

From the Editor

John F. Covaleskie
University of Oklahoma

As we head back to school this fall, we are in difficult days for education in the United States. As the economy has increasingly deprived poor, working class, and even middle class students of a clear path to economic security, it seems we have pretty much given up any idea of education as preparation for citizenship or for a full human life. While there has always been economic and technical rationality to the practice of schooling, that function has previously mostly been balanced (though not always well balanced) with the development of human flourishing and democratic citizenship. This is no longer the case in too many schools, especially the schools where working class, poor, and, increasingly, middle class children are educated. Schooling today is, and is increasingly so, devoted with an impressive single-mindedness to preparation for economic life in a way that suggests that the term *economic life* is itself a redundancy. In different ways, each of the authors in this issue provides some illumination into this (what I would call a) problem.

The lead article, “The Disciplined Mind: How Mid-19th Century North American Teachers Described Students’ Mind, Mental Ability, and Learning” by Jake Stone, exposes the nineteenth century roots of many of the foundational questions we almost no longer ask in education today: How do students learn? What is the nature of learning? What are the roots of motivation? What are the purposes of education? How do we help children become good? Many of the answers we give today about how humans learn are quite different from those from the nineteenth century authors Stone tells us about, but perhaps more to the point,

some of the questions that so engaged writers in the mid-nineteenth century seem almost quaint and naïve today.

While much of how experts understand the nature of intelligence, the meaning of education, and the nature of learning has changed between the nineteenth and twenty-first century, we have plenty of opportunity to reflect on the persistence of today's politicians' and policy-makers' efforts to standardize, pin down, and measure learning, regardless of the individual differences in interest and aptitude of students. In "The Odd Couple: Freire and the InTasc Teacher Education Standards," Erin Mikulec and Paul Chamness Miller argue that it is possible to resist and reduce the detrimental effects of the various standardization movements faced by today's educators. Their goal is to find a seam in which teacher educators can exercise their freedom within the constraints of policy and standards while modeling for their students the possibility of doing the same in public schools. Toward this end, they sketch the means by which teacher educators can apply Freire's pedagogical principles to the task of teacher preparation.

In "Teaching Moral Philosophy Using Novels: Issues and Strategies," Abdelkader Aoudjit explores a pedagogy for moral philosophy in which students are asked to engage with moral questions in a way that encourages thoughtfulness and reflection. Aoudjit's discussion shows us one measure of how differently we understand our humanity and its complexity, in both the moral and the intellectual dimensions, from our ancestors. Further, the approach he offers gives us a sense of the importance of connecting the complexity of life to the teaching of moral philosophy.

While Abdelkader presents a way of reading with others for the purpose of developing greater understanding of morality (and, of by extension, the self), David Lewkowich details his experience of reading as self-pedagogy, and explores the workings of a "something from within" the human learner. This "something" is part of what makes us human. It is the impulse *from within each of us* that not only makes us learn: It is what makes us *want* to learn, and, more to the point, makes learning a joyful experience. How, we might ask after reading Lewkowitz, could schools be different if we believed that humans are beings who are students by (and of?) nature, if schools were places that opened space for students' desires to drive learning?

Steven Halady's review of Naomi Zack's *The Ethics and Mores of Race* reminds us that an honest curriculum requires a filling out of the canon with the content of less-represented traditions. There is both more diversity and more unity among us than we are inclined to take account of. As humans, our ethical issues and challenges are, if not ex-

actly universal, very close to being so and are pervasive through time. Our cultural resources for responding to those issues and challenges are quite varied. Halady's discussion of Zack's book reminds us that what is often referred to as multiculturalism is not valuable just because the exclusive focus on the Western canon raises "a critical problem for many students who do not identify as White Europeans." More to the point of Halady's discussion, increasing diversity improves the quality of teaching and learning because it better represents the collective state of human knowledge and culture.

Now go and vote.