevant and socially enabling mechanism, it can be seen that convivial education is realizable without Illich's concept of radical deschooling. It can still be a convivial tool, and is, in fact, more congruent with the underlying principles of conviviality than the deschooled learning web seems to be. Convivial education implies hope for and trust in humanity. Subsequently it can be a tool for the people living it in trust and hope.

The bestowal of freedom is the bestowal of love.
And only love can save the world.*

---

* Neill, Summerhill, op. cit., p. 92.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Becker, Geer, Riesman, Weiss, Institutions and the Person, Aldine Publishing, Chicago, 1968.

2. Berofsky, B., Free Will and Determinism, Harper & Row, New York, 1966.

3. Brubacher, J.S., Modern Educational Philosophies, McGraw Hill, Toronto, 1963.

4. Coombs, P.H., The World Educational Crisis, Oxford University Press, London, 1968.

5. Davis & Good (eds.), Reinhold Niebuhr on Politics, Scribner & Son, New York, 1960.

6. Dennison, G., The Lives of Children, Vintage Books, 1969.

7. Dewey, J., Experience in Education, Collier Books, New York, 1938.

8. Farnham-Diggory, S., Cognitive Processes in Education: A Psychological Preparation for Teaching and Curriculum Development, Harper & Row, 1972.

9. Freire, P., Pedagogy of the Oppressed, the Seabury Press, New York, 1968.

10. Friedenberg, E., The Vanishing Adolescent, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.

11. Gartner, Greer, Riessman, After Deschooling, What?, Illich et al., Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

12. Hansen, S., Jesper, J., The Little Red School Book, Pocket Book, New York, 1971.

13. Hart, H., (ed), Summerhill: For and Against, Hart Publishing, New York, 1970.

14. Holt, J., How Children Fail, Dell Publishing, New York, 1964.

15. Holt, J., How Children Learn, Dell Publishing, New York, 1967.

16. Holt, J., What Do I Do Monday?, Delta Publishing, New York, 1970.

17. Holt, J., Freedom and Beyond, E.P. Dutton & Company, New York, 1972.

18. Illich, I., Deschooling Society, Harper & Row, New York, 1970.

19. Illich, I., Tools for Conviviality, Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

20. James, W., The Will to Believe; Human Immorality, Dover Press, New York, 1956.

21. Kohl, H., 36 Children, Signet New American Library, New York, 1968.

22. Kohl, H., The Open Classroom, New York Review of Books, Random House, New York, 1969.

23. Kozol, J., Free Schools, Bantam Books, Boston, 1972.

24. Kozol, J., Death at an Early Age, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1967.

25. Kuhn, J.S., The Structure of Scientific Revolution, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

26. Laing, R.D., Politics of Experience, Penguin, England, 1967.

27. Leonard, C.B., Education and Ecstacy, Delta, New York, 1968.

28. Macpherson, C., Theory of Possessive Individualism, Oxford University Press, 1962.

29. Meahan, E., Value Judgement and Social Science, The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, 1969.

30. Nagle, E., The Structure of Science, Harcourt Brace and World, New York, 1963.

31. Natanson, M., (ed), Philosophy of Social Sciences, Random House, New York, 1963.

32. Neill, A.S., Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing, Hart Publishing, New York, 1960.

33. Nyquist, E.B. & Hawes, C.R., Open Education: A Source Book for Parents and Teachers, Bantam Books, New York, 1972.

34. Peddiwell, J.A. (Benjamin, Harold), The Saber-Tooth Curriculum, McGraw Hill, New York, 1939.

35. Postman, N. and Weingartner, C., The Soft Revolution, Dell Publishing, New York, 1971.

36. Province of Quebec, Compilation of Statutes on Education, Quebec, 1970.

37. Reich, C.A., The Greening of America, Bantam Books, New York, 1970.

38. Reimer, E., School is Dead: Alternatives in Education, Doubleday, New York, 1971.

39. Rogers, C., Freedom to Learn, Merrill Publishing, Columbus, 1968.

40. Rogers, C., Person to Person, Real People Press, San Francisco, 1967.

41. Rogers, C., On Becoming a Person, Houghton-Mifflin Company, Boston, 1961.

42. Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L., Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and the Pupil's Intellectual Ability, Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, New York, 1968.

43. Silberman, C.E. (ed.), The Open Classroom Reader, Vintage Books, New York, 1973.

44. Snitzer, H., Living in Summerhill, Collier Publishing, Toronto, 1968.

45. Tallboy, F., Open Education: A Review of the Literature and Selected Annotated Bibliography, McGill Queens University Press, Montreal, 1973.

46. Toffler, A., Future Shock, Bantam Books, New York, 1970.

47. Wilds E.H. & Lottich, R.W., The Foundations of Modern Education, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Toronto, 1969.

ARTICLES

1. Berger, P., The Liberal as Fall Guy, Center Magazine, July, 1972.

2. Buhler, C., Basic Theoretical Concepts of Humanistic Psychology, American Psychologist, Vol. 26, 1971.

3. Burger, W., Decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Case of Willie S. Griggs et al. vs. Duke Power Company, The United States Law Week, Washington, D.C., (39), pp. 4317 - 4231, 71/03/09.

4. Cohen, S., Is the School System Ready for 'Real' Change?, The Montreal Star, February 16, 1974.

5. Freire, P., The Adult Literacy Process as Cultural Action for Freedom, Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 2, May 2, 1970.

6. Freire, P., Cultural Action and Conscienization, Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 3, August, 1970.

7. Gintis, H., Towards a Political Economy of Education: A Radical Critique of Ivan Illich's Deschooling Society, Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, No. 1, February, 1972.

8. Holt, J., Reformulation: A Letter Written After Two Weeks in Cuernavaca, CIDOC, Document A/E, 71, 307, Ceurnavaca, Mexico.

9. Illich, I., Institutional Inversion, CIDOC, No. 1017, Cuernavaca, Mexico.

10. Karier, C.J., American Educational History: A Perspective, CIDOC, Document A/E, 72/366, Cuernavaca, Mexico.

11. Kozol, J., Politics Rage and Motivation in the Free Schools, Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, No. 3, August, 1972.

12. Lavery, Dr. R.E., Welcoming Address, Montreal Catholic School Commision In-Service Programme, Montreal, October, 1974.

13. Murphy, J.T., Cohen, D.K., Accountability in Education - The Michigan Experience, The Public Interest, Summer, 1974.

14. Postman, N., Are We in Todays Generation of Teachers?, Keynote Address to the Canadian Association of School Administrators, September 22, 1974.

15. Postman, Weingartner, A Careful Guide to the School Squabble, Psychology Today, October, 1973.

16. Reimer, E., An Essay on Alternatives in Education, CIDOC, No. 1005, 1970, Cuernavaca, Mexico.

17. Rogers, C., Interpersonal Relationships: U.S.A. 2000, Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences, Vol. 4, No. 3, July/August/September, 1966.

18. Spiller, E., Address to the Canadian Association of School Administrators, Montreal, September 22, 1974.

19. Torczyner, J., Bill 65 and Citizen Participation, Unpublished Paper, McGill University School of Social Work, May, 1975.

20. Urquart, R., Implications of the Supreme Court Decision in the Case of Griggs et al. vs. Duke Power Company, CIDOC, Document A/E, 71/326, Cuernavaca, Mexico.