

SILENCE IS SUSPECT

"The Divided Line: An Unauthorized Version"

Robert L. Gaudino

(preliminary draft)

"Then, take a line, cut it into two unequal segments, one for the class that is seen, the other for the class that is intellected, and go on and cut each segment in the same proportion.

...[Y]ou'll have one segment in the visible part for images. I mean by images first shadows, then appearances produced in water, and in all close-grained, smooth, bright things.... Then in the other segment put that of which this first is the likeness -- the animals around us, and everything that grows, and the whole class of artifacts.... [Consider] also how the intelligible section should be cut.... [I]n one part of it a soul, using as images the things that were previously imitated, is compelled to investigate on the basis of hypotheses. And makes its way not to a beginning but to an end; while in the other part it makes its way to a beginning that is free from hypotheses; starting out from hypotheses and without the images used in the other part, by means of forms themselves it makes its inquiry through them."

-- Plato, The Republic

(Allan Bloom trans.)

We intend to draw a line and divide it. Just as Plato did. We draw our line today. That makes it different than Plato's ancient line. It eliminates Plato's Levels 1 and 4: the experience of reflections and dreams at one end and the experience of being at the other. Images to us. We divide the line to illustrate the purposes of the liberal education. Also, to show the political claims of authority inside each level.

Plato's line divides into four levels: 1) the reflections of objects coming out of mirror surfaces as images (or out of the mind as dreams); 2) the objects themselves whose images appear in 1 above: the concrete individual things which lie all around us; 3) the reflection of these objects in generalizations and theories (hypotheses) which start from and explain things; 4) the objects (and the hypotheses about objects) transcended: a movement into the blinding light of the sun obscuring all individual concrete things.

Let us not divide the line as Plato did. We really cannot. We have become too developed since his time. The triumph of Level 3. We know too much on that level. We are too satisfied with what we have discovered and used there. We will borrow the form of Plato's line but fill it in differently. We are, after all, modern men. That means that we will have no bright, sunlighted, being-loving experience. No blinding fourth level. We refuse to leave the cave. We will remain with the concrete things of the world, the practical day-to-day objects

which we can control and therefore know definitively. We insist on keeping subject and object separate. We do not want to mix them up. We reject the coming together of the knower and known. The loss of their separateness. Our theory will relate concrete things not transcend them, not destroy them with being.

Here, then, is a preliminary statement of the modern version of how the line is divided: 1) Opinion which is formed from one's own life and experience. One's dreams, too. These opinions and dreams take themselves as substantial, as the definitive grounds of learning. 2) The next level up is critical of taking such a private, isolated, exclusive source as definitive. Level 2 thrives on the dialectical movement (dance even) of two or more opinions trying to clarify and develop each other in a clarifying encounter; 3) Personal opinion at this level is tested and criticized by the liberal arts disciplines of history, art, music, philosophy, etc. Here the human pursuits stretch the self away from its own parochial origins into a more universal, imaginative, civilized, artificial community. Growth in humanity and larger vision but, paradoxically, with dangers of snobbery and contempt; 4) personal opinion challenged and reduced by science for the sake of a more exact, real, closely defined, operational theory, the final authorized escape allowed modern man from the low-level insight of a purely personal way of seeing.

It should be evident how thoroughly Plato's Levels 1 and

4 are eliminated by the modern version. It is of necessity a statement of the line that is completely unacceptable by Plato or, perhaps, any traditional writer. Luckily we are not held to account by traditional authors. History, one might say, has progressed, has freed us from this accountability. We intend to make do with the operational theory of science as theory's highest expression. We won't go beyond. No forms, no ideas, no sunlight, no Good. We occupy an easily defensible position and take no risks. At Level 4 we avoid all kinds of common-sense generalizations. We will be accused as lacking imagination. We say: Guilty as charged. Narrowness, after all, has precision in it. Also, we have history on our side. Because of history we know more (by our own definition) than those who went before. We are at the right end of a long line of progress. We do lots of shoulder-standing. In ~~this work~~ ^{other work}, we have too long an historical life to be imaginative. We know too much from books, and have too much experience. Vicariously perhaps, but we have access to everything that's been written down and said to be worth remembering.

We will stay awake and in the world at all of our levels. We choose to be worldly. It is not exactly forced upon us. At Level 4 at least, we prefer reality testing to imagination, data to the isolated facts, theories to dreams, carefully defined exactness to irregular speculation. We have a lot more data these days, and better arranged. We don't resent the loss of Levels 1 and 4. Those images of images and ideas. So unsteady

and flickering in the air without any empirical validation. Our neglect of the illusions of thought under sunlight will not, I presume, distract the sufficiently modern reader. Changing the content of Levels 1 and 4 will not make trouble for the modern sensibilities. Yet, without these dreams and true essences, we are forced to admit there is something fundamental missing. Something we cannot for the present retrieve. Or for the future, either.

Why divide a line, anyway?

To make distinctions.

Are they [^]important? ~~for your time?~~

Important for giving shape to what we see and do.

What shape?

The purposes we are educated by and, I suppose, for.

Only that?

More; what we are ruled for.

Oh, I see. Power.

No, authority.

They're the same.

No, they are different at each level, except the first.

Must be where you're at, ~~in fact~~.

Is it so important to go on like this?

Essential.

Who's to judge?

Anyone who reflects seriously on it. Is it so hard?

~~Impossible~~. We are all too self interested.

That's one of our ~~unthought~~ ^{unthought} ~~unreflected~~ ^{unreflected} upon premises.

Yes, and practical.

Really?

Practical enough for ordinary day-to-day life.

For getting by, only.

What else?

Seeing. Really seeing.

Who?

Persons. Not just their opinions. Sensibilities, too.

Impossible!

Difficult, of course.

This line divided for us distinguishes ^{between} several kinds of things. It can be used for a variety of purposes. To distinguish between four kinds of education, or between four meanings of public authority, or between four expressions of sensibility, or between four uses of opinion. We will use it for ^{all} these distinctions. But we will not insist the line is reality. It is not truth. It is simply a way of proceeding and reflecting. It is not for labeling or classifying people, be they teachers or students or politicians or whatever. It is not a plot to draw circles around purposes to limit or reduce them. It will not show every instance, and of course not every individual. Its purpose is to help us see more clearly. It does put distinctions into the mind, in order to clarify reality not to inhibit it. Nothing sinister or complicated. It supplements understanding. It cannot replace either observation or insight.

Rather, it presupposes both. It has to be used with restraint. It is no substitute for clear thinking. It resolves nothing. It solves no problems, provides no happy ending. The line is just a model, valuable only in so far as it helps make us conscious of a reality, which itself is not as neat and tidy as the model itself. There is no one-to-one. It is an approximation providing at best a starting point for shaping our judgments.

The line can provide us with questions we might ask. Call it, if you wish, a framework for discernment, an alternate way of seeing. It is not precise description. It is not to be used so. It is a useful instrument, handled right, for focusing on the demands and claims of others. It suggests conflicts we normally try to avoid, and so makes conflict easier. More likely. It helps bring the actions of education and authority into sight and contact. The divided line enlightens, tries to make vivid. It does not put into line or impose arbitrary order. It aims to clarify the goals and methods of both public and educational authority for argument's sake. It confronts and contrasts but does not, hopefully, deliver wholesome resolutions.

At each level, we will try to ask the questions that illuminate differences between levels. We will want to know what goes on at each level, its characteristic activity. What does it intend for the student? How does it go about this task? What is the level's definitive personality? How do its people associate? Where? Dress? Treat each other? Style? What kind of personality resists it? What are its demands and where

does it set the limits? What kind of coalition does it need? What does each do best? What are the consequences of its education? What causes joy and despair, success and failure at each level?

The bottom level of the divided line is the longest. It provides the solid foundation for the things nearest to us. It is like home. It is where all of us live a part of our lives. And where we spend the better part of our social and family life. Family? Isn't the modern world more interested in individuality, equality, peer groups than in the family and its outdated hierarchy? The family has become for its members an institution more of rights than of duties. We know that modernity draws our divided line, and makes our distinctions. It defines the family.

Force is seen negatively at the first level. No coercion is allowed. Nor is it admired. Of course, it is used. But nothing important or trivial is overtly demanded. Nothing pushed or pulled against the grain. Force is not humane. Just about everything should originate in individual free choice. That's the principle. It is free choosing which endows merit. It endorses things. All of life is best seen in particulars: isolated, independent, unique. So then, we have free choice and a sense of particularity. What else?

On Level 1, people define themselves without thinking or reflecting or taking distance. Thinking, with its future regarding plans and projects, with its rights and rationality, upsets easy spontaneity. Thinking brings along too much hypocrisy. It

detaches, removes, reduces, makes anonymous, impersonalizes. Too much distance. Better to rely on untutored experience, unreflective action, honest ~~unc~~ complicated insight. To enjoy friends, plans, things without reflection or study is preferred. Level 1 is an educational and political claim derived more from tolerant principle ~~as a claim~~ than from experience of life. You don't have to go to college or be trained to claim these principles. The central principle is to be authentic. That settles everything without hypocrisy.

What exactly is Level 1? What is the character of its opinion and experience? It is opinion very satisfied with itself, opinion made smug. Strong feeling for what is completely one's own, exclusively one's own. One turns inward for the common grounds of sharing. This places assimilation and understanding on the narrowest possible grounds. No stretching. No struggle with the alien. No adventures. No testing. No risk. The reason that many of the very young and of the very old gather separately at Level 1. It is protective of the vulnerable beginning years and of the resistant declining years. It reassures. Never asks the unanswerable. Never asks at all, really. It brings kin and friends close to comfort one, that is, where they can be found. No criticism straight on. It turns strangers away. It turns away from all who have lived and aged differently. Its door is open only to those with keys. Very healthy in the beginning and reassuring at the end. It strains for security, confidence, warm darkness. It endorses by similarity. Hard to

prosper without it. Survival perhaps, but not prosperity. Not being confirmed somewhere in the beginning by an unqualified love can jeopardize a future, even affect the possibility of being educated.

There is no education at Level 1. It is too blind for that, too wrapped up in itself, too parochial, too loyal.

Levels 2, 3, and 4 all involve encounter with difference. That is what they share, a brush with something or someone different. Some evident dislocation sets them apart from Level 1. Pain. That's the definition of higher education that we work on. To be in touch with or in dialogue with difference. Really up against it. The more varied the difference, the more possibility of being educated. Real education mistrusts what we are. It must, in order to be education. Therefore, it must be a rather firm identity which is placed in education's way. Success in pursuit of education is neither natural nor easy. Certainly it cannot be taken up casually. Most of us are forced into it. Even coerced, perhaps? Then, from the beginning, let us not confuse education with learning anything.

The primary political value of Level 1 is equality. Surprised? Probably not. It is not an equality of substance, but of form. At Level 1, difference is avoided, ^{that may} ~~unless it estab-~~ ^{inequality is avoided.} ~~lished some familiarity, some commonness.~~ The proclaimed equality of this level must not be looked at too carefully. It equalizes only those like itself. It is open to what is like itself. Such a narrow, comfortable range makes equality possible. Everyone

is equal, then, in that no one standard is definitive. It is the intuitive and inarticulate sharing that counts. Similarities matched. The like-minded. Silence like. There is inequality in articulation. The community of similars creates association by accident, the accident of being the same or of being quiet. Accident in the sense that what is shared is not the result of conscious effort. There is no effort, no pain in entering this community. It is found, or better, stumbled upon. Even with this auspicious beginning of apparent similarity, it may run into trouble. It doesn't always come off. Silence had hidden the differences.

People at this level claim that they alone themselves best understand what they experience. They refuse to be disciplined by any association, or chief, or community, or power, or professional study. They refuse to accept any authority, arguing that all authority is power and, therefore, either personal or factional. All authority is contrived and self-oriented. The denial of difference between authority and power! Everyone and everything agreed upon must be individually accepted within the confines of a common meaning and similar perception of experience. As for other perceptions of experience, let them live with their own kind. We will avoid them, not see them, make them invisible.

Level 1 is blind. It doesn't choose to look too closely at anything. It does not tolerate difference, especially as it limits one's own natural, unmindful expression. It never gets beyond the local, the common, the shared. All that is worth while responds to choice. But the choice never gets much beyond

what is close. The choice is conscious of being free, even compassionate. It insists on being voluntary. Self-initiated. That is as it must be. Any relation in the line of superior and inferior means power, and power is bad. Power seeks to command. No, Level 1 would prefer to use the word dominate. It always comes down to force when difference confronts difference. No possible compromise. That only occurs when the results of decision don't matter. Therefore, all authority betrays, by pretending to something more. It is fatal foundation. Not to be trusted. Certainly, not to be yielded to under force.

The truly authentic is without reflection, without contrivance, without calculation. Without compromise. There are dangers in trade-offs. You might give up too much. Whatever you get in return usually isn't worth it. The fundamental liberal trade-off (one's natural, unlimited but unstable, enforcement powers given up to the sovereign for a practical, limited, private, partially fulfilled, self-claim) is not a desired settlement at Level 1. You don't bargain away what you are, even though it makes possible a comfortable, secure enjoyment of part of what you are.

There is no hypocrisy at Level 1. It disappears with the trade-off. It is all earnest, serious, exclusive, ~~at level~~. No irony or paradox, for everyone simply demands what he is. No sacrifice. No suffering for others. What one doesn't have the taste for is ignored or thrown away. The oppositions which help human beings discover their own individuality are neglected

for security's and comfort's sake. One never talks to the other side. One doesn't even see them. No up-close contact with the foreign. There is complete lack of empathy: an apparently desired capacity in the modern world, but not often practical. Comedy is missed by this literal seriousness. It misses the humor of the life which is constantly fighting against itself, which never quite brings its behavior into line with its high aspirations. In the assumed equalities of the peer group, everything is too cool and comfortable. Egalitarians take each other's aspirations far too seriously.

We have spoken of both kin and peer supporting and sharing Level 1. What about this contradiction? Family seems to imply a born-into authority. Not free selection. The traditional family is certainly a hierarchy hostile to equality. But our divided line posits not a traditional but a contemporary kind of reality. The modern family is shaping up like a peer group: the demand for fully equal rights, the criticism of the authority of the husband over wife and children, more and more contract over ascription. There has been a pronounced change in the institution. Young people grow up now with very little experience of authority as evidenced in hierarchy in their private lives. It is not surprising that they have trouble recognizing authority in the public setting. They have not been prepared for it.

Opinion exists at all levels. We must make that clear. We have no absolute truth level. How shall we differentiate

between truth? How to distinguish the best among the levels? At each level, opinion has a different use, significance, consequence. The functions and purposes vary. And so does the scope of opinion, its standing, the respect paid it. At this first level, opinion is both uncriticized and isolated. It is not engaged nor does it engage others. Unprovoked opinion starts and ends with itself. It proceeds on its own grounds, made confident by its own isolation. It is never tested. No wonder it has been blind. And of course still is. More so.

This opinion, at least, has always been present to us. What is new is its public character. It appears now as a public claim both to rule and to educate by. It is the young who make first a theory and then a demand out of it. They originate the claim. They make it conscious, bring it up and out of their private space. At Level 1, opinion results from spontaneous and uncalculated experience. Unmediated by reflection. Accepted, acted on, as habit, but never official or authorized doctrine. There is little distance, mostly presence. Distance is seen as cold, unfriendly. Level 1 prefers clear expression of direct feeling to any kind of restraint or putting off. It is right up close. This changes when it goes public. It becomes out-in-front judgment. It causes trouble. What is an attractive and very necessary exclusiveness in private becomes in public the most dangerous and unjust exclusion. For instance in public, the sentiment may function as corruption. Then it does not reinforce and secure but creates opportunism and fanaticism

poisoning the roots of public life. Its promulgation as a public doctrine is more innocent than malicious. That is, those who make the claim seldom are informed about the character, conditions, demands of public life. The innocence does not excuse the corruption and its effects. While attractive enough in private, it undermines justice and equity as public virtues. The beginning of this movement is in Hobbesian Liberalism: The turn to private life ^{for} ~~is~~ authentic expression of the whole personality, ~~with~~ ^{but} public life ^{becomes} ~~as~~ an artificial construct necessary to making the private life truly rich and autonomous. This is ^{an} ~~the~~ extreme version of the claim. Public life disappears in time. All true life seems confined to the private. The distinction between private and public disappears. Caused by lack of any appreciation of the public life through ignorance of and unfamiliarity with the purposes of the public life. The qualities most resisted in politics and education are the two qualities most germane to both of them: empathy and distance. Level 1 denies empathy with anything different, and refuses to take distance from the common and familiar. It denies the possibility of a public life on any but private terms. Therefore, there is the most unassisted happiness at this level. And, uncritical despair. Privacy is important to all of us. We get our start on confidence there. So much more is demanded of us by the public. Level 1 is all private. Which makes it personally easy. That is its problem. It is those other levels which insist we move away from security and family.

Level 1 is not very sympathetic to abstract theory. In fact, it is markedly suspicious of it. Ill at ease, too. Nor is it willful. It tends toward passiveness in private. It does lose that passiveness in public through the insistence on the exclusiveness of its claim.

Where does Level 1 originate? It rests solidly on experience through time. Routine and accustomed things. It is common at this level not to think about or reflect on opinion. But this changes as it becomes a claim of education and politics. More often, and appropriately, the claim appears in public raised by the young. They make the sounds. But there are others, of course, the passive ones, who believe it in silence, not really eager to give it status but believing in it strongly enough. These are the sick, the old, the isolated, the out-of-date. Those who are slowed, those who can't keep up, those who have been made deficient in some way. The weakened or ~~hurt~~ ^{wounded} in some way. Of course, not without the penetrating insight that goes with the condition. The claim is used to assert ^{as proof} their past accomplishment. It is especially valuable for the personal defenses of their present stage of life. It balances them. Reassures them. They are not able to see that Level 1 undermines everything but itself by its confident exclusiveness. This is part of its blindness. It is the old and ~~present~~ ^{great} giants of Level 4 who fall out of the ~~nest~~ ^{scene} by insisting on the old paradigm. Against the new paradigms set up by the young giants.

We all need Level 1. To begin with, to survive, to pass

away with some trace of dignity, surrounded by those who love us, who are too ready to see us as worthy. In birth, growing, and dying, Level 1 is seen at its best and most appropriate. It is at its worst as a theory of power, as a claim to rule. Why? Pressure there has not enough enforcement or police power in it. There is not enough of ~~the~~ betrayal and connivance for ~~ruling~~ ^{unselfish}. Not ~~successful~~ enough to treat strangers with equity. There is not enough of that anonymity which refuses to see for justice's sake. There is not enough of that knowledgeable and narrow expert who will take account only of skills, training, degrees. ^{It} The most common, most attractive, most injudicious of social expressions here is loyalty. Loyalty, that attractive virtue which makes possible that honest corruption which loves those near to us more than achievement, merit, skill. It flourishes under both affluence and necessity, but appears, more boldly as a public claim, when there is a surfeit of production. It seldom assumes or knows, much less values, necessity. It is a political claim for a certain kind of ruler. Its public form and contemporary expression is found within the post-industrial society. But we have seen there is not enough hierarchy, love of power, respect for authority, for ruling and dominating that regime of affluence which provides Level 1 with a public voice. Level 1 is not objective, forceful, tough-minded enough to direct a society, not collected and observant enough for organization, not hypocritical or impersonal enough to defend the processes of law. Not institutional enough. Not national

enough. It cannot solve the problem of control and command. It is too thoroughly itself. It reaffirms. It leaves you right where you are. That is its educational theory.

A good education is not like that. A good education reduces our confidence, limits the certainty of self, pulls us out of the family, questions primary loyalties. Not arbitrarily, though. Something worth having is offered: not a substitute but something very different. Other ways of thinking, special means of seeing, other personal values, unfamiliar content, new persons. All this is really not acceptable at first or rarely later on the whole. Is study ever completely voluntary?

As a theory of education, Level 1 demands authenticity. That means that one's own experience is definitive for one's own self. The individual is to act, judge, evaluate by the things which have happened to him and which have been understood (perhaps only absorbed?) by him. He shuts himself up in his own foundation. He is inflated, rather than grown. There is no education here. Education cannot survive at this level. Liberal arts cannot build or shape its content from such an exclusive, closed-off beginning point. Even though it welcomes, and might even use effectively at Level 2, the student who holds such an opinion. It will insist that he speak and defend his point of view. Primarily, Level 2 encourages participation by all. Why? Because it quite openly seeks to push the student over Level 1 to the higher levels. He will escape Level 1. (Dumb?)

That is, he will begin to see his world from different perspectives.

From Level 1, distance and convention, both so necessary to civility and education, are criticized as hypocritical. Disregarding these necessary and artificial conditions of learning, you may bring people together but you won't educate them. Informality and authenticity are attractive qualities certainly. They are most appropriate among friends. They are best as intimate links. We never want people who differ from us to be authentic. Nor does informality guarantee learning. It too often threatens the structure of learning. Many a discussion is lost in efforts at being friendly. Considerate talk can lose its way in feelings.

Level 1's most characteristic association is the peer group in its egalitarian form: "the rap session." There is seldom intelligent movement here, only disclosure. A trading of anecdotes, feelings, confidences. Many of those who participate strongly feel that there is growth. But does one really get beyond what one is? Of course, there will be that sensitivity which is confirmation. It does build confidence and understanding about what belongs and what doesn't. This is important. Education is thwarted without the confidence in and the knowledge of one's limits. It is difficult to educate without the confidence and firm sense of self that Level 1 provides. It is a very necessary human security not provided by theories or principles but living at ease among one's own kind.

Level 1 is most obviously distinguished from all of the levels above it by the absence of authority. There is no call for order and rank among peers and friends. Distinctions among individuals do develop, but true humanity insists on equality for maximum trust. But look! Level 1, with all its lack of distinguishing, does share an important characteristic with Level 4. Both are blind! But the object of either blindness is different. The blindness of Level 4 is valued and embraced by the liberal Arts College. It is the authorized blindness. Functional to its task and purpose. It is celebrated and honored by higher education. More, Level 4's blindness is a necessary condition of all that follows in that education. Whereas the blindness of Level 1 is not celebrated by higher education. It is rather indiscriminately rejected. No qualifications. Level 1's blindness is too parochial, too lacking in authority, too antagonistic to discipline.

Level 1 is constituted differently from Level 4. It sees its job very differently. Level 1 refuses to judge, to rank, to distinguish, to take apart, to reduce. It likes things whole and round, not broken down or reduced, or split into elements. Not analyzed. It denies any made or contrived authority. Even any authority at all. It refuses to use standards of evaluation for the ranking of persons. It has an unreasonable aversion to conscious judgment, for judgment of any kind. This judging is the important difference between Levels 1 and 4. Level 1 refuses to judge or to compromise its

own kind, but does in fact consciously judge negatively all different kinds. On the other hand, Level 4 judges its own colleagues severely and is neutral or closed to others. Level 1 doesn't like report cards at all. It would like to end rating of any kind. Level 4 must judge. It is a necessary service to its practitioners. People are not at its core, theory is. Its practitioners insist on being graded and grading others in relation to science's project. Judgment protects the science from bad and mediocre practitioners. It improves the level of competence in work. Level 4 does have the clearest standards of evaluation, which it usually makes evident in every individual judgment. It issues the report card, preferably with the strong talents broken down into parts and evaluated ~~separately~~ ^{as part} separately. Special gifts and skills are analyzed and separately scored. Judgment ranks according to the objective needs of the science as an objective pursuit. The wellbeing and prosperity of the science is what requires the ranking.

Level 1 can be silent or articulate, even discursive, depending on one's mood. Speech is not necessary to it, sometimes consciously avoided. Creative silence requires a long friendship. Common experience, shared feelings, personal agreement are not necessarily the grounds of elegant speech. Level 1 doesn't take to words, words, words. In theory, it doesn't like abstractions but it uses them freely. Mainly because of a lack of the variety of experience. It is uncomfortable with reflective talk. In contrast, level 4 is all thought and

abstraction. Its discoveries are shaped by the intellect. It sees as the mind sees. The right and correct use of the mind is essential to its task. Mind-produced theory. But not just unattached. Very specific theory. Its conditions fully specified, very exact. Clear on what it is and what it is not. Theory controllable. It makes fully evident its premises and its limits, what it observes a definite number of times out of ten. It must make possible prediction, even if that prediction is probable. The probability must be in exact numbers. It is theory to show reality as the mind sees it. That is why it insists on the exactness. It is theory made operational. Theory which sees results in consequences as clearly as it sees causes. More clearly in fact. Cause is ~~merely~~ ^{to mind} a term. Everything must be out in front and visible. Respectable experiments, meaning experiments which can be repeated anywhere in the world, ~~after~~ correcting for local ideosyncracies. Universal experiments, free of place and local barbershops. Definitely free of the purely parochial. The mind does this to Level 4. It is mind necessarily and consciously suspicious of all individual feeling, of contemporary passions, of the normal common-sense insight, of the things that rooted people live by.

Level 4 is fragile and dependent. It does not seem so, but it is. It depends on Level 1 for the gift of security and self-confidence, which cushions a person against its hard, impersonal demands. Science does not warm the heart. It learns very little from the passions. Certainly it is not warmed by

them. It generates relief from them. More often it is cold. Level 4 is dependent because it cannot provide itself with its own disciples. It does not attract students without a genuine preparation. It has to be taught to be liked. It takes a lot of discipline and hard intellectual work to learn it, even in the introductory courses. Students have to be placed in its way, brought to it, shoved willfully into dedication. It is true that certain men and women have talent or a vocation for this kind of study. But this enthusiasm-cum-aptitude-cum-talent is not a matter of course but prepared by the subtle, almost invisible pressures of class and family environments. Every civilized, conventional pursuit has to be prepared for in some way. So, level 4's students are given to it, set up for the pursuit elsewhere. Class advantage is a most helpful support.

Although level 1 does not complete things, it starts and ends them. We have mentioned how in the modern world its base is egalitarian and individual. Its landscape is flat, no hills or mountains to suggest natural height. There is no prefiguring of an ordered standing of natural distinction, of authority in hierarchy. In the modern world, authority starts from scratch in the public space. It is not even suggested by the flat spaces of the private world. Thus, education and political authority at levels 2, 3, and 4 have to prove themselves by referring to their actual activities and needs. Institutions can't do it alone any more. Gone are those easy times when institutions perse and as such commanded support and dedication. Not any more!

They have lost the capacity. Institutions carry no automatic prejudice in their behalf. Like everything else today they have to prove themselves. Thus, students appear in the classroom without the assumed reverence and ~~unwilling~~ willingness to accept authority as before. They may have a seeming personal confidence, appear to be balanced and eager, just like the old days. But scratch that surface. They are not the same. Why not? Simply: they have no habit of, no mental set for, no salutary prejudice for authority, either freely accepted or taken on faith. The faith is especially lacking. It is most evident in regard to conventional institutions.

Students, more than in the past, have to be shown the reason for authority. Even if they don't ask for it. In time they do ask, if only by silence. They demand justification. This demand for the reason of authority, why it must be, instead of just assuming it, is very new. It places exacting demands on the work and identity of the teacher. Rather, on our ability to show our work and identity. Especially, as we are unused to giving reasons for what we do. Most reasons for institutions have to come from adults who have the experience of those institutions. Peers and equals mostly provide for personal security. Important, but far too many students have it and nothing else. Without authority, the three top levels of the divided line are helpless. Higher education cannot function without authority.

Are some kinds of self assurance dysfunctional to authority? Is reinforcement secured at the cost of curiosity? It

depends on the source of that security. Peer groups have no stake in institutions. The tradition provided a sound basis of institutional support. Support without reason, simply because it was done so in the past. The elevation of legitimate security needs of Level 1 into a serious claim on higher education is in itself an indication of the loss of traditional authority. Students can no longer be expected to accept institutions at face value. Nothing in their personal education has prepared them for it. Not ~~by~~ ⁱⁿ their primary ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ secondary schools. Nothing on those wide-open flat planes of equality in their private space to give them a lead. The college certainly cannot provide for security and/or identity. These are not the tasks of a college. The personnel and resources are not right. The college community does not have the friendship, the kinship, the compassion for this effort. In fact, it is not a community. It would be destroyed in the effort to become one. That's what the distance is for: holding in check the friendly efforts. The college is a structured, fully self-conscious pursuit of three kinds of learning. It can, should, must provide an understanding of differences among these three kinds of learning and the three kinds of authority appropriate and peculiar to each. The college can do these three things well. Why should it do something it is not equipped for? ^AIt is at Level 4 that the most exact kind of learning takes place.* The fourth level is

* The view of level 4 presented here is shaped by Thomas S. Kuhn: The Structure of the Scientific Revolutions, although the

science. The correct model is, of course, ^{with} ~~in~~ the physical and life sciences. The sciences are very aware of what they do and do not do. What they do and do not know. They are theoretically exact and precise and well drawn. Clear boundaries. They know how and under what conditions the data fits the theory. And what variations will produce what consequences.

Each science has its own particularly defined vocabulary. Devising one's own vocabulary is a good way of restricting meaning. It is a necessary and effective way of cutting through the ambiguities of words shaped by common sense. It separates out the purely local, the equivocal, the ambiguous. The special vocabulary ties things down. Words are really too slippery in their everyday definitions. Of course, their imprecision serves good purposes. It serves society's purposes. Ambiguity in meaning rounds off the rougher edges of conviction for social consciousness. This kind of imprecision, in serving so worldly a purpose, is definitely out on Level 4. There, precision and exactness are served by an agreed-upon clarity of vocabulary.

But the bedrock of Level 4 is not vocabulary. It is method that is the stabilizing force. Not experience. Not persons. Not theories. Not laws. Not even those paradigms. All these dance around. That is, they change. Method remains in place. The how. The way it's done and repeated through time.

^{ambiguity}
tangent presented here does wander a bit. *It over a put del*
to men with a wall.

Even basic questions change with the paradigm. Method doesn't change. Even individual scientists must move and adjust, come and go, but they must retain the way of conducting inquiry, keeping it the same regardless of where it takes them. Method vigorously defined and applied consistently. And kept clean. Valued both for itself, and its consequences. Control. Its result controlled and predicted, just the same, time after time. That's enough! Exactly the same. It takes some stability in the doing.

At any one time, there is a reigning paradigm which supplies and legitimizes the questions that must be asked. Also, the one way one should answer them. Pleasant in the way it's being so evidently confined, Level 4 provides a most tractable environment to work in. One is closed in on all sides by concepts, rules of procedure, admissible evidence, appropriate corrections. Lines must be exactly drawn, but they can't always be straight. Level 4 favors order and the shortest distance between. It can't always have it. The paradigm does not always allow it, and nothing is permitted outside the paradigm unless it is a fairly coherent new paradigm. Limits are drawn for theory's sake (really for the mind's sake), not for the world's or life's or order's sake. Theory requires an effort of the mind and the mind keeps the theory exact. Right on reality. Whether as discipline, whether as control, whether as knowledge. The mind is like that. Like science.

As one might expect, the activity that goes on at Level 4

is properly antagonistic to, even contemptuous of, the ordinary, daily, ad hoc, cluttered, immediate insight that helps us adjust to the practical course of life. Such a base for insight has no status in science. Common opinion is all wrong for science. But contrasting the two brings out more clearly each side of the conflict, each end of the divided line. Science differentiates between the things we love and experience individually, the world we grew up in, and its own separate, defined, well-organized and controllable world, where things don't grow ^{but are} ~~because~~ related. For science, the things closest to common sense and life and that kind of ~~growth~~ are the closest to bad thinking.

At Level 4, just as the student hangs his coat on a hook outside the classroom, so must he also leave there his life, his experiences, and his daily opinions, while he is inside studying and acting out his science. He must leave blind common-sense judgment outside. It is not appropriate to the discussion inside. It's a lot to ask of a student to leave behind such valuable and prized things. He resists it. He feels his personal judgments may be stolen or, worse, he might forget and leave them behind. He will be cold without them. And suffer for it. He is bound to be uncomfortable in taking on wholly new and clearly restricted judgments. In the classroom, method and experience no longer begin with him. He is not at all at the center. They start from the needs of the subject matter, filtered through the scientific method. Study is not to improve or perfect the student. Growth is in the science, the body of

knowledge. The scientist doesn't grow or fundamentally change, the science does. The science is transformed, advanced, moved forward. The individual must subordinate himself to his work and save whatever human freedom he has for the private space. The best use of his mind is reserved for his science. He will have to improvise for the private, let it all fall out. It is *a place of a hour,* more ^{and} ~~current~~ freedom. The scientist reserves the best, most disciplined, use of his mind for his academic work.

Even revolution, or change of paradigm, is determined by each science's history of work and experiment. Revolutions are never totally new beginnings. They grow out of what has gone before. Out of the questions that cannot be answered in the old way. New departures which start out from unsettling new meanings. Each new question, and the investigation and experiments that are created by it, follow from or replace past experiments and questions. The science moves forward toward revolution on footnotes, novel ways of seeing, and unanswered questions. What fellow scientists have done in the past (the question answered in the old way), what one's professional peers are doing in the present (the questions raised in the new way), is the stuff of the science. All very conservative at the center where the aged giants work. The revolutions rise up on the periphery around the young giants puzzling over problems and questions which the old paradigm cannot handle. But as much as revolution means change, or shift of paradigm, it does not mean change of

method. Nor the criteria which define success and truth for science.

It is a circumscribed world. The boundaries are well marked. There is no reason to travel beyond these frontiers, really. The game is played by accepting limits, even those limits which are constantly shifting. This specificity and precision about the line drawn around the science is not just accepted but it is a source of pride. A source of delight. Attracting particular kinds of human beings. It eliminates guessing, or precisely, it eliminates depending upon guessing for other than a start. Nor does science know absolutely and for all time. Its theory is adjustable. It is unstable because it merely correlates particulars in a defined space and time. Truth is a relationship under specified conditions, carefully marked out. Science knows probably. A very closely defined probability, as mathematically accurate as the data permits. Science builds on data, not on facts. Data are facts put into comparable form. Facts related. Ordered. ~~Facts~~ ^{Things} are unique, one-time, one-place occurrences. They suggest or exemplify, not exhaust or verify. Facts are quite individual, kept well separated, and defined by a specific space and time, ~~period~~.

It takes an experienced and intuitive mind (an historical mind really) to encourage the unauthorized leap from facts into generalities. Level 4 leaps more soberly and guardedly. It jumps into the generalities from data rationally arranged (selected to be representative in the proper ratio). This

leaping is well ordered. Safe. Not so imaginative and heroic as the others, but more accurate and representative. With better results. The leap from facts is a bright illumination but isn't lasting or certain. It fizzles out, leaving you in the original darkness. Not every time a bust, but likely.

Level 4 has a right to be dubious of fact, that is, of everything unique, everything individual, everything alone. It's harder to make truth out of facts than data. And it's a different kind of truth. As the foundation for true insight, a fact can and does point beyond its own local meaning. But what is pointed to requires a splendid skill and an adroit handling of experience to be seen fairly.

Level 4 tells no stories. No significant or even amusing anecdotes. It has no illuminating happenings. It is quiet and reluctant toward history. Its distrust is serious, that is, it's a matter of method. There is good cause. Science seeks out comparable things to arrange. Science stresses uniformity. What it initially breaks down it puts back together. It does not unify or make whole. It just puts back together and alongside of. Science is more interested in similarities than in differences. Finally, of course. It distinguishes for its own final purposes of correlating, putting up close mathematically. The objects of its knowing are broken down into variables and then arranged with each other in rational relations of predictability. The delight comes when unexpected combinations of variables lay down together, held solidly in place by the

reigning paradigm.

But we don't grow up like this. At best we have loving parents, not the protection of a theoretically stabilizing paradigm. We don't raise families, make friends, fall in love, get angry according to paradigm. We improvise a lot on these things of living. There's not enough of the individual or the vividness of the fact in correlation. In life there are not correlations, only causes. Particular causes. Life is not really at home with representation. The reality at Level 4 is too close to theory. There is no sweat, no paradox, no irony, no irrational (dataless) surging over the gaps.

At Level 1, life is and can mean whatever the person finds it pleasurable or convenient to be. The most interesting and original thing about people is the way in which each of us varies reality. Our particularities. A common rationality would undo most of us. Even if we could make it stick. Of course, Level 4 must say no to these individual values and meanings. It must insist on the clearly stated, the exactly defined, the experimentally provable, the footnoted ^{hand-on} reality. Concretely unambiguous. Stability is in the method, and in the success of the dominant paradigm in answering the authoritative questions and giving coherent explanations.

Level 4 insists that the scientist show himself, who he is. It wants to see him, his judgments and his personal values behind them. This effort seems promising from a Level 1 point of view. It implies that the primary task is self-discovery.

But don't jump so fast to that commonality! Especially between these two. The scientist does not define himself for pleasure's sake. Not for his own sake in the sense of the joy and satisfaction of seeing who he is. Certainly not for the sake of community -- the rewards of friendly exchange. What for, then? What is the need for it? The stated purpose is sober, scientific, necessary to his work. It is a duty. He seeks to be objective. He seeks to take his life and its created personal judgments out of his science. A correction. He becomes aware of himself for objectivity's sake. He defines himself to correct the influence of self on his work. To trap his subjectivity by sharing it, exposing it. This process of objectifying results is a primary cause of the separation of fact and value. Few scientists would argue that one could finally separate the two. But it is necessary to control the effect of one's subjectivity. The distinction suggests that objectivity is difficult because of what we are: selective creatures. The structure and way of using the human mind are the causes of selectivity. The mind selects, that's the way it is made and used. Just as it is structured to prefer precision and exactness, it has to select, define, distinguish according to some order of its use. If the mind is the essential instrument for the work of science, and the mind is per se selective, we must make evident that subjectivity, we must define it. If we can't change ourself into a perfectly neutral instrument of analysis, we can at least define ourself, and use that definition to make known our own subjectivity to

professional colleagues. The science insists that it be so.

* The scientist has to be most on his guard against the individual, the particular, the local, the fact. Even in himself. The temptation to use fact must be resisted. Values are most likely to sneak in through the unrelated fact. The scientist learns to beware of the individual case. So working as a scientist has its particular pitfalls. Being a scientist means to be critical of personal experience as a means of knowing. Scientists don't learn as all men learn. At the core of science is a suspicion of the individual, the isolated, the significant fact. Level 4 seeks universally valid theories. That means an honest curbing of self. **▲ Sacrifice?**

Science is a demanding, intellectually rigorous vocation. It is at the same time an extremely fragile pursuit, vulnerable, needing protection and an armed guard. It must be kept at the same temperature the year round, supported by a temperature system. It requires a furnace in the winter, and an air conditioner in the summer. Also, insensitive enough to stay indoors in the balmy, attractive days of spring and summer. It requires coddling all year round. There is a particular corruption that threatens it. It is a corruption that undoes all kinds of authority. That corruption is the first person singular: Me, I. Science can do nothing with a self only concerned about self. It cannot handle alienation. It is helpless in identity crises. It has no cure for personal anxiety and despair. It cannot even diagnose it. It requires an almost abnormal sanity.

Now, for the first time, we get an idea of the special blindnesses. Did you think we would forget? Leave Level 4's blindness undefined? Science is uncompromising with most of the basic things Level 1 most values. That is, science is blind to looking at life in terms of particular biographies, blind to common and immediate experience, blind to people (in that special idealistic service-for-people way the word is used by good-natured college students). Science is blind to every-day common shared experience. It is blind to facts in their particular sense. These ordinary day-to-day perceptions cannot be used scientifically. They must be put in order, fit into the possible schemes of investigation.

On the personal level, science can be especially discomfoting to young students. It refuses to take account of what they are. They think it is stronger than they, that it is very expert at coercing them. Everything is on its side. Adults, everyone. Luckily, they don't know their own strength. They annihilate science in their own lives by being themselves, by insisting on their individuality. Most have not yet discovered, or even suspect, the sizeable power of the first person singular to destroy everything not like it. They don't even sense the weaknesses of Level 4.

Science is a mature, civilized, conventional, delicate way of proceeding. It restricts access. Not everyone is welcome. A place for few rather than many. Definitely elitist. Because few are skilled and in control enough to become practitioners. Training and sustained practice are necessary conditions. Nothing comes

into line without focused effort guided by genius and talent. Science is as artificial as anything that close to rationality. Too close to be visibly human. For some people, the rational artificiality is what attracts them.

Science's great vulnerability is the lack of sanction. It has no enforcement power. It must convince, but its way of persuasion has little appeal. Its inward motion is cool to human commitment, passion, loyalty. It does, of course, stir up a few of appropriate temperament. It survives and extends itself by means of the professional association and the free dommitted action of qualified colleagues. It is a choice not available to the people at Level 1. They don't see it. It is hard to comprehend and prize by anyone who has not done it, actually done it. It cannot be chosen wholeheartedly without experience and practice. It is easy to resist in school. Avoiding the study of science puts the student at a loss. It deprives him of the informed freedom to choose to make the study or not. It takes a strong effort of will and some time to master the methods and procedures. With the necessary coercion, and only after the student abandons the low-level insights of his day-to-day humanity, is he ready to practice science.

The completed scientist is not in search of a completed whole personality. He already has a strong one. Already confident, involved, impersonal, his search is for verifiable control. His intentions turn him away from his own individuality to skills and talents of a scientist. He develops a partiality for effectiveness. His satisfaction is in his ability to gather, interpret, reconstruct, coordinate, control his data. Experiments repeatable under duplicated conditions.

One man's work must be done in light of another's, and always inside the circle of colleagues.

There is a critical mass of support, communication, inspiration, ^{summed up in} ~~called~~ "The Literature." Professional criteria of judgment are crucial. They are definitive. The scientific game is played by the most established of rules. The rules determine the boundaries of study. Theory, yes! And power. Status too! Of course power and ~~standing~~ ^{it's} according to the rules. Also, the vocabulary, the paradigm, the circle of professionals. Rules which insist on exact and specific knowledge of the clearly marked and consciously cut-out ~~from~~ chunk of arbitrary reality that the science has decided to carve out of the chaos. The reality, though, that the scientist has set out to define is not the vague, aspirational, pleasant kind of revelation one finds in a fortune cookie, but accurate, analytically clear, reproducible prediction. Therefore, the science insists on an impersonal, abstract, strong-willed kind of ruthlessness, the courage to be anonymous, and the willingness to define oneself out of one's work. There are few really personal achievements but there are some individual heroes. No isolated great ones, of course. Level 4 increasingly works in teams. The activity is one of a professionally correct band of scientists. Their achievements are mostly theoretical. Satisfactory to those within, but often not even visible to those outside. It isn't that scientists don't ever act from pride and vanity. They are like the rest of us. They may experience them differently,

express them differently, and aim them at different purposes.

Level 4 is able to work up a hostility to Level 1 and vice versa. They don't get along well at all, not always knowing why or even making the differences clear. Both are completely turned off to the other's claims. They make no effort to understand each other. That is not education for them. *25 - for 4*
25 - 4

Level 1 has a unique advantage. Everyone lives and survives at its level, even the scientists though they are hardly selfconscious about it. Level 1, with or without reflection, is available to all. The scientist makes a distinction to handle the resistance between Levels 1 and 4. It is the distinction between private and public, between what one makes oneself in public and what one is at home. Level 4 is official, public, open-doored. Its intolerance is public. Tolerance is reserved for the private life. Out of sight. The closed doors and windows imply the absence of standards by which to judge. Lying behind this private tolerance is the absence of a definitive private standard. Everything private is established by personal taste and sensibility. Nothing is definitive among human beings in the private sphere. Nothing really settled or completed.

There may be scientists who think they live completely at level 4, yes, but this is humanly impossible. There must be a dark place for all of us. Damp. We all need such a place to withdraw into. A protective place, where we are not judged. Most scientists try to keep their private and public lives

separate. Even when they are not aware of it. They want to keep their values, their identities, their human qualities in the closet. Their place of retirement. Anything goes in the closet as long as it does not spill over into the public, injure any person, threaten the public order. Especially the order at Level 4. Toleration is turned off for the sake of the public life. No ~~private~~ pursuit or activity can tolerate what threatens its actions. Tolerance exists in the space where each man is answerable to himself only. That *orientation* to self makes the toleration possible. *Not the reverse.*

The out-of-view closet self is very different from the professional or public self. It is necessary to distinguish clearly between the two. The differences are evident enough. Inside that closet, all is intuition, spontaneity, lack of reflection. Things are up close. The windows are closed hard. Assurance against daylight. It is stuffy. Everything is possible in that protected darkness. Of course, it's hard to see others in that dim light. Perhaps that is the real secret of toleration.

The liberal arts college has a stake in Level 4. It is home territory. Not Level 1. That is the threat to traditional studies of the college. A threat to its basic activities. Level 1's approach and content are destructive of the college's purposes. Destructive of authority and the activities conducive to learning as the college practices it. Level 1's program for change in the college is to ~~produce it~~ *achieve the conditions for* consent. Individual

and freely given consent. Freely given consent to replace the disciplined methods and authority of the top three purposes of the divided line.

At level 4, it was once thought that persuasion was sufficient to attract all the students it would need for the continuation of the science. It was assumed that the students of science selected from the higher social classes would automatically be orderly, well-behaved, tractable, quiet, a bit awestruck, and passionate for study. And the silent ones who evidently had nothing to say about the science, would remain silent. But, suddenly, the academics were forced to use police for keeping order among their students. Armed police! Outside police! Strike for rights! But, order? Order is important to teachers. The quiet compliance. They can't teach without it. It is essential, certainly to their own confidence. This innate defensiveness about the necessary conditions of their teaching was underestimated by the students. So the clashes occurred. Some violence too. Faculty can splash blood a bit.

Level 4 moves toward people in order to analyze them. In social science, they study aspects of people. These sciences create certain models of behavior, useful abstractions of analysis. The model makes use of carefully defined characteristics, specific qualities, the analyzable variables of human beings. It distinguishes out variables, puts together hypotheses, relates and correlates. Political science still study people as voters or power holders, economics as buyers or sellers. The

sciences are not interested in whole personalities. They create abstract parts of the whole personality to study. For them, the whole is related to their science, not to personality. Theoretical constructs. The whole is broken up into characteristics which can be subjected to clear definitions, rebuilt into operational theory, verified by repeated analyses and arrangeable data. The defined characteristics are compared with one another, related statistically. Something like voting choice is tied by probability to things like age, education, wealth, sex, race and any other likely influences.

Level 4 is less interested in cause than in comparison. It looks at the likelihood of one variable coexisting with certain others. But cause is too absolute, too academic, too final for Level 4. Too established and too unequivocal. Behind science, a lot of doubt and skepticism. Attention is paid to probabilities. How many cases out of ten or out of a hundred?

Level 4 confines its serious rationality to science. Actually, rationality becomes more the quality of the professional study than it does the character of the ~~man~~ studying. Outside science, one can comfortably and properly have psychological insight, improvement of taste, greater personal responsiveness, warm feelings, voluntary judgments, ~~but~~ ^{and} not really upset rational thought. True rationality is put into contrast with values, appetites, desires. The latter cannot be rationally resolved. There is no objective standard to resolve them. ~~latter. Things like~~ Feelings vary too deeply and are too various

for rational choice. Science gives us theoretical control of externals; feelings give us ourselves. This separation makes scientific thought operational. It means that scientific disagreements are resolvable by rationality, or it's time to get a new paradigm. This makes things fine for science (except during a time of paradigm change).

It's not as easy (meaning as resolvable) for the young person moving into adulthood. There is no scientific criteria to appeal to for solution in this condition. Adulthood means having one's own opinion on one's own ground. Judgment taken seriously. For growth's sake, the student must be asked for reasons, premises, examples, consequences, solutions. He must be pushed for a clear statement, valid reasons, relevant distinctions. The statement of value is just the beginning. It must be tested, questioned, experimented with, poked at, compared, tackled, probably laughed over, perhaps even cried about. Certainly taken seriously, at least partly believed, certainly criticized. Accepted or rejected? Not necessarily. That may be too strong in either direction. Let it be for a while. Munch on it. The first task is to get our opinions into some kind of shape. The young person moves toward adult standing at the point where he is listened to. The acceptance or rejection of opinion is on his own. But he must first be heard and then questioned. As seriously as possible. Rationally even. Of course it's not all rationality, but there has to be some reason to it. The intention of the questioning is to bring out the

student as well as the opinion. The opinion does not always reinforce conviction, nor is opinion necessarily eliminated. It is looked at. A bit later, it is challenged and perhaps changed. It is not a completely rational process. But a lot more use of reason than level 4 expects. A different kind too. More rooted in the young person's particular circumstances. The individual is held to consequences. He is placed into the world and has to learn of the way people usually learn. Through failure. Which is looked at. Level 1, even more suspicious of rational discourse, especially of the kind that shows failure and seeks resolution of differences, denies the rationality which leads to common and conflictful conversation. The uncriticized personal feeling is more reassuring, less effort, easier to handle than the criticized. The rationale for keeping reason away from feeling.

Level 4 does not, cannot, do well in any purely local and particular situation. Nor are provincial colleges, with their scarce resources and inexpensive humanities teaching, the most health places for the necessary teaching and research of Level 4. He must have the "critical mass" there to be effective. His profession pulls him away from the local community. It pulls him away as well from the traditional liberal arts studies. Level 4 is essential for the college. It must both be there and be understood there. Studied. Understood. Taught well and by those who practice it. It must, as well, be supplemented by two other kinds of education. Though Level 4 sustains itself on its

own work, on outside professionals, on the hard critical mass, on dialogue among colleagues, the full liberal education requires two other levels alongside 4. Really against it. Two very different levels. Not just to keep it honest, but as alternatives.

Level 4, in its premise, is unhappy with the contemporary nation state. Though it is well supported by the nation, it is in sympathy definitely international, certainly cosmopolitan. That was true of science from the beginning. Now there is a problem of financing. Some of the recent academic and political controversies have turned around this issue: Where are the enormous costs of research and its practical applications going to come from? Level 4 needs money to stay alive, not to speak of the necessary new departures. Level 4 does not like to consider itself a national activity. That is too exclusive. Rather, its political program is to create a world community. It conceives its own brotherhood as already one. It is basically critical of loyalty that reinforces a certain place, an actual time, a particular situation. It is serious about being universal.

When professional look at each other, they look at skills and competence, not national or regional characteristics or family lineage. They speak one language with each other whatever their native tongue. They are loose and mobile, ready to pick up and move elsewhere for their study's sake. They do not live durably. Nor among durable things. Durability sets a bad example. They have to be ready always to start anew. They come

to rest only with age, and then uncomfortably.

The standards for membership and the measurement of performance in the professional group are based on things which have nothing to do with opinion. Opinion is unreliable at its base, suspect in its line. It is not precise enough, nor is there enough data in it. Nor does it care enough about mathematics, coherence, exactness. It cares more about self protection than rights. Level 4 also mistrusts history. Things are made at Level 4. They do not grow.

level 4 has created the applied knowledge so characteristic of industrial societies. Rather polluting knowledge. They have set the style and tone of that society as well. Its two most evident and celebrated achievements are putting a man on the moon (and fortunately getting him back) and making sophisticated weapons systems of such magnitude that they are frightening the great nations into a respectable peace. In fact, what the United States and Russia share most today, their quiet accidental sober parity, is their advanced weapons systems. Not their way of life, not the rule of law, not the Stalinist state, not the autonomy of the individual, not the freedom of the arts, not a universal culture, but complex weapons of destruction gathered into rational systems of association. What they so markedly share is the rational desire for tried management. What they share, technology used for defense, is at the most abstract point from their national character and values. Calculation creates new communities of interest. Destructive-

ness gives them influence.

The original aim of Level 4 was to produce universal knowledge in all departments of knowledge including politics. Hope for some basic resolutions in each sector. But it didn't work out like that. Now, the aim is better stated as operational theory. It's still universal, as true in China as in Russia. As knowledge grows and develops in time, as it points toward greater precision and theoretical exactness, a closer analysis of the reality organized by the human mind yields results more partial and fragmented, though still of course rational. It becomes less related to life as it falls more under the demands of the mind. More intimidated by the mind's structure and peculiar excellence. More and more is known within the limiting paradigm. The theory most criticized is the intuitive, broad generalization formed on particular personal experience. Level 4 rejects the discrete fact as the basis of generalization about reality. A fact is a one-time, particular, individual, present, concrete, specific. It is a one-shot affair. A fact is seen, fully seen, in its particularity. It takes imagination to see the discrete fact. More imagination to move on to the fact's significance. Data are comparable facts. They are aggregations of articulated facts put together mathematically. Thus are articulated theories made of mathematical correlations on Level 4. Data bring about comparisons. Putting-together relationships. Machines become necessary to store and sort the piles of ordered facts, grown in number and complexity beyond human ability to put them together.

It should be becoming evident that each level of the divided line has its own special defects and virtues. Alone, none of the levels are sufficient to the complete education. It is in contrast with each other that education lies. Coexistence and interaction are the best relations. Not domination. Claims not conquests. Claims worked out in full view of their critics. At no one level is there complete joy or complete despair. Not total fulfillment or total loss. Certainly not complete truth. Not exclusive truth. Perhaps pain at all levels, except Level 1. The levels are separated from each other in definition and purpose, interdependent in practice. They illustrate each other. Different blends of mixtures are necessary to explain any one tradition, any one institution, any one person. Each of us may be more or less comfortable at any one level. We may be made happy or sad by different levels. We find our lives and explain our wants at different points on the line.

Level 1 does not include only the young, but it is the young who are most likely to make a theory out of the experience of self. A public claim. That is where they go wrong. The old take it more naturally, as a need rather than a claim. It is a good place for the aged practitioners of yesterday's paradigms to settle down. Growing old and out of responsibility is a process of limiting our touch with the new and different. One might say, aging is a process of withdrawal, a natural withdrawal back into our own, where we are protected from change. Remember

how Level 1 is life with one's own. But now we see different needs and protections at the beginning and at the end. Level 1 is as necessary to growth in the early stages as it is to protection and reassurance in the latter stages. The middle years are the best and proper years for Levels 2, 3, and 4 because they are the healthiest and most energetic. The prime middle years, the alert and lively years, are the best years for work, for action, for outside activity. As we age, or become sick, we move back to Level 1 where we are not questioned so closely, not expected to keep up, permitted to fall silent without prodding. No more work. Plato's fourth level age. The level of no education as well as no work.

Level 4/^{proper}is a frontier. It thrives on work, on change. There is danger on the frontier for the very young, for the infirm, for the very old, for the timid. There's not much comfort or reinforcement there. Level 4 needs probing, alert movement, deep curiosity, constant attention, criticism, every day you must be willing to start anew, ready to challenge the strongest defense of the old meanings. It's not humanly attractive or even humane, but there are rewards for the mind, and in practical application, comfort for the body.

Level 4 is the place of modern theoretical science and technological practice. Its most authoritative form is that of systems rather than laws. Laws were characteristic of Newtonian science. Our level is much more up-to-date. The closest thing we have to law is standard operating procedures. Techniques,

really. The serious claim of law belongs now with Level 3.

Law is no longer a respectable term or idea in the theory and practice of modern science. The closest thing to law would be the scientific method broken down into rules of procedure. Laws are too dogmatic, too unqualified, too exclusive, too final, too dependent on enforcement, too potentially coercive. The law has to take account of individual opinion, therefore of differences in opinion. It does not find similarities, it makes them. It has to judge the particular. Law has to adjust to change, absorb it without conceding or admitting it is change or that it is necessary. You have to change the law without appearing to. Law as judgment of cases is locked into time and place specifically. Sciences uses the particular instance as experiment. It can change the paradigm. Theory adjusts to reality. Because science aims at the fullest truth possible, a complete ordering by truth, the exception to the paradigm is of prime concern for it may result in a new, more encompassing, theoretical explanation. When in doubt, the exception disproves. The exception has to be explained. It can't be absolute or made ambiguous. Science wants to explain exactly what is true, even in the most isolated exception. Law will give up exactness for order's sake. The crucial point is science's political irresponsibility: it will sacrifice everything, even stability and order, for truth. Politics wouldn't. Nor, of course, would law. The costs of a new paradigm politically are too high. Within enforced, practiced law, which is not concerned with theoretical purity, exceptions must be absorbed. They must be made ambiguous, in order to reduce their threat to stability.

Everything is at best approximate. Laws must change bit by bit, not by sudden revolutionary leaps. Law resists total replacement. But this takes us into the necessary imprecision of all representations on Level 3. Imprecision is a style there. For some there may be an unconscious preference there for order over truth, for enforceable rules over accurate theory.

Let's take a final look at the operational theory which is a result and a purpose of the activity at Level 4. This is not the kind of theory that penetrates to the core of being. It is not theory that confirms the human, that understands how and why, that returns to particulars, that operates in daily life. It doesn't give counsel. It avoids individualization of any sort. What kind of theory is this anyway? It is generalized knowledge, probable knowledge, mathematically precise knowledge, reproducible knowledge. Quite directly and simply it is knowledge which gives control. It is knowledge which makes, which has to be repeatable. It proves content by reproduction. Everything goes again the same way with exactly the same result! Are these the salient elements? Making? Controlling? Reproducing? Dominating? Isolated? Broken up? Put together in a new way? Happy ending? Satisfaction and confidence, perhaps, but happy....?

Science's knowledge is of relationships: how the variables affect each other. It is, in a special sense, control as prediction. Reproducibility against common criteria are essential to its theoretical judgment. The essential proof is not in the attractiveness of the theory, nor in the beauty which gives pleasure, nor the humor which accommodates, nor is the ability

to puzzle or be in awe. ~~It~~ ^{It} is the ability to predict and reproduce, ~~it~~ has to be honest, literal, sober knowledge. The ability to predict is what objectifies it.

Objectivity is serious and straight. It insists on rigor, close attention, carefulness. You have to train long, hard, consciously and have certain intellectual predispositions to do well at it. Also, it requires inhibition of that joy in leaping at conclusions from facts. Better to build up watchfully, testing every leap before it's made. No indiscriminate hops allowed. Be cautious even in the way you talk. Use the special language, the distinctive rules, the right method, the accepted theories. Put it together in a form testable by your professional colleagues in the carefully worked-out ways. Out there in objectivity's place. Not in close. Out in the light, out in the open, out under the glare of professional standards. You can't make it up as you go along. No improvising. There is always a holding-to the data. You don't let go at Level 4. The creativity, which is certainly there, is answerable to standards. Accountable creativity, not self-caused creativity. Very different, as different as the people who do well at either one. Level 4 is a most objective, the most universal, the most anonymous, the most exacting of all the levels. And there is joy on 4 if you have it all in place there and want it like that.

Important for the practice of Level 4 is competition. Real, straight-on competition. Necessary for its health and prosperity (advance). Skill and performance rated according to

clear criteria of excellence. The necessity of constant judgment. No exceptions for "people" reasons. The advance of the project. First things first. The love of the science much more than "humanity." But don't assume malice. None of that, and no resentment. It's a cool, clear rejection of human compassion. Sometimes not admitted!^{on clearly accepted.} It means no harm, only accomplishment. It's a pure, impersonal, ruthless kind of competition. It is ruthless in the sense that it does not excuse or forgive weakness or failure, no matter how much good will. It refuses to indulge or compensate. It makes no concession to human weakness. Or the science would suffer. It doesn't sympathize. With good cause too. It is much more interested in cure than in comfort. The world made both objective and theoretical by the mind, with a guarantee of ^{practical} application ~~and~~ ~~control~~ comfortable results. There is little personal reassurance at this level unless you are ~~very, very~~ competent and know it. Then the rewards are great. There is real enjoyment for the proficient, and money. Not much laughter, but there is satisfaction. An attractive kind of smugness, really. The smugness of doing a worthwhile and difficult job well. Even with the payoffs, it is not surprising that Level 4 is not very popular with contemporary youth. Ironic, isn't it? Ironic because it is Level 4 that made our world and it will have to be Level 4 that can save it. The control of the undesirable and polluting effects of technology require the same kind of knowledge, method, discipline which created the pollution in

the first place.

Level 1 is softer, more pliant, at least among its own kind. Yet there are the dangers of indifference and intolerance too. Boredom is the greatest threat at this level. That bland unconcern with anyone or anything different. The intolerance is arbitrary because its criteria of judgment cannot be justified theoretically. It simply loves its own and hates and dismisses all others. No, that's not the way of putting it. It is indifferent to others which is much less passionate than hate and less active than dismissing. There is no growth at either Level 1 or Level 4. We'd better move on the Level 3. That's where we grow.

The purpose or end of Level 3 is personal growth. Markedly so. The individual is at the center; the primary concern of the disciplines. Improvement. New dimensions of living. The ~~growth~~ ^{growth} of the person. The discipline is the classical instrument of the liberal arts education. Used to make the student's whole. To complete him. Philosophy, history, literature, music, art. The established disciplines for ~~meaning~~ ^{meaning}. Level 3 has been culturally specific rather than culturally plural. It speaks consciously from a selected place. Beginning in the Mediterranean Basin, it moves through Greece and Rome to Europe, and ends in that definitive nation, USA. Also it has been specific as to class. Its use of "culture" for the student's insight and maturity is appropriate to the well-off, career-prepared, abstraction-prone sons and daughters of the middle-

upper classes in America.

There are necessary conditions as well as specific content, that provide the grounds for this culturally induced wholeness. Long stretches of free time, freedom from manual activity (and an ~~implicit and sometimes~~ induce distaste for it), a pleasant and liberating affluence, an easy, casual contempt for "middle American" lives and beliefs, a self-conscious innocence about what it takes to get ahead, a protected life lived more according to high and rather unrealistic ideals of good will and free choice in which various kinds of necessity have been made invisible. To be moderately secure and confident, one has to have it arranged so that the deprivations of life are kept invisible. The hard problems and exploitations put out of sight. Good willed idealism must have it so.

Growth, then, on Level 3 has this defect: it never bumps against necessity. The growth is pleasurable, comfortable, free, open, and mildly boring. It is not ~~hardly~~ tested by the harsh realities of the world. It does not ~~really~~ use the pleasant withdrawal from necessity in an effective way. Education becomes a blank to be filled in, not an essential support for a life lived in accordance with ~~action~~ ^{action} whether ~~in~~ ^{of} power or ~~in~~ ^{of} service. The ease and freedom of these years are conducive to discovery of older, more traditional ideas and ways of living. It is essential that the student be put in touch with these ideas. The best in traditional society in both the great and small cultures. The study is especially

necessary because the pursuit of classical studies points to conceptions, values, cultures new and different for most American upper middle class students. The ideas are alien, strange, abstract. They put great demands on learning. But they are not studied that well or by many. There is really very little pain in them, very small amounts of dislocation or wrenching, almost no confusion. The content is different all right, but the difference is not made real. The necessary contrasts with the modern systems ^{often} are not drawn. The study is carried along the same lines already traced for the student by home, parents, secondary school.

To speak of liberal arts, one must speak of content. But not an exclusive content. Or a definitive world view. Rather, a content which stresses dialectic. The understanding of distinction through conflict. Conclusions at odds and then premises too. Kinds of education contrasted. A content that rubs meanings against each other. Opposition which lights up what is at stake in the present.

Just what meanings are in conflict? Let's take a look. First, the student must understand, and ~~even better~~ ^{by} given some chance to practice, the modern scientific method. What we have called Level 4. It is the most compelling contemporary academic method, the point of view which puts us in ~~intellectual~~ touch with ^{reality}. If it is primary, it is not by any means a definitive approach. There is no definitive approach or doctrine for liberal arts today. But just how far ^{can we go with} ~~does~~ science? ~~go~~ What

does it explain? How? How not?

Secondly, quite separate from science, there is a cluster of values which combine around the "At Home" experience. What we have called here Level 1. The contrast between Levels 1 and 4 is dramatic. Each is made clearer in comparison with the other. Education cannot resolve these conflicts but it must see them.

Third, the student should become acquainted with the religion and/or philosophy of a great tradition within a pre-modern civilization for a straight-on contrast with the scientific -- the liberal model developed in modern Europe. A study of the different grounds and style of ancient wisdom and Western scientific knowledge.

Fourth, emphasis on the small (peasant or tribal) tradition in a closed society. The way the common people live in villages or on the hunt, the kind of values they cherish, how they relate to their tradition.

Fifth, the content and character of the dissent that has grown up defensive against the rationality of the modern period. The themes and concerns raised in philosophy, religion, art, political thought against the new progressive rational man.

Sixth, the traditional society changing in the modern world: the developing society somewhere on the long continuum between its past and its modern future. Showing clearly the poles of modernization. All of the in-between persons and things.

Seventh, understanding other claims and classes in present-day America. The people for whom Level 3, almost without knowing

it, creates a casual contempt for. People within our political order who have been invisible to the educated.

Students are set up for a particular kind of liberal

arts education by their background. They move along a line on which everything reinforces their expectations. They are watched, kept in a line they don't see for some time, protected against stumbling. Expectations appear early in the home, through the presence of the parents' concern. It's there from the beginning of school, as well, whether suburban public or private preparatory. The "Prepies" have no trouble in going on, if they make the personal effort of performing well. They are prepared well. So well that learning something loses its challenge. They know the motions, the vocabulary, the ~~yellow~~ principles that ~~are~~ ^{are supposed to provide ready for} discussion. High school is a bit different. It is more a public place and more open to the competitive realities found in the world. But the public high schools have their own way of tracking down differences and channelling them along different lines. The "bright track" for the bright students. The less bright are assigned their limits, early on. In educational terms, those seen as inadequate are made to feel it. The bright ones are promised growth. They are not pulled out but put on by education. Given a sense of plenty, of prosperity, of surfeit. They haven't struggled either spiritually or physically in spite of their sometime melancholy.

The culture of Level 3 is of a disquieting kind. Growth through the means of great books and objects in literature, art, history, music. Universal in its intention, it is a culture much narrower in practice. It insists on distance, meaningful articulation of the books, disciplined work, great objects, and

growth in the individual. Level 3 is not very communal, cooperative, friendly. Not compassionate. It is not meant to be so now. It was possible in earlier times by restricted entry. Something quite different than now. Simpler. Less educational. Friendship and cooperation end up among people who simply like each other. It is not the result of education. Level 3 does not see itself as competitive as Level 4. But the competition is there. Subtler, less evident. Honestly admired and used ~~by some~~ ^{as a goal}. Performance and comparison with others is important at Level 3. Competition does serve well certain educational aims no matter how sincere the concern for mutual ~~action~~ ^{concern}. That brings up the contradiction between social style and the actual content of study at Level 3. ^{As Level 3's} ~~Internal~~ political and social style is that of the "notable." Soberly vague in its referents, it yearns a bit for the gentlemanly ideal. And is embarrassed by the yearning. Level 3 is somewhat loose, imprecise, general, unselfconscious, nonspecific in its style and mode of communication. That is not to say that the disciplines themselves aren't practiced in articulate and distinctive ways. The imprecision concerns not the teaching of the discipline, nor the academic consciousness of it, but in the social use of it. Also a tendency to ambiguity about hiring and firing, conditions of tenure, benefits and salaries. The necessities of work and practical life. The political-administrative style of the notables running the institution encourages all sorts of vagueness in the interest of convenience.

Sensitivities, intuition, misty appeal to historical experience, various unstated self-protecting assumptions are the working condition which reenforce the absence of clarity about purpose of liberal arts and the kind of young people appropriate to the success of the purpose.

It is easy to ridicule this level. It is the closest thing to a gentleman, and gentlemen are out of date. It would like to recruit its teachers from well-established families, but this is almost impossible in the contemporary intellectual community. The new kinds of intellectuals have neither the style nor the values of a gentleman.

History is central to the classical liberal arts, especially as an anti-scientific force emphasizing the particular action and the illustrative story or anecdote. More than in other academic disciplines, Level 3 teachers have an idea of themselves as craftsmen and their students as apprentices. The relationship involves duty, affection, and distance. It depends upon the student who is alert and ready to expend time and energy to develop his academic skills, who takes joy in study, who is ready to explore his own thought. This tends to be an elitist activity with many more social and personal consequences than Level 4. But today the elitism is defensive, not openly admitted. It has lost confidence in itself. The time isn't right for it. Idealism usually moves on the left. But liberal arts in terms of its history the style of its institutions, its use of reason, what

it chooses to remember, and of course what it gives its students, is conservative. Its content ^{can} produce ~~towards others~~ not empathy but actually a contempt. Contempt for other world cultures. Closer to home, contempt for other classes of people. This elitism is actually found in the structure of ^{the} education. Giving access to different classes of students will not eliminate this elitism, but will certainly create new kinds of problems, which could make for a better education.

There is skill and rigor in the studies at Level 3, but the activity is not all directed to advancement of knowledge per se. The disciplines are more used than built up. They are used for dialogue between student and teacher, at least the student who does his preparation well and knows how to use ~~it~~ ^{his} ~~own~~ ^{own} ~~resources~~ ^{resources}. The central debate in liberal arts colleges today on ~~forming~~ ^{forming} a curriculum is how to balance the claims of Levels 3 and 4. Level 3 is in a far more entrenched position than 4 both in the classroom and in the administrative office, although this domination is not always ~~consciously~~ admitted by Level 3 people. Level 4 sees the emphasis on the humanities well enough. Science is often taught with a Level 3 purpose in a liberal arts college. Reforms are on a line between 3 and 4. Level 3 gets its share of good students. In number, ~~most likely~~ ^{quite} an ~~important~~ ^{important} minority ~~of all students~~ ^{of all students}. Usually quite serious and stable in learning. Individualist students who accept the strict rules of study, and who have the mind and taste for growth through intellectual culture abetted

by their own effort. Again, it is important to stress that such a student ~~has to be~~ ^{is} prepared for this kind of dedication and competence by other people and ~~possibly~~ ^{perhaps} by other institutions. He ~~can't just~~ ^{seldom} find it within himself.

Of course, this intellectual culture is not for all, even those with the right preparation from the right background. It takes more than training. One has to have some love of it within one's self. And there is the career afterwards. Level 3 prepares for the professions and their graduate schools: medicine, law, business, engineering, scholarship, the performing arts, the fine arts, journalism, etc. But given these aims it is, of course, elitist, just as Level 4 is elitist, but in a different way and with different ends. Level 3 has more snobbery in it, more legitimization of social class. It also has less objectivity. It is more uncritically satisfied with itself. There is no tension at the periphery, no threat of replacement, no restless striving for valid theory. Thus, is Level 3 more person oriented ^{by and} with the disciplines at the center.

What about ego? Is there more of it in this doctor-lawyer-professional man than in the scientist? Performance is important for both. Is there, then, more subordination of ego in science than in the professions? Is either more public spirited? The professions certainly require directed will and energy, years of preparation, some astuteness about practical things. But Level 3 professionals are never really threatened by their education. Their basic choices have never been ques-

tioned by anything antagonistic. Are their cultural and class prejudices ever subjected to the resentments and insights of other cultures, classes, races? Have they ever had the feeling of fighting hard for something? The ~~very~~ endangered feeling? The better often settle in and use what they've learned coolly. They move in art galleries, concert halls, museums with ease, and with some happiness and joy. It is their setting. They are at home and provided by their education with an assortment of appropriate responses. For there is no one correct response in spite of what the discipline may have taught them. This assurance of pluralism is tolerance. It serves as practical defense for them: they don't have to give reasons for their judgments. They never have. Is threat, pain, confrontation, antagonistic conflict, empathy for suffering essential to education? If they are, then this Level 3 is a very incomplete education. A very narrow education. Boring? No, not that bad. Except for some.

Level 3 does place limits on authenticity. Complete sincerity is not its goal. It is dependent on original content. The cultivation of the mind is important, but used and defined differently from Level 4. The mind is put in ^{a more limited} ~~its~~ place. ~~It does~~ ~~does emphasize growth~~ ~~It~~ does use the mind as an instrument of growth by analyzing, comparing, distinguishing, bringing into coherence. That use of the mind is encouraged. Its mode, then, is definitely intellectual in a different way and with different ends than Level 4. Level 3 uses intellect. In touch

with the things of life. Things collected into coherence and significance for the educated by great works of art. Of course, it is also selective, ordering, making evident, but not with the same purpose as Level 4. At Level 3, there is a completed product. Complete both in terms of the objects studied and the students studying. The tasks of Level 4 are never completed. The whole person is not the viewer. One doesn't look at reality that way. Competence in the science is the point of view. There is always something new to debate and probe, but within the confines of a thoroughly articulated subject matter, paradigm, skills, methods. Permanence is quite unlikely at Level 4. Even death to it. Nothing is established forever. But who or what can disestablish a work at Level 3? Why should they?

Level 3 thinks that Level 4's attempt to separate fact and value is a useless task corrupting subject matter. Not only impossible but undesirable as well. Level 3 does not want to take human judgment out of study. It wants to put the power of judgment into the person. Study is oriented to fact rather than to data. Level 3 has a history of being premised on an objective moral universe, though it is rather uncomfortable with this horizon now. Still, it is not ready to believe that all things are relative, and certainly not that all things are equal. It must insist that a person is better equipped in mind and sensibility to make an educated esthetic judgment after the study of art that one could not make before. It must believe that knowledge organized into a discipline makes a difference to human

judgment, makes it better. A person can be changed, made discerning, shown his way, consoled by study. Opinion can be informed, to its advantage. Level 3 cannot let judgment go as authenticity or spur-of-the-moment. There has to be a thinking through. Certain conditions are necessary. Distinctions have to be made between good and bad, between freedom and license, between art and trash. These are judgments applied to particular works against discussed criticism. These distinctions are not self-evident or spontaneous, not available without effort and a full experience of the thing. Discussion at Level 3 is not just casual conversation. It includes informed people, a knowledgeable experience, familiarity with the field and the literature, a capacity of creative responses.

Level 3 has a different sense of truth than 4. I might say more profound. The truth at Level 4 is replaceable, more specific, true of the given case under the given conditions. Level 3, although fully dependent on insight and orientation hold closely to particulars, sees its truth as more universal and immediately evident. The Sistine Chapel has outlasted Newton's theory of the physical universe. Thus, Level 3's suspicion of the merely timely and contemporary. Present ~~meaning is lost~~ meaning. The particular achievements of Level 3 are complete, permanent, for all time, yet created and devised in its own times. Level 4's successes are replaceable. Paradigms change. They are adjusted to new questions, problems, theories. It is a method which is stable. That is, the substantive accomplish-

ments of Level 4 are relative. Relative to place, time, paradigm, relevant problems and questions. While Level 3 moves out of the group of time and place on its object, Level 4 wants to be exhaustively and exactly right. It demands more precision of its truth. Level 3 wants a lasting, more humanly acceptable, truth. Level 3 presumes permanence and truth are on the same track. Nothing is replaced, but new entities are created. It is much easier for human beings to live on good terms with 3 than with 4. Replaceability and mobility create trouble and confusion for humans, especially as they grow old. Or, as they live comfortably, free from anxiety, on Level 1. Some suggestion of durability, even if a conscious fiction, is necessary for a healthy life. It's difficult doing anything well with the constant possibility of replacement. Level 4 is too artificial to provide for the human whole. That takes four seasons out in the open. But Level 4 is a greenhouse activity. An activity which requires strong, hard, impersonal practitioners supported by solid institutions. It's a study which demands the hard commitment to rise above compassion and to go beyond sympathy with human weakness. It refuses to settle for the present. Always the testing, the close assessment, breaking the chains and putting together which make the new truth possible.

Level 4 is most satisfied in the city with its larger piles of services, instruments, advantages, energy. Level 4 does not thrive in the rural liberal arts college setting. It gets on. But there is not enough money, research equipment,

library facilities, circles of professionals. The really critical mass! Modern technology does make possible a very respectable existence: it makes data available for those removed rural areas. Among the liberal arts, science will always be somewhat disadvantaged, but its presence is essential as a necessary part of the content of that liberal education. It must be understood, if not seriously practiced. But of course not the only study even if a prime one. Level 3 likes its rural setting. It seems to fit the casual, loose style.

The issue at stake, the difference in meaning and method of education, the at-odds assessments of authority, the open battle between levels 3 and 4, can best be shown, perhaps the only place it can be shown clearly, at the liberal arts college. This issue has to be drawn in clear evident terms. It lies at the core of the present-day curriculum. In the present discussion, it appears in several oppositions: the arts versus the sciences, the two cultures, the economic-technical-industrial order versus the cultural order, positivism versus metaphysics. etc. It is not a question of choosing one over the other, although they have their positions, but of seeing them in conflict, seeing what it is between them. It also means in any particular choice between them to be able to assess their claims and weigh their merits.

Why is a college such a suitable place to draw this distinction? To make evident the differences? The university is not the place for it. It has no time to waste on differences

of this sort. The university already knows which side it will choose. And it will take long hours of open-ended discussion and too much time for the pre-decided result. Talk, talk, and more talk. And very little of it using professional precision. The university is not arranged for such activities. Its prominent professors and best minds are too competent to bother with it. To protect its own activity, the university cannot get into the time and effort it takes to bring out the many issues of the conflict. Such a broad, open discussion does not serve level 4's proper purposes. That's not what it talks about. It's too knowledgeable. Its rules are too well accepted. Level 4 doesn't need this kind of talk and participation for its prosperity. All its creativity takes place according to its own premises. Conflict with other premises cannot be reached reasonably. It will end in shouting, finally a test of the strength of the voices. Level 3 can isolate itself, be secure among undergraduates because it serves so well their life and career needs. Not answerable to the challenges of science, it can see things that science will not look at. It will not be replaced for a long time, not even disturbed. It protects itself by its present mode of organizing study into departments. It rules the liberal arts situation. Not bad in itself. Just insufficient by itself. Still, it will be increasingly pressed by Level 4 and by the new young faculty who come to the college trained in the universities not just to pursue their sciences but to talk about them. Level 3 seems not quite up to encouraging

the conflict insofar as it is not overly aware of its own special premises and method and how to compare them with those of science. It's a problem. Simply, Level 3's view of the tasks of the liberal education is too limited for the needs of students today. No longer sufficient, perhaps out of date. The debate and contest between 4 and 3 must become a central interest of the curriculum. Not the resolution of that difference, but of the difference itself. The two in tension, reflecting each other's practical and political differences. One must know what a choice gives up as well as what it receives. Both are selective -- but different things are retained and thrown away.

But there is another level of the divided line still to be seen, another claim to authority and purpose, another kind of education. Another challenge to Level 3 and even more to Level 4 as a method and aim of education. Level 2 makes trouble for both lines above it, and is generally confused with Level 1 by those above. It will become more an issue in time. It is viable now, but there is not much practical threat from it. In fact, you have to look closely to catch it. Its voice is hardly audible. And the impression it makes is very faint.

At Level 2 there is long and intense discussion. Discussion of a peculiar kind. Feelings and commitments show. And the irritation and anger that go with them. The discussion necessarily forces contradictions, corrections, distinctions, and a moderate amount of abuse. It is opinion confronting and

disagreeing with other opinion to sharpen up both of them. Yes, and after discussion there is at least some rejection or approval. Some resolution of the issue at stake if only in the judgment of the participants. Most discussions list opinions, one after the other. They add them up without touching. They never connect. Nothing is done to make them connect. Mind you, not agree but connect, even if only in opposition. All of the levels above 1 differ from 1 in assuming reality, an external world, concrete, hard things that really exist. The external world is not just the creation of the human imagination. The place of connection then is given. What happens is education. A seeing of oneself and one's world through the means of disagreeing with others. Putting premise, method, significant action forward. What's important is the heard and seen differences. Listen, really listen, hear. It is not easy of course. We like to pretend that it is easy. Talking together freely in a rap session, we think it real talk. There has to be a willingness to waste talk. To talk too much. Most would agree the informed talk is what education is about. But we have no skills in talking. Discussion too often ends up with that list of opinions.

So, a new way of talking. New rules. New duties. New conditions or prerequisites. The most difficult aspect to accept is that Level 2 requires as much authority as does 3 and 4. It is a different kind of authority. The discussion at Level 2 is no more spontaneous or natural or easy in flow than

is that of the science or discipline. It requires an outsider, a director. It just doesn't happen without planning and structure.

What are its conditions? Let's look at them. First, the participants have to believe that there is more to the world than what happens to them. It helps if they are restless, dissatisfied. They have to have some doubt of the things closest to them. They will be ready to leave home. Doubt of home things is strong in youth. Doubt leads to a questioning of the things they have taken seriously earlier. The questioning assumes that reality can be apprehended through dialogue. New issues are available. One must be willing to be open and trustful. Also, a tendency to restlessness, and a discontinuity with the appearance and the present surface of things. At the same time, a faith that what is under the surface can be shared, discussed, agreed or disagreed upon. Competence at disabusing each other's view of reality is not as such a happy pursuit. It requires more respect than friendship. With the proper method and effort, a willingness to learn from each other, even if only through opposition, people are allowed to see and deal with reality together. One reaches reality through the sustained conflict of opinion.

Second, this dialogue does not depend on favoring any one kind of action. It may not even end in action, although the tendency is there. Insight and clarity require no validation by action. Level 2 has an interest in talk per se: it is talk for its own reward. No particular kind of action has to

follow. That is, a wide variety of actions can follow. Or no action at all. Even silence is a possible outcome. Or refusal to go on talking. (Although the latter would probably be graded with a C minus 1.) Variation in circumstance, personal character, individual experience, idiosyncratic expectations (and of course race and creed) shape and vary any student's choice of action, not the discussion alone. Action is chosen and initiated by the individual. It is only the individual who can convert the dialogue into action. It is by independent individual choice, then, that talk is turned into action. It is individual choice which determines what action will be taken, not the dialogue and personal judgment which preceded. And most certainly not by the discussion leader. More, this choice of the dialogue that make it conclusive must be protected from the coercion of action. The discussion cannot be limited or inhibited in any way by the desire for a particular kind of action. Something is learned in the process of discussion, some new things which make the prediction of action uncertain or qualified. There is some movement in the individual, some change, some shift in understanding, something seen which wasn't before, and where it leads is not quite evident until after the talk. Not really definite until after the action. And the action is not necessarily predicted.

Third, one cannot deny or put off discussion on the grounds that it has taken place before. Once or twice, or even ten times through, is not enough. Especially for a student for

whom this kind of discussion is unknown. It takes many repetitions to get things straight. Things might have to be looked at ten times in order to discover their true significance.

Fourth, there has to be commitment, and from commitment follows passion and feeling. There is not enough curiosity in indifference. Languid half-interest won't do it. Also, modesty of style and humility of statement is not proof of willingness to listen. In fact, it often masks dogmatism and rigidity. People should get excited about their opinions, even defensive. To protect them, they might even withdraw in irritation or anger. This excitement, this passion, this deep concern for one's own opinion enough to protect it with emotion does not necessarily inhibit learning. For in this kind of learning, that is, in the discussion, movement, change of personal opinion, understanding comes after discussion, necessarily by reflecting on it. It comes at the point where one sees his defensiveness and thinks out the reasons for it. Sees what he was not seeing at the time. Participants in discussion, who remain calm, modest, apparently in control, are probably not very deep in their opinions. They are turning out views. If a discussion goes too smoothly, there is little reason to recall it, much less to reflect on it.

In Levels 3 and 4, the learning is more likely to take place at the time of the discussion or lecture. Right on the spot. This immediate kind of learning is much less likely at

Level 2. It's the difference between the character of learning at each level. When the individual becomes involved in a conflict with his whole personality, he is much more disturbed about disagreements.

Level 2 is the most directly threatening to our complete personalities. It takes account of all our opinions and judgments, and their coherence. But also the sensibilities underneath. It is potentially most upsetting. We are identified rather than the subject. Level 4 revolves around the experience and logic of the science. It engages our skills and our mind. The self-conscious distance should always be there. It is true that, even with the assumed objectivity of science, the scientist is affected personally by criticism. But his specific attention to and interest in theory over self-knowledge allows greater poise, balance, composure in discussion. Level 3 is more concerned about human sensibility. It is very much a part of the subject matter. The growth of the student is an accepted aim. His individuality has a greater status and prominence than at Level 4. The discipline determines and directs the student's insights and participation. Although he is to grow, it is by mastery of subject matter, not by articulation of what he is. The line of his growth is laid out for him, as for countless others in the past by the discipline.

At Level 3 the student must start on mastery of his discipline before he starts his growth. It is a directed growth. He is involved in it more than responsible for it. He is a

student in the traditional sense. He is definitely taught, as well he must. He needs the teaching. And the teacher.

At Level 2, he needs other different persons and kind of discussions. He must be ready to present his opinion and show his sensibility to all the participants who are interested and responsive in order to bring out their own opinions and the premises lurking behind them. It is this freely accepted responsibility, of being answerable and responsive, but also seeking responsiveness, that is unfamiliar to us but makes possible the reflection that unsettles and teaches us. We are argued with, criticized, questioned, poked right where we are. It should be unsettling. We should be defensive and irritable, especially if the questions seem unfriendly or come from a stranger. Thinking about it afterward, not the engagement itself, produces the insight. And it helps if we've been upset. It is true though that the initiative alone does not produce reflection. It has to be made conscious.

Learning, then, most likely occurs after we have come off the firing line. We are all familiar with that situation in which we have defended our judgments and prejudices against attack somewhat irritably. Of course, we know that we don't learn just by being defensive. That can also lead to withdrawal into our own environment, our at-home place. But we do learn by thinking back through criticism, and seeing where we and they went wrong. And so, ideally, we become diminished. Reduced by insight. Level 3 is the cause of our growth, but Level 2 stunts

us, makes dwarfs of us. We see our limits. We come across many empty generalities, unconvincing distinctions, plain blanks at the core of our thinking. Even our principles are discovered to have little content, or clarity, or distinguishing points. And not much testing by experience. In fact, not much experience. We see that the world is very seldom like what we think it is or what we want it to be. It is made up of institutions, people, situations, values, most of which are not very sympathetic to us. Most often, we are just unknown to them. We do know more than we can control or make, even if that knowledge is less precise than on Level 4. It needs working on. We know more than what even the traditional disciplines teach us. We have to know more to get on in the contemporary world. The task is to make what we know more conscious.

The appropriate association at Level 2 is the opinion group. It must be distinguished from friendship groups. It is not as close as friendship, although it may become so. There is more distance, more formality, more public space, less emotional involvement, less passion, less loyalty, more inhibition in the opinion group. It is marked by the modest reserve and pliant objectivity supportive of worthwhile encounters with strangers. In other words, the opinion group starts as distance. Equality is inappropriate. No, it is impossible. Respect is the necessary attitude here. At this level there must always be distance, impersonality, reserve, and of course preparation for disagreement. It is through conflict that we

learn. The aim has to be seen: it is not making, not controlling, not dominating, not expending, not growing. The purpose is not action of any kind. Rather, we believe that action results from the conscious and articulate will of the individual. His own choice. It is by individual choice that discussion is made act. It is the individual's will that moves him. Therefore, no one kind of action is necessary or required by the start of the discussion. The conversation of the opinion group does not generate necessary consequences. This separation of discussion and action is not very practical. Our intent is to leave discussion to the student. We want to justify the value of knowledge only by the knowledge it gives, not by the action it controls. We make the dialogue valuable for itself. We do not justify it by the action that follows it.

A difficulty is that what is assumed to be a Level 2 discussion is not. The Level 2 discussion is very rare. Important for its success is the making of distinctions which allow discussion to move from and beyond each opinion present. These distinctions, at the least, show the grounds of disagreement, and, at the best, perfect and focus the disagreement into new insights and understanding. The difficulty at Level 2 is establishing and making effective a structure of authority. The discussion-made direction. It does not educate if it is not directed. It is only Level 1 which is spontaneous in inspiration and accidental in accomplishment. The insights of Level 2 are prepared for.

The best teacher at Level 2 is one whom all the participants trust and are willing to have point out failure. Not too much ruthlessness, though, just enough to encourage reality. A judicious mixture of intimacy and distance, friendship and impersonality. The great advantage of this level is in the effort to see the other levels as they would see themselves. The conscious effort of Level 2 is just this: to see the otherness of things and persons. That which is away from where we are. Evidently not the effort of Level 1, but even Levels 3 and 4 are more secure, feel better with their own kind. They aim to replace opinion or to broaden it, but not to engage it upon its own terms. Level 2 makes opinion conscious of its own premises as well as of its situation and consequences. Seeing is both the starting point and the end point of this level. And it covers all the space between.

Everyone needs Level 1. And we all have it in some sense. Personally, we don't have to have the other three levels. They are all contrived. Strictly conventional, not natural. It is only Level 1 that originates in casual undirected expression. The upper three require the support of institutions, skilled teachers or leaders, a hierarchical structure of abilities, a definitive way of proceeding and knowing. Each has a different content as it serves different purposes. Each must be endowed with the proper material conditions. Each is in one way or another coercing its followers.

But Level 2 is the hardest to institutionalize, hardest

to staff, hardest to reduce to skills, hardest to find the conducive atmosphere. It is the most difficult to bring off. Often its pursuit depends on pure chance. An accident of the right person at the place where he can be used. The skills required are very special. Skills of questioning, encouraging, criticizing, bringing out, pushing and shoving, leading, withdrawing, trusting, criticizing. Confusion is natural to it, but it is also one of its most effective means of educating if used consciously. It must always keep in sight of laughter. For balance and tolerance.

The skills required are not taught in any of our colleges or universities. Nor are they well rewarded, mainly because the purposes lack status among educators. There are no evident and precise measurable guides by which Level 2 can be judged or celebrated. The effort to make the student's opinion viable is hard to assess. There is no concrete operational theory easily seen and evaluated by professional peers. No well developed discipline to guide assessment. People often mistake their ordinary talk in these very restricted peer groups for the more probing discussion in opinion groups. When a real discussion takes place, they consume huge amounts of time and attention, often without immediately evident results. They don't seem to get anywhere. And participants don't learn at the time.

The most difficult task for participants in the opinion group is listening. We do it so badly that it produces bad

questioning. Discussions become a descriptive effort with no penetration or new insight by either side. We are too pat in our self-oriented kind of listening to pick up and respond to cues which mainly reinforce our point of view. We have not really succeeded in hearing. And so we are unable to do the basic or first things at Level 2.

Level 2 is neglected in our colleges. We pretend to value it, but we really don't encourage it. We don't educate or hire or advance its teachers. Few would accept it as an educational goal. We don't give attention to it. Or meet together to discuss it. Most teachers feel uncomfortable with it, even though the discussion method is approved of, and provided for in most undergraduate curricula. But most discussions are full of beliefs, which are put forward but untouched by other beliefs. No dialectic. No cooperative working through of premises, principles, consequences.

Why should scholars and teachers feel so uncertain and defensive, and do so poorly at this level? What is the cause of the failure? Is the origin of the neglect? For one thing, the criteria for judging performance are difficult to come by. But even more difficult to apply. There are standards. There is a message. There is substance. But how are these rated? It requires people who differ and who are willing and eager to explore that difference. Conventions hold the discussion together, aim at creating respect and distance. The movement of discussion is not always clear, and it certainly undoes much

of the order put into it by convention. Without control, conversation stutters and fizzles. It rambles around its subject and its object confusing both. It is sometimes close to the line of argument, often some distance off from it. There is the natural tendency to waste time where the aim is not clear. The confusion is mostly due to the necessary mixture of two purposes: the defining of subject matter and the penetration of premises and observations of the participants. Most needed is patience and then laughter.

There are neither professional colleagues nor close friends at this level. Nor are there the personnel to staff it, and it isn't being created. With the absence of friendship, the encounters of Level 2 are very dependent on trust. Trust which gets beyond the differences. Trust which encourages the appearance of one's own individuality. Conflict is not in itself sufficient to learning, and may well destroy trust. Trust pushes conflict along to discovery. This trust involves respect and quite a bit of impersonality to prevent irritability from developing into too much anger. Last names are more appropriate than first names. They provide protection for the whole person, while bringing him forward. This encounter of strangers involves saying things that aren't usually said comfortably to kin and friends. The more intimately and well persons are known to each other, the more difficulty they have in forming a Level 2 discussion. This closeness is better expressed in silence than in words. Also, it takes more energy and cold calculation than

most of us have to talk with objectivity with those we love. It is easier to talk this way with incompletely known persons. It is certainly less tiring. But it is strangers who have the most to teach us. We are reassured by our loved ones; we are taught by outsiders. We do need more energy and will, more curiosity and interest, more resolved purpose to sustain the latter kind of encounter.

Why is Level 2 at all necessary? Why insist upon it? It upsets us; it confuses us. It wastes our time. It puts us out of touch with those we love. It can make it very hard to return to them. We spend too much time with strangers. It is personally painful. It requires support by institutions, experienced teachers, the student himself. Is it natural to expose oneself to something which threatens so directly? It's hard to say. Certainly, we cannot maintain that conscious self-analysis is beneficial for all people. The least we can say is that one should sleep well the night before so as to be in a good and rested mood for the encounter. It's important to be relaxed, and well fed too. The climate should be moderate, not too hot or cold. Lots of space helps, and a beautiful setting. Mountains or seashores are always acceptable. In fact, it requires all the advantages, not that they cause but because they enhance the conversation. What is most essential is someone who can ask the right question and make the necessary distinction.

What human quality does Level 2 demand? Empathy: the

sympathetic penetration and understanding of another's opinions and sensibilities. Its something that takes developing.