

Jürgen Oelkers

*Break and Continuity:
Observations on the Modernization Effects and Traditionalizations
in International Reform Pedagogy**)

"Reform pedagogy" (*progressive education, éducation nouvelle*) is usually described from the point of view of special national *movements of education*. International interweavings are admitted, but they are not the principle of description. On the other hand, we can consider that the development of modern education happens *systemically* in the 19th century, that the differences between the national systems are *decreasing*, and that a critical estimation of the consequences of school development is beginning *everywhere*. Several simultaneities cannot be overlooked, and they are not simply the effect of national schooling- and criticism programs. This can be first demonstrated with a paradox, with *reform pedagogical* literature which is *not* assigned to the context of reform pedagogy, although it has played a decisive role in preparing its central topics - childhood and new education.

1. Literary opening

In 1890 PIERRE LOTI'S "Roman d'un enfant" was published in Paris, an autobiographical reminiscence of the teleological constitution of man which JAMES BALDWIN later called the logic of the genetics. According to LOTI childhood produces all motives of life, by dreaming it leaves its marks on the dreams (LOTI, 1988, p. 74), it defines in advance the memories of the adult and determines the rhythm of the emotions or the paradox of experience. "Il est étrange", LOTI writes, "que mon enfance si tendrement choyée m'ait surtout laissé des images tristes" (ibid., p. 77).

LOTI writes about himself, about the child he once was, the world of experiences from which he emerged and to which he remains attached. He remembers one situation full of worries and one sentence of the adults: "Que sera-ce de cet enfant?" (ibid., p. 102). "Oh! mon Dieu, rien autre chose que ce qui en a été ce jour-là; dans l'avenir, rien de moins, rien de plus.

Ces départs, ces emballages puérils de mille objets sans valeur appréciable, ce besoin de tout emporter, de se faire suivre d'un monde de souvenirs, - et surtout ces adieux à des petites créatures sauvages, aimées peut-être précisément parce qu'elles étaient ainsi, - ça représente toute ma vie, cela..." (ibid.).

This life is *not* at the disposal of adults or educators and it is only available in the autobiographic review. The details fit together and make sense, but what looks like a natural teleology is a retrospective construction. The adult judges his life, the child can only see this life ahead, but it cannot know what will be or what it will become. Only the adult can think "vom Kinde aus", because only he knows both sides.

LOTI'S novel on childhood is not mentioned anywhere in reform pedagogical literature. This is neither a coincidence nor an exception. In the literature of the second half of the 19th century most classical texts on childhood and education are *not* even mentioned in those works which explicitly discuss the child orientation in "new education". As examples of this I would just like to mention JULES VALLES' naturalistic childhood drama "L'enfant" (1879), EDMONDO DE AMICI'S epic life of a child "Cuore" (1886), JULES RENARD'S

exposure of repressive education in "Poil de Carotte" (1894), or even "The education of Henry Adams" (1907), the literary sum of the 19th century education. LOTI'S novel is published in the same year as STENDHAL'S autobiographical "Vie de Henry Brulard", but the style of "Le roman d'un enfant" reminds one more of FLAUBERT, without being as radical as the *mémoires d'un fou*. But then again both STENDHAL and FLAUBERT are no issue for the reform pedagogues although or because they had a lasting influence on the literary conception of *childhood*.

Without this *literature* on childhood and especially without its critical points the public awareness of the maxims of education could probably not have changed so rapidly. But what usually is defined as the beginning of reform pedagogy, the time around 1890, reveals no trace of this, if one refers to theories and models of the school pedagogical journalism in the European and American context. This journalism is interested in reforming the school-system, but it obviously does not think "reform pedagogically", so to say, if one considers ELLEN KEY'S book of the year 1900 - a not coincidental amalgam of literature, philosophy of nature, biology and child psychology - as representative for this kind of semantics. Administration knowledge, the school pedagogical language of the reform, does not occur here, whereas ten years earlier it seemed that reform options could be politicized *only* by means of this knowledge, i. e. by avoiding mere literary echoes.

2. Pedagogical reform options

BEATRICE ENSOR, publisher of the decisive reform pedagogical magazine "The New Era", published an interview with an eminent figure of public life in the edition of July 1928: "Bernhard Shaw: A Talk on Education". In this interview SHAW said the following: (i) Most people were ruined by their education because parents and teachers did not understand what "real education" was about. (ii) There is no sense in improving conventional schools, the more schools of the old type were built, the more children were damaged. (iii) The worst abortionists of the world were those pedagogues who wanted to change the character of a child, that means *to educate*. (iv) The protection of the children against the adults should obtain the rank of the constitution, at the same time the children should be granted constitutional rights. (v) If there should be new schools, then they should proceed according to the project method, they should orientate themselves to situations of life and should lead the pupils to independent activity. In other words, they should *deschool* themselves.

Before and after the First World War SHAW was one of the most influential literary critics of English education, but he was not the only one by far. H.G. WELLS was one of them, as well as G. K. CHESTERTON, T. S. ELIOT, GRAHAM GREENE, D.H. LAWRENCE, W.H. AUDEN and others. Their criticism was various and also variously radical, but it was the most natural thing in the world that writers and artists should participate in a public discourse on educational reform. Forty years earlier this was still largely unthinkable. Pedagogical reforms were discussed by traditional reform pedagogues, authors which could be assigned to the educational system, often as dissidents, sometimes also as part of the establishment, but only very rarely coming from positions which had nothing to do with the system and were just based on free criticism.

OSCAR WILDE'S "A Few Maxims for the Instruction of the Over-Educated" (1893) is literary criticism and had nothing to do with reform pedagogy. Up to the beginning of the 20th century reform pedagogy is part of the school system which reacts towards its own de-

velopmental problems and crises. Noneducational literature either remains ignorant of this or stylizes educational ideals. JOHN RUSKIN's influential book "Sesame and Lilies" which was commented by MARCEL PROUST describes the wrong endeavour which leads to the illiterate, but at the same time it describes the right path of education which is equivalent to literary education itself. According to him only the uneducated is drilled, he has a complete memory but knows nothing; the educated, on the other hand, "is learned in the *peerage* of words", he lives the tradition of education, "knows the words of true descent and anscient blood, at a glance, from the words of modern canaille" (RUSKIN 1900, p.20 c.).

This traditional position of humanistic education may occasionally be connected with school criticism (see SIDGWICK 1867), which, however, can neither become independent as journalism nor as a topic. This would require independent media and supporting groups that were not at hand in the middle of the century. Support for school reforms, at that time, can be found in publication organs of the teachers, in cadres of school administration, in university circles, wherever the form and development of the 19th century school had been criticized, without bringing this in connection with radical emancipation programs, as did SHAW 40 years later. The aim of reformprograms was to overcome the deficiencies of *school* , and this mainly in favour of national political objectives.

This can be shown for Germany in HUGO GOERING's programmatic book "Die neue deutsche Schule" published in 1890. According to its subtitle it describes a "Weg zur Verwirklichung vaterländischer Ziele". It is a project of school reform which had already been published in its outlines in 1886 in the popular magazine "Schorers Familienblatt" (GOERING 1886). In this article GOERING refers to the philanthropic tradition of reform pedagogy, to the faulty development of school in the 19th century, and to the opportunity which the German Reichsgründung in 1871 implied especially for the needs of school reform. This oportunity requires a criticism which in 1886 is neither new nor original but has accompanied the school development since its beginnings. "Man bietet der Jugend fast nur abstrakte Lehren dar, ehe man ihr einen naturgemäss fortschreitenden Einblick in das Leben gestattet. Man zeigt ihr künstliche Ideale, die das Leben zerstörten. Ebenso kultiviert man auf Kosten einer normalen Gemütsentwicklung und der körperlichen Gesundheit das begriffliche Denken und das Gedächtnis" (ibid., p. 823). In contrast with this GOERING demanded that the new education should be integral, the young should be confronted with "full life" and not just with school knowledge, and the teachers should always consider the development and needs of the child. Therefore, the "Erziehungsplan" should equally serve the development of *physical strength, moral impulses* and *knowledge*, but this is only possible if the right place and the right method are chosen and *wholeness* is guarenteed.

"Zu diesem Zweck soll die Jugend, die auf dem *Lande* im täglichen Verkehre mit der *Natur* durch Garten- und Landbau aufwachsen müsste, zunächst nur die *Sinne*, die Muskeln und die Handfertigkeiten üben, durch vielseitige gymnastische und militärische Uebungen sich an *Mut* und *Pflichttreue* gewöhnen, durch geordnete Jugendspiele Gewandtheit, Aufmerksamkeit, Geistesgegenwart und Entschlossenheit gewinnen; sie soll durch *praktische Handarbeiten* lebensvolle Kenntnis von den wichtigsten Berufszweigen des bürgerlichen Lebens bekommen und *erst dann* zum systematischen theoretischen Unterricht, der jetzt einseitig betriebenen Anspannung des Denkens, des Gedächtnisses und der Phantasie übergehen" (ibid.; italics by J. O.).

The book version of 1890 explains this thought in detail and gives even more reason for the conclusion that GOERING founded the "Landerziehungsheime", a conclusion which

did not escape the notice of contemporary observers. More important than this question of priority, however, is the self-traditionalization of the plan which in its principles of sensory activity, practical work and relation to life goes back to the philanthropists, PESTALOZZI and especially FROEBEL (GOERING 1890, p. 46 cc). New in the plan, according to GOERING, are variants of the curriculum, the strict orientation to the present time, and especially "das vaterländische deutsche Element" (ibid. p. 51). It is known that HERMANN LIETZ, too, did not wish to be outdone in this respect.

The plan itself describes a private home as avant-garde of the reform of national schools. This home should test the modernization with an elite and in exclusive environments. The omission of certain characteristic features of the system like homework, marks or formal exams is understood as reform-pedagogical modernization (ibid. p. 13 c.) along with the building up of an educational school ("Erziehungsschule") which orientates itself to situations of life and to practical work and demands a strong moral in order to secure the "Zuverlässigkeit des Charakters" (ibid., p. 16). Every "Abirrung in Gelehrteneinseitigkeit" should be avoided and it is important to impose "*täglich neue Forderungen an den praktischen Willen des Kindes*" in order to educate an "*individuality*" which is ready to take over responsibility (ibid., p. 15, 21).

GOERING'S plan was the basis of the "Allgemeinen deutschen Verein für Schulreform" founded in 1889 of which GOERING became the editor. This association ensured a journalism which influenced the public with its dramatic semantics of crises and decided reform requests. Besides GOERING WILLIAM PREYER was the spokesman of this association. The ten points of their school reform program were decisive for the convention of the first Berlin school reform conference in September 1890. One of the members of this exclusive conference was HUGO GOERING, but in the end an influence on his part on the result cannot be determined. However, school reform has become a public topic which cannot be evaded any longer, and it required nothing more than traditional semantics and a national political turn of the authorization. This goes for all developed systems of education in Europe, for the French as well as the English debate after 1880 in which the question of the development of society, or more precisely: of the connection between imperial power and expansion was bound to the "new education". EDMOND DEMOLIN'S influential manifesto "A Quoi Tient la Superiorité des Anglo-Saxons?" (1897) is only one example of this. At first the foundation of new schools in the country (Landerziehungsheime) followed *this* example everywhere, the education of the elite which was justified national-politically and should no longer to be left to the old-fashioned grammar schools. Insofar GOERING'S participation in the Berlin conference was logically consistent.

How then does change come about? And how does a change come about which does not simply continue the option of the system, but brings in motives which are alien to the system, i. e. an aesthetical and psychological child orientation which has nothing to do with traditional school reform? How come that this option which is alien to the system occurs almost *simultaneously* in different national and cultural contexts?

3. Internationalization

Internationalization - observation and communication between national systems of education - was ensured already before 1890 and parallel to the development of the specific reform pedagogical semantics which, by the way, can be equated quite strongly with a self-traditionalization. Around 1895 most school reformers were either influenced by the "scientific pedagogy" of herbartianism, or they were directly dependent on it as pupils. The

thrust of theory was caused by three factors, (i) a binding paradigm which was formulated especially by WILHELM REIN, (ii) international translations and (iii) exchange and communication of the theoremes in scientific societies which overcame national boundaries just by means of their global journalism. The problems of the national educational systems did not become "international" but they could be picked out as a central theme which could bring forth comparisons and higher abstractions. The formula of "erziehender Unterricht" (education through teaching) gave the signal words for the foundation of new schools in the country in England, France, Germany and Switzerland simultaneously.

The problem of herbartianism, however, was insurmountable especially in the international exchange, that is to say the purely theoretical psychology which was not compatible with the paradigm of empirical research. HERBART'S problem was attractive, the solution, however, seemed outdated. Therefore, the pedagogical herbartianism succeeded in establishing international contacts but it could not set up an international theory. HERBART'S psychology of imagination (*Vorstellung*) may have influenced such different author's as SIGMUND FREUD or ERNST MACH (both of them outsiders of the academic psychology around 1900), but the trends pointed in other directions: the theory of learning on the one hand, and the developmental psychology on the other hand, as far as empirical research programs could be connected with this. For them it is fundamental that *child orientation* seemed to successfully connect with *psychotechnique* in order to solve a dilemma which in a subliminal way had determined the pedagogical theory since the middle of the 18th century, the dilemma to formulate the pedagogical theory universally (and in a utopian way) without being able to technologically meet the requirements. Every particular situation of education seemed to contradict the utopia, but as it seemed only because the theory had always wrongly determined its own boundaries, that is to say dogmatically and not empirically.

Since AUGUST WILHELM REHBERG'S "Prüfung der Erziehungskunst" (1792) the determination of the limits of pedagogical intentions is no longer a new matter of concern. That "intention and success in education have so little connection" was after all the starting point for HERBART'S "Allgemeine Pädagogik" (Päd. Schr. II/p. 23c.). The preconditions for this starting point could already be gathered from HERBART'S letters as a tutor in Berne:

"Der Zweck der Erziehung ist, meiner Meinung nach, die Kinder dem Spiele des Zufalls zu entreissen. Wäre es nicht Ungewissheit, der man nicht Raum geben darf, so sollte man lieber an gar keine absichtliche Bildung junger Leute denken; denn oft erzieht der Zufall viel besser, als die grösste Sorgfalt der Eltern und Lehrer. Der Erziehung gibt also die Zuverlässigkeit ihres Plans ihren Wert; immer muss sie ihren Erfolg, wo nicht mit Gewissheit, doch mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit vorhersehen; gibt sie sich ohne die äussere Not blossen Möglichkeiten preis, so hört sie auf, Erziehung zu sein" (P. S. II/p. 21/22).

At this point in time HERBART was 22 years old; it is not exaggerated to say that this marking of the general problem of pedagogy characterizes his own theory work which wanted to see the fixed points of education in a realistic psychology and in idealistic ethics. The theory attempt failed if one bases oneself on the two criteria of the starting point, that is the reliability and the probability of success in education. The basis could not cover both. HERBART'S mathematicizing psychology at best described the "mechanics" of ideas and not the steps of development or the learning process of children, and his ethics which wanted to connect objective ideas with social institutions did not deduce specific pedagogical institutions.

But 100 years later the prognosis of the young tutor in Berne seemed to come true after all. In September 1892 the French author EUGENE BLUM described the new movement of the educational reform ("le mouvement pédagogique") for the influential *Revue philosophique* as a "science nouvelle" which went ahead with the empirical examination of childhood and wanted to determine the rules of education (BLUM 1892). Seven years later, in 1899, BLUM makes a prognosis which strongly resembles HERBART'S starting problem: According to BLUM a positive pedagogy and even a pædiometry (pédiométrie) would inevitably develop from experimental psychology and from psychophysiology of the laboratory which disposed of empirically secured explanations and generalizations for the scientific securing of education. The aim is program, "une théorie vraiment scientifique de l'éducation" (BLUM 1899, p. 300) which can exclude coincidence.

At the end of the 19th century the scientific pedagogy had several visible advantages on a psychological experimental basis; it demonstrated precision, proved that it was calculable, could be followed by teaching technology and not least it overcame the thematic limitation of classical pedagogy. When we analyze the literature of educational journals of the nineties we can find not only new but also surprising questions which were not treated in this way before. Among them are e. g. characteristics of the best teacher from the point of view of the *pupils* (KRATZ 1896), disagreements between children and adults as they are perceived by *children* (LOUGH 1897), empirical substantiations of the "Genius in children" (LANG 1897), investigations into the way children experience border situations of life, birth and death (MARPILLERO 1897), or extensions of the psychological statements and even a "psychologie du nouveau-né" (VINAY 1897). STANLEY HALL himself caused a thrust of innovation in the area of research topics which again caused whole series of research topics to follow, e. g. in view of "Children's Lies" (HALL 1890), the significance of toys for children ("A Study of Dolls" (ELLIS/HALL 1896)), early aspects of self-confidence in children (HALL 1897/98), or simply a "Psychology of Tickling, Laughing, and the Comic" (HALL/ALLIN 1897).

The program of such a scientific pedagogy was not only methodical, but also promising in content, especially as attractive summaries and generalizing interpretations were published relatively fast, e.g. JAMES BALDWIN'S developmental psychology (1895), TRACY'S "Psychology of Childhood" (1893), or also COMPAYRE'S "L'évolution intellectuelle et morale de l'enfant" (1893). All these titles were translated reciprocally and were used as reference points in an internationally expanding debate. It seemed to be certain that this debate would determine the future of education. Almost 30 years later the literature of "new education" hardly mentions this. This does not only concern the German academic pedagogy which in the meantime had invented an own "psychology of mind" (geisteswissenschaftliche Psychologie) in order to put empirical research aside in favour of intuition, wholeness and integral understanding. At this moment in time - if we just think of FREUD or MACH - one could already foresee that the concept of understanding would just renew a categorial problem of the theory of knowledge without being able to follow the international development of empirical research. However, it was exactly this distance to empirical work which was attractive in circles of reform pedagogy and, therefore, it was no coincidence that the topics of integral understanding, intuitive living and the literary child orientation were taken up, even though the authors often referred to other sources than the German "psychology of mind". Its central problem, on the other hand, how categorial "forms of life" can capture the movements of the psyche, is bound to the new philosophy of life whereas German authors like SPRANGER or LITT wanted to explain the theoremes of BERGSON in a neokantian (rational) way.

This is quite astonishing at first because it was especially the German research of the 19th century which was decisive for the formulation and realization of the program of a scientific pedagogy on an *empirical* basis. BLUM e.g. did not find it difficult in 1899 to describe especially the German research and forms of scientific organization next to the American as constitutive for the French experimental pedagogy (BLUM 1899, p. 300). Up to the First World War this opinion is basically undisputed, with regard to the priority as well as in view of the effect. For French authors at the turn of the century "le mouvement pédagogique" is *exclusively* a question of empirical child psychology which was essentially activated by American and German publications (JEANJEAN 1909/1910, p. 519 cc.). Therefore, many observers do not simply equate the "new education" with *Landerziehungsheime* which in pedagogical criticism seem far less "new" than they claim to be (BURNICHON 1899; CHOBERT 1900). Great expectations, however, were set into empirical psychology especially *because* it wanted to proceed "à la façon de Bacon", as BLUM wrote (1899, p. 303).

After the First World War the German academic pedagogy thought itself to be *beyond* the empirical program, that is to say beyond BACON. It adopted topics, problems and results of empirical psychology only marginally; both the possibilities as well as the limits of this research seemed to have become irrelevant. The leading journal "Die Erziehung" discussed *philosophic* boundaries of education and in this context also the "ethical boundaries" of the experimental approach, but it did *not* discuss the theorems and approaches of empirical research. This has to do with fundamental decisions which were based on philosophy of life and theory of knowledge. Decisive for the debate were DILTHEY'S Hermeneutik on the one hand, and the contemporary approaches of Kantianism on the other hand. Between these two positions EDUARD SPRANGER developed his theory of "forms of life" in 1914, a theory which should be understood as basis of a special "psychology of mind".

This psychology fights against the prohibition of introspection in empirical research, it develops a categorial system for the *understanding* of other people and it was directly normative without being connected with technological expectations. "Acting" is connected with "understanding" between persons, special forms of organization are not necessary. "Understanding" comes from intuition and from categorial reinforcement. The categories of SPRANGER'S "forms of life" are equally descriptive and prescriptive, they are ideal types *in* and *beyond* reality, without reality having to be described empirically once again. That is why SPRANGER and with him other authors of the "geisteswissenschaftliche Pädagogik" around the journal "Die Erziehung" does not have a problem with HERBART'S problem. Their question was never whether and how the child should be pulled away from the "game of coincidence", because "coincidence" can only be an empirical and not a mental instance. Insofar "education" seems to have a sound and profound basis if *Geist* and *Verstehen* which may be limited in its effect but is not controversial itself.

Topoi as *spirit* or *life*, metaphors as *nature* or *development* have the advantage that they can give explanations with the aid of semantics which seem to make sense without having to correspond to an ideal of exactness. The fundamental intuition of reform pedagogy - the child and its natural education - evades the intention to measure and thus the laboratory situation. No one lesser than ALFRED BINET (1911) realized this without, of course, giving up his own technological implications. But BINET understood that educational practice and psychological laboratory are different dimensions and that, therefore, the modernization program of experimental pedagogy was too simple. DEWEYS'S experimental school in Chicago was explicitly called "laboratory school" because the symbolic equation

of "laboratory" and "practice" and not because of the expectation that laboratory results could (or should) be transferred directly into methods of teaching. Here, again, Herbartianism, was revised, it became clear that one cannot *deduce* from certain general laws the right ways of educating. What remained had a really *vague* dimension, "pedagogical tact", which did *not* close the gap between theory and practice.

The expectation that there is an empirical transfer from general laws *straight* to controlled learning became questionable because of the new relation between acting and experience that DEWEY developed. Experience considered as an ongoing process of reconstruction is not guided by the laws of learning but *is* what learning is all about. However, another context was even more important to explain the resistance of many reform pedagogues against experimental pedagogy. The empirical research should *confirm* the intuition of the right education, but it should not come up with *other* results. Falsifications so to speak were undesirable: in other words, the child orientation should not be subjected to an empirical test but should remain a consistent dogma. This, however, violates the basic conditions of a research which wants to base itself on the paradigm of BACON. The condition of research could be read up clearly in the decisive papers. In 1904 HENRI POINCARÉ summarized the *learning experiences* of the experimental sciences as follows: "Toute généralisation est une hypothèse" (POINCARÉ 1968, p. 165). What discriminates science from other experiences is the constant attempt to control and verify hypotheses in order to attain a real generalization (ibid., p. 167)¹ which can never be formulated as a conclusion and has no other condition than controlled experience. Therefore, speculative or aesthetical generalizations should be excluded as inadmissible or be left open as not verifiable.

However, a child cannot appear *as* "hypothesis", just as little as education can be thought of as "verification" of this hypothesis. When at the end of the 19th century an empirical child research develops (DEPAEPE 1993) it carries this burden; aesthetical and speculative approaches are neither verified nor solved. They remain and even determine the concept. The two key terms "child" and "education" have never been rationalized in the sense that empirical theories would have replaced speculative or aesthetical approaches. But this is precisely what reform pedagogy had expected, e. g. when ELLEN KEY in "the century of the child" (1992, p. 129sq.) handed over the verification of natural education to child psychology and counted on it to deliver empirical proofs for the speculative pedagogical theory².

The unfortunate thing about this expectation is the fact that real hypothesis is presupposed and only verification is admitted. In the sense of POINCARÉ this would be a pointless strategy, because hypotheses are only useful if they allow predictions and at the same time elucidate *new* phenomena (POINCARÉ 1968, p. 178). On the other hand, what reform pedagogy understood by "child" and "education" should not be corrected with *unexpected* factors and was not really submitted to a critical experiment. The empirical research was supposed to confirm convictions which were assigned to one's own tradition. What was progressive was secured through the historical continuity from ELLEN KEY (1992, p. 129) in one line to MONTAIGNE, COMENIUS, LOCKE, ROUSSEAU, PESTALOZZI,

¹ POINCARÉ (1968, p. 166/167) discriminates three classes of hypotheses, they can be *dangerous*, *indifferent* or *true*. Hypotheses are dangerous when they are used tacitly and subconsciously; they are indifferent when they are assumed at the beginning of research; they are true when experience confirms or weakens them ("confirmer ou infirmer").

² "Das für unsere Zeit absolut Neue ist ... das Studium der Kinderpsychologie und die sich daraus entwickelnde Erziehungslehre" (KEY 1992, p. 130). Empirical research should describe the real nature of children (ibid., p. 133). It *confirms* the intuition of the pedagogues (ibid., p. 129).

SALZMANN and FROEBEL to SPENCER and child research of the present time. This is meant to be an ancestral line with *identity*, that is to say all the mentioned authors stand for one and the same concept, "natural education" or education *vom Kinde aus*.

Therefore, what was called "new education" and received international significance especially after the First World War could not simply be the consequence of certain psychological theories and techniques of behaviour. This can be demonstrated with the career of the concept of development as well as with the concept of learning; both models *have* influenced the international reform pedagogy, but either as dimensions which were compatible with the aesthetic and religion of the child or simply in a narrow specialisation. JAMES BALDWIN'S theory of a step by step development (widely read up to PIAGET), or JOHN FISKE'S neo Darwinian revaluation of childhood (because of the topic intelligence also significant for PIAGET) were taken up thematically because the image of the child was not endangered by this; THORNDIKES theory of learning which significantly stabilized the project method in the variant of KILPATRICK was acceptable with the addition of child activity (of self organization or self activity), and not as a program that could be mechanized, as the following history of behaviourism demonstrates.

The image of the natural child and the aesthetics of true education were stronger than empirical differentiations and new technologies. BINETS intelligence test has changed schooling but not pedagogical consciousness; the core of identity of new education was never modelled on a certain theory but worked out eclectically because the basic conviction was structured aesthetically and morally, and this diagonally to the national educational systems. A *partial* consciousness of new education does not exist.

Nevertheless, there were *breaks* related to *traditionalization*. The language and thus the core of the theory of reform pedagogy was never radically *new*, but traditional semantics could always prove their modernity. This happened with an emphasized journalism which was linked up internationally especially after the First World War.

4. Break of Traditions

Pour l'ère nouvelle, edited by ADOLPHE FERRIÈRE in Geneva, was the name of the French edition of the first international collaborative journal in the history of pedagogy. The cooperation was carried over from the *New Education Fellowship*,³ founded in Calais in 1921. Three journals appeared under the name of this loose organization of European and American pedagogical reformers. The titles of the journals should announce the change of epochs in education: "Pour l'ère nouvelle," "the New Era," and "das werdende Zeitalter."⁴

³The "New Education Fellowship" originated in 1920 in London as a national association, formed out of circles of the *Theosophical Society*. The first president of the English fellowship was BEATRICE ENSOR, who organized an international congress in Calais in 1921, during which the "League for the Renewal of Education" was formed. Until the second World War, the League held additional international conferences in Montreux (1923), Heidelberg (1925), Locarno (1927), Helsingör (1929), Nice (1932), Cheltenham (1937), and Ann Arbor (1941). Fifty-three nations were represented in Nice (Data from: STEWART 1968; RÖHRS 1977).

⁴*Pour l'ère nouvelle* was founded in 1922 and appeared until 1940, and, in a new series, from 1946 to 1954; *The New Era* was founded in 1920, first edited by BEATRICE ENSOR and ALEXANDER NEILL, and changed publishers several times thereafter but appeared until 1971; *Das werdene Zeitalter* was founded in 1922 (as the successor of the "Internationalen Erziehungsrundschau," 1920/21), edited by ELISABETH ROTTEN and KARL WILKER, and appeared until 1932.

On the front page of the first volume (January 1922), "Pour l'ère nouvelle" is introduced as "la revue des pionniers de l'éducation." These pioneers are presented to the readers under the heading title "notre ligue." Included among them are OVIDE DECROLY, who led the *Ecole de l'Ermitage*⁵ in Brussels, GEORGE BERTIER, the director of the *Ecole des Roches*, the first French "Landerziehungsheim",⁶ ROGER COUSINET, a French school-inspector of schools and a co-founder of the society "La nouvelle éducation,"⁷ GIUSEPPE LOMBARDO-RADICE, the founder of the *scuola serena* in Italy,⁸ and, of course, FERRIÈRE himself.⁹

With this group,¹⁰ the new epoch of education in francophone culture should be introduced and permanently established. FERRIÈRE himself wrote the programmatic article, which was to have set forth the name and the claim of the journal. The "new" of the "new education" was the strict program of child orientation: "Chaque enfant grandit selon son espèce, selon sa variété, selon la nuance particulière de son esprit" (FERRIÈRE 1922, p. 2). But is that really a radical *Innovation*? asks FERRIÈRE, and then expressly places himself in that pedagogical tradition which was standard for the "new education." This movement actually had to be understood as *Renovation*, renovation in the spirit of ROUSSEAU and PESTALOZZI but also in the sense of the neighborly love of Christianity or the wisdom of the Far East. Common to all of these traditions was a conception of education "qui se base sur l'élan de vie spirituelle de l'individu" (ibid., p. 3).

⁵The School was founded in 1907; its principles were formulated by DECROLY at the first Congress of the New Education Fellowship in Calais in 1921.

⁶EDMOND DEMOLINS founded the *Ecole des Roches* in 1899; GEORGES BERTIER became his successor in 1907. BERTIER was also one of the promoters of the French scouting movement and he founded the magazine, "Education," one of the (few) publications of reform pedagogy in France.

⁷ROGER COUSINET was inspector of primary school instruction in France from 1910 until 1941, as well as editor of the "Ecole nouvelle française" and lecture (for psychology) at the Sorbonne. His method of group work was heavily observed in the francophone circles of new education.

⁸GIUSEPPE LOMBARDO-RADICE was a seminar teacher until 1911; he was editor of the magazine "Nuovi Doveri" from 1907 to 1914 and, from 1919 to 1933, of the authoritative magazine "L'Educazione Nazionale;" in 1923 he was named director of primary school instruction in Italy but remained in the office only one year; in 1924 he was called to Rome to the "Institut supérieur du Magistère," where he gave pedagogical instruction (data from: FERRIÈRE 1928).

⁹ADOLPHE FERRIÈRE read Demolin's highly noted polemic pamphlet, "A Quoi Tient la Supériorité des Anglo-Saxons?" which made the two English *pioneer schools* in Abbotsholme and Bedales known to the French public. Influenced by the argument that the imperial superiority of the Anglo-Saxons could be traced back to their reform schools, FERRIÈRE worked voluntarily at three of the new schools, and among this with HERMANN LIETZ in 1900. FERRIÈRE became a private instructor at the University of Geneva in 1909; in 1912 EDOUARD CLAPARÈDE appointed him a teacher at the newly-founded *Institut Jean-Jaques Rousseau*, where he worked until 1922. In 1925 FERRIÈRE founded, together with PIERRE BOVET, the *Bureau International d'Education* in Geneva, a clearing house of the "new education", for Latin America and Asia in particular. FERRIÈRE left Geneva in 1934 in order to set up a home school for neglected children in Lausanne. Thereafter he remained an influential publicist, although, in contrast to PIAGET, his influence was confined to the francophone culture.

¹⁰Additional names include JEAN BRUNHES, professor of the Collège de France, who simultaneously worked as inspector of the *Ecoles des Roches*, GEORGES RENARD, also professor at the Collège de France, JEAN DEMOOR, director of the physiological institute at the University of Brussels and founder of the *Ecole de Pédagogie* there (1914), TOBIE JONCKHEERE, cofounder of the *Ecole de pédagogie*, or G.-C. FERRARI, professor in Bologna and editor of the "Revista di psicologia." The spectrum evidences a definite alignment with experimental psychology and empirical pedagogy, which was typical of Anglo-Saxon and french reform pedagogy. This alignment does *not* contradict the circumstance that philosophical suppositions were *simultaneously* accepted. The two are often processed side by side and unseparated, according to the practical concern of special theories and arguments.

But how then can a new epoch, the *ère nouvelle* of education, come about? How can "reform pedagogy" develop, when the *old* pedagogy was also traced back consistently to ROUSSEAU and PESTALOZZI? The new education cannot simply be the continuation of the tradition through somewhat different means. FERRIÈRE also said very clearly that it could not be a further "méthode didactique;" rather, a radical new *education* must be founded which is directed at nothing less than the whole of humanity (l'humanité entière) and established with propositions that would have been very strange to ROUSSEAU and PESTALOZZI: "Chaos de la Révolution: ce n'est plus l'autorité consentie d'autrefois, c'est l'anarchie relative préparant l'Ere nouvelle de la liberté réfléchie" (ibid., p. 4).

The interesting aspect of this assertion of a "new epoch" is not the compulsion toward a foundation in tradition, neither are the associated propositions; it is, rather, the immanent contradiction: How can there be a modern education, when this education in essence represents not a *break* but a strong *continuity* of reform? It is *not* to be a question of conflict between the *anciens* and the *modernes*; yet a new Era is assumed, one which has invalidated central principles of the "old" education. It is *at once* break and continuity. But how can there be a Revolution of education which leaves its own tradition untouched or only uses it for legitimation?

I will address this question in three steps: First, I question FERRIÈRE'S contention about tradition: The *break* with tradition is what reform pedagogy makes spectacular. It is decidedly *not* just PESTALOZZI or ROUSSEAU who stand as godfathers to the "new education" (ch. 4). Next I pursue the contrary contention that large parts of reform pedagogy are strongly oriented toward tradition and achieve almost no innovation (ch. 5). I conclude by bringing the two lines of argument together and describing the peculiar dialectic of break *and* continuity that characterizes reform pedagogy as a whole (ch. 6).

"Internationality" is unquestionably fundamental in this endeavor, at least for the emphasis of reform, for its language and the most important experiments. Modernization seems to have been unique. Despite all national differences, "Landerziehungsheime" develop the same everywhere in Europe,¹¹ the orientation of the child becomes popular at a certain point, and propositions of educational reform are coupled with those of life reform, and all these movements were called "new" everywhere.

FERRIÈRE inimitably expressed the emphasis of the "new education": "Rêve? Utopie? - Pourquoi donc? Rêve grisant, en tout cas. Utopie qui vaut qu'on se sacrifie pour elle. Courons le risque. Travaillons *pour l'Ere nouvelle*. Qui sait: utopie d'aujourd'hui, réalité de demain! Cela s'est vu dans l'histoire. Et puis, et surtout, Guillaume d'Orange a trouvé le mot juste: 'Ce qui vaut, ce n'est pas d'atteindre le but, c'est d'y tendre'" (ibid.).

But, in certain respects, FERRIÈRE'S pioneers of new education¹² were *not* the leading reformers, those who invented the concepts of reform. Neither DECROLY nor COUSINET or GIUSEPPE LOMBARDO-RADICE discovered or even just used what Ferrière named "élan de vie" in his definition of the new age. All three are methodologists of re-

¹¹"Abbotsholme" (founded in 1889) is *standard* up to the aesthetics of the schoolhouse, with, of course, its own relations to that which reform pedagogy was later to defame, namely, German Herbartianism.

¹²In 1928, FERRIÈRE emphasized three *pioneers* of the "new education" in particular, namely, HERMANN LIETZ, GIUSEPPE LOMBARDO-RADICE, and FRANTISEK BAKULE (FERRIÈRE 1928).

form, who presuppose the theory of the new image of the child.¹³ The same holds for the new research institutes, the *Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau* in Geneva, the *Ecole de Pédagogie* in Brussels, or the *Teachers College* of Columbia University in New York. Psychological research and experimental educational science has been carried out here since EDWARD THORNDIKE accepted his call to the Teachers College,¹⁴ but the new theory of the child was not founded here.

The ambition of modernization, however, fundamentally depends on this theory. FERRIÈRE would not have been able to describe the *Ecole active*¹⁵ if every child had not been granted a center of activity, or *centres d'intérêt* for DECROLY,¹⁶ or even an "élan de vie." The new image of the child fundamentally depends on this expectation; it no longer places conceptual learning or methodological instruction as the focal point but, rather, defines the child itself as activity. This is possible only when a theory that is different from the traditional theory of education, and that stems from learning and growth, is taken as a basis for the concept.

In his main work "*L'école active*," FERRIÈRE presumably drew on ROUSSEAU and PESTALOZZI as forerunners of the "new education,"¹⁷ but founded the concept itself essentially through borrowing from the philosophy of HENRI BERGSON (see RENARD 1941; documents in HAMELINE/JORNOD/BELKAÏD 1995). BERGSON was discussed extensively in Geneva; perhaps the portrayal that PIERRE BOVET had given in October 1911 in the "Semaine littéraire" had direct influence on FERRIÈRE. BOVET himself later depicted the vision of the child as "un être actif" as the radical new idea of reform pedagogy (BOVET 1926), with connotations that refer to BERGSON and which can no longer be included with the old school-method concept of "self-activity."

It was therefore no accident that FERRIÈRE, who accepted the priority of BOVET'S *école active*,¹⁸ established his own theory of the "activités spontanées des enfants" (FERRIÈRE 1930, p. 50) with BERGSON'S theory of *élan vital* (ibid., p. 13 u.pass.). A "dynamisme immanent" must be assumed of the child, rather than simply a scheme of development or a program of learning, which is to be controlled pedagogically. The child was understood as the center of its *own* activity, and only that makes the orientation of the child radical.¹⁹

¹³DECROLY and BOON (1921) described the *école renouée* essentially as an alteration of the methods and the plan of instruction; LOMBARDO-RADICE (1923) likewise places methodological reform at the center of the "new education."

¹⁴Already before DEWEY'S appointment, the *Teachers College* at Columbia University was the most influential liberal institution of American pedagogy. Founded in 1897, the College was a center of international pedagogical research 20 years later. THORNDIKE was appointed to the Teachers College in 1899 (first as lecturer); his "Educational Psychology" (1903) influenced teacher education especially, although or because it was written strictly empirically. Here emerges the paradox of a psycho-technical "Pädagogik vom Kinde aus" (compare DEPAEPE 1993).

¹⁵The "Ecole active" has, in addition, been translated into 13 languages and can be considered one of the most important theories of international school reform in the 20th century.

¹⁶The center of interest is an *emotional* entity; it cannot be reacted to with conceptual abstraction.

¹⁷Together with MARC-ANTOINE JULLIEN and PÈRE GIRARD, who, as students of ROUSSEAU and PESTALOZZI, are drawn upon (FERRIÈRE 1930, p. 26 sq.). FERRIÈRE constructed in this way a strong tradition of his own in order to establish a fundamental new concept. The new is the old but still "new."

¹⁸BOVET'S article, "La tâche nouvelle de l'Ecole," appeared at the end of 1919; FERRIÈRE explicitly refers to it (1930, p. 9/fn. 1).

¹⁹In *this* sense, it holds that the child is at each age "un être *sui generis*" (FERRIÈRE 1930, p. 14).

Children do not grow simply according to their abilities, then would then have to possess the end in the beginning; however, they also do not learn simply that which affects them from outside, then they would not be the source of their own activity. Rather, they exist *as "élan vital,"* for which the direction is not predetermined and into which such a direction cannot be implanted. But this is exactly what the pedagogical tradition always had assumed: The nature of the child either develops according to its abilities, or the child constructs his habits by learning; in both cases education can take place with a view to success, as a promotion of *growth*, or as pedagogically defined *influence*. ROUSSEAU and LOCKE are godfathers of the tradition; FERRIÈRE appeals to the first of these two godfathers without recognizing that BERGSON'S theory of the subject dismantles *both* traditions. He underestimates the radicalism of his own reference and attempts to tie together what is fundamentally contradictory.

In the sense of BERGSON'S philosophy of life, education would no longer be "growth" or "influence" but, at best, support of that which cannot be influenced. Reform pedagogy does not really recognize this paradox, but promotes it. BERGSON'S radical transformation of the subject into a temporal being is a central point of orientation in many places, especially wherever it is not mentioned by name. Between 1888 and 1932,²⁰ BERGSON'S philosophy is throughout Europe *the* theory of the moderns who break decisively with two traditions - idealism on the one hand, mechanistic natural science on the other - that are fundamental for pedagogical reflection. Presumably, no single philosophy at the end of the 19th century and in the first third of the 20th century had enjoyed so much influence in European intellectual discussion as BERGSON'S philosophy of life (SOULEZ 1989, ANTLIFF 1993). This does not exclude oblique references; it is a part of modernism at the turn of the century that theories of intuition can also be connected with the occult (GROGIN 1988, ch. III).

There are traces of BERGSON in German reform pedagogy too, especially where educational reform had to the cultural avant garde. JOHANNES GLÄSER'S enduring manifesto, "Vom Kinde aus," (GLÄSER 1920, p. 21), ELISABETH ROTTEN (1926), the radical "Erlebnispädagogik" (KRAMER 1925; also KUCKEI 1924), parts of the movement for education in the arts (PALLAT/HILKER 1925), and even ADOLF JENSEN and WILHELM LAMSZUS in their pioneering critique of the "Schulaufsatz" (school essay) (JENSEN/LAMSZUS 1920, p. 114 sq., 127 sq. u.pass) refer to BERGSON or to philosophical positions of "creative growth" that are associated with him. In short, in German reform pedagogy BERGSON is present wherever the typical German traditions of philosophy and pedagogy are *not* resorted to.²¹

This presence is still larger in international reform pedagogy,²² a fact which has been often overlooked compared with the influence of other bases of thought, such as that of empirical child research or psychoanalysis. But from the perspective of the reformers, multiple philosophical motives are brought into play whenever the "new education" is to be

²⁰The dates refer to two central writings of BERGSON, each of which strives for its own effects: the theory of subjective time ("Les données immédiates de la conscience," 1888) and the two sources of morality (1932).

²¹That is of course sanctioned; it could be read in 1936 that and how the "nicht-deutsche Modephilosoph BERGSON in dekadenter Weise auf die deutsche Jugend gewirkt hat" (HERMES 1936, p. 32). The point is that the contemporary attempts to employ the philosophy of WILHELM DILTHEY toward the limitation of this radicalism (see also NEUBERT 1925) borrow BERGSON'S concepts, since DILTHEY'S theory of experience is extensively indebted to BERGSON.

²²The first reception is dedicated exclusively to the relationship of time and experience, the *évolution créative* (e.g. GRANDJEAN 1917). After "Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion" (BERGSON 1932), the reception changed (compare WREDE 1935), without revising the early positions of the radical program of child orientation.

described, such as that of dynamic development or creative expression (The Creative Self-Expression of the child, 1921), which almost always can be traced to the *élan vital*, even when no direct reference to BERGSON follows. The theory was ready on call as a slogan, similar to the Freudian "Unbewusste" or the metaphor of the *child-centered* education itself.

That in 1918 HENRI ROORDA²³ was able to have a book appear whose title alone became an often-quoted catchphrase - *Le pedagogue n'aime pas les enfants* (Roorda 1918) - was essentially the result of a philosophical position: "L'activité d'Abord; la Formule Après" (ibid., p. 93). This presupposes a theory which BERGSON had described as *Evolution créatrice* (1907). It represented a break with tradition in three respects: (i) the preeminence of experience as against abstract reasoning, (ii) the closely associated transformation of the subject into a temporal being, which "exists" only in the present moment of experience, as well as (iii) the self-creation of life, which has only to accept the *élan vital* as a basis and requires no higher authorities.

The classical pedagogy conceptional teaching, in contrast, always assumed the moral as well as didactic preeminence of conceptional teaching; this is especially evident in the school pedagogy of the 19th century, which constantly appealed to PESTALOZZI because it justifiably suspected in him the traditional lines of teaching methods. Further, the classical pedagogy asserted the construction of the subject *through* education, which could be completed and sealed off. Here "time" is a function of education, and cannot be viewed independently. Any relation of time with *experience* is excluded. Children can therefore not be perceived as creators of themselves, as guarantors of their own presence; rather, they are viewed as the object of education, which produces what is not inherently present in itself. The time it requires for this must be calculated from outside, from the authority of the educator.

To this extent all recourses to ROUSSEAU²⁴ or PESTALOZZI taken by the reform pedagogues have been possible only as an arbitrary collage of citations. Neither ROUSSEAU nor PESTALOZZI constructed their theories of education with the autonomous, radical subjective experience or even with the autonomous child at all. They are not equipped with a theory of the subject which would permit such an image, even only approximately. *Their* child is understood according to the anthropology of the 18th century, set in a Christian context of creation, and tied to extreme expectations of virtue that can lavish no thoughts on "self-creation." For them an experience that is *independent* from nature, society, and religion is neither possible nor conceivable. This tradition is thus a stranger to reform pedagogy; it is legitimately inclined, but is unable to establish the *éducation nouvelle*, simply because its pioneers had in mind a completely different understanding of education.

²³HENRI ROORDA VAN EYSINGA (1870-1925) was professor of mathematics at the Collège classique and at the secondary school in Lausanne. His work of 1918 appeared one year before in the "Cahiers Vaudois" in limited edition. The main edition was then published by the Librairie Payot. A German edition appeared in 1920: "Der Lehrer hat kein Gefühl für das Kind" (compare GILLIARD 1973).

²⁴The determination that in education it was of most importance to *lose* time (O.C. IV/p. 323) is, as ROUSSEAU noticed, a paradox (ibid.), not a true orientation toward the experience of the child. For ROUSSEAU, BUFFON'S anthropology of child development, not a free flow of experiences, was fundamental. WILLIAM JAMES (1884) is the first to mention this metaphor.

This understanding arises from the *metropolitan experience*, which, since the middle of the 19th century, has affected the theory of the subject as well. It is no coincidence that BERGSON'S philosophy of experience and intuition originated in the last third of the 19th century in metropolitan Paris. It is symptomatic of a change in the field of vision: Subjectivity becomes independent of scholastic conceptuality, and thereby from school and, finally, from the traditional conception of education. ERNST MACH'S impressionist "Ich," GEORG SIMMEL'S theory of social circles, whose difference sets free individuality, or, closer to pedagogy, THEODOR LIPPS' theory of projection and the "*einheitliche Persönlichkeit*"²⁵ can be understood similarly. They had one thing in common, they break through the classical expectations of the efficacy of pedagogy. Thus, if concepts of reform pedagogy attach here, emphasizing experience, self-creation, the present, and creative spontaneity, then they are *not* reconcilable with traditional conceptions of education.

In a second step I will show that this is *not* the mainstream position. In other words, FERRIÈRE was unwittingly correct that reform pedagogy, or what has until now been presented under this term, is far more conforming and anti-modern than it appears. Otherwise it would have hardly been recognizable as "pedagogy" - a theory of *education*. The tie with its own tradition occurs in three respects: through the continuation of a particular *language of reform*, through *model conceptions* which define what is to be considered as "reform" and what is not, and finally, through *practical experiments* that represent for more variations of tradition than radical alternatives. The system of education learns precisely what is inside and what is outside; for long stretches only the *inner* reform movement is considered as "reform".

5. Continuation of Tradition

"Le pédagogue n'aime pas les enfants" - That he *should* love them is a pedagogical command that can be found already in the instruction books of baroque didactic with the result that this command can be forcefully pursued to any extent whatever, but without ever being broadly realized. The simple role of the teacher was always insufficient for school pedagogy, just as students were increasingly supposed to be more than simply "students." The pedagogical theory never accepted business relationships as the basis of school, which itself reveals the power of specific Protestant traditions of education.

In his book, HENRI ROORDA particularly scrutinized the contemporary public school and thus elementary education, which was clearly a constant reform-theme throughout the 19th century, especially for public school teachers and their journalism (for France see: HARTH 1986). The claim that educational systems had to be founded on the "development of the abilities of the child" could be read in 1829 in the "Allgemeinen Monatsschrift für Erziehung und Unterricht" (KRÖGER 1829).²⁶ Following HEINRICH STEPHANI (1836, p. 28), schools that proceed differently must be characterized as "*Zuchthäuser*" in which "keine *Erzieher*" but rather only "gute *Polizeimeister*" are on duty.²⁷ Additionally, the observation

²⁵LIPPS' theory founds a strict pedagogy of personality that is based on aesthetic assumptions (compare LIPPS 1907, p. 175 sq., 235 sq.; LIPPS 1883).

²⁶Here also the medium is the *love* of the educator: "wenn ... die Kinder stäts mit unerbittlicher, schonungsloser Strenge behandelt werden, wenn kein freundlicher Zuspruch, keine liebevolle Theilnahmen ihrem Wohl oder Wehe ihr Herz erwärmt, wie kann da Liebe und Vertrauen in ihnen aufkommen" (KRÖGER 1829, p. 474).

²⁷The principle of the "ächten Erziehungskunst" thus describes the "*Zögling*" as a "*freies Wesen*," whose "*Denkkraft*" should be "*selbsttätig*" trained or developed (STEPHANI 1836, p. 44). The decisive medium is

that schools "educate" *too little* and overestimate the "*bloss theoretische Wissen*" can always be connected with this (FALK 1821, p. XII, 4 sq.). According to this critique of 1821, students should not be educated to become "*gelehrte Halbwisser*," but, rather, "*wahrhafte Menschen*" (ibid., p. 13), as if schools could do that and had only been waiting for this critique.

In response to a public competition in 1851,²⁸ AUGUST WILHELM GRUBE wrote that the "neue Schulbildung" - that is, the compulsory public school, which organizes its plan of instruction by subjects - had reached a fatal extreme because it was grounded in "der einseitigen Kultur des Verstandes," and this one-sidedness brought with it two grave consequences: the "*Überfüllung des Wissens*" and the "*Verfrühung der Abstraktion*" (GRUBE 1851, p. 22). This false method had to be kept at a distance, the chief witness for this is again PESTALOZZI, who - for GRUBE - did not proceed from knowledge and abstract theory but from the inner experience of life.²⁹ PESTALOZZI wanted true emotions, i.e. he wanted "nicht bloss alles mit dem äussern Sinn Wahrgenommene, sondern überhaupt alles zur innern Erfahrung Gewordene, mit dem Herzen und Gefühl Angeschauete verstanden wissen" (ibid., p. 23).

A strong reference to PESTALOZZI is a given too in the Genevese *Psychologie de l'enfant* (ROORDA 1918, p. 96),³⁰ to which the *élan vital*, in turn, refers. Like its Protestant predecessors, it proceeds from the inner being of the child, from its natural spiritual development, the consideration of which must be the primary task of every proper school. This topos can be found throughout the pedagogical literature. Schools of the *wrong* sort are defined by the fact that they instruct *too much* (CURTMANN 1847, p. 15 sq.), their "Vielerlei" is not organized according to a unified purpose,³¹ and abstract teaching is able even to organize "Kleinkinderschulen ... in Sitz- und Lernschulen" (ibid., p. 19, 21). The bad schooling is total, thus leaving no more room even for the love of children:

"Der Schulmeister spricht dem Kinde von Subjekt und Objekt vor, die Mutter lässt es im Theater Trauerspiel und Oper sehen, der Vater nimmt es mit in das Naturalienkabinett, ist das nicht immer die nämliche Verirrung?...
Einst am Tage der Rechenschaft werden diese Kinder auftreten und ihre Jugend von uns fordern. Wir werden dann unsere Liebe freilich als Rechtfertigung vorschieben, sie aber werden antworten: *Ihr habt uns nicht geliebt*, sondern euch selbst, ihr habt uns aus den Spielen des elterlichen Hauses hinausgestossen, nicht damit wir *bessere*

defined in this way: "*Der Mensch gelte in der Schule als Mensch. Seyn Sie innigst davon überzeugt, dass nichts die Herzen ihrer Zöglinge so für Sie mit Liebe und Anhängigkeit gewinnen kann, als eine gerechte, sie als Vernunftwesen achtende, mithin menschliche Behandlung, denn hierdurch spricht sich zuerst alle wahre Liebe aus*" (STEPHANI 1836, p. 46).

²⁸ A Glarner (swiss) Landammann named SCHINDLER held the competition in 1850. It was announced in the entire German speaking region and ran: "How is public school instruction to be redeemed from its abstract direction and made fruitful for the training of the mind?" (GONON 1992 reconstructs the treatment of this competition and its meaning for the discussion of the *work school* in the second half of the 19th century.)

²⁹PESTALOZZI'S *Methode* is defended against its reception and traced back to the training of the mind (GRUBE 1851, p. 23/24), which was, however, possible only through the contemporary veneration of PESTALOZZI (GRUBE refers to BLOCHMANN 1846) and has nothing to do with the original proposal of the method (see: OELKERS/OSTERWALDER 1995).

³⁰ROORDA refers to EDOUARD CLAPARÈDE'S "Psychologie de l'enfant et pédagogie expérimentale" of 1905. PESTALOZZI is mentioned here with his effort, "pour avoir introduire un peu de vie et d'amour dans l'enseignement des enfants" (CLAPARÈDE 1972, p. 86).

³¹"Je schwankender ... die Ansichten von dem Zweck und den Mitteln dieser Schulen sind, desto mehr sucht man sich vor dem Vorwurfe der Einseitigkeit zu verwarren, immer fürchtend, es könnte etwas Standesmässiges in dem Lehrplane vergessen sein" (CURTMANN 1847, p. 19).

und *glücklichere Menschen* würden, sondern damit ihr in eurem Sinnentaumel durch uns nicht gestört würdet, und an uns Gesellschafter des Sinnentaumels hättet; und ihr Lehrer habt uns mit euren Schulpuppen gelockt und mit euren Schulgespenstern auf die Bänke geschreckt, damit ihr nicht mit uns zu springen braucht, und in eurem Sessel der gelehrten Ruhe pflegen konntet (ibd., p. 21; emphasis J.O.).

The quotation stems from a seminar director in Friedberg, WILHELM JAKOB GEORG CURTMANN,³² and was extracted from his work, "Die Schule und das Leben," which was to have laid down in 1847 the causes of the negligible effect of the school on life (ibd., p. 11). The answer is clear: the school is not *organically* connected with life (ibd.) *because* it is "school." This is pointedly expressed in this way: "Wenn es einem Staat gelänge, alle jungen Lehrer mit den gründlichsten und umfassendsten Kenntnissene auszurüsten, und ihnen zugleich die empfindlichste Gewissenhaftigkeit und die gleichmässige Ausdauer mitzugeben, so hätte er immer nur erst eine mässige Wahrscheinlichkeit gewonnen, *gute Schulen* zu erhalten" (ibd., S. 39, emphasis J.O.).³³

Undoubtedly, HENRI ROORDA neither knew of nor read CURTMANN'S work. But he is indebted to the same language of reform; the arguments of school pedagogy are thus interchangeable: For ROORDA, writing seventy years after CURTMANN, the normal schools were hostile to children because they proceeded from their own scheme, from typical school knowledge and the didactic drill that forced the students into something about which they could not freely decide (ROORDA 1918, p. 15 sq.).³⁴ The consequences are grave - instruction in an idling system that treats the student as a defendant (ibd., p. 61 sq., 90)³⁵ - but the critique is in no way new or original. It is always present in the course of the schooling process and is renewed only in order that the leading configuration of metaphors does not once have to be replaced.

The pedagogues, ROORDA writes, reign over the children, but they do not love them (ibd., p. 26). They do not concern themselves at all with the education that is *individually* possible; to the contrary, the schematic processes of instruction suppress the interests of the children,³⁶ and the effect is that what they learn really well is actually just *the school itself* (ibd., p. 27 sq.) For ROORDA, making the student a debtor of the school is what has in fact been achieved. "Jeden Morgen, wenn es seine Lektionen empfängt, wird es behandelt, als müsse es eine Schuld begleichen" (ROORDA 1918, p. 69).

³²W.J.G. CURTMANN (1802-1871) studied theology, after which he was a private tutor. He founded a private school and in 1826 embarked on a career in the secondary school. In 1841 he became director of the evangelical teaching seminar in Friedberg (Wetterau). His "Lesebuch für die Stufe der Anschauung" established an alternative method of instruction (fourth edition 1860).

³³Specifically, what is missing is "der methodische und pädagogische Takt" (CURTMANN 1847, p. 39), which is to replace the methods of the school based on books. At the same time it is contended that this "Takt" must be viewed as a para-method. "Viele Unterrichtsgegenstände warten erst noch auf ihren KEPLER, der die Gesetze ihrer Bewegung aufklären soll" (ibd.).

³⁴The relationship of compulsory education and freedom is also discussed in many places in the literature of the 19th century (compare SIMON 1865, ch. IV).

³⁵"*L'écolier est un prévenu*" (ROORDA 1918, p. 61) - That corresponds to the metaphorical usage of "penitentiaries" or "prisons," as they are to be found in many places in the literature of the 19th century.

³⁶CURTMANN (1847, p. 39 sq.) concurs almost literally with the point: "Man kann nicht erwarten, dass 14jährige Gymnasisten bei der Explication des Ovid noch die nämliche Lebhaftigkeit zeigen sollen, wie 7jährige Kinder in ihren Denkübungen" (ibd., p. 40).

From the language of reform it can be deduced that the school is relentlessly criticized, often with forms of self-accusation, but at the same time nothing is said about what the alternatives should be. It is no accident that most radical critiques end in *vague* notions of the school of the future,³⁷ while the scheme of the school is hardly touched by actual reform. "Reform schools" are at first merely variations of the system; the corresponding article in the second edition of WILHELM REIN'S *Encyclopedia* (KNABE 1908) describes as late as 1908 extensive state politics of reform, based essentially on secondary school variations that had to keep closely to given features of the system and yet were already thought by many observers to be too extensive (with paradoxical effects; compare, for example, SCHLEE 1897 for an extensive discussion).

The critique of schools, the semantics of reform, can be radicalized, as was revealed after the first World War in particular, but this radicalization requires at the same time, should not the whole system be exploded, that the central claims - above all the topos of the "erziehenden Unterricht" - be maintained. Both the critique and its silent precondition are traditional, as can be seen immediately in the first great paradigm of European reform pedagogy, the *écoles nouvelles* or the "Landerziehungsheime". The connection between these experiments and tradition is not only uncontested in early literature but also expressly sought (GRUNDER 1916, Ch. 1).³⁸ In this light, predecessors are school foundations of the Renaissance, the philanthropy of the enlightenment, experiments in the 19th century³⁹ that, through the catchword, "*Erziehungsschule*," are to be connected with the *écoles nouvelles* at the beginning of the 20th century.

This type of foundation in tradition serves legitimate purposes, but at the same time it is more than this. It portrays the experiment as *pedagogical* and thus being able to fulfil the classical goals of education *better* than can other schools. CECIL REDDIE contended in the revised brochure of the "New School of Abbotsholme" (1894) that his school provided "all-around *Education* of an entirely modern and rational character based upon the principles of Educational Science"⁴⁰ (REDDIE 1900, p. 133-134). WILHELM REIN'S "Outlines of Pedagogies," in particular, is considered as "modern educational science" (REIN 1893), the catchword is the "educating instruction,"⁴¹ and the plan of the school (REDDIE 1900, p. 144) fulfils the old pedagogical dream of a total organization of teaching and learning. In the preface to the English edition of HERMANN LIETZ' "Emlohstobba" (LIETZ 1897), WILHELM REIN thus made no effort to recognize the true Educative School in *Abbotsholme* and to distinguish it from the instruction drill of the "so-called 'classical' education." As WILHELM

³⁷For ROORDA (1918, p. 119 sq.), trust in human nature, respect of the autonomy of the child, or the obligation of the educator to human advancement.

³⁸This directly holds for self-substantiation as well, especially where the Protestant tradition of the "educating instruction" has enduring influence (compare also BÄCKER 1913).

³⁹FERRIÈRE (1907/1909) named FRANÇOIS NAVILLES' educational home that opened in 1819 in Vernier an *école nouvelle*, just as BOVET (1938) of named those schools of LOUIS PERROT in Neuchâtel, which were set up after the system of reciprocal instruction (1818).

⁴⁰And adapted to the needs of the English cultured classes" (REDDIE 1900, p. 134) - The concept of the school was elitist and likewise sex-specific. Only boys should be trained in such a manner.

⁴¹The "Outlines of Pedagogies" is a translation of REIN'S "Pädagogik im Grundriss," the first edition of which had appeared in 1892 in the Göschen collection. REDDIE visited the university seminar in Jena for the first time in April, 1893, which involved an awakening experience: "As if by magic, the fog lifted, and we saw a new instructional heaven and earth" (REDDIE 1900, p. 115). The Anglo-Saxon interest in German Herbartianism extended to the first World War, even the large controversies were recorded (HAYWARD/THOMAS 1903).

REIN expressly observed, the new school fulfils above all a pedagogical ambition, the realization of the *best* principles of education.⁴²

The *Ecole des Roches*, LIETZ' own establishments, JOHANNES TRÜPERS' educational home on Sophia Hill near Jena (GRUNDER 1916, p. 84 sq.), the Swiss *Landerziehungsheime*, JOHN BADLEY'S school in Bedales - all subsequent establishments - vary this scheme; that is to say, they expressly place themselves in the context of an educational tradition. Variations include the introduction of coeducational schools,⁴³ the establishment of new fields of learning such as the rhythmic gymnastics or the expansion of the plan of instruction beyond conventional school subjects.⁴⁴ But fundamentally there should be *educational schools* everywhere. For CECIL REDDIE (1901, p. 62), "education" very classically serves the cultivation or *formation* of the universal human, and the new school, which should do justice to this goal, combines English boarding school experiences with those continental programs of education which MATTHEW ARNOLD (1868), for example, had described.

But how then did the legend of the *unconditional new*, the paradigm of the *great reform*, arise? FERRIÈRE could fall back on this legend from the beginning and dramatically stylize it without having to respect the semantic and motivational continuity.⁴⁵ The "Landerziehungsheime" were *private* establishments, they stood outside of the state school administration and could therefore join creative renegades that provided for an expanded field of journalism and, in the case of LIETZ establishments, for spectacular secessions as well, and not at least for an aura of the exclusive. Additionally, these schools had far more experimental latitude than, for example, the tortuously slow secondary school reform in the German *Kaiserreich* before 1914. But they do not represent a break with their own tradition; again, the true pedagogical tradition was expressly sought.

This option for a reform pedagogy beyond the *tradition* of "reform pedagogy"⁴⁶ is also connected with the authoritative model conceptions that defined the borderlines. It had to be decided what was to be considered "true" reform pedagogy and what was not. Not coincidentally, throughout the 19th century the "Arbeitsschule" determined the thought of reform pedagogy, while that which REIN named the classical education - that is, the pedagogy of secondary schools - was *not* seen by the reformers explicitly as a model of reform. The extensive development of didactics in the second half of the 19th century, in particular, was for them no greater a reform process. This holds similarly for the intensive

⁴²"Nothing appear to be neglected in this school, which an Educative School should undertake. Care is taken to secure the freshness and grace, strength and beauty, natural to the healthy body; to train hand and eye in the fields and workshops, as well as in the house and class-room; to train the young to find interest in all the life around them; to teach them to reason as well as to remember, and to love their companions as well as to strike to outstrip them" (REIN in: LIETZ 1897, preface).

⁴³JOHN BADLEY established the school of *Bedales* expressly in demarcation of REDDIE'S principle of separation of the sexes. *Bedales* was the first coeducative *new school* (BADLEY 1923).

⁴⁴EDMOND DEMOLIN'S (1897a) plan of instruction for the *Ecole des Roches* was expanded toward such practical subjects as economics and agriculture. But it always involved *school subjects* and instruction in the subject, rather than merely projects.

⁴⁵FERRIÈRE propagated (at the first pedagogical congress in 1911 in Brussels; FERRIÈRE 1910), historically legitimated, and even tried to bio-energetically ensure the concept of the "écoles nouvelles à la campagne" (FERRIÈRE 1910) as a paradigm of the new school of the future.

⁴⁶The *longue durée* of the language of reform, the model conceptions, and the typical postulates can be demonstrated by means of various longitudinal investigations for the Swiss teacher seminars, among others, which were oriented toward "pedagogical reform" throughout the 19th century (GRUNDER 1993).

organization of schooling, the building up of an effective school administration, the professionalization of teacher education, or the cultivation of a typical school culture.

Although decisive for the modern form of school, this process cannot be considered "reform" or stand in agreement with the postulates of reform pedagogy because it does not accommodate the authoritative model conceptions, and even contradicts them. At least three standard criteria can be distinguished: (i) the connection between school and life, (ii) education through work, and (iii) the self-activity of students or their natural growth. All three postulates are illusionary as against the factual development of schools; in general school work was never realized, on the lines of progressiv education, but *they* determine the model expectations, which in particular can be shown in the concepts of the "Arbeitsschule" or the program of *manual teaching*.

Education through *work* is a protestant myth, just as is character-building as the formation of the inner self, or the community as the forum of morality. These postulates become model assumptions that are demonstrated in the pedagogical discourse of the pietistic milieu of the 17th and 18th centuries, in which PESTALOZZI is also included. "Arbeitsschule" is thus not just a theme of the industry school at the end of the 18th century, or of the handicraft education of the "house industry" discussion in the 19th century, out of which few lasting and survivable programs of reform would have grown, if mythological expectations has not guided their reception. This explains why *work* always appears almost reflexively to be a pedagogical program of reform whenever the scholastic tradition of schooling is brought into question. KERSCHENSTEINERS programmatic speech in Zürich, "Die Schule der Zukunft eine Arbeitsschule" (KERSCHENSTEINER 1908),⁴⁷ is only the repeated renewal of a program that is *always* to be demonstrated as "reform pedagogy."

This holds for almost all concepts that are to constitute the innovative corpus of those movements which should regarded to be accentuated *reform pedagogy* of the 20th century. But just as there are definite beginnings for the project method in the 18th century (KNOLL 1991a), just as that the "nature of the child" can be thought of only with the anthropology of the 18th century, the work school is no more a new theme than are the concepts of self-activity, critique of schools, or the moral claims on the "new education." It is rather astounding that the language of reform and the model assumptions of pedagogical reflection cannot be corrected through historical experience. This is because, in contrast to the development of schools themselves, the reform experiments were largely marginal and very often associated with early collapse, unless they conformed to the normal form of schooling.

A fundamental problem is thus the continuity of the language of theory. How could the traditional semantic be exchanged, when the only usable medium, research, is not used for this purpose? There should not be an independent check on reform-pedagogical reflection, since the early program of research - from CLAPARÈDE to MEUMANN - was obligated to the *confirmation* of the doctrines. Other doctrines, including as well those of subsequent empirical research, were excluded. At the same time, the writing of history synthesized the diverse conceptions of "educational reform" into a unified movement, which was possible only because the tradition of reform itself was unanimously seen as its essence. In this way, *the* "reform pedagogy" as a modernizing factor of the educational system - which at first was not affected at all or received no radical renewal - emerged from practically contradictory positions.

⁴⁷The lecture's context was not accidental: the PESTALOZZI-celebration on January 12, 1908 in Zürich.

Where then is the new?, could now be asked, and in fact the analysis of semantic fields and the typical models of reflection that come into them produce a strong historical continuity which does not collapse even in epochs. At the beginning of the 20th century, "new" in reform pedagogy is almost nothing. One must therefore inquire differently in order to determine the effects of modernization. These effects comprise three levels, which I will address in conclusion: *theoretically* in the acceptance of dangerous paradigms that explode the tradition, *practically* in the learning behaviors of those systems that the school critique so vehemently assails, and *rhetorically* in the reform-pedagogical education of the public.

6. *Effects of Modernization*

The caesura of European pedagogy was the first World War, in which the basic consensus about education and learning fell apart, in so far as it was a part of the pedagogical establishment. Only afterward were those reform processes put into gear should to change society itself through the means of the "new education." The dimensions and the political meanings of the so-designated reform pedagogy correspondingly changed: It advanced to become the decisive power behind reflection on education, which at the same time gained in public influence and, together with strategies of modernization, was also made socially relevant. Socialist school experiments in the metropolis and industrial areas, anarchistic experiments in the country, state structural reforms, which sought to change the organization of the system, reform groupings which were ready for radical changes, - all these had not existed or existed only peripherally prior to 1914.⁴⁸ It could be said that reform pedagogy moved from the periphery into the social center, without itself becoming different in the process.

One can speak of a thrust toward pedagogical modernization in Europe, and especially in the United States, which extended from really radical de-schooling programs, to new interpretations of the teaching profession and the replacement of theoretical paradigms. After 1918 it was impossible to establish "Landerziehungsheime" with Herbartian pedagogy; at the same time, schools themselves changed, corrected their experimental arrangement and expanded its basis, shaped new forms,⁴⁹ and lost their exclusive position. Forms of work instruction, the living-community school, and the project methods also determined the reforms in the state schools, whereby, internationally, the direction of reform unanimously proceeded from the metropolis (for America see: CREMIN 1988). The alteration and modernization of *country schools*, which the early "Landerziehungsheime" had never really acknowledged, could succeed only in this way (for America see: FULLER 1982). They were enclaves, rural store houses of the urban educational culture, which itself did not change, even in only a rudimentary way. This happened in connection with political reforms of the cities; only here did liberal milieus develop, which cultivated and stabilized reform mentalities.⁵⁰

⁴⁸The large experiments of a socialist reform of schools in Berlin or in Vienna, in part also in Hamburg and other large cities, presuppose the democratic society. They would not have been possible in the authoritarian empire, even if there had been school reforms in various places (in the relatively autonomous Hanse towns of Hamburg and Bremen, but also in the Ruhr region and other centers).

⁴⁹Except for the choice of location (in the country), the "free school- and work community of Letzlingen" (UFFRECHT 1924) surely had almost nothing more in common with the Lietzean establishments.

⁵⁰The connection to the typical pedagogical conceptions about "education" run psychologically and aesthetically, that is, over the neo-romantic stylization of the child in the psychology of development on the one hand, and the literature of the turn of the century on the other.

Along side with increasing social differentiation and political liberality "educational reforms" developed in such a way to become *chronic problems* of society. These reforms are always begun anew, but never reach their originally advertised goal, since the reform process changes too much of that which is unexpected. At the same time, the acceptance of the school, which appears more accessible the more it loses its authoritarian character of the old regime, increases with the augmented chances of reform. This in particular gives the semantics of reform pedagogy its relevance; it can continually react to shortfalls of the educational system just when reforms are actually begun.

Social modernizations which were carried out in the course of the 19th century, and with which the traditional socialization processes were fundamentally and irreversibly changed, are to be distinguished from this efficacy of "reform pedagogy". No theory of education took part in these processes; they were carried out without morality and conviction and at the same time reformed all educationally relevant social spheres. Included as well are increases in social mobility, the cultivation of new means of experience, forms of metropolitan communication without strong social regulation, the de-traditionalization of average social expectations, and the changes in the time mode of experience.

In 1902 in his essay "Wirtschaft and Mode," WERNER SOMBART coined for these processes the expression "*Urbanisierung des Bedarfs*" (SOMBART 1902, p. 6), which was to designate such processes of standardization as the "*Collectivierung des Consums*" or the "*Uniformierung des Geschmacks*," with which completely novel directions of cultural individuality became possible. This is evidenced particularly in the development of fashion, for Sombart as well as for GEORG SIMMEL the proper parameter of the modern world. For SOMBART modern fashion was characterized by three typical features, that could be cultivated only in modern metropolitan cultures, (i) the *vast abundance* of commodities with which rational selection becomes impossible, (ii) the *absolute generality* from which no one can withdraw, and (iii) the *frantic tempo* of the change, which causes the period of recognition of particular appearances to be increasingly shorter (ibid. p. 13).

These three criteria determine cultural modernizations absolutely: *complexity*, *generality*, and *transitoriness*. This in itself explains the preeminence of the experience in practical contexts which no longer permit long-term time horizons and which elevate complexity to a requirement. The perception of time is individualized, but is tied to medial events which, became contrasts to the typical forms of schooling. Just how helpless the reaction of the reform pedagogues have been to this "opening into life" can be seen in the experiments of a *metropolitan pedagogy*, which HEINRICH SCHARRELMANN (1921) presented and whose tendency is not incidentally reminiscent of the present day discussions, namely, avoiding the dangers of experimentation exactly wherever those dangers are enjoyable.⁵¹

No theory of education can really adjust to the conditions of learning processes which are coined by fashion and quick use, and still remain radical, since in the process it would abandon its basic claim, which is to determine the *future*. Modernization effects of reform pedagogy are thus always discordant, they go back to reforms but never to those which would react against such conditions as complexity, transitoriness, or acceleration. The "new education" cannot even assume that its effects would dissolve or not even be realized because the programs were too simple or not durably attractive. In other words, re-

⁵¹There are good and bad cinemas; the good ones are in the minority, the bad ones in the majority. Pedagogically, everything depends on promoting those that are good and combating all others that are bad (SCHARRELMANN 1921, vol. 1/p. 15 sq, 18 sq u. pass.).

form pedagogy does not proceed from the premise that in its area, as well, simply fashion determine change. But presumably, this is exactly what ensures its own constancy.

Systems of education are especially protected, legally, symbolically, and motivationally; they are not merely a part of life, which itself explains why there has to be a difference between school and life. These systems are capable of learning, but not without limitation, to the extent that their learning must confirm their premises. Critique of schools is a kind of early warning system with which the setting of limits becomes possible, namely, lines of demarcation between acceptable and unacceptable quantities of communication. Serious reflection about the theme "fashion and cynicism" (VISCHER 1879) is demonstrable nowhere in pedagogy, simply because the critique is indebted to morality and therefore can elevate neither "fashion" nor "cynicism" even to the topic of discussion.

This does not exclude subversive tendencies: The pedagogy of experience (Erlebnispädagogik) is received in a classical manner, that is, to the enhancement of the desirable effects of education, but, theoretically, a great predicament is connected with it, since how can experiences *educate* when they are transient, push for repetition, and produce morally indifferent effects? BERGSON'S paradigm is modern, but its acceptance in the corpus of reflection on education is dangerous because it is through such acceptance that a confirmation in its own tradition, to which it always aspires, is rendered impossible. But that has always been the strategy of reform pedagogy, which paradoxically reacts to modern society, understanding it as the object of reform but always denying this whenever it could have pursued its ambition *ad absurdum*. The pedagogy of experience is only the most prominent example of this.

Another effect is, however, immense: Reform pedagogy has become a single, broad language which is spoken in the public discussion about education. All rivals have vanished or have been marginalized, such as the theory of formation, the scientific schooling or ascetic education, for FRIEDRICH PAULSEN the decisive objection against the "century of the child."⁵² At the same time, however, a dissociation from tradition was also carried out, since the *immediacy* of experience, the instruction on reason and project, self-activity, or the orientation toward clientele have *one* commonality; they allow no further prognoses beyond the learning *situation*. To this extent the true effect of modernization would be a self-destructive effect; it destroys the ambitions of tradition on which reform pedagogy believed itself to be directly dependent.

But modernizations are inexorable; they are not to be worked on with sentimental retrospectives. Presumably, PESTALOZZI would have hardly understood that KERSCHENSTEINER in 1908 wanted to transform the *state* school into a "work school,"⁵³ but KERSCHENSTEINER could not possibly recognize his project in the workshop instruction of today. Here is an irretrievable break, namely the abandonment of the school scheme as it was developed in the 19th century, and at the same time the abandonment of a pietist claim of education which PESTALOZZI had to formulate *against* his time. But "Kopf, Herz und Hand" are metaphors, not attainable realities.

7. Result

⁵²An *educatio strenua* is recommended against the tendencies of "growing effeminate," (PAULSEN 1908), which runs against all modern tendencies and yet, in light of the claim of education, is of greater consequence than the irresolute reform pedagogy.

⁵³This is of course by reason of his opposition against the modern state, which KERSCHENSTEINER requires as given and unchangeable

There are modernization effects of reform pedagogy, but they exist neither as the effects of a heroic epoch nor as exclusively benign results, as the legend assumes. "Reform pedagogy" is a semantic corpus of high continuity, which is elastic enough to react even to dramatic modernizations in the 19th and 20th centuries. The language of reform, its typical model conceptions and those which it excludes, are ground in, but in such a way that the unbroken moral expectations can be continued even under completely altered relationships (OELKERS 1993, OELKERS 1994).

Language and model assumptions of "reform" expand their sphere of influence and increasingly win public approval. The essence of the theory should be preserved under reference to its own tradition, while it is simultaneously exposed to subversions that erode it and fundamentally shift the context of meaning. The model forms are rhetorically renewable, but they are based on divergent definitions. In this way, "Kopf, Herz und Hand" becomes a psychological "totality," which can be therapeutically appealed to without having even to mention the Christian trinity. On the other hand, the burden of proof shifts: "Self-activity" cannot be forcefully pursued without limitation when reality *contradicts* the form less and less.

Simultaneously, the understanding grows that the reality of education is not at all, or at least not decisively, determined by pedagogical intentions and the reforms connected with them. Presumably, then, the educational system as well cannot be arbitrarily burdened with reform pedagogy, in so far as this reform does not make allowances for the conditions under which educational work with children remains possible. Included here are, in particular, unpleasant experiences such as loss of motivation caused by duration that appears unreasonable, coercion to make sacrifices whose purpose cannot be comprehended, a future that cannot be seized through goals, the quick consumption of time due to high registration capacity unique to the present, or a mobility that extends into personal relations. Conditions of this sort never took into consideration reform pedagogy, but they would be the test of the program should it ever be meant seriously. The effect, however, could also be seen in the fact that only moral rhetoric is tied to it. And it has a different function, namely to inspire wherever motivation is normally completely absent. In this sense, reform pedagogy would be a risky but obviously-irresistible impudence.

(A) Sources

- ARNOLD, M.: Schools and Universities on the Continent. Ed. by R.H. SUPER. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press 1964. (= The Complete Works of Matthew Arnold, vol IV) (first edition 1868)
- BÄCKER, M.: Die Landerziehungsheime in Frankreich. Langensalza 1913.
- BADLEY, J.H.: Bedales: A Pioneer School. London 1923.
- BALDWIN, J.M.: Mental Development in the Child and the Race. Methods and Processes. New York/London: Macmillan and Co. 1895.
- BALLARD, P.B.: Handwork as an Educational Medium. London: Allen & Unwin 1915.
- BARNETT P.A.: Common Sense in Education and Teaching. An Introduction to Practice. Ninth Impression. London/New York/Bombay/Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1913.

- BERGSON, H.: Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1888.
- BERGSON, H.: L'Evolution créatrice. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1907.
- BERGSON, H.: Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1932.
- Bernard Shaw: A Talk on Education. In: The New Era 9 (1928), S. 111-12.
- BINET, A.: Les idées modernes sur les enfants. Paris: Ernest Flammarion 1922. (first edition 1911)
- BLOCHMANN, K.J.: Heinrich Pestalozzi. Züge aus dem Bilde seines Lebens und Wirkens nach Selbstzeugnissen, Anschauungen und Mittheilungen. Leipzig 1846.
- BLUM, E.: Le mouvement pédagogique. In: Revue philosophique (September 1892).
- BLUM, E.: La pédologie: L'idée, le mot, la chose. In: L'année psychologique, éd. par A. BINET, cinquième année. Paris. Librairie C. Reinwald, Schleicher Frères, éditeurs 1899, S. 229-331.
- BOVET, P.: La philosophie de Bergson. In: La Semaine Littéraire (Genève) no. 927 (1911), S. 469-471; no. 928 (1911), S. 481-483.
- BOVET, P.: La tâche nouvelle de l'école. In: Intermédiaire des éducateurs no. 71/72 (oct.-déc. 1919).
- BOVET, P.: L'Unité de la pédagogie contemporaine. In: Schweizerische Pädagogische Zeitschrift 30, 4 (April 1926), S. 97-103.
- BOVET, P.: Ecoles nouvelles d'autrefois. Louis Perrot et les débuts de l'enseignement mutuel en Suisse française. Genève: Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau 1938.
- BOYD, W. (Ed.): Towards a New Education. New York: A.A. Knopf 1930.
- BURNICHON, P.: L'éducation nouvelle. In: Etudes religieuses (20 mars 1899).
- CHOBERT, J.: L'éducation nouvelle. (A propos du livre de M. Demolins.) In: Revue de l'Institut catholique de Paris V (1900), S. 25-52.
- CLAPAREDE, ED.: Psychologie de l'enfant et pédagogie expérimentale. t. I: Le développement mental. 11e éd. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé 1972. (Erste Ausg. 1905)
- COMPAYRE, G.: L'évolution intellectuelle et morale de l'enfant. Paris: Librairie Hachette 1893.
- CURTMANN, W.J.G.: Die Schule und das Leben, eine gekrönte Preisschrift. 2., verb. u. verm. Aufl. Friedberg an der Wetterau 1847. (Erste Aufl. 1842)
- DECROLY, O.: L'examen affectif en général et chez l'enfant en particulier. Bruxelles 1926.
- DECROLY, O./BOON, G.: Vers l'école renouée. Bruxelles: Lebégue 1921.
- DEMOLINS, E.: A quoi tient la supériorité des Anglo-Sacons? Paris: Firmin-Didot 1897.
- DEMOLINS, E.: L'éducation nouvelle. Paris 1897a.
- DEWEY, J.: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 4: 1929. Ed. by J.A. BOYDSTON; intr. by ST. TOULMIN. Carbondale/Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press 1988.
- DEWEY, J.: My Pedagogic Creed. In: The School Journal LIV (1897a), S. 77-80.
- DEWEY, J.: The Child and the Curriculum *and* The School and Society. Intr. by L. CARMICHAEL. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Books 1956. (Tenth Impr. 1969)
- DEWEY, J./DEWEY, E.: Schools of To-Morrow. New York: E.P. Dutton 1915.
- DEXTER, T.F.G./GARLICK, A.H.: Object Lessons für Standards I, II & III. London: Longmans, Green 1901.

- EITZE, F.: Die Gesamtunterrichtsbewegung. Ein Querschnitt durch die Lösungsversuche im In- und Auslande. Breslau 1933.
- ELLIS, C./HALL, ST.: A Study of Dolls. In: Pedagogical Seminary 4 (1896), S. 129-175.
- FALK, J.: Von dem Einen, was unsern Gymnasien und Volksschulen in ihrem jetzigen Zustande Noth thut. Nebst einem Sendschreiben an Professor Lindner in Leipzig. Leipzig 1821.
- FERRIERE, A.: Une école nouvelle en 1820. In: La Semaine Littéraire (Genève) no. 700/701, 714 (1907), no. 790 (1909).
- FERRIERE, A.: Les écoles nouvelles à la campagne. In: L'Education (Paris) II (1910), S. 462-490.
- FERRIERE, A.: L'éducation nouvelle. In: Rapports du 1er Congrès International de Pédagogie, 12.-18. août 1911 à Bruxelles. Bruxelles 1911.
- FERRIERE, A.: Pour l'ère nouvelle. In: Pour l'Ere nouvelle I, no. 1 (Janvier 1922), S. 2-4.
- FERRIERE, A.: Trois Pionniers de l'Education nouvelle: Hermann Lietz, Giuseppe Lombardo-Radice, Frantisek Bakulé. Paris: Ernst Flammarion 1928.
- FERRIERE, A.: L'Ecole active, Quatrième édition revue et reduite à un volume. Genève: Editions Forum 1930. (First Edition 1920)
- FINDLAY, J.J./STEEL, K.: Educative Toys. London: Blackie 1914.
- GLÄSER, J. (Hrsg.): Vom Kinde aus. Arbeiten des Pädagogischen Ausschusses der Gesellschaft der Freunde des vaterländischen Schul- und Erziehungswesens zu Hamburg. Hamburg/Braunschweig 1920.
- GLÄSS, TH.: Die Entstehung der Hamburger Gemeinschaftsschulen und die pädagogische Aufgabe der Gegenwart. Diss.phil. Giessen 1932.
- GÖRING, H.: Die deutsche Lebensschule. Ein Vorschlag zur Schulreform. In: Schorers Familienblatt Bd. VII, Nr. 52 (1886), S. 823-825.
- GÖRING, H.: Die neue deutsche Schule. Ein Weg zur Verwirklichung vaterländischer Erziehung. Leipzig 1890.
- GRANDJEAN, F.: Esquisse d'une pédagogie inspirée du Bergsonisme. Genève 1917.
- GREGORY, R.: Elementary Education. London: National Society's Depository 1905.
- GRUBE, A.W.: Der Elementar- und Volksschulunterricht im Zusammenhange dargestellt zur Lösung der Frage: "Wie ist der Volksschulunterricht von seiner abstrakten Richtung zu erlösen und für die Gemüthsbildung fruchtbar zu machen?" Für die Lehrer, Freunde und Regenten der Volksschule. Erfurt/Leipzig 1851.
- GRUNDER, F.: Land-Erziehungsheime und Freie Schulgemeinden. Aus vieljähriger Praxis in Deutschland, England, Frankreich und der Schweiz. Kritische Beschreibung. Leipzig 1916.
- HALL, G.S.: Children's Lies. In: American Journal of Psychology vol. 2 (January 1890), S. 59-70.
- HALL, G.S.: Some Aspects of the Early Sense of Self. In: American Journal of Psychology vol. IX (1897/98), S. 351-395.
- HALL, ST./ALLIN, A.: The Psychology of Tickling, Laughing, and the Comic. In: American Journal of Psychology vol.IX, no. 1 (October 1897), S. 1-41.
- HAMELINE, D./JORNOD, A./BELKAÏD M.: L'école active: Textes, fondateurs. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1995.
- HAYWARD, F.H./THOMAS, F.E.: The Critics of Herbartianism. London: S. Sonnenschein & Co. 1903.
- HERBART, J.F.: Pädagogische Schriften, hrsg. v. F. BARTHOLOMÄI/E.V. SALLWÜRK, Bd. II. Langensalza 1906. (quotation as "P.S.")

- HERMES, H.: Die Idee des Schöpferischen in der Pädagogik des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. München 1936. (=Beiträge zur Erziehungswissenschaft, hrsg. v. H. BRUNNEN-GRÄBER/J.P. STEFFES, P. WUST, Heft 3)
- JAMES, W.: On Some Omissions of Introspective Psychology. In: Mind No. 33 (January 1884), S. 1-26.
- JEANJEAN, G.: La pédagogie nouvelle. In: Revue de Philosophie XV(1909), S. 516-527; XVI (1910), S. 24-43.
- JENSEN, A./LAMSZUS, W.: Unser Schulaufsatz ein verkappter Schundliterat. Ein Versuch zur Neugründung des deutschen Schulaufsatzes für Volksschule und Gymnasium. Hamburg 1910.
- JÖDE, F.: Lehrgemeinschaften und Gemeinschaftsleben in der Schule. In: Pädagogische Reform Nr. 9 v. 26.2.1919.
- KERSCHENSTEINER, G.: Die Schule der Zukunft eine Arbeitsschule. Vortrag gehalten an der Pestalozzifeier 12. Januar 1898 in Zürich. In: Schweizerische Lehrerzeitung Nr. 3/4 (1908), S. 25-27, 34-37.
- KEY, E.: Das Jahrhundert des Kindes. Studien. Uebers. v. F. MARO ; hrsg. v. U. HERRMANN: Weinheim/Basel 1992. (swedish edition 1900)
- KILPATRICK, W.H.: Foundations of Method. Informal Talks on Teaching. New York: The Macmillan Company 1925.
- KILPATRICK, W.H.: Education for a Changing Civilization. New York: The Macmillan Company 1926.
- KILPATRICK, W.H.: Statement of Position. In: The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: The Foundations and Technique of Curriculum-Making. Part II. The Foundations of Curriculum-Making. Bloomington/Ill.: Public School Publishing Company 1926a.
- KNABE, K.: Reformschulen. In: W. REIN(Hrsg.): Enzyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik. 2. Aufl. Bd. 7: Prinzenerziehung - Schulberichte. Langensalza 1908, S. 351-371.
- KRAMER, F.: Die Bedeutung der Bergsonschen Intuitionsphilosophie für die moderne Schule. In: Pädagogische Rundschau Heft 1 (Oktober 1925).
- KRATZ, H.E.: Characteristics of the Best Teachers as Recognized by Children. In: Pedagogical Seminary 4 (1896), S. 413-418.
- KRÖGER, J.E.: Darstellung und Beurtheilung der Erziehungs-Systeme, welche sich auf Entwicklung der kindlichen Anlagen beziehen. In: Allgemeine Monatsschrift für Erziehung und Unterricht, hrsg. v. J.P. ROSSEL, Bd. 11. Aachen 1829, S. 233-248, 345-360, 467-489.
- KUCKEL, M.: Das Ende der Schule. Kettwig-Ruhr 1924.
- LANE, H.: Talks to Parents and Teachers. With an introduction by A.S. NEILL: New York: Schocken Books 1969.
- LANG, A.: Genius in Children. In: North American Review LXVI (1897), S. 32-37.
- LAURIE, S.S.: The Training of Teachers and Methods of Instruction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1901.
- LIETZ, H.: Emlohstobba: Fiction or Fact? Pictures of the School Life of the Past, Present, or Future. Preface by W. REIN; transl. by R.O. MOON. London 1897.
- LIPPS, TH.: Grundthatsachen des Seelenlebens. Bonn 1883.
- LIPPS, TH.: Vom Fühlen, Wollen und Denken. Versuch einer Theorie des Willens. 2., völlig umgearb. Aufl. Leipzig 1907. (=Schriften der Gesellschaft für psychologische Forschung, Heft 13/14)
- LOMBARDO-RADICE, G.: Lezioni di didattica e ricordi di esperienza magistrale. Sesta edizione. Palermo: R. Sandron 1923.

- LOTI, P.: Le roman d'un enfant. Préface, bote, bibliographie, chronologie par B. VERCIER. Paris: GF-Flammarion 1988. (erste Ausg. 1890)
- LOUGH, M.: Difference Between Children and Grown Up People from the Child's Standpoint. In: Pedagogical Seminary V (1897), S. 129-135.
- MAGNUS, P.: Educational Aims and Efforts, 1880-1910. London: Longmans, Green 1910.
- MARPILLERO, G.: Le idee della vita e della morte nei bambini. In: Riv. Ital. de Filos XII (1897), S. 316-353.
- NEILL, A.S.: Theorie und Praxis der antiautoritären Erziehung. Das Beispiel Summerhill. Uebers. v. H. SCHROEDER/P. HORSTRUP. Reinbek b. Hamburg 1969. (american edition 1960)
- NEUBERT, W.: Das Erlebnis in der Pädagogik. Göttingen 1925. (=Göttinger Studien zur Pädagogik, hrsg. v. H. NOHL, Heft 3)
- PALLAT, L./HILKER, F. (Hrsg.): Künstlerische Körperschulung. 2. Aufl. Breslau 1925.
- PAULSEN, FR.: Moderne Erziehung und geschlechtliche Sittlichkeit. Einige pädagogische und moralische Betrachtungen für das Jahrhundert des Kindes. Berlin 1908.
- PETERSEN, P.: Innere Schulreform und Neue Erziehung. Gesammelte Reden und Aufsätze. Weimar 1925.
- POINCARÉ, H.: La science et l'hypothèse. Préf. d. J. VUILLEMIN. Paris: Flammarion 1968. (erste Aufl. 1902)
- REDDIE, C.: Abbotsholme 1889-1899 or Ten Years' Work in an Educational Laboratory. London: George Allen 1900.
- REDDIE, C.: John Bull: His Origin and Character. London: George Allen 1901.
- REHBERG, A.W.: Prüfung der Erziehungskunst. Leipzig 1792. (reprint 1979)
- REIN, W.: Outlines of Pedagogics. Ed. by D. VAN LIEW. London: Sonnenschein 1893.
- ROMAN, F.W.: The New Education in Europe. London: Rotledge & Sons 1923.
- ROORDA, H.: Le Pédagogue n'aime pas les enfants. Lausanne: Les Cahiers Vaudois 1917.
- ROORDA, H.: Le Pédagogue n'aime pas les enfants. Lausanne/Paris: Librairie Payot 1918.
- ROTTEN, E. (Hrsg.): Die Entfaltung der schöpferischen Kräfte im Kinde. Bericht der Dritten Internationalen Pädagogischen Konferenz des Internationalen Arbeitskreises für Erneuerung der Erziehung in Heidelberg vom 2. bis 15. August 1925. Gotha 1926.
- ROUSSEAU, J.J.: Oeuvres complètes, ed. B. GAGNEBIN/M. RAYMOND, t. IV: Emile. Education - Morale - Botanique. Paris: Gallimard 1969.
- RUGG, H./SHOEMAKER, A.: The Child-Centered School. An Appraisal of the New Education. Yonkers-on-Hudson/Chicago: World Book Company 1928.
- RUSKIN, J.: Sesame and Lilies. Three Lectures. Complete Edition. London: George Allen 1900.
- SCHARRELMANN, H. (Hrsg.): Die Grossstadt. Bd. I: Spaziergänge in die Grossstadt. Bd. II: Arbeitsstätten. Bd. III: Aus der Geschichte einer alten deutschen Stadt. Braunschweig/Hamburg 1921. (Erste Ausgabe Hamburg 1914)
- SCHLEE, E.: Reformschule und Realschule. In: Zeitschrift für lateinlose höhere Schulen 8 (1897), S. 131-140.
- SCHLÜNZ, F.: Die Wende. In: Die Wende 1. Blatt (November 1918), S. 1-15.
- SIDGWICK, H.: The Theory of Classical Education. In: F.W. FERRAR (Ed.): Essays on a Liberal Education. London: Macmillan and Co. 1867, S. 81-143.
- SIMON, J.: L'Ecole. Paris: Librairie Internationale 1865.

- SOMBART, W.: *Wirtschaft und Mode. Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der modernen Bedarfsgestaltung.* Wiesbaden 1902.
- STEPHANI, H.: *Handbuch der Erziehungskunst nach der bildenden Methode für Volksschullehrer.* Erlangen 1836.
- TAYLOR, A.R.: *The Study of the Child.* New York: Appleton 1900.
- TEPP, M.: *Die Neue Schule.* Hamburg 1920.
- The Creative Self Expression of the Child. Report of the first Summer Conference of the New Education Fellowship in Calais.* London 1921.
- TRACY, F.: *The Psychology of Childhood.* Boston 1893.
- UFFRECHT, B.: *Die freie Schul- und Werkgemeinschaft Letzlingen.* Berlin 1924. (Reprint 1992)
- URWICK, W.E.: *The Child's Mind. Its Growth and Training.* London: Arnold 1910.
- VINAY, CH.: *La psychologie du nouveau-né.* In: *La Semaine Médicale* XVII, 5 (1897), S. 33-36.
- VISCHER, F.TH.: *Mode und Cynismus. Beiträge zur Kenntniss unserer Culturformen und Sittenbegriffe.* Stuttgart 1879.
- VOGELER, H.: *Siedlungswesen und Arbeitsschule.* Hannover 1919. (= *Die Silbergäule*, H. 36)
- VOGELER, H.: *Unsere Taterziehung auf dem Barkenhof.* In: *Die Arbeitsschule* 35 (1921), S. 175-179.
- WARE, F.: *Educational Reform.* London: Methuen 1900.
- WATKINS, W.E./SOWMAN, A.: *School Gardening.* London: Philip 1909.
- WREDE, O.: *Pädagogische Probleme bei Henri Bergson.* Erlangen 1935.
- ZEIDLER, K.: *Die Wiederentdeckung der Grenze. Beiträge zur Formgebung der werdenden Schule.* Jena 1926.
- ZEIDLER, K.: *Vom erzieherischen Eros.* Hamburg 1919.

(B) Secondary Literature

- ANTLIFF, M.: *Inventing Bergson. Cultural Politics and the Parisian Avant-Garde.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press 1993.
- BOYD, W./RAWSON, W.: *The Story of the New Education.* London: Heinemann 1965.
- CREMIN, L.: *The Transformation of the School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf 1961.
- CREMIN, L.A.: *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980.* New York: Harper & Row 1988.
- DEPAEPE, M.: *Zum Wohl des Kindes? Pädagogologie, pädagogische Psychologie und experimentelle Pädagogik in Europa und den USA, 1890-1940.* Weinheim/Leuven 1993.
- FULLER, W.E.: *The Old Country School. The Story of Rural Education in the Middle West.* Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press 1982.
- GILLIARD, E.: *A Henri Roorda et l'Ecole contre la vie. Notice de J. CORNUZ.* Lausanne: Bibliothèque Romande 1973.
- GONON, PH.: *Arbeitsschule und Qualifikation. Arbeit und Schule im 19. Jahrhundert. Kerschenshteiner und die heutigen Debatten zur beruflichen Qualifikation.* Bern u.a. 1992. (= *Explorationen. Studien zur Erziehungswissenschaft*, hrsg. v. J. OELKERS, Bd. 3).

- GROGIN, R.C.: The Bergsonian Controversy in France 1900-1914. Calgary/Alberta: The University of Calgary Press 1988.
- GRUNDER, H.-U.: Seminarreform und Reformpädagogik. Bern u.a. 1993. (=Explorationen. Studien zur Erziehungswissenschaft, hrsg. v. J. OELKERS, Bd. 6)
- HARTH, W.: Die Anfänge der Neuen Erziehung in Frankreich. Würzburg 1986. (= Internationale Pädagogik. hrsg. v. W. BÖHM, Bd. 13)
- KNOLL, M.: "Niemand weiss heute, was ein Projekt ist." Die Projektmethode in den Vereinigten Staaten, 1919-1920. In: Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Pädagogik 67 (1991a), S. 45-63.
- KNOLL, M.: Europa - nicht Amerika. Zum Ursprung der Projektmethode in der Pädagogik, 1702-1875. In: Pädagogische Rundschau 44 (1991), S. 41-58.
- OELKERS, J.: Reformpädagogik - Epochenbehauptungen, Modernisierungen, Dauerprobleme. In: Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung Bd. 1 (1993), S. 91-108.
- OELKERS, J.: Bruch *und* Kontinuität: Zum Modernisierungseffekt der Reformpädagogik. In: Zeitschrift für Pädagogik 40, 4 (1994), S. 565-583.
- OELKERS, J.: Das Kind als Theorem und Topos der Reformpädagogik. In: H.U. GRUNDER/U. HERRMANN/J. OELKERS (Hrsg.): Reformpädagogik und Fin de Siècle. Weinheim/Basel 1995. (im Druck)
- OELKERS, J./OSTERWALDER, F. (Hrsg.): Pestalozzi im Kontext. Studien zur Historisierung einer Legende. Weinheim/Basel 1995.
- RÖDLER, K.: Vergessene Alternativschulen. Geschichte und Praxis der Hamburger Gemeinschaftsschulen 1919-1933. Weinheim/München 1987. (= Veröffentlichungen der Max-Traeger-Stiftung, hrsg. v. D. WUNDER, Bd. 5)
- RENARD, A.: La pédagogie et la philosophie de l'école nouvelle d'après l'oeuvre d'Adolphe Ferrière. Paris: Editions Ecole et Collège 1941.
- RÖHRS, H.: Die Reform des Erziehungswesens als internationale Aufgabe. Entwicklung und Zielstellung des Weltbundes für Erneuerung der Erziehung. Rheinstetten 1977.
- SELLECK, R.: The English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1972.
- SELLECK, R.J.W.: The New Education 1870-1919. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd. 1968.
- SOULEZ, PH.: Bergson politique. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France 1989.
- STEWART, W.A.C.: The Educational Innovators. Vol. II: Progressive Schools 1881-1967. London/Melbourne/Toronto, New York: Macmillan/St. Martin's Press 1968.