

EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY: LESSONS FROM GOETHE'S *FAUST*

By
CARL NICHOLAS COLAVITO

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
2009

© 2009 Carl Nicholas Colavito

To my family, by birth and kinship

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Most successful large projects are the product of collaborative efforts of dedicated individuals. A dissertation is officially written by one author, but is improved through the efforts of many individuals. I would like to thank those individuals who have helped bring this project to fruition. My current chair, Dr. Elizabeth Bondy, has been instrumental in working to get me focused to bring this study to completion. I cannot thank her enough for this. Aside from her guidance and support, I have learned from her that education can be a consciousness raising experience. My students and I have been the beneficiaries of Dr. Bondy's influence.

Dr. Bondy had taken the baton, so to speak, from Dr. Sevan Terzian, without whom I probably would not have begun this program. Early in my studies Dr. Terzian had offered his insight, experiences, and candor that have grounded me in the historical conversation between America and her educators. Without his influence I may not have understood the value of my study as much as I do. I would also like to thank Dr. Arthur Newman and Dr. Richard Renner for teaching me, and for supporting me well beyond their required duties. The amount of knowledge I learned from these professors is considerable, but the academic support and life lessons I have gained from each personality is equally valuable. I also wish to thank Dr. Fred Gregory and Dr. Bert Swanson for their respective contributions to my knowledge of Goethe and Faust, and democratic theory, and for providing perspective.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the support of my family, and the patience of my friends. I hope those who have seen the transformations of this project from its inception find some reward in seeing it to completion. I would finally like to thank all of those concerned individuals who have spent countless hours discussing education, democratic theory, and Faust with me. You have kept my curiosity alive and excitement level high, and have consistently

reminded me that Goethe's Faust is a masterpiece on more levels than can be addressed in any one conversation or dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
ABSTRACT.....	9
CHAPTER	
1 EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY: LESSONS FROM GOETHE’S <i>FAUST</i>	11
Introduction.....	11
Rationale for the Study	14
Does NCLB Foster Autonomy and Freedom?	16
Does NCLB Foster Community and the Habits Necessary For Communal Life?.....	20
Does NCLB Exercise Students in Deliberation?.....	21
Question Statement.....	23
Scope of the Study.....	24
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	27
Introduction.....	27
Philosophical Context for This Literature Review	28
<i>Faust</i> as Education for <i>Bildung</i>	30
Autonomy in <i>Faust</i>	39
Community in <i>Faust</i>	43
Deliberation in <i>Faust</i>	48
Synthesis	51
Orientation	54
3 AUTONOMY	58
Introduction.....	58
Autonomy Defined	59
Self-Control over Impulses and Desires.....	60
Ability to Set One’s Own Purposes.....	61
Reflective Process	63
Autonomy in <i>Faust</i> : Overview	65
The Prelude in the Theatre: Foreshadowing <i>Faust</i>	65
Prologue in Heaven: The Lord Challenges Mephisto	67
The First Part of the Tragedy: The Wager between <i>Faust</i> and Mephisto.....	68
Palace-Entombment: <i>Faust</i> ’s Salvation.....	69
Autonomy in <i>Faust</i> : Self-Control over Impulses and Desires.....	70
Self-Control over Impulses and Desires Examples 1 through 4.....	71
Self-Control over Impulses and Desires Example 5: Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig.....	71
Self-Control over Impulses and Desires Example 6: Wood and Cave.....	72
Autonomy in <i>Faust</i> : Ability to Set One’s Own Purposes.....	74

Ability to Set One’s Own Purposes Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre	74
Ability to Set One’s Own Purposes Example 2: Night and Before the City Gate	76
Ability to Set One’s Own Purposes Examples 3, 4, and 5	91
Ability to Set One’s Own Purposes Example 6: Laboratory, in the Medieval Style, with Elaborate and Clumsy Machinery for Fantastic Purposes	92
Autonomy in <i>Faust</i> : Reflective Process to Maintain Elements of Autonomy	95
Reflective Process Example 1: Prologue in Heaven Active Learning through Correcting Mistakes	95
Reflective Process Example 2: Palace Dialogue Versus Power	96
Reflective Process Example 3: Large Outer Court of the Palace Perpetual Striving to Maintain Autonomy	97
Reflective Process Example 4: Entombment Development through Error	99
Autonomy as Part of <i>Bildung</i>	100
4 COMMUNITY	106
Introduction.....	106
Community Defined	106
Communication.....	109
Communication Example 1: The Relationship between Faust and Margaret	110
Communication Example 2: Faust’s Relationship with Baucis and Philemon	111
Communication Example 3: Night.....	112
Transformation to Autonomy	114
Transformation to Autonomy Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre	115
Transformation to Autonomy Example 2: Study	116
Transformation to Autonomy Example 3: Martha’s Garden Transformation through a Relationship.....	117
Autonomy	119
Autonomy Example 1: Street Individual Versus Communal Benefit	119
Autonomy Example 2: Dismal Day Internal Versus External Locus of Control	121
Organizing Principle/Collective Will	122
Organizing Principle/Collective Will Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre Unity out of Diversity	122
Organizing Principle/Collective Will Example 2: Street Tradition Can Increase or Decrease Autonomy	123
Inertial Community.....	124
Inertial Community Example 1: Before the City Gate Education as Training.....	124
Inertial Community Example 2: Study Training through Satisfying Impulses and Desires.....	125
Inertial Community Example 3: Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig Satisfaction of Impulses and Desires as a Purpose Itself	126
Inertial Community Example 4: Witch’s Kitchen Power Without Development	127
Community as Part of <i>Bildung</i>	129
5 DELIBERATION	133
Introduction.....	133

Deliberation Defined	134
Deliberation in <i>Faust</i>	138
Example 1: Part II: Charming Landscape Faust Transformed into an Autonomous Actor	138
Example 2: Walpurgis Night's Dream	140
Example 3: Large Outer Court of the Palace.....	140
Less Democratic Deliberation in <i>Faust</i>	141
Autonomy Example 1: Auerbach's Keller in Leipzig Mitigated by Impulses and Desires.....	141
Autonomy Example 2: Street Mitigated or Enhanced by Deference to Tradition	142
Autonomy Example 3: Dismal Day Mitigated- Focus on External Versus Internal Freedom	143
Autonomy Example 4: Deep Night Mitigated by Threats of Violence.....	144
Communication and Agreement Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre Mitigated by Conflicting Wills.....	145
Agreement Example 2: Study Mitigated by Diminished Autonomy and Self-Interest.....	146
Deliberation as Part of <i>Bildung</i>	147
6 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	151
Introduction.....	151
Contributions from Democratic Theorists: Gutmann and Barber	153
Gutmann's Conception of Community	153
Barber's Conception of Uncertainty in Deliberation.....	156
Contributions from Educators for Democracy: Dewey and Wolk	158
Dewey's Experiential Education	158
Wolk's Democratic Classroom.....	161
Lessons from <i>Faust</i>	165
Clarifying Democratic Concepts	165
The Narrative Form	168
Faust as a Model Democratic Actor	170
Final Thoughts.....	172
<i>FAUST</i> : A SYNOPSIS.....	176
PEDAGOGICAL EXERCISE FOR KNOWLEDGE CREATION	180
REFERENCES	182
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	187

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY: LESSONS FROM GOETHE'S *FAUST*

By
Carl Nicholas Colavito
August 2009

Chair: Elizabeth Bondy
Major: Curriculum and Instruction (ISC)

This study employs a philosophical analysis of Goethe's literary masterpiece *Faust* in order to recognize and consider necessary modifications to democratic education. I analyze extant democratic theories, and consider contemporary legislation influencing pedagogical practices, such as the No Child Left Behind act (NCLB) of 2001. I then address three points. First, I highlight problems with NCLB in the formation of democratic citizens. Second, I present a serviceable concept of democracy and its component parts. Third, I present the character Faust as a model toward which educators can orient pedagogical practices that promote, rather than impede, the cultivation of democratic citizens.

John Dewey had declared democracy to be a preferred form of government and social arrangement because it promoted "a better quality of living" than autocratic forms of government. Walter C. Parker recognized that cultivating students toward becoming democratic citizens cannot be expected as a by-product of activities such as raising test scores. In order to cultivate democratic citizens, prominent democratic educators claimed students must exercise habits for democratic life while in school. Critics allege that NCLB does not exercise students in habits for democracy. NCLB impedes democratic education through practices fostering compliance rather than autonomy, competition rather than cooperation, and punishing deviations from an approved core of knowledge rather than rewarding students for creating knowledge.

Maxine Greene has encouraged educators to search the arts for inspiration in ameliorating educational problems. Marshall Berman has presented Goethe's *Faust* as a work of literature that can help address NCLB's negative effect on the cultivation of democratic citizens. Berman identified the time period in which Goethe wrote *Faust* as an historical shift from autocratic to democratic political thinking. The transformation of the main character reveals, through a *Bildung* education, the shift from a discrete individual with less concern for his community, to an autonomous individual deliberating with others in a communal spirit. *Faust* offers a heuristic model through the life of the main character, Faust, so educators can cultivate in students habits of democratic citizenship.

CHAPTER 1
EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY: LESSONS FROM GOETHE'S *FAUST*

Introduction

John Dewey described democracy as a form of “associated living” that was more than a form of government; its principles guide all forms of social life (1916). Why should anyone desire to live in a democratic society? Dewey answered this question: “Can we find any reason that does not ultimately come down to the belief that democratic social arrangements promote a better quality of human experience, one which is more widely accessible and enjoyed, than do non-democratic forms of social life?” (1938, p. 34). Throughout American and United States history, prominent voices have argued that schools should educate citizens for democracy.¹ The latest major legislation defining how schools educate citizens for democracy is the No Child Left Behind act (NCLB).

NCLB was signed into law by President George W. Bush in January of 2002. The stated purpose of the over six hundred page act was “to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.” While originally passed with bipartisan support with stated goals that were, on the surface, generally well accepted, NCLB has amassed numerous critics.

NCLB has far reaching implications, impacting every state in the U.S., and thus virtually every child that attends schools in each state will in some way be affected by NCLB. Of central importance is how NCLB defines an educated person since it is this model that orients the methods of teaching and assessment of students, two areas greatly affected by NCLB. Deborah Meier summed up this point: “The very idea of what constitutes an educated person is now

¹ One source of this thesis is Carl E. Kaestle's *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*. “I argue that the eventual acceptance of state common-school systems was encouraged by Americans' commitment to republican government” (Kaestle, 1983, p. x). “To foster the intelligence required of republican citizens, some of America's most eloquent political leaders looked to education” (Kaestle, 1983, p. 5).

dictated by federal legislation” (Meier & Wood, 2004, p. 71). If NCLB is in fact dictating the definition of an educated person, and if the inculcation of democratic principles in our students is desirable, then it is important to ascertain if NCLB is educating our students to become democratic actors. Many critics argue that it is not.

What must an education include if it is to inculcate democratic principles in our students? Educators must discern salient democratic principles and how education can foster these principles in students. Dewey’s definition of democracy requires an interplay between the psychological or individual, and the social or community, in his idea of “associated living.” Amy Gutmann said that this interplay must become a reciprocal cycle of “conscious social reproduction” of democratic practice (1987).² Benjamin Barber said democracy is “an admonition to people to live in a certain fashion: responsibly, autonomously yet on common ground, in self-determining communities” (1996, p. 279). Barber described a strong version of democracy as a “participatory mode where conflict is resolved in the absence of an independent ground through a participatory process” (1984, p. 132). For Barber, “Democracy begins where certainty ends” (Murchland, 2000, p. 22). According to Dewey’s, Gutmann’s, and Barber’s definitions of democracy, democratic principles require certain conditions in order to be realized: autonomy, community, and the absence of independent ground, or uncertainty. Is the possession of these conditions and information about democratic principles enough to inculcate democratic principles in students? Prominent educators say, no, exercises in democratic action are necessary in addition to knowledge of democratic principles.

² Gutmann stated, “A democratic theory of education recognizes the importance of empowering citizens to make educational policy and also of constraining their choices among policies in accordance with those principles- of nonrepression and nondiscrimination- that preserve the intellectual and social foundations of democratic deliberations.” She added, “A democratic theory of education focuses on what might be called ‘conscious social reproduction’- the ways in which citizens are or should be empowered to influence the education that in turn shapes the political values, attitudes, and modes of behavior of future citizens” (1987, p. 14).

Prominent voices on democratic education have argued that inculcation of democratic principles in students is not merely an issue of informing students about democratic principles, but requires that students become practiced in them.³ Walter C. Parker said that in order to inculcate democratic principles in students educators must involve young people in a variety of associations of governance, infuse the curriculum with decision-making opportunities, and afford students opportunities in schools to deliberate on problems (2003, p. 53). Steven Wolk spoke straight to the point: “You can’t come to know what it means to be a responsible, decision-making member in a democracy if you are not in a classroom or a school that practices democracy to begin with” (1998, p. 80). Without democratic practice students may have less facility with enacting democratic principles in their lives and may even “*resent* being given the responsibility a democratic classroom asks of them” (Wolk, 1998, p. 80).

Perhaps the strongest admonition to encourage democratic practice in schools comes from Paulo Freire, “The oppressors are the ones who act upon the people to indoctrinate them and adjust them to a reality which must remain untouched” (1993, p. 94). In other words, the “oppressors” in the U.S. are the curriculum developers and legislators who have insulated the “people,” who are our students, from epistemic opportunity to gain knowledge of the world on their own. The oppressors have substituted their own version of approved knowledge.

As delineated by these democratic educators, democratic practice includes freedom of people to investigate their world and draw their own conclusions, habits of participation in community life, and exercise in the process of deliberation. As Wolk warned, “We cannot have classrooms and curriculums that silence children and their teachers, control and regulate their

³ For an explanation of this distinction see Dewey’s discussion of Traditional versus Progressive education juxtaposed to his Experiential education in his *Experience and Education*. Also, democratically organized schools have greater success in student achievement than bureaucratically organized schools as noted in Mary John O’Hair, James H. McLaughlin, & Ulrich C. Reitzug’s *Foundations of Democratic Education*, pp. 10-11.

thinking and learning, rate them and label them, and then expect them to take part in what's supposed to be a democratic, pluralistic, and participatory nation" (1998, p. viii). Does NCLB conform to, or violate, the conditions for a democratic education as delineated by Dewey, Gutmann, Barber, Parker, and Wolk?

Rationale for the Study

Critics of NCLB provide a strong foundation for considering the qualities of an educated person in a democratic society and the habits they exercise that foster democratic practice. Criticisms of NCLB fall into two categories: 1) Instrumental elements that can be ameliorated from within NCLB and 2) Elements that define an educated person so as to inculcate particular principles in students. Critics such as David J. Flinders, Patrick J. McGuinn and George Wood criticized NCLB for its lack of funding,⁴ and Wood and Linda Crocker have criticized NCLB for the lack of empirical data that proves a correlation between performing well on a standardized test and how good an employee or citizen an individual will become.⁵ These are first category criticisms and can be addressed by more federal funding and empirical testing, respectively.

My focus will be on the second category of criticisms because it is concerned with how schools educate for democracy. If the definition of an educated person that NCLB propagates fails to inculcate democratic principles in students in accord with the definition Dewey, Barber, and Gutmann endorse, to where can educators and concerned members of society turn to

⁴ First category criticisms include a lack of federal funding for NCLB as claimed by David J. Flinders who said NCLB mandates "are largely unfunded" (2005, ¶ 1). McGuinn noted that a number of state legislatures in 2004 declared NCLB "was largely unfunded" (2006, p. 184). Wood said, "By some estimates the current requests for funding NCLB from the administration fall as much as \$12 billion short of the requirements of the legislation" (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. x).

⁵ First category criticisms include a lack of empirical data proving a correlation between performing well on a standardized test and becoming a good employee or citizen as noted by Wood, who said, "I have searched in vain to find any study that says our children graduate as better employees, college students, or citizens as a result of taking more tests" (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 35). Linda Crocker stated "accountability requires hard evidence that our tests fit the content standards and that the tests are fair. Evaluation of the consequences of these assessments must follow sound research guidelines" (2003, p. 10).

consider an alternative definition of an educated person for a democratic society? In this dissertation I will introduce habits of democratic citizens delineated by prominent theorists and identified in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's literary classic *Faust*.⁶ I have included a synopsis of *Faust* in Appendix A for readers unfamiliar with Goethe's work. Scholars have interpreted *Faust* as a comprehensive play illustrating, through a *Bildung*⁷ education, Goethe's view of the changing political climate from autocratic to democratic thought (Bermann, 1982; Hendel, 1949). *Bildung* implies individual development of faculties rather than merely passive learning such as memorization. A review of critics' concerns about implications of NCLB for democratic education serves as the foundation for this study.

Does NCLB foster democratic conditions and encourage democratic practices? Three conditions for inculcating democratic principles and promoting a democratic citizenry represent the distillation of the criteria delineated by Dewey, Barber, and Gutmann in their respective definitions of democracy. Combined, these three elements form the requisite conditions necessary for developing a democratic citizenry.⁸ The three delineated educational practices

⁶ The emergence of several recent dissertations underscores the recognition of the importance of democratic education. In *Liberal Education and the intellectual and Moral Preparation for Life in a Democracy*, Annick Stephens Draghi claimed that "The primary logic leading to the thesis of this dissertation, then, is that in a democracy, the personal development of that which makes us most human, our intellect and our will, and the development of that which make us contributing members of a society are one and the same" (2006, Abstract). In *Critical Pedagogy and oppositional Politics in Education: Developing Critical Consciousness and Building Civil Society in the Classroom*, Tanya Devra Kravatz stated, "This dissertation researches how education can help maintain democracy by enhancing civil society." Since civil society is seen as a "network of autonomous organizations," the dissertation suggested that "critical pedagogy is a teaching practice that supports the development of a civil society because it emphasizes social critique, community, resistance, and civic engagement" (2007, Abstract).

⁷ The German word *Bildung* has been translated by Dennis Sepper as "The formation of human beings in the fullest sense" (1988, p.191). Sepper added, "It was no less Goethe's conviction that science is necessary for the perfection of *Bildung*, because the inner being is tested and formed by facing and accommodating the public world and the world of nature. Science cultivates human beings" (1988, p.191).

⁸ Instrumental elements of democratic practice, such as voting and campaigning, are secondary in that they inevitably support one of the three delineated principle conditions (for example, voting may simply reveal the autonomous choice of an individual). For this reason, instrumental and secondary criteria will not be the primary focus of this dissertation.

correspond with three conditions necessary for a democratic education.⁹ The condition of autonomy necessitates that students have freedom to investigate their world and draw their own conclusions. The condition of community necessitates that students develop habits of participation in community life. The condition of the absence of an independent ground or uncertainty necessitates that the students develop facility with the process of deliberation. These three elements are fundamental to developing democratic actors according to Dewey, Barber, and Gutmann, with other conditions playing an auxiliary role in support of primary conditions. Democratic activity requires free individuals discussing conflicting views and interests and forming a communal response, whether in the political sphere or the social.

Does NCLB Foster Autonomy and Freedom?

Critics such as McGuinn and Michael Apple allege that NCLB limits autonomy in two major ways. NCLB influences schools to limit curricular choices, and it compels schools through financial ramifications to follow its standards. How does NCLB limit curricular choice and which aspects of the curriculum are lost? How does forced compliance with standards compromise students' autonomy?

McGuinn, Apple, and Peter McLaren have argued that NCLB is driven by a market mentality which in turn shapes curriculum and instruction. McGuinn noted that education "is intimately connected to children, jobs, taxes, religion, race, and class" (2006, p. ix) and is thus of

⁹ Dewey, Gutmann, and Barber have delineated these criteria as fundamental for a well developed democratic theory. Dewey acknowledged in democracy "the principle of regard for individual freedom" and "that mutual consultations and convictions reached through persuasion, make possible a better quality of experience than can otherwise be provided on any wide scale" (1938, p. 34). Gutmann admonished against depriving anyone of "the capacity to choose a good life" (1987, p.40), acknowledged that "Most Americans are committed to sharing sovereignty with each other" (1987, p. 40), and claimed, "A society is undemocratic ... if it restricts rational deliberation" (1987, p. 95). Barber claimed that his strong democracy, "rests on the idea of a self-governing community of citizens who are united less by homogeneous interests than by civic education and who are made capable of common purpose and mutual action by virtue of their civic attitudes and participatory institutions" (1984, p. 117).

central importance in the political and social life of society. McGuinn added, “Ideas must be paired with political will and institutional capacity to be effectively implemented” (2006, pp. 201-202) and concluded, “the dominant paradigm of educational policymaking in the contemporary era is ... founded on market principles of standards, accountability, choice, and competition” (p. 203). Thus if a market mentality drives the education system, it may support only dominant ideological values, thereby excluding values extant in marginalized segments of society.

Apple explained that with a market ideology, society, made up of consumers, must be able to compare products, in this case students and schools, so standardization is required. He added:

New definitions of democracy are largely based on possessive individualism, on the citizen as only a ‘consumer,’ and are inherently grounded in a process of deracing, declassing, and degendering. ... If this is the case ... the long term effects of neo-liberal definitions of democracy may be truly tragic. (2006, p. 114)

According to McGuinn and Apple, this market system of competition and choice has limited curricula to material that can be measured with standardized tests, and has excluded minority voices from consideration. I am not claiming that standards are themselves anti-democratic. Rather, the method in which standards are developed and employed can either represent the will of the people, or represent only a dominant faction whose goals are not in concert with the will of the community.

Which parts of the curriculum are excluded under the pressures of NCLB and a market driven mentality? Apple said, “Such a system excludes almost everything that is harder to test and establishes a curriculum in which certain subjects are seen as important (mathematics and reading) because they are tested, while other equally important subjects (e.g., science and social studies) are either done in increasingly surface ways or even neglected” (2006, p. 96). Wood

decried the loss of recess, the arts, and other aspects of the school experience.¹⁰ Linda Darling-Hammond said many schools “have abandoned measures of critical thinking and performance” and that “this not only reduces the chances that schools will be able to focus on helping students acquire critical thinking, research, writing, and production abilities; it will also reduce opportunities for students who learn in different ways and have talents to show what they have learned” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 18). The loss of curricular choice itself limits students’ freedom in selecting what they may be taught. The ramifications of those excluded curricular elements can limit the autonomy of individual students by reducing the capacities that may have been developed had those excluded aspects of the curriculum been included.

NCLB not only limits curricular choices to measurable aspects; it sanctions those schools and students that do not meet its standards. Flinders indicted the U.S. Department of Education for a misuse of standards: “Rather than approach standards as opportunities for discussion, reflection, and learning, the DOE has taken up standards as a means of control” (2005, ¶ 7). Flinders made it clear that NCLB was not using standards and assessments to “help schools but to control them.” He claimed educators need to do more than what NCLB requires:

We need to know more about the conditions that help students direct their own learning, formulate their own questions, and cultivate personal talents. We need to ... help students assume multiple points of view, see beyond their own self-interests, and make connections between what they study in school and their lives outside of the classroom. (2005, ¶ 19)

Apple stated, “The accountability system interrupts the ways of knowing that are powerful in the cultures and languages of a diverse student population, making it even more difficult to connect the curriculum to students’ lived realities” (2006, p. 93). NCLB limits students’ autonomy in two major ways. First, it limits available curricula to that which can be measured. Second, a

¹⁰ “Schools took away recess time to make more room for instruction...Remember field trips? When done well they made real-world connections with what was learned in school... In one Florida community the entire agriculture program was threatened with closure due to pressure to provide more academic time to help students pass the FCAT” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, pp. 42-43).

curriculum limiting exercise of particular faculties may cause those faculties to become atrophied. Critics such as Meier, Wolk, and Parker claim that some of these lost capacities are the very habits necessary for a democratic society. Meier said, “Standardized tests measure only a very small portion of what is vital for adult success in contemporary life. They totally ignore vast areas of critical significance (such as oral language, teamwork, reliability, initiative, and judgment)” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 77). Wolk wrote that textbooks “emphasize the memorization of endless facts rather than encourage the creation of our own knowledge, a questioning and critical habit of mind, the seeking of multiple perspectives” (1998, p. 84). Further, there may be capacities not readily identifiable that may be lost if schools inculcate habits of transmission of accepted knowledge rather than encourage the search for, and creation of, knowledge by individual students. In addition to the loss of such things as initiative, judgment, and the creation of our own knowledge, we may not know what we will miss.¹¹

Peter McLaren claimed that with a market mentality endorsing a pro-capitalist position, “Schooling and education carry out the ideological and economic reproduction that benefits the ruling class” (2003, p. 22). He continued: “The severing of workers from the products of their labor under the capitalist mode of production *mirrors in a number of basic instances the separation of the production and consumption of knowledge among students*” (McLaren, 2003, p. 30). While McLaren takes a more radical view of the relationship between capitalism and schools, his basic point is similar to Apple’s: a capitalist economic system influences schools to distribute knowledge in a method analogous to the distribution of material goods. Knowledge is simply another commodity to be controlled by elites. McLaren added:

¹¹ Experiments such as the *Eight-Year Study* may provide some idea of other potential losses to students when education excludes certain progressive subjects and methods. Myra Pollack Sadker and David Miller Sadker claimed that in the *Eight-Year Study* the graduates of progressive schools: “Earned a slightly higher grade point average; received slightly more academic honors; were judged to be more objective and more precise thinkers; and were judged to possess higher intellectual curiosity and greater drive” (2005, p. 300).

Ironically, existing criticisms of schooling and the agenda for educational reform themselves constitute part of this retreat. ... Neoconservatives have defined the school as an adjunct of the labor market, and subset of the economy, couching their analysis in the technocratic language of human capital theory.

In the present rush toward accountability schemes, corporate management pedagogies, and state-mandated curricula, an ominous silence exists regarding the ways in which new attempts to streamline teaching represent an attack on both the democratic possibilities of schooling and the very conditions that make critical teaching possible. (2003, p. 34)

McGuinn, Apple, and McLaren have alleged capitalism is an impediment to democratic education due to the influence of a market mentality that treats knowledge as a product. Schools and students are expected to conform to quality and accountability standards that they may have had little influence on developing. Subjects not tested are often neglected, resources are allocated to passing standardized exams, and students whose performance does not meet the standards may be marginalized and fall even further behind in their education. Critics have argued that these conditions are not conducive to the cultivation of autonomy, and may be an impediment to transforming students into democratic actors. A capitalist society may be democratic if constituent members are autonomous and deliberate in a communal spirit. However, if individuals do not receive an education in which they exercise habits for democracy, they may be influenced by external forces and fail to arrive at democratic decisions. It is in the exploitation of these inertial individuals that capitalism may reflect undemocratic choices. Inertial individuals may be more easily influenced to vote or spend money in a manner inconsistent with their interests or the interest of society.

Does NCLB Foster Community and the Habits Necessary For Communal Life?

Meier cautioned that acquiescence to authority external to a democratic process can have disastrous effects on a democratic ethos, especially considering Barber's description of community as individuals who participate in deliberation before reaching a decision. According to Meier, NCLB declares, "A well-educated person is one who scores high on standardized math

and reading tests” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 67). This is significant because standardized tests are factors in our society used to determine who counts as educated. Meier argued that schools can be “places where citizens and professionals can exercise judgment and build trust,” but that “NCLB assumes that neither children, their families, their teachers, nor their community can be trusted to make important decisions about their schools” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 71). Meier said problems in students’ lives could be beneficial to their development as good citizens, thus negating any claim that hierarchical decision-making eliminates problems. Noting that democracy requires debate and compromise, Meier wrote, “It is the habits of mind necessary for practicing and resolving disagreement- the mental toughness that democracy rests on- that kids most need to learn about in school” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 74).

According to Wolk, “The most powerful symbol for learning in our society, our schools, are not about practicing freedom in body, mind, spirit, and voice, they are about blind compliance, learning through competition, maintaining the status quo, silencing voices, and ignoring critical habits of mind” (1998, p. 73). Parker warned, “Because democracy is tenuous and unsure ... the cultivation of democrats is not to be wished away as a natural by-product of attending to other things, such as raising scores in reading and math” (2003, p. 53). It is difficult to form a community when voices are silenced, competition is valued over cooperation, and individuals are subjected to an external authority rather than relying upon each other. Rather than “cultivate” important “habits of mind” necessary for a democratic society, NCLB limits the exercise students may get in communal life.

Does NCLB Exercise Students in Deliberation?

Apple argued that the curriculum

must be the result of long-term democratic and substantive discussions. It cannot be imposed from the outside and legitimately claim to be based on a common core knowledge. Nor can it be legitimate if it is simply based on, for example, test-driven

content that has not itself been subjected to the intense kinds of debates that must go on if that knowledge of all of us is to be truly representative. (Ravitch, Ed., 2005, p. 189)

Flinders noted under the standards already settled upon by NCLB such intense debates are absent, thus teachers' "professional judgments become a liability rather than an asset" (2005, ¶ 11). Due to the necessity of compliance in meeting strict standards, Flinders claimed that NCLB is "a futile education policy," citing Dewey from his pedagogic creed: "All reforms which rest simply upon the enactment of law, or the threatening of certain penalties, or upon changes in the mechanical or outward arrangements, are transitory and futile" (Dewey, 1929, pp. 291-295 in Flinders, 2005, Conclusion). An approved core body of knowledge, and the sanctioning of deviations from it, stifle the democratic process by settling the curriculum debate through federal legislation.

E.D. Hirsch endorsed the idea of teaching core knowledge, referring to studies which claimed, "Students who have followed the Core Knowledge program in elementary school are said to be readily identifiable as the best students in their middle schools, regardless of their demographics" (Ravitch, Ed., 2005, p. 180). Apple pointed out a detriment to an accepted idea of core knowledge: "What counts as 'core knowledge' has all too often been someone's core, not everyone's core" (Ravitch, Ed., 2005, p. 189). Democratic praxis requires that all the voices contribute to what counts as core knowledge.

Jonathan Kozol claimed NCLB, in expressing the will of a market-driven society, becomes an "all-inclusive system of control" (2005, p. 69) that directs schools to teach an approved curriculum and sanctions schools and teachers who deviate. McGuinn noted the "Department of Education has been reorganized to facilitate the agency's new focus on student achievement and state compliance" (2006, p. 182). He emphasized NCLB compels schools to reach specific benchmarks in a particular time frame and by particular means (e.g., evidence-based reading

instruction). Monty Neill stated the point succinctly: “Students must be actively engaged in learning to be part of a democratic citizenry and not be treated merely as passive recipients of knowledge.” He added, “Because the various actors can have conflicting interests, structures must be created that allow all of them to come to share decision-making power” (Meier & Wood, 2004, p. 106).

According to prominent critics of NCLB, students may not be exercising the habits of mind necessary to become democratic actors. As Wolk warned, without “practicing democracy,” such as seeking multiple perspectives, exercising judgment and trust, and sharing in decision-making, students may not gain the capacity to act as democratic citizens. NCLB may be contributing to a loss of autonomy and community, and may be limiting students’ powers of deliberation by mandating an approved core of knowledge.

Question Statement

Which model of educating for democracy can educators and legislators utilize that minimizes the detriments of legislation such as NCLB and maximizes student development toward becoming democratic actors? The prominent educational philosopher Maxine Greene recommended that educators search the arts for cohesive works offering models of education. Forrest Williams claimed *Faust*, a cohesive work of literature displaying *Bildung* education (Cottrell, 1979; Dieckmann, 1972; Williams, 1953; Jantz, 1951), provides an excellent model of an educated person. Why study *Faust* as a source for democratic education? Charles W. Hendel explained:

The drama mirrors a change that was taking place in the thought of the eighteenth century.... There was widespread attack ... on the conventions, rules, prejudices, and superstitions with which men were weighted down. A strong reaction had set in against authoritarian rule. (1949, p. 159)

Critics have claimed practices endorsed by NCLB are often more autocratic than democratic (McGuinn, 2006; Flinders, 2005; Kozol, 2005). The development of autonomy in the character Faust might provide a model for educators to utilize in exercising students in democratic practices. Faust had become transformed through a *Bildung* education. Marshall Berman interpreted Faust's transformation in terms of political development:

Faust springs up enraged: Why should men let things go on being the way they have always been? Isn't it about time for mankind to assert itself against nature's tyrannical arrogance, to confront natural forces in the name of "the free spirit that protects all rights?" (10202-05). Faust had begun to use post-1789 political language in a context that no one has ever thought of as political. (1982, p. 61)

Scholars' interpretation that *Faust* illustrates the historical and ideological transformation of political thought from autocratic to more democratic serves as the basis of my choice to study *Faust*. Goethe's *Faust* can be viewed as a commentary on political changes; Faust's development can be seen as an example of an emerging, autonomous, democratic actor. Critics claim that contemporary educational policy under NCLB impedes the development of democratic education. Considering that *Faust* has been interpreted as an example of the transformation of autocratic to democratic thinking, my question is: How can Goethe's *Faust* contribute to a model for educating students to become democratic actors?

Scope of the Study

Greene made the case that the arts can be one important source for new perspectives on orienting our schools: "One of the greatest arguments for making the arts central in the curriculum is that informed encounters with them may indeed open vistas on alternative possibilities for being in the world" (Beane, Ed., 1995, p. 141). She added:

Whenever I recall John Dewey's conception of philosophy as "thinking what the known demands of us- what responsive attitude it exacts," I am always stirred by his relating it to "an idea of what is possible, not a record of accomplished fact" (1916, p. 381). As we devise curriculum and work on curriculum frameworks, it seems important to hold in mind the prospective, the possible. This means encouraging the kind of learning that has to do

with becoming different, that reaches toward an open future- toward what might be or what ought to be. (Beane, Ed., 1995, pp. 139-140)

Here Greene emphasized the benefits of encouraging students to offer alternative views on problems. But if we allow a dominant ideological voice to dictate to our students prescribed “right” answers and solutions, then “what we think of as coherence will give way to the rigid uniformity of belief imposed by some authoritarian kind of training” (Beane, Ed., 1995, pp. 140-141). This rigid uniformity under NCLB is legislated by the very government that depends upon democratic practices, violating Gutmann’s and Dewey’s admonition that democratic education should result in a reciprocal process of schooling for democracy and legislating democratic educational practices.

Forrest Williams, commenting on Harold Stein Jantz’s book *Goethe’s Faust as a Renaissance Man: Parallels and Prototypes* (1951), noted that Goethe’s literary classic *Faust* was “trying to make as broad a gamut of experience as clear as possible” and that *Faust* was concerned with “man’s activity in the universe in its manifold aspects, social, political, historical, epochal, and metaphysical” (1953, p. 395). Jantz showed that Goethe endorsed the cultivation of personal perspectives in the pursuit of knowledge, and Goethe was clear that such perspectives collectively contribute to an objective reality. Jantz also showed that Goethe was compiling in *Faust* numerous philosophies in order to show that the multiplicity of philosophies represented were each resultant from some experienced reality. According to Jantz, it was the relationship among these realities that Goethe was highlighting. These multiple philosophies can contribute to a democratic society only if they are allowed expression. Williams’ and Jantz’s view of Goethe’s *Faust* character reveal a model toward educating individuals to become democratic actors. Democratic citizens: 1) Exercise autonomy as opposed to compliance; 2) Recognize multiple perspectives in a community as opposed to a single, “official” ideological position; and

3) Create knowledge through a perpetual process of deliberation not limited to a universal “right” answer or core knowledge. I will examine these three components from Goethe’s *Faust* in light of how they contribute to a model for educating students to become democratic actors. My goal is to clarify these concepts through an analysis of *Faust* so educators may consider how they can be employed to facilitate democratic education.¹²

¹² I will confine my analysis of *Faust* to culled elements that fit at least one of the following criteria: Aspects of *Faust* that juxtapose autonomy or free acts with compliance or un-free acts; sections that deal with the importance or value of community; and an examination or exposition of deliberation in decision-making.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe has written in many fields including literature, philosophy, natural science, history, and education. Paul Bishop, in his edited volume *A Companion to Goethe's Faust Parts I and II* (2001), claimed in 1999 Goethe was noted as the eighth most famous name in history, considering the 3,431 books written about him in the Library of Congress. According to a German weekly magazine *Die Zeit*, many writers and intellectuals have ranked *Faust* as one of the top ten books of their canon, often as number one. Walter Kaufmann noted the influence of Goethe's *Faust* saying, "Goethe created a character who was accepted by his people as their ideal prototype" (1959, p. 56).

Goethe's *Faust* is most often considered a work of literature or philosophy, but many have recognized the educational lessons it contains. I have selected works addressing Goethe's *Faust* as it concerns democratic education.¹ I have systematically searched relevant databases² for

¹ Not every commentator claimed Goethe had democratic tendencies. Wolf Lepenies noted the idea of Thomas Mann, "One hundred years after Goethe's death, Mann now spoke of the Olympian as a human being, a citizen and a man of letters who had stubbornly resisted the two main tendencies of his epoch, the nationalistic and the democratic" (2006, p. 59). Yet in the same edited volume, perhaps in anticipation of a German Democratic Republic yet to be, Walter Ulbricht, the first secretary of the Socialist Unity Party, claimed only two books as sufficient reading- the *Communist Manifesto* and *Faust*. "The GDR would become a cultural state, a pedagogical province as Goethe had foreseen in his novel *Wilhelm Meister*. Even stronger was the affinity to *Faust*" where "Goethe had described not a peaceful utopia, but a world to fight for, not a ready-made land, but an earth that had to be created by man's own hands" (Lepenies, 2006, p. 162).

² Following is an indication of my search parameters: "*Faust* and democratic education" proved far too broad so I divided my search into three constituent parts: *Faust* and autonomy; *Faust* and community; and *Faust* and deliberation. These three categories are based upon the three salient elements of democratic education I have culled from *Faust* and democratic theorists.

In databases under the subject "Education," my first search focus was "*Faust* and autonomy." In Pro-Quest I got 7 total hits, 2 of which were useful for this study. In Wilson Web I got no hits, and in Emerald I got 11, none of which proved germane. From ERIC CSA I got 1 hit but it wasn't helpful, and from JSTOR there was little to utilize in the 396 hits.

My second search focus was "*Faust* and community." In Pro-Quest there were 0 out of 18 hits worth pursuing. Wilson Web offered nothing useful in the 2 hits, and in Emerald 27 hits produced no useful works. ERIC CSA offered nothing in 5 hits, and JSTOR delivered little in its 1526 hits. "*Faust* and deliberation" was too prolific

commentaries on Goethe's *Faust* that address the three major components of democratic education I have identified from prominent democratic educational theorists: autonomy, community, and deliberation.

I will first situate Goethe's *Faust* in a philosophical and historical context that is relevant to Goethe's view of education. I will then identify *Faust* as a work revealing Goethe's educational lessons for *Bildung*. The penultimate section will be divided into three parts, and in each one I will discuss the major works addressing autonomy, community, and deliberation as found in *Faust*. I will conclude this literature review with an overall context for my discussion of *Faust* as it offers a model of a democratic actor.

Philosophical Context for This Literature Review

Arthur Zajonc has written a number of analyses concerned with Goethe's understanding of education in the life of an individual. With Zajonc's expert analysis the reader can situate commentaries on *Faust* within the vast body of literature on it.

In "Goethe and the Science of His Time" (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998), Zajonc said Goethe's scientific studies were undertaken in an environment shaped by the age of Enlightenment. Zajonc noted that researchers in this time of the Enlightenment "sought only to bring the scientific spirit, as it was understood at the time, into all aspects of human endeavor, thereby bringing to each the certainty of celestial or terrestrial mechanics" (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998, p. 15). Goethe wrote in an age when many writers claimed the sum of human knowledge could be expressed in terms of

a search to be productive, so I decided to search for links between *Faust* and deliberation by recognizing issues relevant to deliberation in various formats.

It became clear that relevant commentaries on *Faust* and democratic education would have to be culled from the constituent elements of democratic education found in *Faust*. I revisited the wide net search for any commentary that could contribute to my research, and I found works that at least in part dealt with *Faust* and education to produce a democratic citizen.

Enlightenment reason. A clear example is the attempt by *Philosophes* to transmit knowledge to all literate persons:

Denis Diderot and his widespread army of collaborators gathered together and systematically ordered the knowledge of humanity in his *Encyclopedie*, including in their opus all the arts- scientific, artistic, and industrial. Throughout, the encyclopedists communicated the accomplishments of science so that all might be freed from ignorance, superstition, and oppression. Reason was to act as final arbiter over all matters, whether technical, political, or moral. Thus, enlightenment was to transform individuals and nations. (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998, p. 15-16)

In this period of enlightenment, “The perceived coherence of the universe rested on an explicit set of convictions shared by the *Philosophes*, namely, the adoption of mechanical philosophy as the reigning metaphysics. In the same breath that they damned the sciences of the past for the presence of ‘occult qualities,’ they deified their own set of metaphysical, if materialistic, assumptions” (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998, p. 16). I will view Goethe’s method of science and education in contradistinction to this Enlightenment approach.

Goethe utilized the same method in his search for knowledge in science and education.

Alan P. Cottrell noted the link between Goethe’s scientific views and his literature when he wrote, “Goethe’s science is centrally important to his world view and to his art. Indeed, the more deeply and clearly we come to understand Goethe’s science the more richly and precisely shall we understand *Faust*” (1979, p. 7).

After explaining Goethe’s scientific method³ as an empiricism untainted by theoretical constructs, Zajonc concluded, “We find, therefore, the theme of human development, or *Bildung*,

³ In order to avoid “the human tendency to prefer the conception of phenomena to the phenomena themselves,” Goethe had considered “basic phenomenal demonstrations and descriptions” to be the most certain type of fact a researcher can claim to be true (Sepper, 1988, p. 91). Goethe further claimed that a researcher must consider *Vorstellungsarten* as “the very foundation on which the scientific community was built” (Sepper, 1988, p. 95). *Vorstellungsarten* are the “ways of conceiving things,” as Goethe had considered that “there are manifold legitimate ways of conceiving things” (Sepper, 1988, p. 91). For Goethe, “The most fatal epoch that can befall science, then, is one in which a single *Vorstellungsart* predominates to nearly the exclusion of all others” (Sepper, 1988, p. 93). Sepper gave the example of Goethe’s view of the science of color as “a communal effort calling not only on physicists and chemists but also on physiologists, technicians, craftsmen, mathematicians, philosophers, historians,

to be an essential feature of Goethe's mode of scientific investigation" (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998, p. 27). I will view education for *Bildung* in juxtaposition to the Enlightenment approach discussed by Zajonc.

Faust as Education for Bildung

Viewing *Faust* as a work toward *Bildung* supports the importance of my thesis that the development of a democratic citizen is achieved through exercising in students habits for autonomy, community, and deliberation. Parker said, "Citizens emerge from idiocy to puberty, thereby regarding themselves as having a public life in which they are challenged to manifest as democrats. This requires them to reflect on public life and to form it anew, again and again, in community service, social action, and deliberation" (2003, pp. 29-30). Parker's admonition for students to continually reflect and act to change their social conditions through deliberation is analogous to an education of *Bildung* which cultivates individuals through their reflection and deliberation. The goal of *Bildung* is the cultivation of the whole range of human characteristics, and among these are the characteristics of a democratic citizen. Wolk claimed democratic education "requires a certain *thoughtfulness* and *consciousness* in our daily lives" and "the single greatest hope of democratic schooling" might be that it "can raise a person's consciousness to the world and to the people around them" (1998, p. 10). A goal of *Bildung* is also to elevate individuals' consciousnesses to the world around them. I will discuss relevant characteristics of *Bildung*, and show how *Bildung* education differs from the Enlightenment approach discussed by Zajonc. I will then provide evidence that *Faust* is a work endorsing *Bildung* education.

and representatives of any other vocations and disciplines that might have something to offer" (1988, p. 95). Sepper claimed Goethe was worried that "As long as a scientist remained wrapped up in a single dominant *Vorstellungsart*, he would be unable to criticize his work adequately, unable perhaps even to conceive that there might be something lacking from his understanding of nature" (1988, p. 95).

Sepper defined *Bildung* as, “The formation of human beings in the fullest sense” (1988, p.191). Klaus Prange, noting that the term *Bildung* covers many things and has not got a very clear definition, claimed, “This is a nightmare to anyone who subscribes to the rigors of scientific correctness” (2004, p. 502). There is an important difference between *Bildung* and the Enlightenment education as discussed by Zajonc. Educators who endorse a reified idea of an already discovered world may prefer the educational prescriptions of Enlightenment *Philosophes* to education for *Bildung*. Education for *Bildung* requires students to create knowledge and cultivate their faculties. *Bildung* provides an alternative for democratic educators who seek to cultivate autonomy in students.

Prange claimed *Bildung* can “bridge the gap between the scientific approach to and the social function of education” (2004, p. 502). This means education can transmit to students the discoveries of science, yet also allow students the freedom to both discover and create their social world. From an Enlightenment perspective, transmitting discovered knowledge is the purpose of education, yet Prange claimed, “*Bildung* is a value in itself” (2004, p. 503). In order to illustrate the value of *Bildung*, Prange used an analogy between modern art and education. He noted, “In authoritarian societies we ... find a genuine distrust of and antagonism to modern art” (2004, p. 508). He further claimed, “Modern art seems to be incompatible with the regime of a closed society. It does not provide a place, to put it paradoxically, for the relevance of irrelevance” (2004, p. 508). Prange utilized the analogy between modern art and education in order to illustrate the value of *Bildung*:

The very existence of an alternative to the network of functions is proof of that which is beyond planning and faithful obedience to the imperatives of the social system, beyond instruction and direct schooling, a proof of *paideia* and *Bildung*. They are the perennial alternative paradigm to the ruling paradigm of the day. (2004, p. 508)

Bildung is a distinct alternative to an Enlightenment idea of education as discussed by Zajonc. Just as modern art provides a perennial alternative to the expressions of a society, *Bildung* education requires alternative perspectives to the dominant educational perspective of the society. Numerous writers have claimed Goethe endorsed *Bildung* education in *Faust*. Commentators such as Hendel, Harold Stein Jantz, Eda Sagarra, Peter Skrine, and Frederick Ungar have explicitly identified *Faust* as a work toward *Bildung*.⁴ Commentators such as Alan P. Cottrell, Lisolette Dieckmann, and Forrest Williams have implied that *Faust* was a work toward *Bildung*.

In *Goethe's Faust and Philosophy*, Charles W. Hendel claimed Goethe had “expressed throughout his work that comprehensive interest in the whole of existence and the true values of human life which also characterize the philosopher” (1949, p. 157). The motif Hendel emphasized was Goethe’s view of *Faust* as a model of *Bildung* education, which he juxtaposed to an Enlightenment model offered by *Encyclopedists*.

Hendel claimed Goethe agreed with Rousseau, Buffon, and Montesquieu that the natural world operated according to natural laws and is thus objectively verifiable even from various perspectives. However, Hendel pointed out Goethe emphasized that in order to preserve human freedom, society cannot educate students to treat humans as objects in the natural world. Thus, as Montesquieu noted in the political realm, Buffon in the natural, and Rousseau in the social, humans must approach a subject without preconceived categories. For example, Hendel claimed, “Montesquieu first taught scholars to beware of reading their own motives, interests, and circumstances into those of different peoples in remote times and places- warned them not to see one pattern of life everywhere” (1949, p.159). Hendel introduced Buffon’s warning that the

⁴ I have limited my search to texts in English, but there are references to *Faust* and *Bildung* written in German.

researcher should “not assume, in advance of the evidence, that the phenomena of life would exhibit the same mechanical regularity as inanimate matter,” reminding the reader that “living nature was full of nuance and exhibited less fixity and repetition than the study of physical nature would lead one to expect” (1949, p. 160). With the recognition that only a *Bildung* model of education can adequately educate a student in the world of human affairs-political, social, and artistic- Hendel concluded *Faust* offered Goethe’s criticisms of schooling that did not educate for *Bildung*. There are three specific sections addressed in Hendel’s work that support this assertion.

Hendel introduced a quote from Faust at the beginning of the play: “Oh, that’s enough of it- philosophy, jurisprudence and medicine, . . . and here I am now, poor fool, no wiser than before, yet called Master, yes, even Doctor” (1949, p. 157). Hendel revealed Goethe’s idea that an educated person is not simply one who possesses knowledge gained from the thoughts of others or through books. Only an individual’s experience, without ready-made categories, can offer an apprehension from which *Bildung*, or development, can take place. In fact, Goethe is noted for his idea that science would benefit from the perspectives of non-scientists as well as “heretical” scientists because they would not have instilled in them pre-conceived categories.⁵

The second section of Hendel’s article that indicates Goethe was unsatisfied with educational practices that did not augment an education for *Bildung* is the section where Mephisto, in the guise of Faust as a professor, advised a young scholar to take a course in logic. Faust commented that such students, and indeed professors, may not themselves become “master-weavers of thought” but rely upon the words of others and upon logic. Further, Mephisto mocked metaphysics and deep thoughts by saying that where there is a lack of such

⁵ For a full explication of this idea that non-scientists could add to a more comprehensive scientific perspective see: Sepper, Dennis L. (1988). *Goethe contra Newton: Polemics and the project for a new science of color*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

thoughts, “a handsome word will do.” Mephisto then advised the scholar to study paragraph by paragraph so that “the master doesn’t say anything but what is written in the book” (Hendel, 1939, p. 158). An education of *Bildung*, as exemplified by the character Faust, requires that the student develop powers of apprehension rather than limit knowledge to what has already become known.

A third portion of Hendel’s work revealing his appreciation of Goethe’s commitment to *Bildung* is directed at Goethe’s understanding of human beings’ place in the universe. Hendel noted that a common understanding during the time in which Goethe lived was a mechanistic view of the universe, but Goethe held an organic view. Hendel said that for Goethe, “nature was no longer conceived as purely mechanical in its processes. The phenomena of life exhibited *purpose*, which is something very different than *cause*” (1939, p. 169). When Mephisto told the young scholar to learn logic and what is written in books, Hendel revealed Goethe’s preference to view humans as autonomous and not determined, meaning humans have freewill and thus make their own purposes.⁶ A pedagogy that does not recognize this will indoctrinate students in a particular “approved” core knowledge. A view of *Bildung* for education will allow individuals the freedom to determine their own path, and collectively, the path society will take.

Hendel highlighted the importance of *Bildung* so that students would be free to determine their own purpose without predetermined categories of thought imposed upon them. Jantz emphasized that this freedom lay in the development of the individual’s faculties and internal capacities of apprehension.

There are two main points Jantz introduced in support of *Faust* as an example of education for *Bildung*. The first is Jantz’s recognition that Goethe thought individuals ought to cultivate as

⁶ For an explication of this idea, see John Dewey’s *Experience and Education*, specifically chapter six, “The Meaning of Purpose.”

many of their internal powers and faculties as possible. The second is Goethe's treatment of his characters Wagner in *Faust* and Wilhelm in *Wilhelm Meister* and how they differ from the treatment of the Faust character in *Faust*.

Jantz, echoing Goethe's sentiments, said, "The chief duty of man is to develop himself into as full and perfect a microcosm as his natural endowments and powers will permit" (1951, p. 132). Jantz quoted Goethe: "If I had not already carried the world in myself by anticipation, I would have remained blind with seeing eyes" (1951, pp. 10-11). Jantz interpreted this as a variant of the idea of correspondence between the microcosm and the macrocosm, where man is the microcosm and the universe is the macrocosm. Goethe recognized that the world a student is likely to understand is only as comprehensive as the world that student carries within. In other words, whenever particular faculties for apprehending the world are unavailable, those aspects of the world analogous to those faculties will be lost to that student. For example, if individuals are blind, then the visible world will be unavailable to them through sight. And if individuals' visual worlds are limited after birth, those individuals may have limited vision for the rest of their lives, regardless of later exposure to visual stimuli. Another example might be that a person with a mechanistic view of the universe might be less inclined to either accept or even apprehend certain metaphysical theories or perspectives. The important point is not which particular faculties remain undeveloped, but rather, that particular faculties may remain undeveloped or underdeveloped if an external set of categories is imposed on students and which limit their experiences.

The cultivation of internal faculties can be viewed in opposition to the Enlightenment model discussed by Zajonc which is aimed at overlaying a "social pattern on human reality" (Jantz, 1951, p. 133). Rather than conforming to any imposed external pattern of social behavior,

world view, or ontology, an education for *Bildung* emphasizes that individuals cultivate their own powers of apprehension of society, world view, and ontology. Goethe viewed the collection of these views as the perpetual apprehension of nature and as the goal of science. Where an education for *Bildung* can lead to multiple perspectives, Goethe saw the education of his day- the enlightenment project of education discussed by Zajonc- as being limited. Jantz offered evidence of Goethe's views through an analysis of the characters Wagner, Wilhelm, and Faust.

Jantz interpreted Goethe's attitude toward Wagner: "Faust's derogatory remarks, show clearly that Goethe envisioned him as the typical scholar of the Renaissance for whom the sacred source was an old manuscript and the chief end of learning was to issue a critical edition of some Greek or Roman work in which he could annotate every word with every shred of pertinent and impertinent learning at his command" (1951, pp. 20-21). Wagner deferred to past knowledge with preconceived categories rather than relying on his own apprehension and understanding.

In the more contemporary setting of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, the main character Wilhelm is "educated in and for society" where the reader sees "him and his associates developing even beyond their Enlightenment social-minded aristocracy to the initiation of a great experiment in industrial democracy on American soil, with themselves as equals among other workers" (Jantz, 1951, p. 130). The development of these characters shows that Goethe recognized changes throughout history may be met best by an education that allows for individual growth along with the external changes, rather than imposing past categories on the new world. Jantz summed up *Wilhelm Meister* and compared it to *Faust*:

The complex of basic assumptions and motivations then is something like this: being a useful member of society is the highest ideal; achieving some work which receives social recognition is the highest glory; helping to reform or establish a society in which harmonious mutual adjustment is possible, in a carefully balanced reciprocity between the individual and the group, that is the ultimate exalted effort in which a human being can engage.

If we measure *Faust* against these criteria, we can observe an almost total discrepancy. Only the ending is in essential harmony.... There is then an entirely different way, from very different assumptions, toward much the same end. (1951, pp. 130-131)

While an imposition of preconceived categories of thought can lead to harmony in society, it will not allow for individual freedom. In both *Wilhelm Meister* and *Faust*, the main characters lived in different historical settings, each with its own political, social, and cultural influences. Yet both characters developed according to his respective surroundings; each character cultivated whatever traits were appropriate to meet their respective needs.

Jantz, in his concluding observations, summarized Goethe's view of the Faust character:

It is thus Faust's duty to expand his understanding by the full range of experiences attainable to man, and not to desist from his studies in the great university of the world until he has such a practical and well-rounded comprehension of the laws of life and the cosmos that he feels a spontaneous inner urge to participate in the act of creation on its own terms. (This basis for action is quite unlike the theoretical constructions of an idealist visionary, whose efforts to foist his artificial social pattern on human reality can lead only to the misery and degradation of mankind.). (1951, p. 133)

Wagner represented individuals who deferred to an education focusing on the acquisition of preconceived thoughts. Wilhelm and Faust represented characters whose development was the product of their own free choices, made in accordance with the changes they had experienced. Through the comparison of Wagner, Wilhelm, and Faust, Jantz showed the importance of *Bildung* education to Goethe, and Goethe's opposition to an Enlightenment model discussed by Zajonc.

Sagarra and Skrine (1997) and Ungar (1963) also saw similarities with respect to *Bildung* in *Faust* and *Wilhelm Meister*. Sagarra and Skrine noted that attempts to analyze *Faust* have been many, but "in some periods critics have preferred to see it as a unified presentation of its protagonist's journey through life, in line with Goethe's conception of the *Bildungsroman* as exemplified by his *Wilhelm Meister*" (1997, p. 84). Ungar said of Goethe:

His autobiographical writings, his letters and recorded conversations are filled with observations on this central problem of what the Germans call *Bildung*. More than that, his *Faust*, his two *Wilhelm Meister* novels, his *Elective Affinities* are built entirely around the question of the ethical growth of the leading characters. *Bildung* is a term that cannot be readily translated into English with a single word. To Goethe it implied the shaping of man's God-given endowments of mind and character- God being equivalent to nature-together with the sum total of his successful efforts to use them.

Yet *Bildung*, the conscious planned forming of character and spirit, must not be taken to mean that error and transgression are avoidable in the life of man. (1963, pp. 6-7)

Many writers have made indirect references to parts of *Faust* that further reveal it as an example of *Bildung*. Three such writers are Cottrell, Dieckmann, and Williams.

Cottrell said in *Faust*, "Goethe's message was not mechanical but organic and developmental ..." (1979, p. 3). Dieckmann commented on the character Faust, late in the plot in the emperor's court: "Whereas Faust seems to have degenerated morally, at the same time he has in some ways developed" (1972, p. 55). Williams claimed that "the Faustian struggle is not one of sense versus intellect, nor is it the struggle of ego versus non-ego...but the effort of man...to realize his person *in* and *with* an objective context" (1953, p. 396). All of these writers have noted the human development of the character Faust throughout the play. Human development is characteristic of an education for *Bildung*.

I have established *Faust* as an example of *Bildung* education. Because an education for a democratic citizen requires the cultivation of autonomy, community, and an ability to deliberate, and not merely the imposition of rules of conduct, an education for *Bildung* is best suited for developing a democratic citizen. My next task is to discern the elements of *Bildung* education in *Faust* that specifically refer to the elements of an education for a democratic citizen. The three components I have identified for the cultivation of democratic citizens are autonomy, community, and deliberation. In the next three sections I will discuss works that show how each of these components is present in *Faust*.

Autonomy in *Faust*

The element of autonomy in an education for democracy implies that an individual exhibits human agency.⁷ While it is almost unanimously agreed upon that human beings are constrained physically by the laws of the material universe, that is, physical laws, there is less consensus that human beings can be autonomous in their actions in the non-material world such as the psychological, social, and political realms. Social science itself is an endeavor to subsume the actions of human beings under rules. An education for *Bildung* can cultivate the habits necessary for an individual to become autonomous in the non-material world and thus make that individual capable of being a democratic actor.

A small minority of *Faust* commentators concluded Goethe was opposed to autonomy in favor of external constraints on the actions of human beings. For example, Daniel W. Wilson argued that Goethe was on the side of law and order as opposed to being an idealized model democratic citizen (1999). Other scholars have discussed autonomy in *Faust* in relation to the natural or physical world, and many have discussed the theme of autonomy in *Faust* in a social and political or cultural context.

Albert Schweitzer said that Goethe praised Kant for his claim, “Nature like art is not determined by final causes, and that both are creative” (1961, p. 107). This creativity can be viewed as an expression of autonomy. In order to preserve this creativity and thus autonomy, Peter Salm declared, “Goethe fought long and hard against the application of logical and mathematical categories to living nature.” (1971, p. 133). With the rise of science in the view of the Enlightenment, this “creativity” in nature was in danger of being subsumed under natural

⁷ According to Barber, “Radically isolated individuals are autonomous individuals, capable of voluntary choice and thus capable of self-government; they are ratiocinative and thus able to envision and choose among commensurable options; and they are psychologically interchangeable, which trait provides the egalitarian base upon which democracy rests” (1984, p. 76).

laws. Goethe warned against allowing this view of nature to be applied to human beings. Alan P. Cottrell claimed, “Reductionistic thinking fails to rise methodologically to the challenge of the role of intentionality, with the result that the activity of the mind is seen to be an epiphenomenon of physiology” (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998, p. 269). If the mind is seen as an epiphenomenon of physiology, then physical laws may govern it, thus removing autonomy. Cottrell concluded, “Goethe holds the view that modern human beings must systematically work toward increasing freedom and self-determination” (Seamon & Zajonc, 1998, p. 273). Goethe endorsed the idea of cultivating autonomy, and illustrated this point in the actions of his characters in *Faust*.

Hendel offered an example of how Goethe utilized the character Mephisto in order to illustrate the point that educators often attempt to apply laws to human actions. Mephisto disguised himself as Faust in order to address a student. The character Faust looked on at this “ironical picture of himself and the life of the Doctor.” Mephisto, in the guise of Faust, then lectured the student about courses in logic and systematic thinking. In Mephisto’s words, “See how the philosopher steps into class and proves to you that it *must* be so. ... That’s what the scholars in all places prize so highly!” (Hendel, 1949, p. 158). Mephisto here is portraying a scholar who searched for knowledge of human actions that followed logic and laws. These words indicate the dichotomy between the natural world, where processes are determined by laws, and that which lies within the human world, where autonomy may reign. Goethe’s choice of this exchange between Mephisto (disguised as Faust) and a young scholar indicates that Goethe was concerned with the effects of an education that fails to separate these two realms. Where “laws” and logic are the epistemic ground for action, autonomy may be called into question.

Barnard considered the dangers of a human belief that all acts in the world can be subsumed under a set of laws. He warned against “following Goethe’s *Faust- Titanism*, the

danger, to wit, of mistaking a belief in human agency for a belief in unlimited mastery” (1981, p. 302). Barnard explained, “The very same science which feeds man’s pride in his achievements at the same time undermines his self-conscious autonomy; for, paradoxically perhaps, a man’s sense of mastery over nature derives from the same source which treats him, the master, as a mere product of causal processes” (1981, p. 302). Goethe fought against the idea that the power human beings have gained through finding causal relationships in the natural world could also be utilized to place human actions under a set of laws.

Goethe warned that laws of nature cannot be applied to human actions. Further, even nature itself was capable, in Goethe’s eyes, of creativity, thus the application of our discovered “laws” to the activity of natural processes should remain open to change. In the world of human actions, that is, culture, Goethe was at least equally vocal about the presence and value of autonomy.

Autonomy in the cultural world includes the psychological, social, political, and anthropological. The important aspect of each of these expressions of human beings is that they were not determined, although certainly influenced, by their conditions. None of these expressions of human beings obeys social laws, therefore human behavior is not strictly predictable. However, human behavior may follow patterns due to the influence of their respective historical environments. Still, human behavior in the social world remains autonomous. The value Goethe placed on autonomy in *Faust* was noted by Cottrell, who claimed that “*Faust* above all other poems depicts the struggles of modern western man for spiritual autonomy and self-determination” (1979, p. 3).

Michael Roth illustrated the importance of self determination in Part II of *Faust* where Faust is about to journey back in time to 48 B.C. The destination is Pharsalus, the site of the

battle between Caesar and Pompey. As this battle is “sometimes taken to mark the end of the ancient tradition of freedom,” the reader is oriented to Mephisto’s interpretation of the scene: “No more! That privilege I gladly waive, of hearing about tyrant versus slave They fight, they say, dear freedom’s cause to save; but seen more clearly, slave is fighting slave” (Roth, 1994, p. 107). According to Roth, “Goethe establishes the importance of the theme of freedom at the outset of the Greek journey. Faust eventually takes on the role of sovereign ruler in his quest,” although “he has heretofore found it so difficult to learn how ‘to rule his inner self’” (1994, p. 107). Roth concluded, “Goethe presents Faust as achieving true freedom by learning to curb his selfish impulses in favor of the common good of society” (1994, p. 113). Mephisto had claimed slave was fighting slave, which is to say, one was a slave to an empire but the other a slave to his own desires. This curbing of our desires can be called self-control, an important component of autonomy. The issues of freedom and autonomy are present in numerous other scenes from *Faust*.

Mcgrath claimed, “The interrelated issues of freedom and authority are prominently announced in Act II of *Faust Two*” (In Roth, 1994, p. 106). Mcgrath summed up the movement through each of three scenes: “In terms of freedom and authority, the movement is from the presentation of Helen as the representation of authority under challenge, to the synthesis of freedom and authority symbolized by the marriage of Faust and Helen, to the loss of balance and restraint expressed by the wild freedom of Euphorion” (In Roth, 1994, p. 107). Mcgrath made the point that autonomy lay neither in unrestrained licentious liberty, nor in compliance. He concurred with Roth, claiming self-control is a prominent theme in *Faust*.

For Goethe, self-control and autonomy were valuable in the development of the human being, and therefore were important components of an education for *Bildung*. I.H. Shafer

recognized the value of autonomy, “Faust is a true hero. He is in control” (2005, p. 906). In the final scene of *Faust*, Shafer noted that Faust was triumphant because he had “a vision of a future world populated by a free people” (2005, p. 907).

The exercise of autonomy may be dangerous as well as beneficial. Faust’s development throughout the play is not always for his betterment; it is not always positive development. As highlighted by Jantz, “The potentiality of man...rising upward toward divinity...has its necessary complement in the potentiality of man to sink lower than the animals. Such are the implications of man’s freedom, man’s freedom of choice” (1978, p. 111). The journey of Faust throughout the play was fraught with negative acts, which illustrates Goethe’s contention that autonomy leaves human actions in the hands of the individual, and does not necessarily lead to positive development.

While not all *Faust* commentators have recognized Goethe’s focus on autonomy, several authors have provided ample evidence that the theme of autonomy was for Goethe part of the development of the human being in terms of *Bildung*. Autonomy also constitutes an important element in an education toward a democratic citizenry.

Community in *Faust*

Several authors have examined the theme of community in *Faust*. I have included authors who present Faust’s changing views on community over the course of the play. This development of Faust’s relation to community represent Goethe’s view on the role of community in the development of a human being, and can represent the importance of community in an education for a democratic citizen.

At the beginning of the play, Faust was contemplating his work and life and wondering what direction to take; he even considered committing suicide. Hagen and Mahlendorf asserted, “Faust’s dilemma, to choose what self he is to become, is every man’s dilemma” (1963, p. 475).

This assertion set up *Faust* as an exemplar for the theme of human development, or *Bildung*. Faust's development can be noted from his state at the start of the play through its conclusion.

Hagen and Mahlendorf asked, "What kind of man is Faust at the beginning of the play? We are confronted with the portrayal of a man dedicated to knowledge and to the scholarly life. His commitment to this way of life is itself an expression of his commitment to the community and of his deep concern for others" (1963, p. 475). Not all scholars exhibit a commitment to community, but Hagen and Mahlendorf saw Faust's dedication to scholarship as a commitment to community in at least a nascent form.

Hagen and Mahlendorf then highlighted some development in Faust's thinking. They claimed, "Faust's anxiety about his work passes into concern: the work ceases to be an end in itself, it becomes a means in the service of a community in which Faust desires to participate as an equal. Faust resigns himself to human concern, to an interest in others, he commits himself to the community of man," where, "concern means active participation of the individual in the life of the community" (1963, p. 480). Faust's earlier commitment "did not involve his basic humanity, but merely his intellect" (1963, p. 480). Hagen and Mahlendorf noted that speaking the words of the wager⁸ "marks Faust's final commitment" (1963, p. 480). By the end of the play, "Faust now is willing to sacrifice his life in commitment to the community" (Hagen & Mahlendorf, 1963, p. 480). Hagen and Mahlendorf have illustrated the development of Faust, first from considering his commitment to community to be confined to his research and teaching, finally to a commitment of his entire life. They concluded, "Only action, deliberate and intelligent, committed to the community has redemptive power (we should notice here again that

⁸ When Faust thinks that his land reclamation project is about to be completed, he utters the words for the moment to tarry: "With free men on free ground their freedom share. Then, to the moment I might say: Abide, you are so fair! ... I now enjoy the highest moment" (Kaufmann, trans., 1961, p. 469). Faust's desire for the moment to abide stems from his belief that his great effort and sacrifice has resulted in sustainable land on which a community may develop and thrive. Faust died after his efforts had been spent on the project; he had given his life for it.

the community is inseparable from the self)” (Hagen & Mahlendorf, 1963, p. 481). The development of Faust’s commitment to the community in turn benefited Faust as an individual. His efforts throughout his life and at the last moment had brought him to a higher state where he was not subject to Mephisto’s power. Faust had been redeemed by his own efforts.

The recognition of this relation between development of commitment to the community and personal redemption was also noted by Frank Horvay, who expressed Goethe’s view of the importance of commitment to community. He stated that Faust “toils for a better life for all the people” (1970, p. 80). As the play developed, Faust had an “increased recognition of responsibility to society” (Horvay, 1970, p. 82). Horvay echoed Hagen and Mahlendorf in the recognition of the development of Faust’s increased commitment to community over the course of the play. By the end of the play, “by showing in his deeds an increasing social responsibility, culminating in a gigantic project for humanity, Faust inadvertently works for his own redemption” (Horvay, 1970, p. 86). The last line of Horvay’s article demonstrated his recognition that a commitment to others in a community was important in *Faust*: “Love, by us mortals, must be expressed by a commitment for others and in deeds” (1970, p. 87). Hagen, Mahlendorf and Horvay have provided evidence that Faust’s commitment to community increased over the course of the play. An examination of Faust’s commitment to community near the end of the play will show the extent of this development, and may reveal Goethe’s desired goal for this aspect of *Bildung*.

Hendel discussed Faust’s development as an individual over the course of the play. He then noted Faust’s eventual recognition of his own power, claiming, “This power in the end is not to manifest itself as a power against others but as one harmonious with others’ natures and strivings” (Hendel, 1949, p. 166). Hendel here showed the importance of development of

individuals and the value of their commitment to each other in a community. Hendel's discussion of Faust's final scene on earth summed up this point.

Faust had had numerous experiences on earth where he had acted selfishly, exploited others, and even committed crimes. But over the course of the play his character had developed to a point where he was moved to act on the behalf of others. In his final scene on earth, Faust was waiting for a land reclamation project to be completed at the seashore so it could be utilized by a community of people. The goal of the project was to take land by the seashore and turn it into a viable community.⁹ The project had almost come to fruition when Faust was about to utter his wish for the moment to tarry. He thought that his land reclamation project was about to be completed so he was not only happy, but satisfied with his work. It was this sense of satisfaction with a moment of earthly existence that was supposed to allow Mephisto to take Faust's soul, having won the wager set at the start of the play.¹⁰ Faust's desire for the moment to linger was due to his thought that this new village would be a functioning community when the project was completed.

Hendel recognized that Faust's development over the course of the play was due to his constant striving to reach beyond the limitations of his finite, material existence. Hendel noted Faust's development concerning an individual's relation to community, and that it was the result of Faust's striving throughout the play. Hendel claimed, "The Faustian life-motif of striving realizes itself in this wisdom of the final moment when man contemplates himself as one with all

⁹ Baucis described the beginning of the project of reclaiming land from the sea: "Pick and shovel, stroke for stroke; Where the flames would nightly swarm, Was a dam when we awoke. Human sacrifices bled, Tortured yells would pierce the night, And where blazes seaward sped A canal would greet the light. (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 435-437). Faust desired even more: "This marshland I hope yet to drain, And thus surpass what we achieved. For many millions I shall open regions to dwell" (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 435-437).

¹⁰ Faust declared to Mephisto: "If ever I recline, calmed, on a bed of sloth, you may destroy me then and there," and later, "If to the moment I should say: Abide, you are so fair- Put me in fetters that day. I *wish* to perish then I swear" (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 183-185).

humanity” (1949, p. 166). This realization at the final moment of development for Faust can be examined in light of Goethe’s thoughts about *Bildung*, specifically about a human being’s relation to community. Goethe’s endorsement of *Bildung* in its manifold aspects is revealed by Schaefer’s examination of Faust’s final scene on earth.

Schaefer claimed Faust was saved at the end of the book “by wedding love for humanity to scientific rationality. When the moment of satisfaction finally arrives, it is a moment of altruistic concern, of a vision of a future world populated by a free people engaged in fruitful labor, realizing themselves” (2005, p. 907). Schaefer showed *Bildung* involved striving toward individual fulfillment while being committed to community. Faust had been committed to scientific research and scholarly activity early in his career, and continued to develop beyond these commitments over the course of his lifetime. His development was the result of striving to excel beyond the social and historical conditions of his time. Rather than become the product of his conditioning, Faust aspired to reach a state analogous to the macrocosm, beyond immediate social and temporal conditions. Since Faust was embedded in his social and temporal state due to his humanity, the closest he came was to create a state that was analogous to the macrocosm and beyond the immediate social and temporal conditions- a community that would live on beyond his own lifetime. The culmination of Faust’s strivings over the course of his life was Faust’s recognition of his contributions to his community, and to all of humanity, by completing his land reclamation project. According to scholars, Goethe thought the development of an individual’s commitment to community was an important part of an education for *Bildung*. This commitment to community is also a main component in an education of a democratic citizen.

Deliberation in *Faust*

A number of prominent authors have addressed the theme of deliberation in Goethe's *Faust*. Deliberation is exemplified in myriad aspects of Faust's life, each a part of his *Bildung* education. Faust's development involved harmonizing these myriad parts of his life to make sense of his world and find purpose. The ability to maintain autonomy and the integrity of a community can be achieved through deliberation.

Hendel recognized that Goethe saw individual salvation was to be attained through striving. He compared this to Spinoza's idea that effort or power can help a person understand his world and make sense of "confused ideas and purposes" (1949, p. 165). In explaining Spinoza's idea Hendel illuminated Goethe's position, "When that is attained man is no longer determined simply by external forces...then man is free, without internal conflicts of motive and without conflicts, too, between himself and other beings" (1949, p. 165). Individuals are autonomous when they are as free as possible from both external forces and internal conflicts. Autonomy can be gained through deliberation. It is important to recognize that deliberation is not an externally imposed structure on the individual by the community. Rather, as Jantz recognized in *Faust*, deliberation involves synthesis and is an element of *Bildung*:

The protagonist is a Renaissance man ... in the sense that he stands as the most vital and eloquent symbol of its distinctive and central drive: the will to all-inclusive synthesis- not the medieval synthesis of the *Summa* which subsumes everything to a pre-formed system and method, but a synthesis which allows everything to come together freely, finds its own level and natural integration, and gradually emerges out of a seeming confusion into a living, dynamic interrelation of forces and influences. This has a far greater claim to agreement with truth and reality than has the violent procrusteanism of any philosophic system. (1951, pp. 126-127)

Jantz saw deliberation at work, rather than an agreement of individuals according to an imposed system of thought. In a society with a variety of ideas, individuals could deliberate together in order to take collective action. Taking collective action does not require compliance with an

externally mandated decision. In fact, Goethe was explicitly opposed to any imposition of a static philosophic or scientific system of thought. The importance Goethe placed on including multiple *Vorstellungsarten*¹¹ in apprehending reality would preclude such an imposition, and invite deliberation.

The value Goethe placed on apprehending reality with multiple *Vorstellungsarten* through deliberation is noted in the summary of an abstract on Ulrich Gaier's chapter entitled "The Dialectic of Perceptual modes as a Principle in Goethe's *Faust*."¹² The abstract stated, "Goethe recognized that conflicting philosophical systems and conceptual modes inform an individual's thinking" (Gaier, as cited in Brown, Lee, & Saine, Eds., 1994 p. 158). One specific example of the importance of multiple *Vorstellungsarten*, informing deliberation, is highlighted by Gaier in "Prelude in the Theater":

Goethe adapts this insight to his play: three figures advocate three different and often mutually exclusive positions concerning the constitution, production, and reception of text. . . . The poetics of the scene are programmatic for a reading of the entire *Faust* text: because no single interpretation can ever be sufficient to comprehension, multiple readings, especially mutually exclusive ones, are the best means to understanding the text. (Brown, Lee, & Saine, 1994)

Deliberation involving multiple *Vorstellungsarten* can also be viewed in the dialectical processes of several characters in *Faust*.

Lisolette Dieckmann claimed, "From the overall viewpoint of the work, the alternation between Homunculus' desire to become man and Faust's desire to become myth is as essential a dialectical process as Faust's own ups and downs. It is another side of the Faust outlook, which demands that different realms of human experience cross-fertilize" (1972, p. 63). This cross-

¹¹ See footnote #4: *Vorstellungsarten* are the "ways of conceiving things," as Goethe had considered that "there are manifold legitimate ways of conceiving things" (Sepper, 1988, p. 91).

¹² The article abstract and summary are translated from the German: "Dialektik der Vorstellungsarten als Prinzip in Goethes *Faust*," (pp 158-171).

fertilization is part of deliberation. A goal of deliberation is to act so that either an individual or a community can integrate disparate elements into a coherent and unified whole. A lack of deliberation may lead to conflict among members of a community due to lack of communication. Individuals who do not coordinate their actions with their values may become stressed. Individuals might find it difficult to achieve a goal if they have conflicting elements in their life, or their actions are inconsistent with their values, just as a community might find it difficult to reach a goal if different members of the community work against each other. Individuals can simply obey an external authority and deny their autonomy, just as a community might simply defer to an external authority. In either case, a goal would be easier to reach without the conflict, but the goal would have been imposed and not freely chosen. Goethe's goal was harmony in action but without imposition from external sources such as social systems and natural laws. Goethe revealed *Bildung* in *Faust*, including the synthesis of scientific research and individual apprehension. *Bildung* education implies the synthesis of all elements in an individual's life working harmoniously toward a purpose.

Salm explained, "Certain resemblances between Goethe's natural science and his poetry have long been taken for granted." He continued, "Of Goethe's works, *Faust* offers by far the richest possibilities ...; a kind of 'unified field theory' might be the final goal" (1971, pp. 18-19).¹³ Salm claimed, "The quest for organic unity gave a decisive character to Goethe's early intellectual and emotional life. He sought to reconcile opposites in the phenomenological realm as well as in mutually exclusive modes of thought" (1971, pp. 18-19). Salm admonished readers that we, too, may respond "to the *Faust* poem with all our faculties, rather than forcing our

¹³ The search in physics for a theory that incorporates and explains the laws governing seemingly disparate aspects of nature is often referred to as a "unified field theory." The term is used by Salm as a metaphor to explain that he views *Faust* as a unification of seemingly disparate aspects of man, specifically theories of natural science and the expressions of poetry.

sympathetic vibrations through the selective filter of a rigorous cerebral and syllogistic analysis,” since “Goethe fought long and hard against the application of logical and mathematical categories to living nature” (1971, p. 133). Salm recognized *Faust* as an example of the unification of many seemingly disparate elements of man working together toward his development. Rather than compartmentalizing each modality of apprehension, individuals can harmonize each perspective and expression so a comprehensive view of reality is formed. Rather than viewing each aspect of their lives as conflicting with other aspects, individuals can learn to view all perspectives and expressions as having a common source. Salm emphasized *Faust* was a play which showed that seemingly disparate aspects of an individual can be reconciled as actions toward a single purpose. Throughout the play numerous seemingly disparate aspects of Faust were reconciled through deliberation working toward an overall *Bildung* education and an education for a democratic citizen.

Synthesis

Numerous scholars have identified autonomy, community, and deliberation individually as components of democratic education. Other scholars have identified in *Faust* each of these components as part of *Bildung* education. However, none of these scholars has utilized an analysis of these three specific components of democratic education in *Faust* to show their relation to each other and their prominence in an education for a democratic citizen. In *Faust*, Goethe incorporated autonomy, community, and deliberation as components of *Bildung* toward educating individuals in becoming democratic citizens.

With an understanding of how autonomy, community, and deliberation function in the life of a democratic actor, educators and legislators may develop an alternative type of education to one influenced by legislation such as NCLB. Such an alternative education may reveal practices required to exercise in students habits aligned with democratic principles. This

alternative education extracted from Goethe's *Faust* might help ameliorate negative conditions in education and society that critics have claimed are the result of NCLB. Rather than compliance, it may facilitate autonomy. Rather than competition, it may facilitate community. And rather than delivering an approved core of accepted knowledge, it may facilitate deliberation toward a democratic decision. Thus, *Faust* can offer to educators and legislators principles of education that can develop democratic citizens in a manner not presently employed by educators in compliance with NCLB.

Scholars revealed that Goethe's *Faust* is an excellent source for viewing components of democratic education in an organic and unified whole represented by the life of the character Faust. Autonomy is a main feature of *Bildung* education, and there is evidence to show autonomy, a key feature of democratic education, is expressed in *Faust*. The authors cited have shown that, in Goethe's view, human beings may be materially determined by physical laws, but the actions of a human being are not determined by these laws. Further, human beings may be conditioned to act in certain ways by their circumstances, but they are capable of making their own decisions. As scholars have made clear, Goethe opposed the application of logical and mathematical categories to human decisions. Further, Goethe warned against reductionism applied to human beings in the social realm. Goethe claimed cultivated individuals are free to choose their own purposes; cultivated individuals are autonomous. Having autonomy to make one's own decisions is a key component of democratic education.

Scholars cited herein have also provided evidence that being part of a community is a major component of *Bildung* education. Scholars of democratic education have said being part of a community is also a key element in an education for a democratic citizen.¹⁴ At the beginning of

¹⁴ See Dewey (1938, 1916); Barber (1996, 1984); and Gutmann (1987).

the play, Faust reflected on his life as a scholar. This life could already be seen as a commitment to community, yet over the course of the play, Faust found that increased internal development coincided with an increased attention and service to community. The final scene of Faust on earth shows him about to express his desire for the moment to linger, because he had finally had a moment of satisfaction. The event that brought this moment of satisfaction was Faust's perception that his land reclamation project had been completed, and that the community would be able to sustain itself out of formerly unusable land. Scholars noted that Goethe saw the desire to meet the needs of the community as a sign of a far more developed human being than the life of a simple scholar like Faust was at the start of the play. Being a member of an organic and unified community is also a key element of education for a democratic citizen.

The theme of *Bildung* throughout *Faust* includes deliberation as a mechanism for transforming students. This deliberation is also the third major element of an education for a democratic citizen. Scholars have shown that Faust had numerous conflicting motivations throughout the play, and a number of other characters in the play had their respective motivations. A major example provided was the distinct motivations of the Director, Clown, and Poet in the "Prelude in the Theatre." Goethe showed that the presence of multiple *Vorstellungsarten* could yield a unified whole- the three characters together were necessary to enact a play. This prelude was noted as a foreshadowing of the entire *Faust* story, and could be viewed as a microcosm of the play. *Faust* scholars have also noted development in other characters through deliberation.

A clear exemplar of development through a dialectical process is Faust himself. Faust began the play contemplating his life as a scholar and considering committing suicide. The play ended with Faust, after a lifetime of changes, committing himself to the service of his

community. His development was the result of his numerous dialectical exchanges with Mephisto over what actions he ought to take. Mephisto continuously offered choices, and Faust had to debate which actions would best suit his purposes. Faust's deliberations with Mephisto, other characters, and even himself, all helped to cultivate Faust's character.

Orientation

Scholars provide a context within which I will analyze the concepts of autonomy, community, and deliberation in *Faust*. *Faust* has been identified as a work of *Bildung* education. *Bildung* implies the cultivation of a human being. Goethe showed the value of autonomy, community, and deliberation in the cultivation of Faust and other characters throughout the play. I will identify in *Faust* examples of how autonomy, community, and deliberation inform *Bildung* education. I will then illustrate how they relate to each other and work together in the cultivation of a human being toward becoming a democratic actor.

Goethe's *Faust* could be viewed as a syncretism in the sense that it attempts to combine disparate elements of the character Faust. Faust was a scholar, he explored alchemy, made a deal with Mephisto, allied himself with an emperor in a battle, embraced and lived according to the mores and values of ancient cultures, fell in love, and found redemption in autonomous striving for the benefit of his community. He attempted to learn about life from as many perspectives as possible, and as he experienced each perspective he transformed into a more autonomous actor with a broader vision.

I have chosen to study *Faust* because it shows the process of Faust's transformation through a *Bildung* education. Faust transformed into an autonomous actor who desired the well-being of his community. He grew to respect the autonomy of others with whom he engaged in deliberation rather than enforcing his will through power. Faust's transformation is analogous to the development of democratic actors.

Goethe scholars have found elements of democratic education in *Faust*, although many of them have not identified these elements specifically as democratic principles. Cottrell, Hendel and Barnard have identified and analyzed the theme of autonomy in *Faust*. Hagen and Mahlendorf, Hendel, and Schaefer identified and analyzed community. Hendel, Jantz, Gaier, Dieckmann, and Salm saw deliberation as a mechanism for transformation from individual centered to community. Williams and Jantz recognized in *Faust* a unified work in the sense that it attempted to encompass multiple philosophies and ideologies. Through multiple epistemologies, more than one ontology can be apprehended.

Most Goethe scholars studying *Faust* have identified and analyzed particular elements according to their respective theoretical lenses. Scholars cited herein have viewed *Faust* through the lenses of the history of science, literary themes, and philosophy. I have chosen to view *Faust* in terms of *Bildung* education, specifically for the purpose of viewing the transformation of individuals into democratic citizens. My research differs from Goethe scholars studying *Faust* in two ways. First, I have chosen to focus on democratic education in *Faust*, unlike the *Faust* scholars cited. Second, I have chosen to view *Faust* as a work that unites the elements discussed by other scholars. While *Faust* scholars have discussed autonomy, community, and deliberation to various degrees, emphasizing different aspects, I will view all of the transformations of Faust in terms of his development into a democratic actor.

Democratic educators have identified constituent elements of democratic education. None of the scholars cited herein have done so in terms of the transformation of a character over a lifetime. I will identify in *Faust* the principles of democracy delineated by democratic educators, and view their development in the character Faust through his transformations. Democratic

educators can consider the entire process of individual development into a democratic citizen by seeing *Faust* through the lens I offer.

Dewey, Barber, Wolk, and Gutmann have identified autonomy, community, and deliberation as important components of democracy. I will analyze these concepts separately in order to show their respective roles in democracy. As each concept becomes clear, it will be easier to view how each contributes to democracy, and how the cultivation of each is germane to a democratic education.

Autonomy may be the fundamental component of democracy because it allows individuals to govern themselves. Without autonomy, individuals may be controlled by external forces such as their own impulses and desires, an influential crowd, or an autocratic leader. Exercising students in habits of autonomy may allow them the capacity to decide how to govern themselves as individuals, and how to govern their society. I will analyze autonomy first and in depth because it is a primary building block of a democratic community, and deliberation with autonomous individuals is more conducive to democracy than deliberation with individuals easily influenced by external forces.

After discussing autonomy, I will analyze community as a component of democracy. Autonomous individuals may have limited resources, perspectives, and knowledge. A collection of individuals may be able to offer to each other a great deal more knowledge than any could gather individually, thus increasing autonomy through increasing the number and type of possible choices available. In addition, individuals are not raised in a vacuum; the type of person one becomes is at least in part influenced by that person's environment. This means that one may be influenced in any number of ways by surrounding individuals. If these surrounding individuals form a community imparting democratic or otherwise beneficial values, the

individual will be influenced by those values. If an individual is reared in a community with less than beneficial values, the individual may be less capable of governing himself.

While autonomous individuals are fundamental components of democracy, an aggregate of autonomous individuals may be mutually supportive, increasing the autonomy of constituent members of the community. Perhaps it is equally important to cultivate a community that raises children to value autonomy and imparts values beneficial to individuals and society. I examine the relationship between community and democracy after analyzing autonomy because it appears that a more democratic community is a community populated with autonomous actors.

The process of distributing resources, and communicating perspectives and knowledge, can be either autocratic or democratic. The type of deliberation in society is crucial to maintaining democracy. Communication must allow each to consider the respective needs of others. I will examine types of deliberation to see which best facilitates autonomous individuals communicating for mutual benefit. Deliberation may be considered most democratic when it allows and replicates individual autonomy, facilitates communication in a communal spirit, and supports individuals in continuing to desire and work toward democratically arrived at decisions.

These three concepts are not discrete. Each is supported by the other two, and each in part requires the other two in order to become fully manifested. I have separated them for the point of analysis, but their interrelatedness may become clear when they are viewed as elements of a *Bildung* education. My primary goal in the next three chapters is to highlight the concept and importance of autonomy in democracy. My secondary goal is twofold. First, I will attempt to discern a community most efficacious at democratic governing. Second, I will attempt to discern a process of deliberation that is conducive to democracy.

CHAPTER 3 AUTONOMY

Introduction

Critics of NCLB claim it does not exercise habits necessary for students to become democratic actors. One delineated component of democratic education not fostered by NCLB is autonomy. If individuals lack autonomy, society is in danger of being governed by a collection of individuals' impulses and desires.¹ This can lead to anarchy. If individuals in a democracy consider exclusively their own needs, then society will be governed through the power of a potentially majority faction. A majority decision based upon a collection of individual needs may not reveal the will of the people as a democratic expression.² If individuals are uninformed about the needs of others or of their community, their decisions may be antagonistic to their community or detrimental to themselves.

Democracy can also include a mechanism to reflect changes in individual wills and in the will of the people as each individual becomes better informed. Understanding specific elements involved in developing and maintaining autonomy can help educators exercise students in the habits necessary for becoming democratic actors. In order to understand how autonomy informs education for democracy, I will examine constituent elements of autonomy as discerned by prominent political theorists.

¹ According to Barber, "Self-direction brings freedom only when the self is emancipated from mere impulses and appetite, when it is associated with intention and purposes that by their nature can only arise within the guiding limits of a society. To be unimpeded and infinitely mobile is not freedom but deracination" (1984, p. 100). "Deracination" implies alienation from culture, and "anarchy" implies lack of government producing order. Therefore, individuals guided by impulses and desires may lose the salutary benefits of government order, whether self-government or public government.

² A democracy where individuals vote their individual interests is analogous to Adam Smith's theory of *Laissez-Faire* economic theory where individuals buy what they think they need. In both cases, individual autonomy is expected but not necessarily present. Individuals may not know what they need or what they want. For example, individuals with addictions may desire something that is unhealthy, and thus purchase a product or vote for an issue that is not in their best interest.

Autonomy Defined

I have discerned three elements of autonomy from my analysis of the ideas of Dewey, Barber, Wolk, and Gutmann. Autonomy can be realized when individuals (a) have self-control over impulses and desires, (b) possess an ability to set their own purposes, and (c) engage in a reflective process to maintain these elements.³ An examination of these elements yields a serviceable definition of autonomy which I utilize in identifying autonomy in *Faust*. I chose these four theorists because each contributes an explanation of how important components of autonomy inform democratic education and help exercise students in habits of democratic action not addressed adequately by NCLB.

My reason for utilizing Dewey's ideas on democracy is that Dewey recognized individual and social aims of education are mutually supportive. He explained that individuals would learn best if their experiences in education related to their lives, and noted their personal development would enhance their material productivity and efficacy as democratic citizens. Dewey endorsed education where individuals worked together to satisfy social needs.

Dewey was clear that individuals cannot be autonomous unless they have developed self-control. The definition of autonomy I have delineated includes the criterion of self-control because democracy requires individuals to act toward a collective will, and this collective will is less likely to be determined without the deliberation of autonomous individuals in a community.

³ There are other important aspects of autonomy discussed by these theorists, but these other aspects are subordinate to the three I have culled. For example, gaining knowledge of available choices and increasing available choices are two aspects of autonomy that can increase the parameters of individual freedom. However, these aspects still rely upon individuals being free from the coercion of their impulses and desires. Further, individuals must be able to set their own purposes so they know which options would have value for them. Finally, individuals remain free through a perpetual process, which would have to be in place prior to acquiring knowledge or making choices.

Barber cautioned that individuals who do not maintain self-control may be subject to the manipulation of capitalists, and that this manipulation can undermine autonomy. If the habits formed in a capitalist society undermine autonomy, then these habits also undermine democracy. Murchland asked Elmer Johnson what Rousseau had to say to the Polish people when they asked for advice on how to structure their government.

Here is what he told them: “If your only wish is to become noisy, brilliant, and fearsome, and to influence the other peoples of Europe ... try to make money very necessary, in order to keep the people in a condition of great dependence; and with that end in view, encourage material luxury. In this way you will create a scheming, ardent, avid, ambitious, servile and knavish people.” (Murchland, 2000, pp. 76-77)

Barber added that citizens must communicate and deliberate so their decisions are not only mutually arrived at, but reflect their most current will. If this process is interrupted then some orthodoxy might replace a democratically arrived at collective will.

Wolk advocated classrooms where students communicate with others to create a full spectrum of knowledge, from moral to intellectual. He advocated classroom exercises necessary for students to form habits of democratic action, including deliberation which helps students avoid the tyranny of orthodoxy through inertia.

Gutmann discussed myriad forms of democratic education and concluded that individuals must have not only a voice in government, but must have the opportunity to create their government. The only necessary constraint in the form of government they might choose is that the government must not limit future choices. Each theorist has discerned important components of democratic education that I will examine to better understand the concept of autonomy examined in scenes from *Faust*.

Self-Control over Impulses and Desires

Dewey claimed, “The ideal aim of education is creation of the power of self-control” (1938, p. 64). He explained that while external freedom is necessary to carry out our chosen

purposes, “The mere removal of external control is no guarantee for the production of self-control” (1938, p. 64). He added, “To find one’s conduct dictated by immediate whim and caprice . . . has at most only the illusion of freedom” (Dewey, 1938, pp. 64-65).

Dewey identified freedom as the “power to frame purposes and to execute or carry into effect purposes so framed.” He said, “Such freedom is in turn identical with self-control. Plato once defined a slave as the person who executes the purposes of another, and, as has just been said, a person is also a slave who is enslaved to his own blind desire” (Dewey, 1938, p. 67).

Dewey expressed that individuals who act solely upon their impulses and desires do not exhibit self-control and are not autonomous.

Barber maintained that autonomy can only be exhibited with the subordination of individuals’ impulses and desires to their thoughts and independent judgment. Barber, observing the relation between capitalism and democracy, claimed “Capitalism needs consumers susceptible to the shaping of their needs and the manipulation of their wants” (Murchland, 2000, p. 33). Barber claimed that if the consumers’ own impulses and desires can be manipulated by capitalists, then their decisions are not autonomous. If NCLB does not foster autonomy to gain control over impulses and desires, then individuals become a slave, as defined by Plato, to advertisers who manipulate their impulses and desires.

Ability To Set One’s Own Purposes

Wolk advocated classrooms where individuals are seen as “important creators of ideas and knowledge” (1998, p. 78) and whose structure and operations reflect democratic praxis.⁴ He endorsed classroom management that involved individuals in democratic practices, and noted the importance of allowing individuals to create knowledge and ideas.

⁴ “*Praxis* is an important word in both democratic schooling and reflective thinking. It is the combination of theory, reflection, and action, and can truly liberate students” (Wolk, 1998, p. 62).

Wolk echoed much of Dewey's admonition that schools should maintain an idea of freedom beyond mere absence of external constraint. Wolk said, "Freedom just may be the most important element of democracy," but schools typically teach freedom so that, "like their limited interpretations of democracy, it is a very physical freedom, leaving immense voids in how freedom can be moral, intellectual, creative, communal" (1998, p. 95). Wolk added to a definition of autonomy the idea that students ought to express their wills in an active manner through affirmative acts with moral, intellectual, creative, and communal purposes.

Gutmann claimed that an education should include individual choices of purposes even if a desired hierarchy has been established in a society. Even when members of society have determined particular purposes to be the best or most desirable, Gutmann claimed students' education should allow for alternative choices. In a discussion involving the relation between the individual and the state, Gutmann responded to a defense of a non-neutral education which endorsed a particular idea of a good life:

It would be an illegitimate pretension to educational authority on anyone's part to deprive any child of the capacities necessary for choice among good lives. The pretension would be illegitimate for two reasons. First: even if I know that my way of life is best, I cannot translate this claim into the claim that I have the right to impose my way of life on anyone else, even on my own child, at the cost of depriving her of the capacity to choose a good life. Second: many if not all of the capacities necessary for choice among good lives are also necessary for choice among good societies. (1987, p. 40)

Gutmann further claimed that autonomy is not restricted to choices among goods in a selected society, but should also include the ability to choose a type of society. She said that not only does autonomy involve the ability to set one's own purposes, but suggested that an education to produce a democratic citizenry should include developing in individuals the capacities necessary to choose goods in a society as well as a type of society. Autonomy includes not only control of impulses and desires, but affirmative acts of individuals in expression of rationally conceived purposes.

Reflective Process

The unconstrained exercise of power alone is not an adequate definition of autonomy; self control and the ability to form one's own purposes are also necessary components. In order to avoid a loss of autonomy to dogmatism, a reflective process must be maintained. In order to cultivate this reflective process Dewey believed education required constructive activities which contribute to a "continuing reconstruction of experience."⁵ Barber also saw the need for a process to maintain self-control and the ability to form one's own purposes. His goal for civic education was to "catalyze community without undermining citizenship" where the role of a citizen is "to participate in a certain conscious fashion that presumes awareness of and engagement in activity with others" (1984, p. 155). Barber stated, "Democracy needs citizens autonomous in their thoughts and independent in their deliberative judgment" (Murchland, 2000, p. 33). Gutmann recognized that educational authority in a democratic state should support "conscious social reproduction" where "rational deliberation remains the form of freedom most suitable to a democratic society" (1987, p. 45).

Political theorists have recognized that autonomy is not a static state; it requires a dynamic process in order to maintain the conditions necessary for individuals to make autonomous decisions. Many theorists have concluded that individual autonomy is more fully expressed in a democracy through mutual interaction rather than individual decision-making. This may appear contradictory if we consider autonomy as mere freedom from external manipulation, but Barber explained how individual interaction supports individual autonomy.

⁵ See Dewey's *My Pedagogic Creed*.

Barber claimed that it is not the exercise of power of an individual that limits the freedom of another; even the power the state exercises over individuals need not be considered coercive.⁶ He criticized the materialist interpretation of the relation of autonomy with power⁷ which claimed that wherever power is exercised, notably by the state, it does so at the expense of freedom:

Could we ask, “How much room does education leave for autonomous thinking?” Social and political constructs such as “legal person” and “citizen” suggest that relations may be mutual as well as adversarial, cooperative as well as antagonistic, and overlapping as well as mutually exclusive. Political relations tend to be dialectic, dialogical, symbiotic, and ambivalent.

Rendering freedom and power in physical terms not only misconstrues them, it produces a conception of political liberty as entirely passive. Freedom is associated with the unperturbedness of the inertial body, with the motionlessness of the inertial frame itself. It stands in stark opposition to the idea of politics as activity, motion, will, choice, self-determination, and self-realization. (1984, p. 36)

Barber explained that not all influence is coercive; autonomy can sometimes be expressed best when individuals inform each other. He claimed dialogue is the mechanism through which citizens can inform each other so each may exercise self determination and choice. Barber added that autonomy required citizens to talk to each other:

It is through talk that we constantly reencounter, reevaluate, and repossess the beliefs, principles, and maxims on the basis of which we exert our will in the political realm....

Today’s autonomously held belief is tomorrow’s heteronomous orthodoxy unless, tomorrow, it is reexamined and repossessed. (1984, p. 190)

In order to avoid orthodoxy or dogmatism, Barber claimed that individuals must enter into a dialogue. This dialogue allows individuals to maintain autonomy for two reasons. First, they are informed by every other citizen and have the most information possible to make a decision.

⁶ “If democracy is popular government in the name of and for the benefit of individual liberty ..., collective coercion in matters political or economic will always appear as illegitimate” (Barber, 1984, p. 252).

⁷ For a complete explanation of the relation between power and autonomy in terms of a materialist perspective see “Chapter Two: The Preconceptual Frame: Newtonian Politics” found in Barber’s *Strong Democracy*.

Second, each individual will have a better idea of the will of the people and are in a better position to make democratic decisions. This process can occur between individuals through deliberation in the form of dialogue between individuals, or through reflection within an individual's mind. An overview of how autonomy is displayed in *Faust* will provide a context for understanding the importance of autonomy in a democracy.

Autonomy in *Faust*: Overview

A brief analysis of four scenes in *Faust* will help reveal the progression of the play. These four scenes together form the basis of Faust's journey and illustrate the reasons for his eventual salvation. An understanding of these four scenes will help explain the value Goethe placed on autonomy, and supports my recognition of autonomy as important in educating for democracy.

The first scene is a microcosm of *Faust* and foreshadows the rest of the play. The second scene introduces the Lord's challenge to Mephisto for Faust's soul. The third scene includes the wager between Faust and Mephisto. The fourth scene culminates in Faust's salvation.

The Prelude in the Theatre: Foreshadowing Faust

Autonomy focuses on three conditions necessary for individuals to make free, democratic decisions. The three delineated elements of autonomy are represented in *Faust* in "The Prelude in the Theatre," in each of three characters, a Clown, Poet, and a Director.⁸

The Clown represents the impulses and desires in individuals. The Clown wanted to enjoy the moment, and was not interested in a suppositious future. His concern was to please the crowd before him, regardless of their level of apprehension of the production. In other words, the

⁸ Jantz compared the "Prelude in the Theatre" with a journey through life. On the Prelude he noted, "Though the audience is assembled, the drama is not yet written." He compared this with life, "The spectators are assembled before the play they are to see is written, rehearsed, and staged. This happens continuously on the stage of the world where the spectators watch an action for which no one, whether actor or manager or playwright, knows the exact course or the outcome" (1978, p. 89).

Clown wanted to give the crowd what it desired, much like individuals could simply choose to act on their own impulses and desires.

The Poet represents the creative power of individuals. This creative power is the aspect of autonomy concerned with the ability of individuals to set their own purposes. Rather than reacting to impulses and desires, or being influenced by the environment, creative individuals have the freedom to determine their own purposes.

The Director represents a process that maintains a state of self control. He literally facilitated deliberation between the other characters, and metaphorically represented a reflective process in an individual's mind. The Director's job is to encourage the Poet to create, and to allow the Clown to fulfill his desire to please the crowd. Producing a play requires creativity, but the goal is to please the crowd. There would be no production at all without taking action.

All individuals enter a society already formed, with education being one method of initiating the young into its particular mores and systems. Jantz interpreted the interplay between the Poet, Clown, and Director as a metaphor for how individuals act together to form a society: "With every participant contributing his own share to it from his own different and often conflicting point of view," we see that "all the world is a stage and creation rises from chaos" (1978, p. 90). In *Faust*, the Poet, Clown, and Director were producing a play *in medias res*, that is, in the middle of things. This echoed Dewey's point that preparation for living occurs while living:

When preparation is made the controlling end, then the potentialities of the present are sacrificed to a suppositious future. When this happens, the actual preparation for the future is missed or distorted. The ideal of using the present simply to get ready for the future contradicts itself. ... We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future. (1938, p. 49)

Jantz highlighted Dewey's point, noting in "The Prelude in the Theatre," the Poet, Clown, and Director needed to produce a play while living their lives, with the world already in progress.

The Poet, Clown, and Director were talking as a crowd was assembling. The Director chided the Poet and the Clown that their talking would not produce a play, but in order to carry out their production, they must take action. At the end of the scene, the Director declared that the whole of creation should be employed, "from heaven through the world to hell" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 81). *Faust* itself is a production over the course of Faust's life and contains scenes from heaven, earth, and hell. Employing the whole of creation signifies two things. First, Goethe will examine in *Faust* the development of autonomy and other characteristics over an individual's entire life. Second, autonomy can be expressed best if more possibilities are available from which to make choices. The phrase "all of creation" signifies all available possibilities and possible creations, thus providing the greatest chance of autonomous decisions.

The interplay of the Clown, Poet, and Director in the "Prelude in the Theatre" is analogous to the interplay of three aspects of individual characters in the play *Faust*: impulses and desires, creativity to formulate purpose, and a reflective process to maintain self-control. The Lord challenged Mephisto to sway Faust from striving for autonomy through self-control, to being satisfied with expressing impulses and desires.

Prologue in Heaven: The Lord Challenges Mephisto

God and Mephisto⁹ discussed the state of humans, with Mephisto calling man the "small god of the world," but also claiming man is "whimsical." Mephisto recognized that man had been given the power of reason, which Mephisto called a "spark of heaven's sun." This section alluded to the idea that autonomy is gained through the use of reason, but Mephisto commented

⁹ Mephisto, or Mephistopheles, is a medieval term for a devil.

that man's use of reason has made him "more brutish than is any brute." The "Prologue in Heaven" introduced Mephisto's view that man is at the mercy of impulses and desires, elements beyond his self-control, but the Lord commented that "man errs as long as he will strive," and he will in the end "remember the right road." The Lord knew man was capable of autonomy. The Lord challenged Mephisto and they bet on whether Mephisto could get Faust to become satisfied with what Mephisto could offer. Throughout the play Mephisto attempted to control Faust through manipulating Faust's impulses and desires, and Faust continued to strive for the macrocosm¹⁰, beyond his mere impulses and desires. The Lord's challenge to Mephisto is over Faust's ability to attain, and maintain, an autonomous state. Mephisto accepted the Lord's challenge and sought Faust.

The First Part of the Tragedy: The Wager between Faust and Mephisto

Faust was a professor who was contemplating his life and found the knowledge he accumulated to be unsatisfying. Rather than "rummaging in phrases," he wanted to "envisage the creative blazes." Faust found a symbol of the macrocosm and became jubilant. He equated the power implied by the symbol, being free from external manipulation and having the power of creation, to being godlike.

Mephisto entered Faust's study and offered to show him all of the material gifts of humankind and nature. It is here that Faust offered his own wager, challenging Mephisto to try and satisfy his search for the macrocosm. If Mephisto could satisfy Faust, then Mephisto would get Faust's soul. If he could not, Faust could enjoy the satisfaction of his impulses and desires, yet not lose his soul. *Faust* is focused on Faust's journey through the adventures Mephisto had

¹⁰ The term "macrocosm" refers to the "big picture," which in *Faust* refers to the infinite natural universe and to the totality of human creations. The whole of creation is the source of infinite possibilities and allows for the greatest autonomy.

set up for him. With autonomy defined as a state free from external manipulation, with individuals creating and maintaining their own purposes, we can understand Faust's search for the macrocosm to be a search to become autonomous. Mephisto's attempt to satisfy all of Faust's impulses and desires was inadequate since Faust sought the power of creation. Faust's desire for creativity rather than satisfaction of impulses and desires is a major reason for his eventual salvation near the end of the play.

Palace-Entombment: Faust's Salvation

Near the end of the play, Faust had begun a land reclamation project to make previously unusable land available to settlers. He had become blinded and when he heard the sound of shovels digging, he thought his land reclamation project was coming to fruition. Faust did not realize that he was about to die and the noise he heard was not the sound of his project being completed, but rather, the sound of lemures digging his grave. Faust thought his project was nearing completion, and he declared that he wished for that moment to linger. Mephisto thought that this declaration should commit Faust's soul to Hell according to the terms of their wager, but Angels were dispatched to save Faust. Faust's redemption can be viewed as a sign that he had remained in a search for autonomy, although he had committed numerous transgressions during the process. The value Faust placed on the land reclamation project shows he recognized that maintaining autonomy, for himself and his community, was a dynamic process and not a static state.

These four scenes provide a context for understanding individual components of autonomy expressed throughout *Faust*. In order to understand how each constituent element of autonomy comprises the whole, I will analyze specific scenes in *Faust* which illustrate delineated elements. The purpose of analyzing these scenes for constituent elements of autonomy is to recognize how *Faust* can contribute to democratic education in a manner not met by proponents of NCLB. The

delineated elements I will examine are (a) having self-control over impulses and desires, (b) possessing an ability to set one's own purposes, and (c) engaging in a reflective process to maintain these elements.

Autonomy in *Faust*: Self-Control over Impulses and Desires

As Dewey and Barber maintained, the ability to have control over impulses and desires is required if an individual is to become autonomous. Goethe implied this point in several scenes in *Faust*. I have discerned exemplary scenes which I will utilize to illustrate particular elements and applications of autonomy. I chose two types of scenes to illustrate the value of autonomy. One type exemplifies delineated components of autonomy through the behavior of the participants in the scene. The second type illustrates the value of autonomy through a contrast with less than autonomous behavior. It is important to view both types for two reasons. First, since autonomous behavior can lead to democratic action, it is helpful to view examples of autonomous behavior when formulating a system of democratic education. A clear idea of desired behavior may help formulate practices conducive to democracy. Second, illustrative examples of less than autonomous behavior may allow democratic educators to discern between practices that promote democracy and practices that impede it. By viewing illustrative scenes of practices that promote and impede democratic education, it may become more clear how practices fostered by legislation such as NCLB affect democratic education.

McGuinn and Apple noted NCLB was a market driven model, thus consumer impulses and desires could influence decisions in schools. If under NCLB educational decisions are influenced by individual consumers, and individual consumers are influenced by impulses and desires, then educators may not be inculcating habits necessary for students to become democratic actors. Goethe illustrated the impediment to autonomy if individuals do not maintain control over impulses and desires.

Self-Control over Impulses and Desires Examples 1 through 4

There are numerous examples in Faust where Goethe illustrated the importance of maintaining self-control. In the “Prelude in the Theatre,” Goethe showed the value of mastering impulses and desires for the purpose of creating. If students are to become democratic actors, educators must help them to master impulses and desires and use them as the impetus to create knowledge. In the “Prologue in Heaven,” Goethe juxtaposed self-control with satisfaction of impulses and desires. In “Study” Goethe revealed a difference between schools helping a student gain power in order to satisfy impulses and desires, and educating students to becoming autonomous and better capable of democratic action. In “Study-continued,” Goethe showed that autonomy was not gained through sequestering students from the distraction of impulses and desires, but required mastery over them. With an emphasis on standardized testing, a product of NCLB, there is an emphasis placed upon knowledge as a finished product. But democracy requires citizens who can create knowledge and decisions. As critics of NCLB have warned, the habits required to pass an examination are not the same habits required to create knowledge. I will examine two scenes in greater depth to illustrate the importance Goethe placed on gaining and maintaining self-control.

Self-Control over Impulses and Desires Example 5: Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig

The conclusion of “Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig” shows that Goethe was unsatisfied that the absence of a ruling power was the sole condition for a state of autonomy. Democratic action is then not merely action performed by individuals outside of the power of an external government. Rather, Goethe showed that individuals are not autonomous if they act like animals, which is to say, if they are under the rule of their own impulses and desires.

Mephisto and Faust began exploring the world. Mephisto took Faust to a tavern where people were socializing. Mephisto greeted the group and told them a story about a king who

treated a flea as his family, and wouldn't let any of the nobles swat the flea or its kin. When the story was finished, Altmayer exclaimed, "Long live freedom! And long live wine!" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 223). Altmayer's point was that unlike the nobles, he was free to swat fleas if they bothered him. Altmayer considered himself free because he was allowed to act on his impulses and desires. At that point, Mephisto offered more alcohol to the group.

Another character, Frosch, asked if he had a lot of alcohol. Mephisto answered, "I let each have what he may choose" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 225). The implication appears to be that individuals are free when they are allowed to indulge their impulses and desires. Later, when many individuals were drinking, Mephisto exclaimed, "Look there how well men are when they are free," and when Faust wanted to leave, Mephisto continued, "First watch how their bestiality will in full splendor soon appear" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 229).

Mephisto was indicating that individuals believe themselves to be free in the absence of a ruling power or external control. Mephisto mocked their idea of freedom by predicting that once they began drinking, their "free" act will convert them into animals. In other words, these individuals believed themselves to be free when in fact they made slaves of themselves by seeking to satisfy their impulses and desires. Rather than displaying self-control, these individuals had allowed free reign to their impulses and desires.

Self-Control over Impulses and Desires Example 6: Wood and Cave

Goethe examined another possible condition of autonomy in "Wood and Cave" in the form of fidelity to tradition. Margaret had control over her impulses and desires, a delineated requisite condition for autonomy. Her control was aided by her fidelity to tradition and religion. Goethe showed the value of such traditions in keeping individuals from falling prey to their impulses and desires, but in contrasting Margaret's fidelity to tradition with Faust's striving to be creative, Goethe showed that autonomy was not gained merely through exchanging strictures of tradition

for impulses and desires. Raising and educating children according to the strictures of some tradition can offer a foundation for decision-making that limits the influence of impulses and desires. However, Goethe illustrated that democratic action requires autonomy gained through mastery of impulses and desires and an ability to create since, as Dewey later explained, situations arise that require entirely new approaches to adequately address them.

Mephisto helped Faust gain the attention of Margaret. Faust had grown attached to Margaret, but Mephisto told Faust to move past his desire for her. Mephisto asked Faust, “Was it not I that helped you disown, and partly cured, your feverish unrest?” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 313). Mephisto claimed that Faust’s feelings were merely physical impulses and desires, and that he, Mephisto, had helped Faust to partly satisfy those impulses and desires by introducing Faust to Margaret.

Faust had impulses and desires toward Margaret, but had also begun to develop deeper feelings for her. Mephisto claimed Faust was practicing self-deception, and that his pleasure “can’t last indefinitely.” Mephisto didn’t recognize desires beyond natural instincts. Mephisto noted, “At first your raging love was past control,” admitting these impulses and desires were insatiable (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 317). Mephisto knew these impulses and desires can become the ruler of whoever feels them. Faust compared his impulses and desires and their effect on him, to the effect impulses and desires had on Margaret:

From rock to rock I foam,
Raging with passion, toward the abyss?
And nearby, she- with childlike blunt desires
Inside her cottage on the Alpine leas,
And everything that she requires
Was in her own small world at ease. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 319)

Goethe utilized the relationship between Faust and Margaret to show that individuals can feel impulses and desires without becoming a slave to them. Faust was distraught, believing he had

shaken Margaret's peace by his attentions and his own impulses and desires. Faust was not upset that Margaret was unsatisfied, but that she had lost her peaceful state, that is, control over her impulses and desires. Mephisto simply sought to satisfy Margaret's impulses and desires, but Faust wanted her to be at peace by regaining self-control. Goethe will show throughout the play that Margaret maintained a fidelity to an internal peace through her faith in God, her traditions, and love for Faust. This fidelity allowed her to maintain control over impulses and desires. Faust maintained his self-control by constantly striving to be creative. Which method is more conducive to autonomy? This is unclear, but it is noteworthy that Faust had committed numerous transgressions throughout the play yet was still saved, and he was at most times aware of his actions. Margaret had made far fewer choices throughout the play. Perhaps Goethe's point was to show not straying from the "right road" may lead to good decisions, but that knowledge of the entire terrain will afford even lost individuals the chance to make good decisions. In other words, knowledge of the right decisions can help an individual live well, but knowledge of how to create decisions can help individuals create the best decisions where necessary. Goethe would endorse the latter condition as more autonomous for not only mastery of self over impulses and desires, but the ability to create.

Autonomy in *Faust*: Ability to Set One's Own Purposes

Ability to Set One's Own Purposes Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre

Critics of NCLB claim it does not foster the ability to create knowledge, an important element of autonomy. Recall Linda Darling-Hammond had said NCLB has reduced the chances schools will focus on "helping students acquire critical thinking, research, writing, and production abilities" (Meier & Wood, 2004, p. 18). Further, Wolk warned that NCLB promotes an emphasis on memorization and does not "encourage the creation of our own knowledge" (Wolk, 1998, p. 84). Goethe expressed the value of an ability to create knowledge throughout

Faust, foreshadowing the drama in an early scene. The Poet, representing creative powers, wished “to create and nurse with godlike hands the gift of verse,” noting that, “The genuine lives on from age to age” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 71). The Poet introduced two aspects of individuals’ creativity. One, individuals can express a godlike power in their ability to create something new. Two, whatever these individuals create may become a model for others. Individuals who are not genuine in their creativity may still either utilize what others have created, or can piece together elements from the creations of others.¹¹ An ability to create allows individuals freedom to set their own purposes because their choices would not be limited to impulses and desires or to choosing from what others had created.

The Director was willing to do whatever necessary to make the play successful. The Poet chided the Director for proffering the works of poor writers in an attempt to elicit applause: “The manner of the hacks that dabble has furnished you, I see, with laws” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 73). Goethe was saying that those who follow the dictates of impulses and desires are at the mercy of natural laws in the sense that the individual may become a slave to impulses and desires. The Director responded, “Do not forget for whom you write!” The Director was reminding the Poet that purpose can be cultivated from the impetus of impulses and desires. The Poet countered, “Seek yourself another slave!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 75). The Poet resisted the temptation to merely satisfy impulses and desires.

The Clown told the Poet to utilize all the tools at his disposal, covering all aspects of life, in creating for the crowd. Goethe’s point was that autonomy is increased if more choices are available. Creative individuals can increase their number of choices by utilizing more available resources. The Clown’s distinction between people who had ceased growing internally and

¹¹ An example would be Mary Shelly’s Frankenstein monster.

people who continued to cultivate their internal faculties shows that resources available to creative people is limited to their level of apprehension. The critical point is that individuals can be educated to cultivate more internal faculties, and thus more resources would be made available to them. This leads to greater autonomy due to an increase in choices, regardless of the particular faculties cultivated. An ability to create allows individuals to set their own ends.

Ability to Set One's Own Purposes Example 2: Night and Before the City Gate

One of the most comprehensive, illustrative relationships in *Faust* is between Wagner and Faust, and it is worth analyzing in depth. Wagner represented a pedant who was satisfied with collecting knowledge others had created. The importance of standardized testing under NCLB is analogous to the importance Wagner placed upon accumulating knowledge. Critics of NCLB can recognize the value of active learning in Faust as an alternative to Wagner's passive learning. Passive recipients of knowledge engage the same faculty, memorization, regardless of the content of the lesson. Students involved in active learning must create knowledge; different knowledge might engage different faculties. Creating knowledge in science might involve a student's imagination and develop habits of induction. Creating knowledge in math might exercise habits of deduction. For an example of a pedagogical practice involving students creating knowledge, see Appendix B.

John Bremer offered a theoretical distinction between passive and active learning in his description of two types of rhetoric, that of domination and of liberation (In DeNicolas, 1989/2001). These are aligned with two types of teaching. Bremer said the rhetoric of domination is persuading someone to do as you desire. He claimed the purpose of this type of rhetoric "is to get someone to buy a particular make of car, to lobby or agitate, to approve or endorse someone or something, or to be angry about this or pleased about that" (In DeNicolas,

1989/2001, p. 449). Bremer claimed that the type of teaching associated with the rhetoric of domination,

means telling, conveying, instructing, and informing somebody who does not know what he ought to know, even though he may not know that he does not know it. The best virtues of the teacher dedicated to this kind of teaching are clarity, orderliness, precision, and direction-virtues primarily connected with the way in which subject matter is held and presented. (In DeNicolas, 1989/2001, pp. 449-450)

Bremer added that the second type of rhetoric has a different goal: “It is intrinsically valuable and its worth does not depend on the content that is transferred” (In DeNicolas, 1989/2001, p.450). He continued, “It is a contradiction to suppose that the freedom and self-control required in virtue can be structured into the soul from without¹²” (In DeNicolas, 1989/2001, p. 451).

Bremer meant that it is a contradiction to claim an individual can have autonomous motivations forced upon him from an external source, like a teacher utilizing the rhetoric of domination.

Bremer concluded, “The curious nature of the soul as that which moves itself becomes apparent in this endeavor, for the soul will find its own proper peace in the realization of its own order.... No external criterion is necessary” (In DeNicolas, 1989/2001, p. 454). Individuals involved in passive learning are like the subjects of the rhetoric of domination in that they are passive recipients, subject to external influences. They cannot gain autonomy because they have not sought to create their own purpose, but have been subjected to the purpose of another. Individuals involved in active learning can find motivation from within, and cannot rely on an external source for an answer or purpose. They may be guided, but must move themselves to learn. Wagner represented a passive recipient of knowledge that had been created by past scholars. Faust’s transformation began with his refusal to be satisfied with being a passive recipient.

¹² Bremer uses the word “soul” to describe the motivations of an individual. Such motivations include autonomous decisions, impulses or desires.

Faust had not yet realized he desired to be creative. His dissatisfaction with impulses and desires and learning others' knowledge had led him to consider suicide. Goethe illustrated Faust's mental state prior to Wagner's entrance. Faust was alone in his study, reflecting upon his life and what he had learned:

I have, alas, studied philosophy,
Jurisprudence and medicine, too,
And, worst of all, theology
With keen endeavor, through and through-
And here I am, for all my lore,
The wretched fool I was before. ...
Do not fancy that I could teach or assert

What would better mankind or what might convert. (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 93-95)

Faust had mastered the knowledge others had created, yet he considered himself to be no better off than he was before. While considering his mental state, Faust found a symbol of the macrocosm and asked:

Was it a god that made these symbols be
That soothe my feverish unrest,
Filling with joy my anxious breast,
And with mysterious potency
Make nature's hidden powers around me, manifest?
Am I a god? Light grows this page-
In these pure lines my eye can see
Creative nature spread in front of me. (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 97-99)

Faust then saw a symbol for the Earth Spirit, commenting: "How different is the power of this sign! You, spirit of the earth, seem close to mine" (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 99-101). The Earth Spirit, now manifested and present, seemed unimpressed with Faust. Faust identified himself, "It's I, it's Faust; your peer am I!" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 103). The Earth Spirit explained its role, which included "creative storm" and "changeful strife." This ability to create was exactly what Faust had unknowingly desired. The spirit continued, "At the roaring loom of the ages I plod, and fashion the life-giving garment of God" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 103). The Earth Spirit told

Faust that the Earth Spirit was the mechanism through which creation occurred. When Faust declared that he felt close to the Earth Spirit, the Earth Spirit replied, “Peer of the spirit that you comprehend, not mine!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 103). The Earth Spirit then vanished. Faust collapsed, exclaiming, “Not yours? Whose then? I, image of the godhead! And not even yours!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 105). Faust had briefly enjoyed the proximity to a creative power, but became dejected when told that he was not yet a creative individual.

When the Earth Spirit vanished, Wagner entered, interpreting Faust’s emotional state as a reaction to Faust having read a Grecian tragedy. Faust’s remarks to Wagner were similar to what Faust was told by the Earth Spirit:

What you don’t feel, you will not grasp by art,
Unless it wells out of your soul ...
Children and apes may think it great,
If that should titillate your gum,
But from heart to heart you will never create.
If from your heart it does not come. (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 105-107)

Faust may not have become the creative individual he desired to be, but he was keenly aware that Wagner had not even had the desire to be creative. Wagner’s answer to Faust supports this contention: “Yet much depends on the delivery; I still lack much, don’t you agree?” Wagner continued to voice his perspective:

How hard the scholars’ means are to array
With which one works up to the source;
Before we have traversed but half the course,
We wretched devils pass away.

Faust replied that mere utilization of knowledge others had created is inadequate:

Parchment- is that the sacred fount
From which you drink to still your thirst forever?
If your refreshment does not mount.
From your own soul, you gain it never.

Wagner countered:

Forgive! It does seem so sublime,
Entering into the spirit of time
To see what wise men, who lived long ago, believed,

Till we at last have all the highest aims achieved. (Kaufmann, 1961, pp. 107-109)

Upon exiting, Wagner said, “Though I know much, I should like to know it all” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 111). Wagner considered knowledge to be simply what others have learned, where the student would be a passive recipient of this knowledge. In this view of knowledge, the highest goal would be the knowledge of everything others have learned. Faust was unimpressed: “Hope never seems to leave those who affirm, the shallow minds that stick to must and mold- They dig with greedy hands for gold, and yet are happy if they find a worm” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 111). Up to this point neither Faust nor Wagner had fulfilled their creative potential, but Goethe juxtaposed these two characters to show that a desire to be creative can lead to autonomy more often than accumulating knowledge of what others had created.

Faust lamented his state, continuing to call himself the “image of the godhead” but no longer considering himself the peer of the Earth Spirit. He had continued to recognize in himself the potential for creativity, but did not see himself as having produced anything creative, despite all the knowledge he had gained. He began a long soliloquy where he asked, “Who teaches me?” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 113) and he recognized that his restlessness could not be quenched by gaining more knowledge. Faust was placing a bowl of poison to his lips when he heard Easter bells and a choir singing. Faust decided not to take the poison, and proclaimed himself “back into life” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 121). Goethe utilized the imagery of resurrection to illustrate that striving can lead to creativity. Individuals with an ability to create are better able to set their own purposes.

After Faust decided not to commit suicide, he observed crowds of people celebrating Easter. Faust was delighted to see the newly “resurrected” townspeople appreciating spring, with

new flowers and new hopes that spring and Easter represented. Wagner interrupted Faust's delight, declaring, "To take a walk with you, good sir, is a great honor and reward, but I myself should never so far err, for the uncouth I have always abhorred. ... I hate these noises of the throng" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 133). The crowds continued to dance and sing, then praised Faust for being a doctor and healing them. Faust was appreciative, and Wagner said to Faust that he must feel powerful when crowds revere him. Faust claimed that the reverence was misguided since many errors had caused many citizens to die. Wagner simply asked, "What more can honest people do?" Faust had lamented the human toll of his mistakes; those mistakes were the cause of him retiring from being a medical doctor like his father. Wagner continued:

If you respect your father as a youth,
You'll learn from him what you desire;
If as a man you add your share of truth
To ancient lore, your son can go still higher. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 141)

In emphasizing that a son can learn from and add to the knowledge of previous generations, Wagner maintained that accumulation of knowledge was desirable. Faust and Wagner continued their discussion, with Faust expressing his unrest and frustration: "The spirit's wings will not change our shape: Our body grows no wings and cannot fly. Yet it is innate in our race, that our feelings surge in us" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 143). Faust did not address Wagner's point that accumulation of knowledge is desirable. He concentrated on the feeling that his "godlike ways" were being limited. Wagner replied to Faust's lamentations:

I, too, have spells of eccentricity,
But such unrest has never come home to me.
One soon grows sick of forest, field, and brook,
And I shall never envy birds their wings.
Far greater are the joys the spirit brings-
From page to page, from book to book. ...
And when one opens up the ancient parchment scroll,
The very heavens will descend on him. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 143)

Goethe's juxtaposition between Wagner and Faust illustrated the difference between active and passive learning. Each of these types of learning has its own methods. The practitioners of each are affected differently and autonomy is not equally available to them. Wagner represented a pedant whose idea of knowledge is whatever has been "approved" as scholarly. Faust had mastered scholarly knowledge, yet remained unsatisfied. He wanted to be able to create knowledge and be and be able to create his own purpose.

Faust had already mastered what had been known, but he was curious as to whether he could in fact create in the world which others had only studied. Faust had recognized the potential creative powers inside himself, but for all of his book learning, he had not yet found a way to unleash them. Dieckmann explained, "He does not yet realize that what he is searching for is an active as opposed to a contemplative life" (1972, p. 48). Salm showed how this exchange set up Faust's development throughout the play:

The Spirit's words remarkably reflect an often stated principle in Goethe's natural philosophy, most notably in the Introduction to his Theory of Color. ...

Equipped with this information, we can read the Earth Spirit's lines somewhat as follows: "You, Faust, have not yet developed a sense capable of reaching me. You are still far away from the level of 'higher contemplation' at which I can be grasped. You must develop and acquire this sense through progressive transformations before you can hope to countenance me: 'You're like the spirit that you grasp,/ You're not like me.'" (1971, p. 78).

Salm explained that Faust had not yet developed his range or depth of faculties to the point where he could understand or participate in the process that the Earth Spirit represented.¹³

¹³ Interpretations of poems can yield unsteady facts upon which to base or support a theory. I include Salm's reasoning behind utilizing such interpretations in the case of *Faust*: "Scholarship moves on thin ice when it resorts to metaphors and analogies in explicating poetic images. On the face of it this practice would appear to be compounding the difficulties of interpretation by interposing yet another obstacle between the reader and the material he aims to understand. ...

Inasmuch as Goethe insisted that to a delicately empirical mind the theory behind the phenomenon is the phenomenon itself, we might meet him on those terms and be unashamed in responding to the *Faust* poem with all

However, the creative powers represented by the Earth Spirit are present in Faust in potential. It is the free expression of this creative power that Faust sought, not the knowledge of what had already been created. If individuals' options are chosen from whatever has already been created, those options are limited to what has already been created. If students can choose from what they can create, their options are potentially unlimited. By seeking creative powers, Faust was fundamentally seeking to be autonomous by increasing his available options to accomplish his own purposes.

Faust privileged an active learning, seeking to create knowledge, and Wagner privileged passive learning, seeking knowledge by learning what was already known. Faust saw a relationship between an individual's power to create and the extent to which that individual would be able to apprehend. I interpret this to mean that, for example, an individual may memorize all of the equations of a theory, but that does not mean that the individual has the powers necessary to create or wholly understand that theory. An individual's autonomy would be limited to extant theories if that individual did not cultivate the powers to create. The faculties needed to acquire knowledge are not entirely the same faculties required to produce or create knowledge.¹⁴

our faculties, rather than forcing our sympathetic vibrations through the selective filter of a rigorous cerebral and syllogistic analysis. ...

Critical illumination, after all, need not restrict itself entirely to cognitive analysis. It is only after we arrange and readjust our own impulses that we move toward a capacity for hearing the authentic voice over its entire range. 'You're like the spirit that you grasp,' Goethe has the Earth Spirit say to Faust, who cannot stand up to the apparition- much less understand it- because he does not in any way resemble it, at least not yet. ...

We are under no obligation to model ourselves on Goethe in order to interpret the *Faust* poem, but we will not lose anything by provisionally accepting some of his basic tenets. These are not irrelevant principles brought in from outside the framework of the poem" (1971, pp. 133-135).

¹⁴ See Appendix 1 for an explication of the difference between teaching what others have done and cultivating in students the faculties necessary to create knowledge.

When Faust explained that one could not grasp or create that which did not come from within, Wagner did not understand the message. Faust had reiterated the Earth Spirit's idea that one can only possess what one has grasped internally, and this could only be done by a process analogous to the process that created the knowledge to begin with. Wagner was concerned with the effect of his knowledge after he had gained it. For Wagner, the knowledge was simply to be learned, with the proper use of it being up to the individual. For Faust, acquiring knowledge would not provide exercise of the faculties that could help him become a creator of knowledge.¹⁵

In discussing Faust's father's medical career, Wagner had described the pursuit of knowledge as a pursuit of that which had already been created. His goal was to learn the "source" of knowledge. Wagner expressed the idea that knowledge is cumulative, and that rather than straying from the errors of former ignorance, Faust should simply add what he can to the accumulation of knowledge. This is entirely consistent with Wagner's privileging of passive learning since Wagner sought knowledge of what had become known. It is not consistent with Faust's active learning because Faust desired the ability to create knowledge, and not merely to replicate or memorize.

I have defined autonomy as having control over one's impulses and desires, the ability to set one's own purposes, and having a reflective process in place to perpetually maintain the first two conditions. Is Faust's active learning more conducive to gaining autonomy than Wagner's passive learning? The answer is, yes.

Faust may have been moved by his impulses and desires, but autonomy does not preclude having them. Autonomy requires having control over impulses and desires, and subordinating

¹⁵ Emerson asked, "Where is the master who could have taught Shakespeare? Where is the master who could have instructed Franklin, or Washington, or Bacon, or Newton? Every great man is an unique. The Scipionism of Scipio is precisely that part he could not borrow. If anybody will tell me whom the great man imitates in the original crisis when he performs a great act, I will tell him who else than himself can teach him. Shakespeare will never be made by the study of Shakespeare" (1926/1951, p. 61).

them to one's own purpose. Faust has the potential to lose autonomy by losing self-control, and Mephisto's aim is precisely to get Faust to lose control over his impulses and desires. If Faust lost self-control he would not be in a position to set his own purpose.

Having autonomy requires the motivation to set one's own purposes, and to create knowledge so as to create options. Faust's privileging of active learning makes it possible for him to have autonomy because he would have potentially unlimited options. If he ever lost self-control he would be equally liable to become a slave to his own motivations. Wagner's options are limited to what has already been discovered and created, thus Wagner's choices were between already established knowledge and his impulses and desires.

As a scholar, Faust had mastered knowledge in books. He now desired to apprehend the world through direct experience. With the ability to apprehend through direct experience, Faust's options would no longer be limited to what had already been apprehended by others. From books and direct experience, Faust's options would be enlarged. With greater options, plus an ability to create, Faust could set his own purpose. Wagner did not desire to have direct experience of the world, but rather, desired to have knowledge of the world through books. Before any purpose could be set, if Wagner had a purpose in mind, he would be limited to what had been known and how that knowledge had been expressed in books. Faust's active learning would then allow for greater autonomy since active learning would allow for direct apprehension of the world, and would allow Faust to be an active and free participant in the creation of his own purpose. Wagner could still desire to set his own purpose, but his autonomy would be limited by the options presented in books. Book options are limited not only in content, but in the form of their expression through passive learning. Goethe showed that Wagner's passive learning was potentially inferior in its form, and the exercise of passive learning can limit certain faculties in

students. Passive learning utilizes static forms for transmission, such as books. I will examine the format of transmission of passive learning, and then I will discuss how the exercise of passive learning can limit the faculties of apprehension of students. Limited faculties of apprehension can lead to diminished capacity for autonomy.

Passive learning involves the transmission of knowledge through instruments such as books. Knowledge in books can include facts and theories, as well as interpretations and insights. Facts are either accurate or inaccurate. Their accuracy can be tested empirically. Theories can be shown to be consistent or inconsistent with observable facts. Theories shown to be inconsistent with observable facts can be refined or discarded. A major problem Goethe emphasized was with theories that have not been contradicted by observable facts. What is the problem with theories if they are consistent with observable facts? Why did Goethe endorse Faust's way of knowing over Wagner's?

Arthur G. Zajonc quoted Goethe from Goethe's letter to Schiller, "We are not seeking causes but the circumstances under which the phenomenon occurs" (1983, p. 251). Zajonc claimed that Goethe's goal was not to arrive at "reasoned abstractions" but "beheld experience." Why would Goethe endorse this empiricism and discount knowledge from books? Zajonc said Goethe thought, "Human faculties must be fashioned, formed on the full, rich variety of natural phenomena" (1983, p. 252). Wagner's passive learning privileged exercising faculties of memorization and logical deduction. Goethe endorsed active learning for increasing autonomy, and this is better accomplished by cultivating in each student as full a range of faculties as possible.

Wagner's passive learning privileged memorization. The exercise of passive learning can limit faculties available to students. But what is the problem if researchers had already

discovered facts through empiricism, or have a theory that is consistent with facts? Why not teach students about what has been discovered or created if it is consistent with observable facts? Zajonc explained the problem: “We should recall that the simple process of ‘seeing’ is not an uncomplicated one. ... Scientists often ‘see’ phenomena- meter movements, a flickering light, and so forth- in terms of the dominant theory” (1983, p. 262). If a theory is consistent with observed facts, and then taught as if it were itself factual, then students may become conditioned to look for aspects of the theory as if it were a fact, whether it were true or not. The history of science is replete with newer models and theories replacing older ones, as more or keener observations become troublesome for an older theory, or especially when a paradigm shows itself to require a revolution in construction.¹⁶ Goethe considered any single approach, including positivism, limited within the parameters of that paradigm. Because of the constraint of any single approach, Goethe advocated a multiple *Vorstellungsarten* approach, where numerous researchers could collectively inform science from multiple paradigms. There is another reason why Goethe considered passive learning through book knowledge, whether facts or theories, to be inadequate.

Zajonc explained that any number of theories could match a given, finite set of observations, thus we cannot be sure if a particular theory is “true.” An example is Isaac Newton’s theory of color. Newtonians, according to Zajonc, often made an error by refusing to consider Newton’s theory of color to be one possible or hypothetical explanation. It is because some Newtonians claimed Newton’s theory to be “true” on the basis that it was consistent with

¹⁶ An excellent source for understanding the history of science as a series of revised models and occasional “revolutions” in a dominant paradigm, see Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996, 1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

observable facts that drew Goethe's disapproval. Even the theory of gravitational attraction cannot be proven to be true. Goethe wrote:

No one, no matter who, can undertake to give out an explanation, theory or hypothesis as fact. That the stone falls is fact, that it occurs through attraction, is theory. One may be deeply convinced of the theory, but one can never experience, never see, never know it.¹⁷ (As cited in Zajonc, 1983, p. 256)

Zajonc claimed that for Goethe "to 'free the human spirit from an hypothesis which causes it to see falsely or partially'" would be in itself a service to science and knowledge (1983, p. 255).

Goethe explained that there are limits to any single way of knowing. Considering this point, Zajonc emphasized that our education system must include exercising students' modes of apprehension so they will have multiple perspectives available. If individuals are to be able to "see" from multiple perspectives, they must not be limited by passive learning, but must develop their faculties: "The most important business of education then becomes the schooling of faculties, not the mastery of information"¹⁸ (Zajonc, 1983, p. 269). A clear example of Goethe's views in contradistinction to passive learning, or any single approach to knowledge, is in Goethe's view of science.

Dennis Sepper outlined Goethe's scientific approach, and reported on a polemic by Goethe against Newtonian mechanism, the forerunner of positivism. Sepper said Goethe's disagreement with the Newtonians was due to their insistence on considering Newton's discoveries about light and color to be facts, and not theories. Further, Goethe considered the method of crucial experiments to "prove" their hypotheses correct to be incomplete. Goethe said phenomena can be apprehended through direct experience. Goethe insisted that researchers allow phenomena to

¹⁷ This quotation is from: J.W. von Goethe. "Ueber Newtons Hypothese der diversen Refrangibilitaet," in *Chromatic, II Abteilung, 5 Band of Goethes Werke* (Weimar: Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger, 1897), p. 170. (In Zajonc, 1983).

¹⁸ This idea is from: Harry S. Broudy, "Tacit Knowing as a Rationale for Liberal Education," *Teachers College Record* 80, no. 3 (February 1979): 446, found in Zajonc (1983).

speak for themselves without theoretical constraints. Goethe also advised researchers to allow phenomena to express themselves through any and every epistemological approach possible. Sepper noted that “Goethe never thought that discovery was simply a matter of painstaking induction from the particulars, and he always approached science from the perspective of the whole of nature” (1988, p. 184). Goethe saw active learning from every source possible as superior to passive learning from only one model or one paradigm.

Sepper recognized that Goethe saw active learning as superior to passive learning, and highlighted Goethe’s idea that the search for knowledge must include numerous *Vorstellungsarten*. Sepper defined *Vorstellungsarten* as “the ways of conceiving things” (1988, p. 90). According to Goethe, even a model or theory that was consistent with observed facts could only explain a limited aspect of phenomena.

Sepper echoed Zajonc’s comments, recognizing that each epistemological approach to knowledge has a built-in ontological reality; individuals will “see” that for which they have been conditioned to search. This is due to the way the researcher’s minds have been trained. Training in a particular paradigm of knowledge causes researchers to view as evidence only facts that are consistent with their paradigm. When limiting research to a single form of apprehension such as book knowledge, researchers lose a more complete knowledge of multiple views, multiple paradigms, multiple *Vorstellungsarten*. Individuals are left favoring the view of those who dominate the scientific conversation¹⁹ rather than allowing for different possibilities that fit facts, or intuitions concerning the relation of the phenomena to other phenomena and to humans, or simply the experience of the phenomena. For Goethe, there was more to “knowing” than placing facts into models that we utilize for predicting and controlling phenomena. Equally important is

¹⁹ The word “conversation” is used in the sense it is utilized by Jane Roland Martin in *Reclaiming a Conversation: the Ideal of the Educated Woman* (1985). The word describes the entire corpus of thought and debate over that which is considered important on a given topic, in Martin’s case, education, in this case, science.

an holistic view of knowledge, that is, seeing the whole of nature as more than the sum of individual parts. There are multiple paradigms that can explain the connection of observable facts. Individuals cannot be fully autonomous if their apprehension of these multiple paradigms is limited.

If autonomous individuals can set their own purposes from among a given set of options, and more options are available through multiple perspectives, then increasing perspectives increases autonomy. Wagner's passive learning was limited to knowledge and perspectives others had previously apprehended. Faust sought freedom in apprehending through multiple perspectives. Goethe endorsed Faust's active learning over Wagner's passive learning in part because increasing available modes of apprehension increases autonomy.

Through the juxtaposition of Wagner's passive learning and Faust's active learning, Goethe highlighted the importance of two points. The first point is that simple cognition such as scientific rationality is only one way of apprehending the world. Individuals are capable of other ways of knowing through apprehending the world by poetic interpretations, emotional and aesthetic appreciation, intuitive and metaphysical sensibilities, and possibly other as of yet undiscovered modes. Wagner's passive learning limited knowledge to previously apprehended facts and paradigms, which limits Wagner's autonomy. Faust's active learning enhanced autonomy by making available potentially unlimited apprehensions of the world, and potentially unlimited purposes, without being confined to previous paradigms.

The second problem is that passive learning is often in the form of book knowledge. Book knowledge is often transmitted as facts in support of theories. These theories are not necessarily true even when experiments testing them are replicable and they can be used to predict and control. If theories are taught as if they were true, students might believe them to be true even

when they are not. More than one theory can be consistent with a given set of facts. Wagner privileged book knowledge, which sets Wagner up as Goethe's exemplar for passive learning. Faust privileged experience and creation, supporting Goethe's view active learning is a superior education if the goal is to cultivate autonomy in students. The creation of purpose is best served by creative individuals. Active learning is more capable than passive learning in educating individuals to be creative and have the ability to set their own purposes. Critics of NCLB have noted passive learning undermines autonomy and habits necessary for inculcating democratic principles in students. Perhaps Faust could be utilized as an exemplar for active learning in order to foster autonomy in students so they might become democratic actors.

Ability to Set One's Own Purposes Examples 3, 4, and 5

The importance Goethe placed upon an ability to create purpose is illustrated in numerous scenes. In "Study" Goethe used Mephisto as an exemplar of one who seeks power to satisfy desires, and Faust as an exemplar of striving for the power to create purpose after having gained self-control. If educators help students gain power for the purpose of fulfilling desires and impulses, educators have not exercised in them habits of democratic action. Students must be able to formulate their own goals, that is, set their own purposes, if they are to practice democracy as discussed by Wolk.²⁰

In "Study- continued," Mephisto's advice to a student echoed criticisms of NCLB concerning students as passive recipients of knowledge rather than becoming active creators. Mephisto claimed students who had not developed particular faculties of apprehension may not be able to learn knowledge delivered through the missing faculty. If schools and students favor

²⁰ "If a person does something for their own purposes, because it is *relevant* to their own life and their own being, they will learn and grow significantly more than if they are doing something for someone else's purpose" (Wolk, 1998, p. 40).

memorization and passive learning, students may apprehend far less than they might have apprehended had they developed other faculties. The ability to create knowledge requires more than memorization. Only Faust's active learning can develop faculties necessary to create knowledge. Educators concerned with exercising habits of autonomy and inculcating democratic principles in students may recognize Faust as an exemplar, rather than Wagner or Mephisto whose passive learning may atrophy the faculties necessary for autonomy and democratic action.

In "High-vaulted, narrow Gothic room," the student who had previously conversed with Mephisto disguised as Faust returned and was quite sure of his intellectual prowess. Mephisto mocked the student's limited powers of merely memorizing knowledge created by others. If legislation such as NCLB influences passive learning, schools may in turn influence students to become just like this student, less able to create knowledge. Mephisto mockingly called the student "original" to highlight that the student had not created knowledge but had only learned what others already knew. The student was a passive recipient of knowledge, and his powers of apprehension were not sufficient to recognize Mephisto as a devil, nor to create on his own.

Ability to Set One's Own Purposes Example 6: Laboratory, in the Medieval Style, with Elaborate and Clumsy Machinery for Fantastic Purposes

Goethe recognized the power to create knowledge is integral to becoming autonomous. Political theorists have recognized autonomy as an important component of democratic action. Critics of legislation such as NCLB claimed it has fostered habits of passive learning, thus diminished students' capacities for autonomy by limiting their exposure to habits of creating knowledge. There is one alternative type of creation not diminished by passive learning, which could provide students with an ability to create and preserve autonomy. Goethe examined this alternative type of creation.

This scene examines a method of creation different than creating through internal, individual processes as portrayed by the Poet. The Poet created through his own internal processes, informed by his level of apprehension of social and natural environments. Goethe utilized Wagner as an example of an attempt to create by piecing together parts of his environment according to scientific principles, much like Mary Shelly's Frankenstein monster. The idea is to utilize knowledge already created in order to theorize about possible combinations that might explain, predict, or control. Through this scene Goethe showed that individuals who do not create from within may still create theoretically. Does theoretical creativity support individual autonomy? Goethe will show that creation by piecing together parts does not help individuals to create purpose and is not supportive of individual autonomy.

After Mephisto asked Wagner what he was doing, Wagner said he was conducting an experiment to make a human being. Mephisto assumed that the creation would be through human passions, but Wagner answered:

Forbid! While procreation used to be the fashion,
We think of that, pardon, as tripe.
...That is divested of its ancient rank:
If animals still like that kind of prank,
The human being with his gifts must win
Henceforth a purer, nobler origin. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 36)

After Wagner gave his speech, he created Homunculus, a little man, in a test tube. The emergence of Homunculus appears to show that Wagner's method of creation was powerful. Wagner's method of creation is powerful, and this is one of Goethe's points in allowing Wagner to create Homunculus. The life of Homunculus reveals Goethe's warning about creation through piecing together parts. Much like Shelly's point in the story of Frankenstein, Homunculus exhibits power but he is outside the control of his creator. Wagner's purpose is never served by

Homunculus. Goethe showed through Homunculus that creation through piecing together parts does not support individual autonomy, and may even conflict with it.

After emerging from the test tube, Homunculus was able to read Faust's dreams, even when Mephisto could not. Homunculus claimed Mephisto's limitation was due to his origin being from the north: "In a sad mess of knights and popery; how could your eye, my friend, be free?" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 36). Goethe used Homunculus' words to show the limitations of any single paradigm. Mephisto is the product of Christian lore, and thus cannot see beyond his conditioning. Faust was dreaming about the ancient Greek figure of Leda, the mother of Helen. Homunculus had to lure Mephisto to visit the Classical Walpurgis Night with stories of seductive witches. Although Mephisto was unfamiliar with Classical times, he understood the lure of impulses and desires.

Mephisto carried the sleeping Faust, and both of them accompanied Homunculus on the journey to Classical Walpurgis Night. Wagner was left behind. As Mephisto, Faust, and Homunculus departed, Mephisto exclaimed, "In the end, we are dependent upon the creatures we have made" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 37). Goethe had juxtaposed three paradigms of desire in the figures of Mephisto, Wagner and Homunculus, and Faust.

Mephisto desired the satisfaction of impulses and desires. Wagner had just accomplished the heights of his capabilities in making Homunculus- the creation of artificial life. Homunculus was out of control of Wagner, and was limited to intellectual prowess and power. Faust strove to create purpose and become autonomous. These three paradigms reveal the hierarchy Goethe endorsed in the development of human faculties. Mephisto represented individuals who cede control to their impulses and desires. His wish to satisfy impulses and desires is almost universal, but leaves individuals slaves to those impulses and desires. Wagner represented individuals who

cede control to their creations, such as technology, scientific paradigms, or past knowledge. Wagner had gained power through the creation of Homunculus, but the power was out of his control. Faust remained unsatisfied, yet maintained his autonomy by constantly striving for the power to create his own purpose.

Autonomy in *Faust*: Reflective Process to Maintain Elements of Autonomy

Dewey's "reconstruction of experience," Barber's emphasis on communication, and Gutmann's "conscious social reproduction," each requires individuals to discuss, evaluate, and re-evaluate their individual and collective experiences when deciding upon a collective action. Flinders noted schools that endorse standards approved by NCLB limit "opportunities for discussion, reflection, and learning." In *Faust*, Goethe exhibited an implied reflective process throughout a number of scenes in order to show how a reflective process enhances autonomy.

Reflective Process Example 1: Prologue in Heaven Active Learning through Correcting Mistakes

Standards endorsed by legislation such as NCLB imply that knowledge is a finished product for students to learn. Critics have argued that the existence of such an "approved" core of knowledge implies that such a core is the most valuable, and perhaps more importantly, that students lose exercise in creating knowledge if deviations from the core knowledge is punished. With NCLB, schools are punished when students do not meet approved standards. In "The Prologue in Heaven," Goethe implied making mistakes is a valuable part of a process of creating knowledge.

Mephisto claimed Faust did not seek earthy food, and yet knew "how foolish is his quest." Mephisto considered the macrocosm, the ability to be creative and autonomous, to be out of Faust's reach. Mephisto's lack of confidence in Faust encouraged Mephisto to challenge The Lord for Faust's soul. The Lord acknowledged Mephisto's position, but declared, "Man errs as

long as he will strive.” The Lord predicted that Faust would continue to strive for self-control and to be creative, even though he will make many mistakes along the way. The self-reflective process of examining past actions and creating purpose toward the goal of autonomy guided Faust through his experiences, including Mephisto’s attempts to capture Faust’s soul by seeking to satisfy his impulses and desires. The Lord’s recognition that Faust will make many mistakes in his quest for autonomy is analogous to Postman’s lesson of treating students as error detectors.²¹ Legislation such as NCLB can be considered an impediment to autonomy and democracy if it impedes students from developing a process of reflecting upon and correcting errors.

Reflective Process Example 2: Palace Dialogue Versus Power

Throughout the play Mephisto had attempted to satisfy Faust’s impulses and desires by offering sensual experiences, and Faust did engage in them, committing numerous errors as predicted by The Lord. Throughout, Faust employed a reflective process as exemplified in his colonization attempts.

Although Faust had reclaimed a great deal of land for use by a large number of people, he was frustrated with his failure to convince Baucis and Philemon to exchange their home for a grander estate in a different part of the land. Baucis and Philemon had expressed their desire to remain on their land, while Faust wished them to be removed.

Faust’s autonomy seems to conflict with the autonomy of Baucis and Philemon. One of the two sides will not get what it wants. Mephisto’s advice was clear, “One has the power, hence the right” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 441). Mephisto’s answer to Faust’s dissatisfaction was simply for Faust to employ power. If Faust’s actual purpose was to clear the land, this advice would be

²¹ “As things stand now, teachers are apt to think of themselves as truth tellers.... I would suggest a different metaphor: teachers as error detectors” (Postman, 1995, p. 120). “First, we help students to see that knowledge is a stage in human development ... and third, we show them that error is no disgrace, that it is the agency through which we increase understanding” (Postman, 1995, p. 125).

valid. But Faust was against the use of power simply to satisfy his immediate impulses and desires. Faust still wanted a just exchange with Baucis and Philemon.

Faust's displeasure at the thought of simply removing Baucis and Philemon forcibly signifies Goethe's view that autonomy must be extended beyond mere satisfaction of impulses and desires, even when those impulses and desires are good for a community. This is consistent with Gutmann's view of democratic action where individuals do not have the right to impose a way of life on another, even if that way of life is found to be superior. Faust represented an autonomous individual who desired to come to a suitable agreement with Baucis and Philemon, and he resisted using force even when convinced his goal was good for the community.

Faust reflected upon the motivations of his impulses and desires but decided Mephisto was wrong in suggesting Faust use force. This decision was a sign that Faust had achieved a state of autonomy through self-control and creation of purpose, and through a reflective process he recognized his autonomy was intertwined with the autonomy of his community.

Reflective Process Example 3: Large Outer Court of the Palace Perpetual Striving to Maintain Autonomy

With the addition of new knowledge, perspectives, or goals, the decisions of a community may change. Without a reflective process to insure this change is addressed through a democratic procedure, a society is in danger of ossification into orthodoxy. Goethe recognized this danger and included in this scene an inoculation against it through a reflective process in his community.

Faust strove for the macrocosm throughout the play and had not yielded self-control to his impulses and desires. He had pursued his created purpose in almost every scene even though he often erred in his decisions. None of the experiences Mephisto offered Faust brought him satisfaction, but Faust found satisfaction at the moment he thought his land reclamation project was being completed. Why had this project brought Faust satisfaction?

The land reclamation project was itself a perpetual endeavor; the settlers would remain free on their land as long as they continued to keep the dykes in good repair and continued the cycle of life. This indicates metaphorically Goethe's recognition of the importance of a reflective process in maintaining autonomy. Throughout the play Faust reflected on his goal of the macrocosm and had kept his impulses and desires under control. When the land reclamation project neared completion Faust was able to recognize that the process of creativity itself had been created. Faust declared:

This is the highest wisdom that I own,
The best that mankind ever knew:
Freedom and life are earned by those alone
Who conquer them each day anew.
Surrounded by such danger, each one thrives,
Childhood, manhood, and age lead active lives.
At such a throng I would fain stare,
With free men on free ground their freedom share.
Then, to the moment I might say:
Abide, you are so fair! (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 469)

After uttering these words Faust fell back dead into the lemures' hands, and they lowered him to the ground. What Faust had considered to be the "highest moment" was the state of autonomy won by him and the people living on the land that Faust had developed. The state was not static, but had to be won anew continuously. This exhibited not only freedom of the people living there, but a perpetual striving to remain free. Perpetual striving is what gained Faust his redemption, and not the satisfaction of his impulses and desires. Jantz affirmed that human freedom is found in perpetual striving to create the world anew. Jantz wrote about the final scene where Faust is saved:

The great theme of the scene, raised to an ultimate beyond the limitations of place and time, is announced by the archangels at the beginning and confirmed by the Lord in his last words. It is the theme of creativity, constant overcoming of past errors, constant rising to higher things. We are thus prepared early for Faust, at the last, choosing a life of creativity (under the oldest and most persistent symbol of creativity: that of separating the land from the waters). (1978, p. 90)

Self-control and creativity can be utilized to maintain autonomy through a reflective process where each supports individuals' desired purposes regardless of how these change. If self-control is lost, individuals become slaves to their impulses and desires. If creativity is lost, individuals limit their choices to what has already been created. If a reflective process is not utilized, dogmatism may lead to an orthodoxy dominating society, possibly mitigating democratic expression.

Reflective Process Example 4: Entombment Development through Error

In one of the final scenes of the play, Goethe again implied error plays a significant role in developing autonomy in individuals if they exercise a reflective process. How did a reflective process contribute to Faust's salvation? Mephisto was sure he would capture Faust's soul as soon as it left Faust's body since Faust had signed the wager. As Mephisto waited, he exclaimed, "You know how in the most accursed hours, we planned destruction for the human race; the vilest product of our powers in their devotions has a place" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 477). Here Goethe insinuated that error is actually a part of the process toward a higher state of awareness, and ultimately autonomy. Mephisto and devils offered destructive experiences to people who utilized these experiences as part of their development. It is through reflection upon error that individuals can remain on a path toward their goal.

Recall Postman understood that reflecting upon error is part of the process of education,²² and had recommended that teachers set up lesson plans that involved having students strive to work through mistakes. Postman's goal was to teach students the process of creating knowledge rather than assuming it was provided by an authority in a fixed form. Grant Wiggins had similarly decried the use of textbooks and other forms of passive knowledge being transmitted to

²² See Postman's *The End of Education*.

students. He claimed, “We still teach physics as metaphysics” and later, “Most students come away from a course in geometry with the idea that somehow the postulates are God-given and self-evident” (In Beane, 1995, p.115). Modes of passive learning condition individuals to view knowledge as a final product. This may be detrimental since history has shown that new models of knowledge periodically replace older models.²³ Perhaps more significantly, individuals fail to cultivate the faculties necessary to create knowledge if they are conditioned to accept knowledge in a final form.

Students can accept or reject transmitted knowledge. With active learning, students work through mistakes until they create knowledge themselves. In this way students become the author of the knowledge, even if it had previously been known. Active learning such as reflecting upon mistakes can contribute to autonomy. Passive learning, such as knowledge transmission, leads to veridical decision-making where the “right answer” has been pre-determined. This could inhibit autonomy. Goethe stated his main point clearly through the words of a Chorus of Angels, “Those damned by deed are healed by verity” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 485). Although individuals will make mistakes through the active learning process, reflecting upon and correcting these mistakes helps lead to autonomy. If NCLB punishes student errors and only rewards learning an “approved” core of knowledge, then legislation such as NCLB may impede the exercise of a reflective process, thereby limiting autonomy and inhibiting democratic expressions.

Autonomy as part of *Bildung*

I have presented evidence from political theorists and Goethe’s *Faust* to show autonomy is an important component of democratic action. If, as critics claimed, NCLB inhibits rather than promotes autonomy, then students may not learn to become democratic actors. Goethe showed in

²³ For a full explication see Kuhn’s *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

Faust how *Bildung* education can help develop autonomy. *Bildung* education may not be the sole method for developing autonomy, but educators for democracy may consider it as an alternative to education influenced by legislation such as NCLB.

How does an education for *Bildung* promote autonomy and democracy? *Bildung* education emphasizes individual development of faculties rather than merely becoming passive recipients of an approved body of knowledge or acquiring skills for the marketplace. Democratic theorists have claimed democracy requires students to exercise practices necessary for democratic action.

Marshall Berman wrote, “The vital force that animates Goethe’s *Faust*, that marks it off from its predecessors, and that generates much of its richness and dynamism, is an impulse that will call the desire for *development*” (1982, p. 39). *Bildung* education is designed to develop students’ faculties so they have a broad range of knowledge available to them. A greater range of faculties allows students more choices through both greater apprehension of existing knowledge, and an ability to create knowledge.

Many philosophers have recognized the value of developing faculties, although the pedagogy through which the development occurs is debated. For example, John Locke was a proponent of using society to guide individuals’ development, while Jean-Jacques Rousseau is known for his idea that Nature should be the guide in the development of students’ faculties. Locke would have students subordinate nature, and Rousseau would have students led by it. Dewey recognized a middle ground. He claimed, “Neglect, suppression, and premature forcing of some instincts at the expense of others, are responsible for many avoidable ills,” but the goal of educators should be “to provide an environment which shall organize them” (1916, p. 115). Dewey supported the development of faculties through the use of impulses and desires as the

impetus, but guided by intelligence to organize them. The method resembles *Bildung* in the cultivation of faculties through intelligent control of habits.²⁴

Faust's development can be traced from his original position in his study as a scholar and recluse ready to commit suicide, to a productive creator of useable land for a village. During the course of the play, Faust acted rashly and committed numerous transgressions, yet his soul was saved.²⁵ His salvation was not due to having achieved a static state that satisfied him, as Mephisto learned, but through constant striving. His mistakes along the way had been instrumental in his development. If educators desire to have students become autonomous, democratic actors, they must help students develop even through mistakes. Rather than passive learning which transmits knowledge in a completed form, Goethe's endorsement of active learning allows for numerous mistakes to be made by individuals. Commenting on Goethe's character Wilhelm Meister, Zajonc claimed, "He sees the world differently for having passed through countless struggles" (1983, p. 268). The active struggle through making mistakes changes individuals and helps them cultivate faculties. Zajonc added, "In the present day we must be active ourselves in the development of new faculties. We may possess innate talents, but these must be developed" (1983, p. 268). Zajonc continued, "Long after facts as explicit knowledge have disappeared from active memory, we will continue to perceive patterns, solve problems, and make discoveries by means of the faculties we have acquired" (1983, p. 269).

²⁴ Dewey praised Herbart for recognizing the importance of developing faculties in students, but criticized Herbart for minimizing the importance of the individual as "a living being of active and specific functions which are developed in the redirection and combination which occur as they are occupied with their environment" (1916, p. 71). Goethe's *Faust* is a presentation analogous to Dewey's version of learning considering that the particulars of Faust's life are directly related to his growth.

²⁵ Cottrell explained, "The perennial question as to whether or not Faust is worthy of being 'saved,' especially after having committed three additional murders immediately preceding his death, is improperly put. ... At bottom, Goethe's world outlook is concerned less with absolute judgment than with the process of transformation and becoming" (1976, p. 63).

Is the goal of *Bildung* to obtain power for the satisfaction of impulses and desires? No, according to Berman: “Earlier incarnations of Faust have sold their soul in exchange for certain clearly defined and universally desired things of life: money, sex, power over others, fame, and glory” (1963, pp. 39-40). “What this Faust wants for himself is a dynamic process that will include every mode of human experience ... and that will assimilate them all into his self’s unending growth” (Berman, 1963, p. 40). Passive learning might limit students to a circumscribed, “approved” worldview. Development through active learning can allow for a greater range of apprehension, thus more choices and creativity, both valuable for democratic action.

The development of faculties does not necessarily lead to democratic action, but with the development of faculties greater choices are presented. An example is Faust’s decisions involved with his land reclamation project. Berman claimed that Faust’s land reclamation project could not be achieved without great resources. Goethe had a choice between allowing Faust to get the necessary resources through, “On the one side, a crumbling multinational empire left over from the Middle Ages ...; on the other side, challenging him, a gang of pseudo-revolutionaries out for nothing but power and plunder” (Berman, 1963, p. 63). The choice was between an established authoritarian rule with resources, and an association of individuals bent on securing satisfaction of impulses and desires. Berman referred to Lukacs’ assessment that Faust did not seek the latter, a democratic revolution, since he was so confident in his idea of progress that he found it unnecessary to gain anyone’s approval. Berman conceded, however, “But if he drives his workers hard, so he drives himself....He has finally achieved a synthesis of thought and action, used his mind to transform the world. He has helped mankind assert its right over the anarchic elements” (1963, p. 65). Although Faust did not fully embrace democratic procedures by

securing the votes of the community, he did embrace a democratic ethos by seeking the will of the community in the form of useable land for a village.

Berman noted that Faust had not yet fully embraced a democratic ethos in his pursuit of the land reclamation project, but did concede that Faust himself had developed his creative powers, and further, had desired to put them into the service of a community. Even Faust's desire to remove Baucis and Philemon from their land did not cause Faust to remove them by force, although that is what happened without Faust's knowledge. Faust not only maintained his own autonomy, he respected the autonomy of Baucis and Philemon, trying to convince them to move through reason and a greater than equitable exchange of estates.

Faust's development reveals that individuals gain autonomy through a process of *Bildung*—a cultivation of faculties. Active learning engages and develops the faculties necessary for *Bildung*. Passive learning does not help develop faculties necessary for *Bildung*, and doesn't help individuals to become autonomous. Gutmann claimed democratic individuals must develop capacities “to choose a good life.” She was clear that a democratic society cannot simply demand individuals accept the dominant idea of a good life, even if the dominant society is confident it is the best life. Barber offered that democratic action amongst individuals must be preceded by “dialectic” and individuals' communication in a democracy must be “dialogical.” If individuals cultivate the faculties necessary for dialectic and dialogical communication, their ability to form a democratic community will be enhanced.

I have defined autonomy as a state in which individuals have (a) control of impulses and desires, (b) an ability to set their own purposes, and (c) a reflective process necessary to maintain these elements. Having control over impulses and desires is a constant struggle; individuals must be vigilant in pursuing their goal to control their impulses and desires.

The ability to set purposes requires both an ability to create, and having a choice among alternatives. An ability to create can be developed through active learning, where various faculties are cultivated. With passive learning, faculties such as memorization and logic constrain choices to already created knowledge. Faculties such as imagination and dialectic can increase available choices for individuals to include whatever they can create, what they can inspire others to create, or what they can learn from others. Throughout the development of these faculties numerous mistakes will be made, but dealing with mistakes develops faculties in individuals which lead to greater autonomy. Advocates of passive learning such as supporters of NCLB privilege the acquisition of knowledge over the development of faculties. Critics of NCLB allege this loss of development of faculties inhibits democratic action by diminishing autonomy. Passive learning can provide knowledge of natural laws and human processes which can assist autonomy through providing predictive power. However, without self-control individuals would be slaves to their impulses and desires, and without the ability to create individuals would be limited to extant or “approved” knowledge.

Bildung education implies a reflective process that can be used to maintain self-control, cultivate faculties, communicate, and learn to predict and control. A community can cultivate a reflective process by developing democratic principles in individuals, and by forming a society whose practices are democratic and reflective. Gutmann advised, “Just as we need a more democratic politics to further democratic education, so we need a more democratic education to further democratic politics” (1987, p. 18). Faust’s development throughout the play is an example of how *Bildung* education can cultivate faculties necessary for autonomy and democracy.

CHAPTER 4 COMMUNITY

Introduction

Critics warned that NCLB limits students' exercise in habits required for democracy due to forced compliance with external authority, lack of trust in the ability of communities to make decisions, diminished communication, and a diminution in problem-solving (Flinders, 2005; Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004; Wolk, 1998). Rather than fostering a community of learners, NCLB establishes a hierarchical decision-making mechanism and punishes non-compliance. Meier specifically noted that exercising students in problem-solving skills can help them become good citizens. Wolk claimed schools are the best place to exercise autonomy and communication skills before students enter society as democratic citizens. The problem is that NCLB forces blind compliance, competition, and silencing of voices. Parker further criticized the expectation that performance on standardized tests translates into cultivation of democrats. According to critics, if NCLB inhibits the formation of community, it impedes the development of democratic actors. What defines a community necessary for fostering democratic principles?

Community Defined

Wolk introduced a concept of community as the actions of a group of people rather than merely as the place in which they congregate, claiming we "must stop seeing community as merely a physical thing, as a place *where* people live, but rather as *how* people live" (1998, p. 10). He said schools rarely see community the way they ought to, with "people getting together as a regular part of their daily lives to enjoy one another's company, grow from one another, share perspectives and experiences, care for one another, and engage in important conversation" (1998, p. 10). Barber and Wolk claimed that sharing perspectives and engaging in mutual

interaction can transform individuals. Conversation is one mechanism of communication through which people can develop the capacities necessary for a democracy.

Barber supported Wolk's idea: "Communication is a function of community. The equation is simple enough: no community, no communication; no communication, no learning; no learning, no education; no education, no citizens, no freedom; no freedom- then no culture, no democracy, no schools, no civilization" (Murchland, 2000, p. 28). Communication influences all aspects of social life, as Barber noted in his endorsement of Dewey and Whitman, who Barber claimed "refused to wall off democracy from life, or life from poetry, or poetry from democracy" (Murchland, 2000, p. 28). Wolk and Barber recognized that a community is not simply a group of isolated individuals. Barber explained what is necessary for an aggregate of people to be recognized as a community, and thus capable of democracy:

The thin liberal community lacks any semblance of public character and might better be called a multilateral bargaining association. ... The traditional hegemonic community achieves the integral and public character missing in thin democratic communities- but only by bartering away autonomy and equality. ... In a strong democratic community, our third alternative, the individual members are transformed, through their participation in common seeing and common work, into citizens. Citizens are autonomous persons whom participation endows with a capacity for common vision. (Barber, 1984, pp. 231-232)

Individuals in Barber's example of a "thin liberal community" may possess communication and a certain level of individual autonomy, but may lack individual transformation and an organizing principle beyond the structures and procedures of government. Individuals in a "traditional community" may possess an organizing principle but lack autonomy and transformation. In Barber's "strong democratic community" individuals possess four components necessary in a community for fostering democracy.

Wolk claimed ideally a community should include individuals who engage each other, influence each other, care for each other, and grow through their interactions. Barber added individuals in community must work toward a common vision. Does this common vision inhibit

individual autonomy? No, Barber claimed that through community, individual autonomy is expressed even as individual perspectives become oriented toward a collective will:

Only in strong democratic community are individuals transformed. Their autonomy is preserved because their vision of their own freedom and interest has been enlarged to include others; and their obedience to the common force is rendered legitimate because their enlarged vision enables them to perceive in the common force the working of their own wills. (Barber, 1984, p. 232)

Barber explained that autonomy is best expressed by individuals submitting to government they have instituted for themselves because each may understand that their individual autonomy is enhanced through such a government rather than having individual liberty acting against the liberty of others.¹

Based upon the ideas of Wolk and Barber, community is defined as an aggregate of individuals who a) communicate b) are transformed through their interactions c) have their autonomy enhanced and d) deliberate to create an organizing principle for determining a collective will. Without communication individuals' choices could be limited to their own perspectives and experiences. Without transformation, individuals could not grow and adapt to new situations. Without autonomy, individuals could not express their will. Without agreeing upon an organizing principle, individuals could not act in concert.

The components of community are interrelated; each component supports another. For example, individuals can become transformed through communication with others.

Communication is also necessary to declare a common voice. Autonomy is enhanced in

¹ See Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*. "The passage from the state of nature to the civil state produces in man a very remarkable change.... Although, in this state, he is deprived of many advantages that he derives from nature, he acquires equally great ones in return; his faculties are exercised and developed; his ideas are expanded; his feelings are ennobled... and transformed him from a stupid and ignorant animal into an intelligent being and a man" (Crocker, Ed., 1967, p. 23).

See also Aristotle's *The Politics*, "As man is the best of all animals when he has reached his full development, so he is worst of all when divorced from law and justice.... Hence man without virtue is the most savage, the most unrighteous, and the worst in regard to sexual license and gluttony. The virtue of justice is a feature of the state" (Sinclair, trans., 1962, p. 61).

individuals through progressive transformation. And progressively transformed individuals may be better able to communicate their individual will and determine a collective will.

Not all communities are equally efficacious at fostering autonomy or exercising students in habits necessary for developing into democratic actors. I will designate the community least capable of fostering democratic principles as an inertial community since individuals do not exercise the habits necessary for becoming democratic actors. The concept of inertia implies a lack of self-motivation or autonomy. Communities that do not foster democratic principles may leave constituent members more susceptible to inertia. In *Faust*, Goethe illustrated the difference between communities that foster democratic action and those that impede it. I will first examine components of community that foster democratic action so educators might orient pedagogy for democracy. I will then discuss aspects of inertial communities to establish the problem with legislation such as NCLB.

Communication

The component of communication is important because it supports the other three delineated components. As Barber explained, communication allows individuals the opportunity to transform through shared experiences and understand and organize their experiences toward a common goal. In addition, communicating knowledge and experiences can also increase autonomy by increasing options. Individuals who communicate can make autonomous decisions and coordinate actions around a unifying principle to identify and carry out a collective will. With an emphasis on high stakes testing and rewards and punishments, critics of NCLB claim schools may undervalue communication and foster competition. In *Faust*, Goethe included several examples of how communication can increase autonomy and help transform individuals, as well as help communities act upon a common organizing principle. Individual transformation

leads to individuals developing into democratic actors because they will have increasing facility with the three delineated democratic practices.

Communication Example 1: The Relationship between Faust and Margaret

As McGuinn warned, legislation such as NCLB can engender competition between individuals which may not be conducive to democratic action. Competition where individuals encourage mutual autonomy may be beneficial for democracy, but competition in a market-driven model may cause individuals to minimize the autonomy of others in order to gain an advantage. This could result in development of individuals in less than autonomous or democratic ways.² Goethe illustrated in the relationship between Faust and Margaret that communication for mutual benefit can maintain autonomy and lead to individual development.

Faust's relationship with Margaret had grown into shared love, and this caused Faust to treat Margaret with sincerity and respect. Faust said of Margaret:

Do we not look into each other's eyes,
And all in you is surging
To your head and heart,
And weaves in timeless mystery,
Unseeable, yet seen, around you?
... Call it then what you will,
Call it bliss! Heart! Love! God!
I do not have a name
For this. Feeling is all;
Names are but sound and smoke. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 327)

Faust recognized that Margaret shared his love, yet all Mephisto noted was Faust's desires.

Mephisto asked, "The Monkey! Is she gone?" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 333). This reference to

Margaret as a monkey is consistent with Mephisto's perspective that humans are simply animals with impulses and desires. Mephisto mocked Faust, "You supersensual, sensual wooer, a maiden

² Berman explained this idea in depth in *All That is Solid Melts Into Air*. "The trouble with capitalism is that, here as elsewhere, it destroys the human possibilities it creates.... It fosters, indeed forces, self-development for everybody; but people can develop only in restricted and distorted ways....Everything else within us, everything nonmarketable, gets draconically repressed" (Berman, 1982, p. 96).

leads you by the nose” (Kaufman, 1961, p. 333). Mephisto assumed Faust could be controlled through his impulses and desires. However, Goethe juxtaposed Faust’s love for Margaret with Mephisto’s view. Where Faust recognized autonomy in Margaret through her fidelity and love, Mephisto saw lust. Faust recognized that through their love, he and Margaret gained autonomy and would resist falling prey to impulses and desires.

Goethe illustrated through the relationship between Margaret and Faust that communicating with sincerity and regard for mutual beneficence will maintain autonomy and resist external control through impulses and desires. Had lust been the motivation, both parties might have manipulated their communication for personal benefit. We can view Margaret and Faust’s love as a metaphor for autonomous communication as opposed to Mephisto’s view of communication for satisfaction of impulses and desires.³ If, as critics allege, legislation such as NCLB fosters competition, it may not foster an environment for communication that respects individual autonomy.

Communication Example 2: Faust’s Relationship with Baucis and Philemon

In his attempt to negotiate with Baucis and Philemon to gain their land for his reclamation project, Faust had become frustrated. He was sure his goal was beneficial, but he didn’t want to force the couple into compliance. Although throughout the play Faust had made numerous mistakes and ethical transgressions, he had grown to where he now treated the couple as he might have treated Margaret- as autonomous individuals deserving respect. While Faust still utilized some harsh methods to complete his project, Philemon reminded her husband of Faust’s fairness: “But he offered-you are harsh!- Fair estate in his new land” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 437). Faust’s goal was to complete his vision, but he recognized the value in mutual satisfaction

³ Recall how readily Mephisto advised Faust to lie in testifying to Martha’s husband’s death, “Just testify, and hang whether it’s true!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 293).

toward a common goal. At this point Faust displayed elements of a democratic ethos even though he had authoritarian power. Mephisto remained committed to power over respect for autonomy.

Mephisto declared if Faust wanted the land, he should just take it, “One has the power, hence the right” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 441). Faust, however, tried to convince the couple rather than merely exert power over them as Mephisto suggested. Faust did become angry with the couple so Mephisto dispatched messengers to again offer the couple a new estate in exchange for theirs. The couple resisted and the messengers killed them and set the cottage on fire. Faust saw the flames and assumed the couple left on their own. When he was told of what transpired he exclaimed, “Did you not hear me that I bade not robbery but simply trade? The ill-considered, savage blow I curse herewith” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 453). Faust’s respect for Baucis and Philemon shows he wanted communication between autonomous individuals.

In demanding compliance with preconceived benchmarks, legislation such as NCLB discourages communication in the form of a mutual exchange toward a common vision. Schools and students must compete with others instead of offering mutual support. As Meier warned, rather than fostering communication for mutual benefit, NCLB hinders trust and removes the exercise in democracy students would get if they participated as autonomous actors in debate and compromise.

Communication Example 3: Night

Barber claimed it is autonomous citizens in a democratic community who have a capacity for a common vision. Postman claimed schools and society function best when they work toward what he called an “end” or a purpose. He said this end would be “a great narrative, one that has sufficient credibility, complexity, and symbolic power to enable one to organize one’s life around it” (Postman, 1995, p. 6). How does an organizing principle aid communication? It

provides a common set of axioms for a common vision.⁴ Are all organizing principles democratic? No. Barber recognized obedience to a common will is democratic if it is decided upon by autonomous actors in a free exchange, but less democratic if imposed from an external authority. Critics noted NCLB imposes goals and demands compliance. Although NCLB provides a common goal, it does not recognize free communication toward formulating or reaching that goal. Goethe provided an example of each community in the scene “Night.” Wagner’s community was a community of past scholars, demanding Wagner exercised the habits of research, logical inference and memorization. Faust recognized a transmission method for gaining knowledge can limit the modes of communication and atrophy faculties of apprehension in the practitioner.

Faust and Wagner were discussing their roles as professors and scholars. Wagner extolled the value of past scholarship:

It does seem so sublime,
Entering into the spirit of the time
To see what wise men, who lived long ago, believed,
Till we at last have all the highest aims achieved. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 109)

Faust derided this praise:

Achieved indeed!
My friend, the times that antecede
Our own are books safely protected
By seven seals. What spirit of the time you call,
Is but the scholar’s spirit, after all,
In which times past are now reflected.
In truth, it is often pathetic. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 109)

Wagner declared, “Oh, that everybody knew part of the same!” Faust replied, “The things that people claim to know!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 109).

⁴ Postman claimed, “What makes public schools public is not so much that the schools have common goals but that the students have common gods. The reason for is that public education does not serve a public. It *creates* a public” (1995, pp. 17-18).

Wagner considered himself a member of a community of scholars whose knowledge Faust claimed is safely protected from the present day by “seven seals.” Faust’s point was that contemporary scholars may be insulated from past knowledge due to misinterpretations by individuals who may lack faculties of apprehension, or by being prejudiced by a contemporary version of approved knowledge. Wagner considered past scholars’ knowledge to be objectively true.⁵ In this view, as NCLB prescribes, communication is hierarchical; knowledge of an approved core is a desired goal and deviations are punished.

Critics of NCLB and Faust objected to communication between passive learners because people can claim to know things they do not really know,⁶ and may have memorized inaccurate knowledge if past scholars had been proven wrong. Although active learners can make mistakes, their method is self-correcting; active learning exercises habits of communication more conducive to democracy than passive learning. A mandated organizing principle influences students to exercise habits of communication less conducive to democratic action than an organizing principle decided upon through debate and compromise. If NCLB punishes non-compliance with its mandated goals, individuals may develop habits of communication that foster passive learning, further inhibiting future democratic practice.

Transformation to Autonomy

Barber claimed that in a strong democratic community individuals are transformed into citizens who exercise individual autonomy in formulating a collective will. Wolk agreed that

⁵ This is an allusion to the goal of French *Philosophes*, also known as *Encyclopedists*, to spread knowledge.

⁶ In Plato’s *Phaedrus* Socrates introduced the story of Theuth, who was trying to convince the king Thamus to accept the art of writing and calculation for his people. Thamus eventually rejected the dissemination of writing: “It will introduce forgetfulness into the soul of those who learn it: they will not practice using their memory because they will put their trust in writing... You provide your students with the appearance of wisdom, not with its reality. ...They will imagine that they have come to know much while for the most part they will know nothing. And they will be difficult to get along with, since they will merely appear to be wise instead of really being so.” See Cooper’s *Plato: Complete Works*, pp. 551-552, or Plato’s *Phaedrus*, 274e-275b.

individuals should grow through interaction with others in their community. Recognizing the play as an example of *Bildung* education, it is not surprising there are numerous examples of transformation and development in *Faust*. Does all transformation help individuals become democratic actors? No, Goethe included in *Faust* numerous examples where individual transformation does not help individuals become democratic actors. Individuals may develop into autonomous actors or may become prone to inertia. The development of autonomy in individuals can lead to a democratic community because individuals maintain self-control and each considers the well-being of the community when making decisions. Inertial actions, such as acting under the influence of an addiction, can influence individuals to disregard community in their decision-making. Experiences that transform individuals toward a more autonomous state lead to individual development and a democratic community. Experiences that transform individuals toward inertia sacrifice the development of a democratic community for the satisfaction of impulses and desires. Goethe included both types of experiences in *Faust*. An examination of each example can help orient educators for democracy to recognize specific problems with legislation such as NCLB.

Transformation to Autonomy Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre

Critics of NCLB claimed it does not emphasize the exercise of habits for students to become democratic actors. As critics argued, if educators want schools to develop students into democratic citizens, schools must provide experiences for individuals to exercise habits for democratic governance. Goethe introduced this point through the Poet, who commented that individuals in a crowd “lack the least rapport, each playing his disgruntled part” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 75). The lack of rapport is a sign that individuals may not act according to a unifying principle in expression of their collective will. The Clown noted individuals in a crowd might be

moved differently by the Poet's creation, "One thrills to this, one finds that in your art, each sees precisely what is in his heart" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 77)

Individuals might be moved by the art to act according to their individual impulses and desires, the totality of which could form a tapestry of concepts. The atomized electorate would not act as a democratic community because their communication would lack a unifying principle. Individuals could become transformed and united in their mutual orientation based upon the art as an organizing principle for their lives. The art could serve as a principle, inspiration, or paradigm that transforms individuals into autonomous actors capable of creating a common purpose. The Poet's creation can be viewed as a metaphor for Postman's "end" or Barber's "common vision." None of these organizing principles will be democratic if individuals remain atomized and do not transform into autonomous actors.⁷ In order to transform students, educators must first understand their capacities and then provide the necessary experiences. This idea echoes Dewey's admonition to consider individuals' interests prior to educating them to enter and maintain a society.⁸ Educators who advocate passive learning through a transmission model may fail to exercise the faculties necessary for individual transformation of students into democratic actors.

Transformation to Autonomy Example 2: Study

Mephisto remarked that Faust must be boring to students and to himself. He asked why one would work so hard since, "The best that you could ever know, you may not tell the little boys" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 193). Goethe utilized Mephisto's perplexity to show that educators

⁷ See Dewey's delineation of "purpose" and the importance of educated individuals in a democracy (1938, p. 67; 1916, pp. 86-87).

⁸ "If we eliminate the individual factor from society, we are left only with an inert and lifeless mass. Education, therefore, must begin with a psychological insight into the child's capacities, interests, and habits." See Dewey's "My Pedagogic Creed" for a fuller explanation of the importance of learning individuals' preferences in fostering their education.

may possess knowledge and be able to transmit knowledge to students, but educators cannot transmit the faculties they have developed. As critics of NCLB argued, only active learning can offer the experiences necessary for individuals to become autonomous, democratic actors.

Further, knowledge that served one generation might not be as helpful for future generations, thus students need to be able to create knowledge they need to survive in whichever set of circumstances they encounter. Dewey made this point, warning educators, “It is a mistake to suppose that acquisition of skills in reading and figuring will automatically constitute preparation for their right and effective use under conditions very unlike those in which they were acquired” (1938, p. 47). Dewey added, “Collateral learning in the way of formation of enduring attitudes, of likes and dislikes, may be and often is much more important” (1938, p. 48). Dewey recognized that offering students experiences necessary for their transformation will allow students to create knowledge to meet future conditions. If, as critics allege, NCLB encourages the transmission of an approved core of knowledge and punishes non-compliance, individuals may not exercise the habits necessary to transform into autonomous actors who can adapt and create knowledge to thrive within a changing society. Goethe advocated an active learning through the example of Faust, whose experiences transformed him into an autonomous actor capable of making decisions for the betterment of society.

Transformation to Autonomy Example 3: Martha’s Garden Transformation through a Relationship

Goethe showed Margaret’s fidelity and devotion to tradition gave her self-control and inoculated her against the control of impulses and desires. Margaret is an exemplar of an individual who maintained self-control, even though she had little power through mastery of information. If proponents of passive learning maintain information transmission is a primary goal of schools, what is lost to students? Freire claimed students may lose their relationship with

a community, critical consciousness, and exercise in democratic action.⁹ Dewey (1938; 1916) and Wolk (1998) warned that individual interests may be sacrificed to learn an approved core of knowledge, and students may spend more time learning to solve past problems than considering solutions to contemporary ones. Goethe added the loss of transformation toward becoming autonomous.

Margaret felt as though Mephisto “has no sympathy for anything” and that “he thinks love is a disgrace” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 331). When Margaret left, Mephisto asked, “The monkey! Is she gone?” Mephisto saw Margaret as a simpleton who knew little, had little power, but was capable of being manipulated by her impulses and desires, and equally capable of controlling Faust through inflaming his impulses and desires. However, Margaret was in love with Faust, which may appear to control her as much or more than impulses and desires. Did Margaret’s love for Faust control her, or liberate her?

Goethe utilized Faust and Margaret’s love to show that knowledge may be useful in controlling one’s environment, but striving for mutual beneficence is liberating because the individual will not be influenced by natural desires and impulse. Margaret did not allow impulses and desires to control her; she desired Faust’s well-being, and she maintained fidelity to her traditions despite temptations. Margaret is an example of an autonomous actor seeking to maximize the well-being of her community, specifically Faust. Though lacking knowledge and power to create purpose, she maintained self-control. Faust’s experiences with Margaret transformed him into an autonomous actor because Margaret’s love demanded sincerity from Faust. Faust’s experiences with Mephisto only required the satisfaction of cyclical impulses and

⁹ Wolk supported Freire’s criticism of a banking conception of education: “The development of a critical consciousness is all but ignored within the dominant paradigm of schooling today, which is all about banking knowledge and perpetuating an unconscious and antiintellectual way of life. Democracy demands much more than this; it needs people who refuse to live passive lives” (1998, p. 93).

desires, thus no transformation was necessary. Faust was transformed through experiences with Mephisto only temporarily, as in the case of alcohol and revelry. If a transmission model of education does little to transform students as Faust had been transformed, it may impede the development of democratic actors. Students may learn a great deal of information and gain power, but without the exercise in community and communication they may be getting little exercise in becoming citizens in a democracy (Wolk, 1998).

Autonomy

Autonomy is one of three main component of democratic education, but, as Barber explained, it also supports the development of community (Murchland, 2000). Community offers individuals the resources of numerous minds, tradition, power, and laws, which can enhance or impede individual autonomy. Goethe included in *Faust* examples of the relationship between individual autonomy and community.

Autonomy Example 1: Street Individual Versus Communal Benefit

Democratic educators allege practices such as NCLB that promote competition rather than cooperation may result in students seeking advantage over others rather than mutual benefit implied by democracy.¹⁰ Goethe illustrated a difference between the two strategies in “Street.” Mephisto wanted to gain the attention of Margaret’s friend Martha. He claimed to have news that Martha’s missing husband had died in Padua. Martha wanted a testament to the death of her husband, so Mephisto said, “What is testified by two is everywhere known to be true” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 289). Mephisto said he would bring another to testify because he wanted an excuse to bring Faust to Margaret.

¹⁰ “Some parents ... expect schools to provide their children with an advantage over other children. That is the third form of success-*competitive*-in which my success implies your failure” (Parker, Ed., 2002, p. 6).

When Mephisto informed Faust of his plan, Faust considered respecting Martha's autonomy by actually visiting Padua to learn the truth of her husband's fate. Telling the truth would be respecting Martha's autonomy because she could make an informed decision if she had the proper information. Faust was anxious to meet Margaret but became angry that they had to go to Padua, but Mephisto said he had no intention of doing that; they would simply lie. Faust was unhappy, but Mephisto declared:

You gave your definitions with power and finesse,
With brazen cheek and haughty breath.
And if you stop to think, I guess,
You knew as much of that, you must confess,
As you know now of Mr. Schwerdtlein's death. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 293).

Mephisto claimed Faust knew as much about the death of Martha's husband as he did about much of the knowledge he had imparted to students, which is sometimes very little. Faust called Mephisto a "sophist and a liar," but Mephisto simply asked Faust to appear the next day to testify.

Telling lies reduces the autonomy of deceived parties by treating them as a means to an end and not as autonomous beings.¹¹ Mephisto had manipulated Martha and Margaret through lying in order to gain an advantage for himself and Faust. Faust had respected the autonomy of others because it was reasonable for him to expect people to tell the truth in order to discern their will prior to making a decision that affected all of them. Lying interrupted a democratic process by excluding the will of the participants who were affected. Critics alleged NCLB interrupts the democratic process not necessarily through lying, but by excluding the will of the affected parties.

¹¹ For a more full explication of the relationship between autonomy and lying, see the example of Immanuel Kant's Categorical Imperative.

Autonomy Example 2: Dismal Day Internal Versus External Locus of Control

Autonomy can lead to happiness, but there is no guarantee that freely arrived at decisions must do so. Goethe showed having autonomy provides individuals with control over decisions even if those decisions lead to actions that do not lead to happiness. Autonomous expressions of individuals may not lead to actions that bring happiness, but may lead to the development of individuals in community which eventually lead to the fulfillment of purpose rather than the satisfaction of impulses and desires.

Faust had enjoyed revelry in Walpurgis Night, but Margaret had been imprisoned and become miserable. Faust learned of this and cursed “unfeeling mankind.” After also cursing Mephisto for diverting his attention from Margaret, Mephisto simply offered that Margaret wasn’t the first person to perish helplessly. Faust exclaimed, “The misery of this one woman surges through my heart and marrow, and you grin unperturbed over the fate of thousands!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 401). Faust revealed his love for Margaret had made him miserable simply because she was. Mephisto asked Faust, “Who was it that plunged her into ruin? I or you?” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 403). It was Margaret’s love for Faust that led to her misery, and his love for her that led to his misery. If either party had simply desired satisfaction of impulses and desires, neither would have been plunged into misery from this situation. If individual autonomy can lead to misery in a community of individuals who are for each other rather than only themselves, why would individuals seek to develop such a community?

Margaret freely chose actions through love for Faust, which did lead to misery. Had she been under the influence of impulses and desires, she would not have had such misery, although she may have been dissatisfied. Consider that the benefit of satisfying impulses and desires is temporary and can be externally manipulated. Margaret and Faust had internal motivations that were not easily influenced by external factors like manipulation of their impulses and desires.

Educators who teach power over the natural world for the satisfaction of impulses and desires do not transform students into autonomous individuals because they would remain at the mercy of an external form of satisfaction. Being at the mercy of an external form of satisfaction implies a lack of self-control. Educators who teach self-control liberate students to enjoy satisfaction of impulses and desires without subjecting them to the control of impulses and desires. Rousseau made this point in *Emile* when he declared students should become self-reliant rather than desirous of wants outside of their power to obtain them, or when they are influenced by society to desire baubles.

Organizing Principle/Collective Will

An organizing principle is an idea, image, or vision toward which individuals in a society orient their actions. Gutmann asserted, “The ideal of democratic education also insists upon instituting a common standard compatible with diversity” (1987, p. xi). A common standard can orient a collective will with autonomous individuals communicating their perspectives and agreeing to act in concert. Goethe recognized Gutmann’s point that a common standard can orient a community toward collective action while respecting diversity.

Organizing Principle/Collective Will Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre Unity out of Diversity

Goethe illustrated the importance of an organizing principle for democratic action in the “Prelude in the Theatre.” A Director and Clown desired to please a crowd, but a Poet only seemed to consider his art. The Poet later asked, who “secures Olympus and unites the gods,” claiming, “The strength of man, in poets become flesh” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 77). While at times claiming to disdain the crowd, the Poet actually saw his role was to unite the crowd into a community. The Poet discussed his relationship with a crowd:

When all the living lack the least rapport,
Each playing his disgruntled part-

Who scans the selfsame lines as they unroll,
Bestowing life, and quickening, rhythmic motion?
Who calls each single voice to celebrate the whole,
So all may blend in musical devotion? (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 75)

The Poet recognized his work could serve as a principle, inspiration, or paradigm that could transform individuals in an analogous manner, forming a common reference point for decisions and collective action. While individuals in a crowd may “lack the least rapport,” the Poet can call “each single voice to celebrate the whole.” Neil Postman offered a similar thesis in declaring educators should offer “gods” to serve as organizing principles for students.¹² Postman claimed, “You cannot have a democratic- indeed, civilized- community life unless people have learned how to participate in a disciplined way as part of a group.... Individuals must learn in a setting in which individual needs are subordinated to group interests” (1995, p.45).

Organizing Principle/Collective Will Example 2: Street Tradition can Increase or Decrease Autonomy

Goethe made numerous references to customs and mores throughout *Faust*. Customs and mores can serve to limit autonomy if society punishes transgressions of them. Customs and mores can also serve as an organizing principle in the form of tradition. If individuals maintain fidelity to tradition, their actions become somewhat predictable within parameters. One example of tradition as an organizing principle is Martha and Margaret’s expectation concerning their own actions after the news of Martha’s husband’s death.

When Mephisto informed Martha that her missing husband had died, he claimed she could marry again. Martha replied she could not. Mephisto said she could take a lover, but Margaret said that wasn’t their custom. Mephisto said maybe it wasn’t, but it was still done.

¹² In his *The End of Education*, Postman called organizing narratives “gods” since they served to unite individuals and provide a purpose for education. He claimed that some “gods” in American education, such as materialism, no longer serve as a beneficial organizing principle.

Martha maintained fidelity to tradition. Mephisto offered satisfaction of impulses and desires by claiming she could take another lover. Goethe showed that tradition could provide stability against the influences of impulses and desires. Is ceding self-control to tradition a more autonomous act than ceding self-control to impulses and desires? Goethe's treatment of tradition in *Faust* implied it is better to cede self-control to tradition because individuals would act in concert according to an organizing principle. Autonomy would be maintained through adherence to a common set of rules. Knowing the rules confers a degree of autonomy via predictability and expectations of the actions of others. Impulses and desires may be natural and uniform, but they are erratic and temporary. Educators for democratic citizens may recognize value in traditional practices, but dogmatic acceptance of traditional practices leads to a loss of democratic practice.

Inertial Community

I have designated a community as inertial if individuals do not exercise habits necessary for developing into democratic actors. Individuals in inertial communities may lack autonomy, their communication may support their inertia rather than liberate them from it, and they may lack self-created purpose. I will examine four examples of inertial communities in *Faust* to isolate problems with legislation such as NCLB.

Inertial Community Example 1: Before the City Gate Education as Training

Apple (2006, p. 91) claimed individuals in a market-driven educational system view students as consumers. In this model, schools provide a product capable of comparison to other products in the form of standardized tests. Legislation such as NCLB fits well with a market model since it advocates standardized tests so students and parents can compare schools. The point is that communities that view students as consumers orient pedagogy toward a market-driven model. Apple has provided numerous problems with this view.

“Before the City Gate” provides another example of how a model can affect pedagogy.

Faust and Wagner noticed that a poodle had followed them home. Faust thought there was something strange about the poodle, but Wagner explained that dogs are trained to follow people, and concluded:

By dogs that are extremely trained
The wisest man is entertained.
He quite deserves your favor: it is prudent
To cultivate the students’ noble student. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 149)

Wagner discussed the poodle in the same terms he discussed students; both humans and poodles could be trained. Goethe illustrated that although autonomy is potentially available to all individuals, teachers can “train” students who lack an ability to create purpose or are slaves to impulses and desires. In either case student learning is externally directed and not self-created. Advocates of passive learning such as proponents of NCLB may view pedagogy in terms of training. This training may lead to an atrophy of skills necessary for students to develop into democratic actors.¹³ As Apple noted, there is a relationship between how educators view students and pedagogy. If educators view students as consumers, they may employ a pedagogy that impedes rather than promotes democracy. If educators view students as individuals to be conditioned, as Wagner has done, then educators may not develop pedagogy necessary to exercise students in habits necessary for democratic action.

Inertial Community Example 2: Study Training through Satisfying Impulses and Desires

Satisfaction of impulses and desires is not itself a detriment to democratic education, but as Dewey explained, “Neither impulse nor desire is itself a purpose” (1938, p. 67). Control over impulses and desires can lead to satisfaction of a purpose. If students do not have control of

¹³ Monty Neill wrote, “Students must be actively engaged in learning to be part of a democratic citizenry and not treated merely as passive recipients of knowledge” (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004, p. 106).

impulses and desires, they are susceptible to inertia. Dewey recognized that students not in control of impulses and desires are sometimes trained rather than educated:

In many cases-too many cases- the activity of the immature human being is simply played upon to secure habits which are useful. He is trained like an animal rather than educated like a human being. His instincts remain attached to their original objects of pain or pleasure. But to get happiness or to avoid the pain of failure he has to act in a way agreeable to others. (1916, p. 13)

Individuals susceptible to being controlled by impulses and desires are less capable of developing autonomy since they act to satisfy impulses and desires rather than create purpose. Goethe illustrated this point through the relationship between Mephisto and Faust. The two entered into a wager where Faust declared, “If ever I recline, calmed, on a bed of sloth, you may destroy me then and there” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 183). Mephisto assumed that Faust’s impulses and desires would lead Faust to indulge in the experiences to satisfy them. If Faust were controlled by his impulses and desires, Mephisto could control Faust and obtain his soul. If Faust ceded control to impulses and desires, he would be in a state of inertia because his actions would be determined by external factors - his impulses and desires, and by extension, Mephisto who controlled Faust’s experiences.

If legislation such as NCLB does not exercise students in habits for democratic action, students could be left susceptible to their impulses and desires. If students are susceptible to impulses and desires, they can be “trained” to behave in a prescribed manner. Such training replaces individual action through autonomy with controlling individuals through manipulation of desires and impulses.

Inertial Community Example 3: Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig Satisfaction of Impulses and Desires as a Purpose Itself

I included this scene as an example of a community that is an aggregate of individuals united for a purpose, but the purpose itself is inertial. The satisfaction of a desire for alcohol, and

the revelry that ensues, impedes rather than promotes autonomy and democratic action. The patrons in this scene united under a common purpose at first- to enjoy the evening- and then united several times to act upon various suggestions of other patrons. The point is that democratic action is not simply unified action by an aggregate of individuals.¹⁴ The community itself is inertial due to the influence of alcohol on each individual and their lack of self-control over impulses and desires.

The patrons in this scene are transformed by consuming alcohol, and Mephisto and Faust joined in. Mephisto then deceived the patrons and they became angry, with one patron shouting suggestions as to how to proceed to attack Mephisto and Faust. Although the patrons unanimously followed the suggestions, it was the alcohol that provided the stimulus that moved them, not their autonomy. It was a lack of self-control that allowed inertia to influence their behavior. If NCLB uses rewards and punishments to effectively control schools, then the rewards and punishments can act like the alcohol in this scene- an inertial element controlling individual behavior. This control could be hegemonic if parents and legislators accept the goals and methods employed, as many have accepted the goals and methods of NCLB. The goal of democratic educators would include exercising in students habits of individual self-control so the community could determine a democratic purpose for action rather than simply act upon a unanimously agreed upon option determined by impulses and desires.

Inertial Community Example 4: Witch's Kitchen Power Without Development

Goethe illustrated a community that provides power to individuals but does not cultivate faculties in those individuals. In this scene a group of monkeys were working for a Witch. As a few monkeys were preparing a potion one monkey implored Mephisto:

¹⁴ Recall Adam Smith's vision of an invisible hand guiding the economy through the self-interest of individuals.

Oh please throw the dice
And lose, and be nice
And let me get wealthy!
We are in the ditch,
And if I were rich,
Then I might be healthy! (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 239)

Mephisto responded, “How happy every monkey thinks he’d be, if he could play the lottery.”

Goethe’s point in this exchange was that power could be obtained in a manner that does not transform the individual. The power gained through money from winning a lottery may give the monkey power over its environment, but the power it has gained would not lead to its development. There are two reasons for this. First, the outcome of a lottery is outside of the monkey’s control. If individuals do not have control over the mechanisms through which they obtain something, they are at the whim of the external source and thus they become acted upon rather than autonomous actors making a decision. Second, even though the power obtained from winning a lottery can offer control over their environment, if individuals do not have self-control they may be subject to another external force which would in turn mean that anything in their control would be at the mercy of whatever controlled them. An example is an addict who wins a lottery. The addict could use the money for a number of beneficial purposes, but if the addict lacked self-control then the money may not be utilized in a manner that benefits him or his community. Goethe offered another example of inertia through the words of the Witch:

The lofty prize
Of science lies
Concealed today as ever.
Who has no thought,
To him it’s brought
To own without endeavor. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 253)

Goethe’s point was that although the benefits of science were gained by the work of a few scientists, all members of a community could enjoy the discoveries. As in the case of Wagner and Homunculus, Goethe warned that power outside the control of individual’s autonomy may

not help individuals obtain their purposes, and can even be destructive or antagonistic to their desired purpose. A community that delivers power without opportunity for transformation does not increase autonomy or lead to democratic action. Legislation such as NCLB may deliver power to students in the form of knowledge and skills. The point is that legislation such as NCLB may do little to create a democratic community, much like monkeys who gain power by winning a lottery may not have learned to direct the power of their wealth toward the creation of a purpose.

Community as part of *Bildung*

I discussed autonomy as a component of democratic education and an element of *Bildung* education. Educators noted exercising autonomy can develop in students habits required for democratic practice (Meier & Woods, Eds., 2004; Parker, 2003; Wolk, 1998). A second delineated component of democratic education is community. Educators have noted *Bildung* education can exercise faculties in students which can help transform individuals into a community. Berman recognized, “The only way for modern man to transform himself, Faust and we will find out, is by radically transforming the whole physical and social and moral world he lives in” (Berman, 1982, p. 40). Communities that foster individual autonomy may then develop citizens capable of democratic practice. A goal of *Bildung* education is transforming individuals into autonomous actors, who in turn are capable of democratic practice in community.

Dewey made this point in discussing the dialectic between the individual and social aspects of education.¹⁵ Aristotle, in the *Politics*, claimed man develops reason best through interaction with the state, and only through proper use of reason would man experience *eudaimonia*.¹⁶

¹⁵ See Dewey’s “My Pedagogic Creed,” *The School Journal*, Vol. LIV, Num. 3 (January 16, 1897), pp. 77-80.

¹⁶ *Eudaimonia* is a Greek word meaning happiness or fulfillment.

Goethe illustrated the social influence on individual development by following the life of Faust from his contemplation of suicide, through his love affair, up until his death and salvation.

Faust was a solitary figure at the start of the play, but developed into a leader whose land reclamation project was beneficial to an entire village. Faust had greatly desired to complete his project, but as the example of his dealing with Baucis and Philemon reveals, he did not merely exercise power to get what he wanted. Ungar noted, “The crucial element to him [Goethe] was the communal spirit, without which man’s social life, no matter how well organized, was doomed to frustration and failure” (1963, p. 15). Even the influence of Mephisto, who helped Faust obtain a great deal of power, did not dissuade Faust from his fidelity to his own autonomy and respect for the autonomy of members of his community.

In *Faust*, Goethe showed that *Bildung* transformed Faust from a solitary scholar to an active member of a community. Part of this development led to self-control and autonomy. Ungar interpreted Goethe, “Man must learn to indulge or curb his desires, as the case may be and as reason and responsibility dictate” (1963, p. 16). Mephisto had offered power for the satisfaction of impulses and desires. Faust at first took advantage of this power to become young, enjoy revelry, gain the attention of Margaret, and eventually secure the resources to begin his land reclamation project. However, Faust’s development led him to cede his autonomy to the benefit of the community. Ceding autonomy to an external source such as the community may appear to negate autonomy, but as Barber explained, autonomy can be best expressed through an “enlarged vision” revealing “in the common force the working of their own wills” (1984, p. 232).

Goethe gave examples where individuals cede self-control to impulses and desires, authority figures, approved knowledge, traditions, love, and the community. Ceding control to impulses and desires means satisfaction is outside of individuals’ power. Even when impulses

and desires are satisfied, satisfaction is temporary. Ceding control to authority figures leaves authority figures in control. If the authority figure is autonomous and beneficent, individuals who ceded control may enjoy benefits but would still lack self-control. Future authority figures may be less than beneficent. Ceding control to approved knowledge leaves individuals at the mercy of those who control knowledge production and approval, such as high stakes test developers or the legislatures that purchase these tests. Ceding self-control to tradition leaves individual autonomy at the mercy of rules determined in the past. Tradition, however, does provide for some autonomy because all individuals operate under the same rules and should be able to predict the actions of others. Further, traditions can evolve as needs change. Ceding self-control to love retains autonomy in the same sense that Immanuel Kant claimed autonomy was a state of adherence to self-derived laws.¹⁷ The individual will finds its expression in the will of a larger group, whether kingdom of ends according to Kant, or a relationship or community according to Goethe.

In ceding self-control to community, individuals are fulfilling their autonomy. First, they have freely decided to multiply their knowledge by communicating and deliberating with individuals in the society. Second, a collective will can multiply the power of any single individual. Third, a majority of reasonable individuals can override the decisions of any single individual; presumably a majority of reasonable individuals has greater knowledge than a single individual. Fourth, as Gutmann emphasized in her idea of “conscious social reproduction”, a community is best able to maintain an education system necessary to insure it educates students to become autonomous.

¹⁷ See Kant’s *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. H.J. Paton, trans. (1964). New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Goethe showed that Faust's development at the end of the play led him to act for the benefit of Margaret, and to complete his land reclamation project for the benefit of his community. Both decisions were autonomous expressions revealing Faust's transformation over the course of the play. Numerous educators recognized the value of exercising students in habits for democracy as opposed to transmitting to students knowledge about democracy. The development of Faust through *Bildung* education reveals his transformation into a more autonomous actor working toward the improvement of the community- two habits of democratic practice. Legislation such as NCLB that promotes passive learning may not be exercising students in habits of democratic practice. Students who lack exercise in democratic practice might be less capable of transforming into democratic actors. *Bildung* education as revealed in Goethe's *Faust* might offer a model toward which democratic educators can orient pedagogy.

CHAPTER 5 DELIBERATION

Introduction

According to prominent democratic theorists, a democracy requires three main conditions: autonomy, community, and the absence of an independent ground for decision-making.

Democratic educators claim in order to develop a democratic citizenry, individuals must exercise habits of democratic practices. Three delineated practices correspond with the three conditions necessary for a democracy: a) exercising freedom and self-control; b) exercising habits for communal life; and c) exercising habits in deliberation. I have discussed the conditions of autonomy and community in *Faust*, recognizing their development in individuals through *Bildung* education. The third delineated condition required for a democracy is deliberation.

Deliberation can occur between any combination of autonomous and inertial individuals. It can occur between individuals or among individuals in a community. Deliberation between autonomous individuals can lead to democratic decisions. Deliberation between inertial individuals may lead to power being exerted in accord with impulses and desires rather than created purpose. The most democratic combination is deliberation between autonomous actors who have transformed to the point of recognizing a communal spirit. This form of democratic deliberation is most conducive to replicating democratic society in a “conscious social reproduction” because individuals have knowledge and perspectives of others available to them, they have a communal spirit, and they communicate periodically to update their individual knowledge of their collective will.

Societies, whether democratic or not, exhibit a process toward taking collective action. Goethe included in *Faust* a number of examples of processes toward collective action, some more democratic than others. What constitutes democratic deliberation? Democratic deliberation

involves autonomous participants (Gutmann, 1987; Dewey, 1938) who communicate with each other (Parker, 2003; Gutmann, 1987) in order to arrive at mutually acceptable decisions (Parker, 2003; Freire, 1993; Gutmann, 1987). Deliberation is less than democratic if it mitigates any of the three delineated conditions for democratic collective action: autonomy of participants; participants' ability to communicate; or process and desire for making mutually acceptable decisions. *Faust* includes examples of more and less democratic deliberation. After discussing deliberation based upon the definitions of prominent democratic theorists, I will identify in *Faust* examples of processes for collective action and divide them into two groups: less than democratic deliberation and democratic deliberation. I will then discuss how an education for *Bildung* can contribute to democratic deliberation.

Deliberation Defined

Murchland asked Barber which characteristic he considered most important in discerning a genuine public voice: "Barber said if he had to choose one it would be deliberation. That is so important to the democratic process" (Murchland, 2000, p. 25). How did Barber define "deliberation"? Murchland quoted Barber:

The public voice is deliberative, which means it is critically reflective as well as self-reflective; it must be able to withstand reiteration, critical cross-examination, and the test of time- which guarantees a certain distance and dispassion. Like all deliberative voices, the public voice is dialectical: it transcends contraries without surrendering their distinctiveness (just as a good marriage between strong individual partners makes them one without losing their two-ness). (2000, p. 25)

Barber has identified a number of elements of deliberation that can lead to democratic practice; critical reflection can confer autonomy, dialectical exchanges imply communication, and transcending contraries can lead to agreement. How do educators contribute to creating a democratic electorate? Gutmann suggested exercise in deliberation should include conscious, self-reflective choices:

As citizens, we aspire to a set of educational practices and authorities of which the following can be said: these are the practices and authorities to which we, acting collectively as a society, have consciously agreed. It follows that a society that supports conscious social reproduction must educate all educable children to be capable of participating in collectively shaping their society. (1987, p. 39)

Gutmann's requirements for a pedagogy aimed at creating citizens capable of participating in a democracy include practices for individuals to be self-aware and to have power to shape their environment. Gutmann added:

A necessary (but not sufficient) condition of conscious social reproduction is that citizens have the capacity to deliberate among alternative ways of personal and political life. To put this point in more 'liberal' language: a good life and a good society for self-reflective people require (respectively) individual and collective freedom of choice. (1987, p. 40)

Barber's dialectic and Gutmann's deliberation require "self-reflective" and "conscious" communication between participants in a democratic society. Parker stated clearly individuals in deliberation should engage in "a purposeful relationship that requires some measure of getting to know one another, presenting ourselves to one another, expressing opinions and reasons for them, and listening" (2003, p. 80). What gives collective decisions the authority to lead to collective action?

Barber and Parker claimed a democratic deliberation is itself an authority guiding collective action. According to Barber, "Democracy is... a system of conduct concerned with what we will do together and how we agree on what we will do" (Murchland, 2000, p. 22). Parker clarified, saying the method and goal of a democratic deliberation should involve "weighing alternative courses of action and trying to decide which policy would be best for all concerned" (2003, p. 80). According to Barber and Parker, deliberation is democratic if autonomous participants communicate and decide upon the procedures for arriving at a mutually

agreeable decision. This is similar to Habermas' "reconstructive" conception of a legitimate democratic decision-making process.¹

Are all deliberations equally democratic? Prominent democratic theorists cite examples of less than democratic deliberation. What elements might enter into deliberation that makes it less than democratic? Gutmann acknowledged inertial self-interest, impulses and desires, and tradition, can influence deliberation:

The willingness and ability to deliberate set morally serious people apart from both sophists, who use clever argument to elevate their own interests into self-righteous causes, and traditionalists, who invoke established authority to subordinate their own reason to unjust causes. People who give careful consideration to the morality of laws can be trusted to defend and to respect laws that are not in their self-interest, at the same time as they can be expected to oppose laws that violate democratic principles. (1987, p. 52)

Deliberation can be more or less democratic depending upon the presence of the three delineated conditions: autonomous participants, communication, and mutual agreement. Less than democratic deliberation may defer to an external authority such as self-interest or tradition. Barber agreed with Gutmann that deference to such external authorities such as self-interest or tradition is less than democratic because these external authorities exclude the involvement of members of society. Self-interest excludes the input of others, and tradition defers to past input. Without following impulses and desires or tradition, how do societies begin a process toward collective decision-making and collective action?

Barber acknowledged that democratic deliberation begins with the absence of an independent ground for decision-making: "If we had certain knowledge about the ideal forms of human association we wouldn't need democracy" (Murchland, 2000, p. 22). Are all deliberations

¹ Habermas had delineated his "reconstructive" process for taking collective action. He claimed a recommendation "X" is legitimate if it is in the general interest and the "normative validity claim connected with X counts as justified" (Habermas, 1979, p. 204). A claim connected with a justificatory scheme "S" would be legitimate if it were valid in S. Habermas claimed a decision is democratic even if parties disagree with X as long as all parties had agreed with S.

that include input from participants considered democratic? Democratic theorists are divided on this question. Theorists such as Dewey (1938; 1916), de Tocqueville (1969), Parker (2003), and Gutmann (1987) seem to endorse as democratic only deliberation that include autonomous actors. Murchland (2000) accepts that individual impulses and desires, and tradition, influence decisions: “I’ve learned that one source of democracy’s strength is its embrace of the very ambiguity, contradiction, and conflict decried by its critics” (2000, p. 4). He explained:

Unlike other political theories that would transform human nature to some ideal mold, democracy accepts a warts-and-all humanity. This pessimistic anthropology is one of democracy’s greatest strengths. It accepts that self-interest and passion are the mainsprings of human action; that tragedy and failure go with the territory; that the engine of history is the conflict of wills. The raw materials of humanity are not very promising, but democracy takes them for what they are and in this realism finds a source of creativity. (Murchland, 2000, pp. 4-5)

Murchland acknowledged conformity to an external, “ideal mold” is less than democratic, but he claimed inertial influences such as impulses and desires may influence collective decisions which would still be considered democratic. Considering a conflict of wills is a precursor to a deliberation, how does Murchland expect society to arrive at a collective decision? Murchland is not clear on this, but Dewey and Parker offer a possible answer.

Dewey declared, “It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ... indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties. This formulation...does not mean that the latter should attempt to bring about a compromise between opposed schools of thought” (Dewey, 1938, p. 5). Dewey claimed although participating parties are represented in deliberation, democratic deliberation does not mean society must find a compromise between ideas of competing parties. Parker referred this compromise-type of deliberation as *negotiation*.

Negotiation and compromise both imply competing interests. Parker explained negotiation: “Here discussion is involved, certainly, but the group is assuming competing interests and the

discussion is guided by calculating constantly the gains and losses of each” (2003, p. 81).

According to the three delineated conditions for democratic deliberation, competing interests that don’t transcend contraries to yield a mutually agreeable decision are less than democratic.

Notwithstanding the exception of Murchland’s “pessimistic anthropology,” I will utilize the three delineated conditions in a search for more democratic deliberation and include compromise and negotiation in the category of less democratic deliberation. After identifying in *Faust* more and less democratic deliberation according to the three delineated conditions, I will consider how an education for *Bildung* can develop practitioners toward becoming more democratic actors.

Deliberation in *Faust*

Goethe included in *Faust* myriad combinations of more and less democratic deliberation. I have discussed examples where the delineated conditions for democratic deliberation have been mitigated and produced less than democratic decisions toward collective action. I will introduce three examples where participants orient decisions toward collective action more closely satisfying criteria for democratic action.

Example 1: Part II: Charming Landscape Faust Transformed into an Autonomous Actor

Faust had awakened after many experiences with Mephisto, and a love affair with Margaret, to feel renewed in the spring. He was greeted by spirits who offered to help heal him: “Whether wicked, whether holy, they would heal the wretched man” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 423). These spirits we asked to attend to Faust, and “Relieve the bitter conflict in his heart.” The chorus exclaimed, “You are healed- oh, apprehend it, trust the newborn light of day!” They gave a specific explanation of how this occurred:

To have wish on wish fulfilled,
See the splendor of the day!
Lightly only you are held:

Sleep is shell, cast it away!
Do not waver even when
Many falter and stand back:
All things can be done by men
Who are quick to see and act. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 425-427)

The references to being born again are reminiscent of Faust's first "new" birth into Mephisto's world of physical and material experiences. This time they signal Faust's birth to his transformed, developed self. He is now capable of autonomy because of the knowledge he has gained from his experiences with Mephisto and Margaret. Faust found all Mephisto could offer to be unsatisfying, and Margaret's love to be liberating. The new Faust had greater self-control, and a broader perspective to include the well-being of Margaret and his community.

After his soliloquy Faust declared, "Deep within you prompt a stern decision: To strive for highest life with all my powers" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 427). Faust offered an analogy: The rainbow mirrors human love and strife; consider it and you will better know: In many-hued reflection we have life" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 429). Faust now knew the best decisions he could make were decisions made in the interest of the whole society. The rainbow suggests discrete parties, but as a totality they are one. If combined, they form white light. The rainbow is a metaphor for society in the sense that discrete individuals can combine to form one whole.

With knowledge and a broader perspective, autonomous individuals, such as Faust in this scene, may realize improvement for the collective whole is also in the best interest of each participant. Power struggles may gain benefits for discrete parties in the short run and a compromise may temporarily relieve antagonism, but competing interests remain until a mutually agreeable decision is reached. Goethe utilized the concept of "striving" to display two major ideas. One idea is the development of Faust over the course of the play through *Bildung*. The second is the recognition that collective decision-making leading to collective action is a

process perpetually open to re-evaluation as knowledge is gained, perspectives are voiced, and a purpose toward a goal is modified.

Example 2: Walpurgis Night's Dream

Goethe used the metaphor of a wedding to explain the decision of a collective. A herald proclaimed, "To make a golden wedding day takes fifty years to the letter; but when their quarrels pass away, that gold I like much better" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 387). A couple may have conflicting individual interests that manifest as quarrels in their communications. If they are committed to the success of the marriage, their individual interests will be satisfied in the form of a mutually agreed upon decision. Recall Barber utilized this exact metaphor of a good marriage to describe the dialectical process leading toward an agreed upon decision. Goethe called the resultant decision "gold" implying it is valuable. I view this metaphor in the context of the play as evidence Goethe recognized a mutually agreed upon solution to be more valuable than arguing for individual interests. Considering Goethe highlighted that the process takes time, and may include quarrels along the way, indicates the role *Bildung* has in leading individuals toward a more democratic action through a mutually agreed upon decision.

Example 3: Large Outer Court of the Palace

Goethe showed a practical example of a community acting in concert for the benefit of the whole. Faust was lauding his accomplishment of reclaiming land from the ocean, desiring further to drain swamps to make even more land available. Faust described how such projects can get accomplished:

Both men and herds live on this newest earth,
Settled along the edges of a hill
That has been raised by bold men's zealous will.
A veritable paradise inside,
Then let the dams be licked by raging tide;
And as it nibbles to rush in with force,
A common will fills gaps and checks its course. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 467)

Faust's vision, not unlike the Poet's created purpose, functioned as an organizing principle for the individuals inhabiting the newly reclaimed land. Realizing a common interest in the project, individuals deliberated and decided that working together under Faust's direction was the best way to create the community, although Mephisto continuously suggested Faust should use power to force compliance. Faust resisted, as exemplified by the deal he offered Philemon and Baucis—a grand estate on the new land in exchange for their cottage. Although Mephisto's compatriots did eventually use violence to remove Philemon and Baucis, this was not Faust's intention. Faust's efforts were in concert with the will of the community, and all parties worked to perpetually maintain the new community. When Faust was near death, it was in part this perpetual state of striving that won him salvation.

Less Democratic Deliberation in *Faust*

The three delineated conditions for democratic deliberation include participants who: a) are autonomous; b) communicate; c) seek to arrive at mutually acceptable decisions prior to taking collective action. Goethe included in *Faust* examples of participants making decisions and taking collective action based upon conditions where these criteria are mitigated. I will discuss each example in terms of the presence and/or absence of these delineated conditions.

Autonomy Example1: Auerbach's Keller in Leipzig Mitigated by Impulses and Desires

Goethe showed that an individual's actions, and an aggregate of individuals acting collectively, may yield inertial behavior if the individuals involved were influenced by impulses and desires. In this scene a group of intoxicated patrons decide to take collective action by following anyone who offers a suggestion. When one begins to sing, they all follow in a chorus. When Mephisto offers more wine, they all partake and become more intoxicated. When one recognizes that Mephisto tricked them, they all advance on Mephisto with knives. Goethe

showed through the actions of this group that a mob mentality can lead to collective action based upon the decision of inertial deliberation, in this case driven by impulses and desires.

A more specific example from this scene is reflected in a song chosen by a patron. He began to sing about the Holy Roman Empire when another retorted, “A nasty song! It reeks of politics! ... At least I think it is much to be grateful for that I’m not Emperor nor Chancellor. And yet we, too, need someone to respect- I say, a Pope let us elect” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 213). Goethe illustrated through this song that individuals may not feel capable of democratic government, and may desire to be led. Their lack of desire for democratic government may be the result of genuine recognition of a lack of autonomy, lack of confidence in their autonomy, lack of effort, or hegemony. In any of these cases, this group acted collectively after deferring to the power of an external authority.

Autonomy Example 2: Street Mitigated or Enhanced by Deference to Tradition

Goethe introduced Margaret as a traditional young girl from a village. In her relationship with Faust, Mephisto, Martha, or anyone else, Margaret deferred to traditions in making her decisions. She referenced her place in society,² Faust’s place in society,³ social conventions concerning jewelry,⁴ affairs,⁵ family obligations,⁶ and the simplicity of pastoral love.⁷ In each of these decisions she deferred to tradition. The concept of tradition presents a dichotomy in autonomous decision-making.

² “I’m neither a lady nor am I fair” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 257).

³ “He looked quite gallant, certainly, and is of noble family” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 263).

⁴ “It’s not meet to wear them in the church or street” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 279).

⁵ “That’s not the custom around here” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 285).

⁶ “The troubled life I led; but I would gladly go through all of it again” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 299).

⁷ “Dearest man! I love you from my heart” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 309).

Deference to tradition can sacrifice the autonomy of the individuals required to act from tradition since they had no input in the decision-making process. Tradition can also form a set of social rules applied to all parties equally, which would allow each party to know the parameters of actions of other parties. In the first case, autonomy is limited by tradition. In the second case, autonomy can be enhanced by tradition. Goethe utilized examples where both occurred to show that tradition is not in itself antagonistic to autonomy, as Goethe revealed through Margaret's eventual salvation. Traditions to which Margaret deferred can be beneficial when they maintain social order that enhances autonomy; tradition can impede autonomy when its power is applied without consent, understanding, or a dialectical process capable of updating it.

Autonomy Example 3: Dismal Day Mitigated- Focus on External Versus Internal Freedom

In this scene Margaret had been imprisoned, and Faust ordered Mephisto to free her. Mephisto said, "I shall make the jailer's senses foggy, and you may get the keys and lead her out with human hands" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 405). Faust removed her chains so they could exit the prison. Margaret claimed that she would not go since she would have a miserable life anyway, having a guilty conscience. She became distraught, and Faust wailed, "That I had never been born!" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 421). Mephisto entered and requested that they all leave. Margaret didn't like him, and asked for God's judgment. Mephisto said she would now be judged, and a voice declared, "Is saved" (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 421).

Faust wanted to free Margaret from prison and with Mephisto's help he had the power to do so. Was this power sufficient to gain Margaret's freedom? No, Margaret's misery was self-imposed based upon her own judgment and guilty conscience. Both Faust and Margaret desired Margaret's freedom. Faust desired her physical freedom; Margaret desired freedom through accepting culpability for her actions. Margaret's decision to remain in prison and take responsibility for her actions gained her release from internal torment. Goethe had Margaret

declared “saved” even though she was still in prison. Faust had power to decide Margaret’s external freedom but this power could not alter Margaret’s self-judgment. Faust was mistaken about what would free Margaret.

This example illustrates that autonomy is not a state of power over others or power over solely external, physical conditions. Rather, it was Margaret’s autonomy in the form of self-judgment that allowed her to deliberate with Faust and Mephisto over their attempt to free her from prison. Faust did desire her to be happy, and thought he could achieve this by freeing her from the physical prison. Margaret communicated to Faust that she desired release from internal torment. Because Faust loved her and desired her happiness, he recognized his desire to free her physically was not the best course of action if he really wanted her to be happy. The lack of initial communication impeded both Faust’s and Margaret’s autonomy. Faust wanted to free her but mistakenly thought physical freedom would make her happy. Margaret’s happiness was in her ability to assuage her guilt. She thought accepting culpability for her actions was the best way to do this, rather than exiting the prison with Faust.

Autonomy Example 4: Deep Night Mitigated by Threats of Violence

Societies may employ threats of violence to gain support for a decision toward collective action. Faust did not support the use of threats even though he desired to have a couple removed from their cottage; he had respected their autonomy. Faust ordered Philemon and Baucis to be removed from their cottage and offered an estate on the new land reclaimed by his project. Faust did not at first want to use force, but admitted that he might not be able to remove them if he couldn’t resort to unjust methods. When Faust heard that the couple had been killed in the attempt to remove them, he became angry. A chorus countered:

The ancient world still makes good sense:
Succumb at once to violence!

If you are bold and don't give in,
Then risk your house and home and- skin. (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 453)

This chorus proclaimed deliberation that included the threat or use of violence was utilized in many societies for the purpose of taking action. Violence or the threat of it was the motivation for collective action rather than the autonomous deliberation Faust had employed with Philemon and Baucis. Decisions reached and action taken after a threat of violence cannot be considered democratic because the threat or use of violence mitigates the autonomy of the participants. Does the fact that NCLB threatens sanctions for non-compliance mitigate the autonomy of the participants in schools? This question is important for educators to ask if a goal is to exercise in students habits for democratic deliberation.

Communication and Agreement Example 1: Prelude in the Theatre Mitigated by Conflicting Wills

Goethe utilized a Poet to represent power to create purpose which could be used as an organizing principle around which a community could decide collective action. The community in this scene is a crowd that expressed impulses and desires in conflict with the created purpose of the Poet. All parties in this community had their voices represented, but not all parties expressed a desire toward reaching a mutually agreed upon decision toward collective action.

The Poet criticized “the surging rabble that draws us with might, to compromise our every great design!” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 71). The impulses and desires of the crowd limited their ability to recognize the consequences of their actions, and limited their ability to see the benefit of the Poet's created purpose. Even if the Poet knew what was best for society, he would not have the right to utilize power to enforce his will.⁸

⁸ Recall Gutmann's admonition to maintain democratic integrity: “Even if I know that my way of life is best, I cannot translate this claim into the claim that I have the right to impose my way of life on anyone else” (1987, p. 40).

The Clown explained to the Poet, “Those who have ceased to grow, find nothing right; those who are growing still, will not spare thanks” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 79). The Clown meant that while the Poet created a purpose for the betterment of the whole society, some individuals in the society were influenced by their impulses and desires. Had these individuals recognized the benefit of the created purpose of the Poet, they may have agreed upon a decision toward collective action. Since many of them were influenced by impulses and desires, they did not communicate an autonomous position and this mitigated their attempt at a mutually agreed upon decision. Although democratic theorists such as Murchland (2000) would recognize the compromise between the Poet and the crowd as fulfilling criteria for democracy, numerous theorists find compromise less democratic.

Agreement Example 2: Study Mitigated by Diminished Autonomy and Self-Interest

In the “Prelude in the Theatre,” Goethe displayed a society including a Poet capable of autonomy, and individuals in a crowd influenced by impulses and desires. In “Study,” Goethe illustrated deliberation with Mephisto motivated by impulses and desires, and Faust seeking a mutually agreeable decision. Neither party fully displayed autonomy since Mephisto was influenced by impulses and desires and Faust lacked knowledge. Could deliberation between these parties result in a democratic decision? Goethe indicated that a compromise between these two parties would not produce a democratic decision because neither party had as a goal a mutually agreeable decision. Mephisto lacked desire to decide for the betterment of the whole, and Faust lacked knowledge and power.

When Mephisto offered Faust material goods and physical pleasures, Faust wanted to know the price, “Make your conditions very clear; where such a servant lives, danger is near” (Kaufmann, 1961, p. 181). Faust understood Mephisto offered many things, but was self-serving.

With this knowledge, Faust was aware that Mephisto would not seek an action best for the community.

Deliberation as part of *Bildung*

Prominent democratic theorists have established autonomy, community, and deliberation as conditions for a democracy; a collective will is established through the deliberation of autonomous individuals. Prominent democratic educators claimed in order to develop and maintain a democracy, individuals must be exercised in habits for democracy. Education for *Bildung* includes active learning which emphasizes individual development, as opposed to a passive learning through transmitting knowledge. Due to its emphasis on active learning and individual development, *Bildung* education may be beneficial for exercising individuals in habits necessary for democracy. I have discussed the relationship between *Bildung* education and Autonomy and Community; *Bildung* may also exercise in individuals habits for more democratic deliberation. How can *Bildung* education exercise in individuals habits for more democratic deliberation?

Barber described *Bildung* as possessing “the same unifying cultural thrust” as *paideia* in that “it brought together under the rubric of life, learning, and self-reflective experience the same ideas of the fully developed citizen” (Murchland, 2000, p. 29). According to Barber, *Bildung* encourages self-reflection and individual development. Barber further claimed, “Dewey’s conception of education is often deemed progressive, yet in fact it harks back to neoclassical models of *paideia* and *Bildung*” (Murchland, 2000, p. 28). Dewey endorsed aspects of Progressive education for much the same reason as Barber appreciated *Bildung*- it developed individuals:

The ultimate reason for hospitality to progressive education, because of its reliance upon and use of humane methods and its kinship to democracy, goes back to the fact that

discrimination is made between the inherent values of different experiences. ... Every experience enacted and undergone modifies the one who acts and undergoes. (1938, p. 35)

Barber and Dewey identified *Bildung* education as transformative. The mechanism for transformation, according to Dewey, is a reconstruction and continuity of experience: “It is when we note the different forms in which continuity of experience operates that we get the basis of discriminating among experiences.... Growth, or growing as developing, not only physically but intellectually and morally, is one exemplification of the principle of continuity” (Dewey, 1938, pp. 35-36). What is the influence and importance of individual transformation on deliberation?

Dewey recognized a synthesis of Traditional and Progressive education as superior to either type alone. Traditional education such as transmitting a canon of knowledge does not transform individuals. Progressive education, Dewey clarified, could lead to mis-educative experiences if not guided by intelligence. Dewey advocated a process of education that included the continuing organization of facts and ideas around an intelligent, contemporary purpose.⁹ Similarly, Murchland explained that the development of individuals through transformative experiences can lead to the canons of culture and science, as well as freedom in society:

The trouble with the purist’s canon is that it renders knowledge a product stripped of the process by which it is endowed with its quickening vitality and its moral legitimacy. The canon does not produce the cultural education the Germans called *Bildung*; *Bildung* produces the canon, which consequently needs to be no less flexible and mutable than the life processes that make it. The trouble with the vocationalist’s servitude to society is that it fails to distinguish society or society’s fixed conventions from the free society and the unique educational prerequisites that condition freedom. A free society does not produce *Bildung*, which is always critical of it; *Bildung* produces a free society, keeping it from ossifying and perishing- helping it to overcome its most difficult contradiction: the institutionalization and petrification of the spirit of freedom that animates it. (Murchland, 2000, p. 29)

⁹ “The active process of organizing facts and ideas is an ever-present educational process” (Dewey, 1938, p. 82). “Growth in judgment and understanding is essentially growth in ability to form purposes and to select and arrange means for their realization” (Dewey, 1938, p. 84). “Failure to give constant attention to development of the intellectual content of experiences ... may in the end merely strengthen the tendency toward a reactionary return to intellectual and moral authoritarianism” (Dewey, 1938, p. 86).

Bildung is a dynamic process utilizing a reconstruction of experience where the canon is not an authority external to the learner, as Wagner's passive learning would imply, but a product of a process including input from active learners as well as transmitted knowledge. *Bildung* is a dynamic education.

Bildung is important for democracy because it transforms individuals through a continuous process of experiences, incorporating extant canons as well as contemporary purposes. Members of society can gain autonomy partly through transmitted knowledge, as Dewey recognized from Traditional education, and can create their own purpose, similar to Progressive education. *Bildung* education is a dynamic process constantly seeking input from all available sources. As democratic theorists noted (Meier & Wood, Eds., 2004; Parker, 2003; Wolk, 1998; Freire, 1993) only an active learning can exercise in individuals the habits necessary for democracy.

Berman also recognized Faust's education through *Bildung* as an active process incorporating the three delineated conditions: "What Faust wants for himself is a dynamic process that will include every mode of human experience, joy and misery alike, and that will assimilate them all into his self's unending growth" (1982, p. 40). The incorporation of every mode of experience can increase autonomy, requires communication for gaining experience, and recognizes fulfillment in the interest of the whole.

At the end of the play, Faust has developed into a more autonomous actor, desiring to be beneficial to his community, as exemplified by his land reclamation project. Berman noted Faust's land reclamation project is a metaphor for modern individuals, "Faust's unfinished construction site is the vibrant but shaky ground on which we must all stake out and build up our lives" (Berman, 1982, p. 86). This metaphor highlights the process through which individuals in

modern society can become educated through *Bildung*: “Goethe’s hero is heroic by virtue of liberating tremendous repressed human energies, not only in himself but in all those he touches, and eventually in the whole society around him” (Berman, 1982, p. 40).

The goal of *Bildung* is the development of the self, which can be accomplished through active learning. Democratic educators claimed in order to develop democratic citizens, individuals must be exercised in habits for democracy. *Bildung* education exercises individuals in habits for democracy by emphasizing active learning toward satisfaction of three delineated conditions for democracy: a) autonomy; b) community; and c) deliberation.

CHAPTER 6 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Dewey listed a number of reasons democracy is desirable as a form of government and social arrangement (1938; 1916). Wolk advocated a democratic classroom, seeking to nurture “freedom, dignity, thoughtfulness, community, and a natural love and respect for learning and knowledge” (1998, p. viii). Cornel West proclaimed, “There is a deep public reverence for- a love of- democracy in America and a deep democratic tradition” (2004, p. 15). Americans have overwhelmingly agreed, “Democracy is the best form of government.”¹ Provided Americans desire democracy, what is a primary mechanism for developing and maintaining it? Barber offered, “Citizens certainly are not born, but made as a consequence of civic education and political engagement in a free polity” (1984, p. xvii). Parker further explained:

Democratic living is not given in nature...there can be no democracy without its builders, caretakers, and change agents: democratic citizens. These citizens are constructs, too. Who ‘builds’ and cares for them? ... Educators are the prime stewards of democracy. They must do what no one else in society has to do: intentionally specify the democratic ideal sufficiently to make it a reasonably distinct curriculum target. (2003, p. xvii)

Two reasons emerge that justify the need to analyze legislation such as NCLB. These are the desirability of democracy, and the recognition that educators have a major role in the cultivation of democratic citizens. Does NCLB foster or hinder the cultivation of democratic citizens?

Critics alleged legislation such as NCLB is inadequate for educating individuals to become democratic citizens, claiming it influenced educational practices that foster compliance rather than autonomy, competition and atomization rather than collaboration, and advocated memorizing an approved core of knowledge rather than exercising students in habits of

¹ Hochschild and Scovronick. Chapter 1 “Democratic Education and the American Dream: One, Some, and All,” p.4. Found in Parker, Walter C., Ed. (2002). *Education for Democracy: Contexts, Curricula, Assessments*. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, pp. 3-26.

deliberation. Their arguments illustrated that NCLB has led to educational practices which impede, rather than promote, democratic education. A market mentality may seek to express freedom of choice and a meritocratic reward system, which can be viewed as a democratic expression in the economic sphere; the aims of democracy may coincide with the aims of capitalism providing individuals are autonomous. The problem, critics allege, is that students influenced by legislation such as NCLB may become inertial consumers rather than autonomous actors.

Prominent democratic theorists such as Gutmann, Barber, Murchland, and Dewey have delineated major components of democracy. Prominent educators for democracy such as Dewey, Wolk, Meier, Parker, and Freire, have offered guiding principles for educating students to become democratic citizens. All of these theorists and educators have carefully considered what constitutes a democracy and how to educate students to become democratic actors. In *Faust*, Goethe illustrated three main components delineated by democratic theorists and educators: autonomy, community, and deliberation. These concepts have been discussed and explained by theorists, but Goethe revealed how individuals develop into citizens capable of exhibiting autonomy and deliberation, and illustrated a possible structure of a democratic community. Individuals who develop through *Bildung* education become capable of transforming into democratic citizens.

Through *Bildung*, myriad experiences transformed Faust into a democratic actor. In order to situate my analysis of *Faust* in literature on democratic education, I will briefly discuss the contributions of Gutmann and Barber, two democratic theorists, and Dewey and Wolk, two educators for democracy. My purpose is to compare pertinent elements of their theories with the lessons from *Faust*, and to contrast them with the method and message in *Faust*.

Contributions from Democratic Theorists: Gutmann and Barber

While concepts delineated by democratic theorists are salient in the play, *Faust* contains lessons that are in some ways distinct from them. I will confine my comparison to Gutmann's and Barber's theories since they are sufficiently broad and comprehensive to represent significant elements of pertinent theories. An analysis of their ideas will serve to situate my research on *Faust* in literature on democratic theory informing democratic education.

Gutmann's Conception of Community

Gutmann advocated the development of a system of education designed for conscious social reproduction, insisting the primary constraint is to avoid allowing any form of government that interferes with democratic decision-making. She claimed the purpose of her research was to focus on a democratic theory supporting democratic education. The need for a theory of education becomes clear when educators are asked to explain the reason for their pedagogical prescriptions. Gutmann's final admonishment was for educators to avoid the allure of certain pedagogical practices; although they might "improve the academic achievement of students, they neglect the virtues of citizenship" (Gutmann, 1987, p. 287).

I have utilized much of Gutmann's democratic theory of education in my analysis of *Faust* in order to assist in developing a concept of democracy capable of sustaining a democratic society. However, there are elements of Gutmann's theory that could be improved by utilizing Goethe's ideas. In *Faust*, autonomous decisions require the expansion of the concept of individual self-interest to include both the individual as influenced by community, and interested in community.² Gutmann considered a community to be a collective of discrete individuals:

² "Only he who has learned to respect others in a spirit of friendship can come to respect himself and thus attain inner freedom" (Unger, 1963, p. 16). "Humanism alone bade fair to give rise to that enduring harmony in human social bonds that might reconcile conflicts among individuals, classes and creeds" (Unger, 1963, pp. 15-16). A similar concept is Jose Ortega y Gasset's quotation "I am I, plus my circumstances."

The ideal of democracy is often said to be collective self-determination. But is there a “collective self” to be determined? Are there not just so many individual selves that must find a fair way of sharing the goods of a society together? It would be dangerous...to assume that the democratic state constitutes the “collective self” of a society, and that its policies in turn define the best interests of its individual members. (1987, p. 289)

Goethe showed how Faust’s self-interest at the start of the play had broadened to be confluent with the interests of his community. Faust had begun with Gutmann’s assumption of individual interest, and emerged with Barber’s concept.³ Goethe illustrated the development of the character Faust through myriad experiences, including many mistakes. At the start of the play, Faust’s view of his life was narrow in scope; he even considered suicide. Over the course of the play he transformed into an individual concerned about not only his love, Margaret, but serving his entire community. This is not the exchange of individual interest for community interest, but rather, the fulfillment of individual interest through community interest.

Gutmann claimed, “The democratic theory that I developed is inspired by Dewey, but it also diverges from Dewey in at least one way” (1987, p. 13). Where Dewey had faith in man’s ability to reason- what he called intelligent activity- Gutmann was compelled to offer a warning: “Citizens and public officials can use democratic processes to destroy democracy. A democratic society must ... be constrained *not* to legislate policies that render democracy repressive or discriminatory” (1987, p. 14). Gutmann’s goal was to, “preserve the intellectual and social foundations of democratic deliberations” (1987, p. 14). Dewey saw democratic practice as a result of intelligent activity that included foresight through observation, information, and judgment (1938, p. 69); Gutmann warned that society must be vigilant to avoid deciding upon repressive procedures.

³ “Citizens are autonomous persons whom participation endows with a capacity for common vision. A community of citizens...cannot be treated as a mere aggregation of individuals” (Barber, 1984, p. 232).

Gutmann built a case for what she called a family state that would educate in the manner prescribed by Dewey- leaders of a state would educate their students just as a wise parent would educate their children:

Even if the philosopher-queen is right in claiming that a certain kind of life is objectively good, she is wrong in assuming that the objectively good is good for those of us who are too old or too miseducated to identify the objectively good with what is good for our own lives. "That may be the best life to which people- educated from birth in the proper manner- can aspire," we might admit, "but it's not the good life for *us*. And don't we have a claim to living a life that is good for us?" The objectively good life, defined as the life that is best for people who are rightly educated from birth, need not be the good life, or even the closest approximation of the good life, for people who have been wrongly educated. (1987, p. 26)

Gutmann explained that individuals have a right to live a life good *to them*. She assumed individual self-interest might be in conflict with other individual self-interest. Under her concept of the individual as a discrete, self-interested actor, this assertion is reasonable. But if Barber's conception of individual interest is employed, it is arguable that reasonable individuals would prefer having the best possible education for individuals in their community. If individuals are well educated, and they contribute to their community, other individuals gain. This is why Barber said self-interest should be confluent with the interests of the community. Gutmann acknowledged individuals can be wrongly educated, but this would make them less capable of contributing to the community. Goethe's conception of autonomous individuals is more similar to Barber's than Gutmann's because it implies individuals have knowledge of, and interest in, their community.

It is important to consider the difference between Gutmann's and Goethe's method of transmitting their ideas. Gutmann delineates her theory of democratic education in a discursive style. Goethe illustrated the development of Faust through a narrative. Faust transforms through a *Bildung* education into an individual capable of democratic action. This narrative style allows the reader to situate characters within a train of life experiences rather than de-contextualizing

their characteristics and growth. An advantage to the narrative style may be the relation individuals have to life experiences of Faust and the other characters. Dewey had recognized the value of individuals relating experiences to their own lives. In an analogous manner, the experiences of Faust may serve as an exemplar to which individuals might relate.

Gutmann's theory of democracy required conscious social reproduction to maintain and promote democratic practice in a society. Much of her theory concerning autonomy and deliberation is consistent with Barber's and Goethe's, but her idea of community is different. Where Barber considered autonomy of individuals to be fulfilled by their participation in communal life, and Goethe saw individual autonomy gained by individual transformation in community, Gutmann saw community as an aggregate of discrete, self-interested individuals whose autonomy rested in individual decisions toward their own good. Gutmann's concepts and explication of components of democratic theory are comprehensive and edifying. However, Goethe's *Faust* offers a more complete view of the individual's role in a democratic society, and does so in a narrative style- a heuristic more easily accessible to many readers.

Barber's Conception of Uncertainty in Deliberation

While Barber's concept of community is in many ways more consistent with Goethe's than Gutmann's, Barber's view of deliberation is different in a significant way. Barber considered deliberation to be a collective decision-making mechanism without independent grounding. In other words, Barber denounced both autocratic authority as a guide to collective decision-making, even a democratically elected leader,⁴ and sympathetic tradition or common adherence that might take the force of law. In contrast, Goethe did not constrain collective decisions, but

⁴ "In the ideal participatory community, moral leadership must therefore be exercised *outside* the political arena, in a public but non-political fashion that is conducive to fraternal affection and common values yet hostile to conformity" (Barber, 1984, p. 241).

saw the process as a development of individuals into an autonomous community, where the collective autonomy would rule by the authority of the collective will. Goethe saw democratic action unfolding in a process as individuals gained autonomy.

An obvious drawback of Goethe's view is the scarcity of autonomous individuals per community at any given moment. Goethe recognized this, and illustrated in *Faust* numerous examples of communities ruled by myriad authorities, containing individuals with varying levels of autonomy. The point of analyzing *Faust* is recognizing the value of *Bildung* in transforming individuals into autonomous actors in a community capable of democratic action. Barber's concept may be less beneficial for educating individuals to become democratic actors than Goethe's ideas. How does Barber's concept of deliberation contrast with Goethe's?

Barber claimed, "The challenge facing strong democratic theory is to elaborate institutions that can catalyze community without undermining citizenship" (1984, p. 233). Deliberation is in part the mechanism through which such catalyzing can be accomplished. This is not inconsistent with Goethe's goal of transforming individuals into autonomous actors through participation in community. Barber continued, "Common political decisions appear to run into error more swiftly than do nondecisions," yet, "strong democratic politics is informed with a spirit of transience and circumstantiality that encourages community self-reflection and favors its self-reflection over time" (Barber, 1984, p. 258). Again, Barber's recognition of changing circumstances requiring self-reflection over time is consistent with Goethe's ideas. However, Barber claimed:

The transitory character of every act and decision, each only one in a train of ongoing reflections and modifications intended to transform communities and their citizens over time, guarantees a certain impermanence in the decisional process and a certain mutability in the world of action that accommodates and even honors uncertainty. (1984, p. 259)

There is a subtle difference between Barber's and Goethe's grounding for a democratic decision.

Barber assumes uncertainty as the background for democratic decision-making, but Goethe

expects individuals to develop into autonomous actors capable of considering a course of action. Barber's concept emphasizes the lack of independent grounding, while Goethe's concept emphasizes the process of arriving at a superior decision defined by the collective will.

Barber had situated his idea of strong democracy between an "archetypical thin democratic community" and an "archetypical unitary democratic community":

In the first case, the community of citizens results wholly from a social contract and owes its existence and legitimacy to the voluntary consent of a self-constituted aggregation of individuals seeking the preservation of their lives, liberties, properties, and happiness. In the second case, the community is bound together by existential ties that define and limit the individual members no less than the community to which they belong. These ties ... create a structure that can be hegemonic and inegalitarian. (Barber, 1984, p. 231)

Barber's first example highlights a possible absence of autonomous individuals, a criticism of Gutmann's community of self-interested individuals. His second example defers legitimate authority to an external source. In Barber's strong democratic community, individuals are transformed through participation, thus the community is more than an aggregate of individual self-interests, and citizens are ideally autonomous participants with a capacity for a common vision. Goethe's inclusion of individual transformation leading to this common vision can replace simple uncertainty as the grounding for democratic action. Barber's theory does not exclude this, but Goethe's idea of education through *Bildung* requires it.

Contributions from Educators for Democracy: Dewey and Wolk

Dewey's Experiential Education

Dewey understood the importance of educating individuals for their own subjective good while simultaneously working toward social aims. His recognition of democracy as a form of social life as well as a governmental arrangement is consistent with concepts and prescriptions for democratic education delineated by Gutmann, Wolk, and Goethe. A substantial similarity

between Dewey and Goethe is their mutual recognition that individuals change through their experiences, and can foster this change through cultivation of particular habits:

The basic characteristic of habit is that every experience enacted and undergone modifies the one who acts and undergoes, while this modification affects, whether we wish it or not, the quality of subsequent experiences. For it is a somewhat different person who enters into them. The principle of habit so understood obviously goes deeper than the ordinary conception of a habit as a more or less fixed way of doing things. (Dewey, 1938, p. 35)

Goethe displayed a similar understanding that individuals transform through experience, which is a reason for a *Bildung* education as well as a result of it. Dewey advocated intelligent activity informing a purpose, and warned against mis-educative experiences. Goethe illustrated problems with individuals who remained in a state of inertia throughout their experiences. Dewey and Goethe are somewhat similar in their ideas, although they diverge in their method of transmitting their ideas. I have already discussed Goethe's literary work in a narrative style as being heuristic in a different manner than discursive language. The remaining difference between Goethe and Dewey is in their respective expectations from the experience they advocate.

Goethe's narrative followed the character Faust over the course of many years and experiences, revealing details of Faust's development as he transformed. The outcome of Faust's development remained unclear until the final moment of the play, and even then his redemption required explanation. Dewey's faith in democracy seems more optimistic in the sense that individuals who employ intelligent activity should become autonomous, democratic actors. Randall H. Hewitt analyzed in his dissertation Dewey's faith in democracy and found a problem, "Dewey's alleged insufficient concept of power is that it makes his faith in an amelioristic sense of experience and a democratic ideal untenable" (2001, p. 3).

Hewitt explained, "Dewey purportedly failed to develop a sufficient concept of power, which jeopardizes his faith in the human ability to direct experience according to a democratic ideal" (2001, p. 9). Goethe also expected individuals to develop through *Bildung* education into

more autonomous actors, but he recognized the equal possibility of transforming in a different manner. Goethe included numerous instances where Faust's actions were inconsistent with democratic ideals, yet through constant striving Faust transformed into a more autonomous actor capable of democratic action. While Goethe was clear that human intelligence could be employed for good or ill, Hewitt alleged Dewey did not have the same appreciation of the possible consequences of intelligent activity⁵: "Dewey sees human intelligence as having only benevolent social consequences and has no idea that intelligence also can lead to social conflict and power relations over others" (Hewitt, 2001, pp. 4-5). Hewitt continued:

Dewey's experimentalism rests upon the mistaken assumption that human experience progresses in a linear march toward a predetermined state of affairs.... As Dewey's critics point out, this project fails because it does not incorporate the possibilities of deep-seated evil, inevitable human conflict, and the uncontrollable impulse to dominate other human beings. (2001, pp. 7-8).

Hewitt concluded with prescriptions to, at least in part, supplement what he claimed was missing from Dewey's concept of power. In order to accomplish this Hewitt claimed, "The school must provide a context that ensures intellectual freedom and encourages shared inquiry, communication and deliberation" (2001, p. 197). He then cautioned, "All those concerned with public education must be involved and vigilant in detecting relations of power that, intentionally or not, prevent, censor, or distort the freedom of inquiry, discussion, and expression" (Hewitt, 2001, p. 197). Hewitt emphasized that school must protect students from experiences that might impede their development as democratic actors.

⁵ "As teachers we have, it seems to me, made a fetish of science and the scientific approach, until it threatens to engulf us. This is because we have forgotten the lesson of *Faust*, that knowledge, of itself, may be useless or useful, harmful or beneficial, depending upon the purposes or ends for which it is employed. We must have scientific knowledge, to be sure, but unless it can be directed to socially desirable ends it is not only useless, but dangerous" (Kingsley, Apr. 1941, p. 212).

How can schools protect students from experiences that might impede their development as democratic actors? Hewitt advised, “The role of the teacher is to serve as a resource for suggestion and guidance” (2001, p. 202). He added:

More specifically in terms of power, the teacher carries the responsibility of making explicit the point that underlying ideas of good and right represent specific relations of power.... This task involves leading students in tracing out and examining the particular means used to legitimize one way of acting, one form of power, over another. (Hewitt, 2001, p. 203)

Hewitt introduced this proposition to supplement Dewey’s concept of power, with the ultimate goal of producing a democratic citizenry. His addition to Dewey’s concept was a caution to avoid intelligent activity that might obstruct the development of democratic actors. How can teachers lead students to develop into democratic actors?

In order for teachers to begin the process Hewitt advised, “The teacher must lead students to see that only as they draw upon the lived experiences and stories of others can they gather a range of facts and judgments necessary to bring particular injustices into adequate focus” (2001, p. 203). This advice clarifies how Dewey’s prescription of experience through intelligent activity can guide individuals to become democratic actors. Hewitt alleged Dewey did not provide a specific mechanism because of his faith in intelligent activity, thus he offered his own advice on how to insure the cultivation of democratic citizens through teacher guided experiences. *Faust* can provide to students an encyclopedic compendium of experiences and their consequences to begin their own transformations, and importantly, to avoid experiences and actions that might impede future growth and their development into democratic actors.

Wolk’s Democratic Classroom

Wolk wrote at length about the role schools can play in cultivating a democratic citizenry. He was consistent and emphatic about allowing students to utilize and develop skills for

democracy through their experiences in schools. Rather than merely teaching students about democracy, he advocated students be practiced in habits of democracy.

Wolk also recognized the influence schools have on the development of students into political actors:

Schooling is inherently political, which makes teaching inherently political. It is not possible to shape the minds of people ... and not play a role in developing and influencing their political selves. I know that my students (and I) are part of a political world, so I want to encourage them-and *teach* them- to consciously take part in the evolution of who they are and what they want their world to be. (1998, p. ix)

Having established that schools can play a significant role in developing in students habits of democratic decision-making, Wolk discussed particular components of democratic education. He claimed his first impulse upon entering teaching was to allow his students to express themselves in what he would later consider a democratic manner:

I don't remember exactly when the notion of *democracy* entered the picture, but from my very first day with my own students I constantly worked to give them freedom, to allow them voice, to give them ownership in their own learning process, to help and challenge them to see the world critically, to *trust* them. (Wolk, 1998, p. viii)

Wolk came to advocate numerous practices designed to execute these fledgling ideas of freedom, voice, critical thinking, and trust. These ideas are not inconsistent with the three delineated concepts for a democracy: autonomy, community, and deliberation. Wolk acknowledged democracy requires active participation, and he criticized American society for its limited view of a citizen's role:

The sad and insidious truth is that our common notion of citizenship has been perverted by an understanding of ourselves as spectators and consumers. This leaves us with the antithesis of an active, conscious, and compassionate citizenry- with the antithesis of a democratic society. (1998, p. 12)

While Wolk is clear about the need for students to have the freedom to participate in democratic practice, he is far less clear about how to cultivate autonomous actors than he is on developing a community or exercising habits in deliberation. Much of *A Democratic Classroom* is filled with

examples of practices designed to allow students free expression and freedom to develop their personal life and society. Wolk's practices do not exclude the development of autonomy in individuals, and often it can be fruitfully inserted, but they do not demand autonomy as a condition for democratic decision-making. In "Freedom Versus Control" (1998, pp. 72-95), Wolk discussed the benefit of knowledge and critical pedagogy for democratic practice. This chapter reveals his appreciation of autonomy as part of democratic practice, but he emphasizes freedom, community, and voice far more.

Wolk's assertions about the importance of freedom and voice in a democracy may appear consistent with the three delineated criteria for democratic action. However, there is one aspect that remains unclear. Wolk claimed, "Community and democracy can never exist in a society with a hierarchy of voices" (1998, p. 11). Presumably Wolk desired to inoculate society against some authoritarian power that might silence legitimate ideas and perspectives which would in turn undermine democracy. A hierarchy implies some voices are greater than others in some way, but in what way does Wolk mean? To consider this question we may ask, in what sense are all voices equal? Two possibilities are a) equal in access, and b) equal in authority or value.

To allow all voices equal access to democratic expression is different than admitting all voices have equal value to that democracy. Democratic theorists have resisted admitting all voices are equally valuable to democracy. Gutmann admonished society to refuse expression of anti-democratic practices. Barber warned against individual self-interest as a guiding principle for community action. Dewey discussed mis-educative experiences as an impediment to future learning. If Wolk implied that all voices should have equal access to, and equal voice in, a community, this is consistent with the three delineated concepts for democracy. But if Wolk implied all voices can contribute equally to a democracy, this may undermine the very notion of

a developed citizen, specifically an autonomous one. What would be the point of education and developing into an autonomous actor if such development did not enhance democratic decision-making and action?

There are three possibilities for democratic education and democratic practice. One, a society can count all voices equally in governing, regardless of individual development. Two, society can count all voices, equally or not, in governing, yet strive to educate citizens to develop into autonomous actors. And three, society can place greater value on the voice of autonomous actors in governing. Gutmann, Barber, Dewey, and Wolk have advocated option two, with respective emphases on democratic voice, deliberative voice, intelligent activity, and expression of voices. Wolk provided one possible scenario to guide schooling toward option two:

What if from the first day children walked through their school's front doors, they were encouraged to think for themselves, to ask questions, to seek the common good, to act on their original ideas, to be critical readers of society, to share their selves and their cultures and their voices, to explore personally meaningful and relevant interests, to see themselves as creators? (1998, p. 202).

The prescriptions in this scenario are consistent with democratic practice. Goethe might have us add one element- that students are encouraged to develop into autonomous actors, and that teachers assist in the transformation by providing experiences to guide students. *Faust* is a narrative of a character who is constantly transforming through a variety of life experiences. It is the developed, autonomous Faust who gains salvation, even after numerous mistakes and transgressions.⁶ Goethe did not intimate if Faust would have attained salvation at any point in the play prior to his transformation into a more autonomous, community interested individual. The fact that he did gain salvation can attest to the value Goethe placed on Faust's development.

⁶ "These forces of redemption gain access to the sphere of men's destinies through the transformation of lower instincts by penitence and self-sacrifice" (Cottrell, 1976, p. 61).

Lessons from *Faust*

Clarifying Democratic Concepts

The answer to the question, “Why should democratic educators study *Faust*” is twofold. First, *Faust* offers clarifications and modifications to the three components for democratic practice delineated by prominent democratic theorists. This is significant because if pedagogy is designed to achieve a less than desirable goal, then even a successful pedagogy would not have a beneficial outcome. Second, *Faust* offers a heuristic model that can be studied to view the development of a potentially democratic actor through a series of transformative experiences. Educators can recognize in Faust’s development experiences and practices which can lead to the formation of democratic habits. Although the theorists discussed herein have provided a strong foundation for a theory of democratic education, I will briefly discuss relevant scenes to show how *Faust* illustrates modifications to the three delineated components.

A major criticism of Gutmann’s democratic theory is viewing participants in society as discrete individuals who act upon self-interest. *Faust* displays a number of scenes where participants act from the perspective of Gutmann’s self-interested, discrete individuals, but also where individuals behave like Barber’s autonomous actors. In the “Prelude in the Theatre,” a Clown wanted to please the impulses and desires of a crowd, a Poet desired to create purpose, and a Director wanted to coordinate the two in order to carry out a successful production. This shows Goethe’s view that if desires and impulses of self-interested individuals are guided by a purpose, the play, representing life, has a greater chance of being successful. Goethe showed later in “Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig” that if desires and impulses alone motivated a crowd the self-interested individuals might lose communal autonomy and become a mob. Alexis de

Tocqueville warned of this danger.⁷ Goethe illustrated in “Palace-Entombment: Faust’s Salvation,” through the value Faust placed on the land reclamation project, that maintaining autonomy for himself and his community could be beneficial to the entire community, present and future. *Faust* supplies examples of a range of individuals, communities, and decision-making processes.

Barber’s idea of uncertainty as the background for democratic action asserts the benefit of avoiding imposition from an external authority and acquiescing to self-interests. Goethe supplemented Barber’s concept with a mechanism for deciding upon collective action. Goethe illustrated in “Auerbach’s Keller in Leipzig” the negative consequences of having no grounding except the self-interest of the crowd. Without individual autonomy a crowd may act in concert based upon desires and impulses, or simply follow a leader’s initiative. The intoxicated crowd followed a course of action based upon each shouted suggestion. This scene supports Barber’s assertion that an aggregate of self-interested parties is not the most democratic community. However, Goethe revealed in the “Prelude in the Theatre” that the organizing principle created by the Poet could serve to ground a collective decision. Faust’s vision for the village built upon the efforts of his land reclamation project served to help the entire community’s interests. The “Prelude in the Theatre” served as a foreshadowing of the forces acting on society and transforming Faust. The village represented a concrete example of the fruits a transformed Faust added to a community, that he helped work toward a common goal.

⁷ If individuals act outside of the interest of the community, there is a danger of what de Tocqueville called the “Tyranny of the majority” (1969, pp. 250-253). A procedural democracy with the vote as a primary mechanism of signaling individual will can produce this tyranny if decisions are arrived at by the power of a majority without autonomous individuals communicating prior to reaching a decision. De Tocqueville explained that the source of power in any government is simultaneously the locus of possible abuse of power. In a monarchy, the locus of power and possible abuse is a monarch. In a democracy, the source of power and possible abuse is a majority of citizen’s votes.

Dewey is widely acknowledged as having explained in detail his ideas concerning the interaction between individual and social aspects of individuals and their respective roles in education, and by extension, democratic decision-making. Dewey identified the guiding principle behind autonomous or democratic action as intelligent activity.⁸ Hewitt criticized Dewey's faith in intelligent activity, which Hewitt claimed Dewey saw as leading predominately to positive activity.

In *Faust*, Goethe included examples where activity fitting Dewey's description might be viewed as less than positive. Almost all of Mephisto's endeavors are guided by knowledge, in a form of intelligent activity, but his goals were rarely beneficial to anyone but either himself or Faust, who he was trying to satisfy in order to gain his soul. One example is Mephisto's knowledge to help an emperor win a battle in an unjust manner. This presents knowledge as power, but not informing autonomous action. Another is Mephisto's use of deception as intelligent activity to have Faust seduce Margaret. One more example is when Faust wanted Philemon and Baucus' cottage; Mephisto took this goal upon himself and formed a plan, with full knowledge of the consequences, which did not exclude killing the couple.

In the scene "Laboratory, in the medieval style, with elaborate and clumsy machinery for fantastic purposes," Wagner created Homunculus. Wagner capitalized on power, utilizing it to create his desired purpose- making a little man. Goethe quickly showed that Homunculus was powerful-he could read dreams and thoughts. But he was out of the control of Wagner, joining Faust and leaving his maker behind. Intelligent activity may confer the power to carry out purposes, but it does not necessarily confer communal autonomy as defined by Barber. Only

⁸ Dewey identified "freedom with power to frame purposes and to execute or carry into effect purposes so framed. Such freedom is in turn identical with self-control; for the formation of purposes and the organization of means to execute them are the work of intelligence" (1938, p. 67). Dewey added three conditions for the formation of purpose: observation, knowledge, and judgment. But by judgment Dewey explained only an ability to put "together what is observed and what is recalled to see what they signify" (1938, p. 69).

Faust's village- a project that brought benefit to his entire community- can claim to be the product of an autonomous actor acting in concert with a community. Although there were negative consequences to the project, such as Baucus and Philemon's deaths, the purpose Faust had for his vision was in concert with the will of the community.

In his democratic classroom, Wolk advocated providing extensive opportunities for students to express freedom and their voices. These are not inconsistent with autonomy, but Goethe provided a number of scenes to reveal the inadequacy of freedom without pursuing autonomy. In "Study," Mephisto claimed he could make Faust feel released and free, but he only meant free to carry out impulses and desires. This common theme throughout *Faust* revealed Goethe's recognition that freedom to carry out desires and impulses is not enough to transform individuals into autonomous actors. The clearest example is "Auerbach's Keller in Leipzig." Mephisto claimed to let each one have what he chose to drink, mirroring the language of freedom, but in reality the patrons became further subjected to their impulses and desires leaving them with even less autonomy.

The Narrative Form

With all of its characters and their respective experiences and transformations, *Faust* offers educators, in a narrative form, a model to view the three delineated components of democratic education in action in the life of an individual. Rather than relying on static concepts and explanations, educators can view in *Faust* a process of transformation through *Bildung* education. Although *Faust* is a far-fetched tale, it is rife with character development, analogies and metaphors that introduce and illustrate autonomy, community, and deliberation.

There is precedence for using narrative to illustrate pedagogical principles, a notable example being Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Emile*. Elliot M. Zashin claimed Rousseau had written *Emile* to illustrate his ideas for education in contemporary society, and *The Social Contract* was

written to show how to live in an ideal society. Many ideas from these works echo the lessons from *Faust*:

Emile was written for educating an individual who would have to live in society as it was then constituted, while *The Social Contract* represents Rousseau's view of men in a *properly* constituted political society. While it might seem that his concern with individual autonomy evaporates when he theorizes about "healthy" political relationships, this apparently was not what Rousseau thought. The education of Emile was designed so that he would grow up free of all dependencies; likewise, Rousseau wrote *The Social Contract* to elucidate the principles by which men could live *in community* without servitude, without dependence. Rousseau hoped to prevent Emile from becoming subservient to his passions, to prejudices and social conventions which would bind him to views not his own, and to other people for his livelihood and self-esteem. He was to grow up a man whose judgment, whose conscience and actions, were thoroughly self-determined, so far as that was possible. (Zashin, 1972, p. 41)

The recognition of the value of autonomy over impulses and desires, living in community as autonomous individuals, and self-determination, are ideas displayed in *Faust* as well as Rousseaus' works. Goethe incorporated in *Faust* desirable expressions of the delineated components and numerous examples of less than desirable experiences and actions toward these ideals. I include this comparison to illustrate the use of narrative to identify, analyze, and explain, political or educational principles.

Another example is from Mark Allen Beckham, who had analyzed the educational philosophy of Goethe's *The Sufferings of Young Werther*:

The research problem is to examine Goethe's educational philosophy as identified through an analytical study of the character Werther in Goethe's novel *The Sufferings of Young Werther*. The purpose of this study is to reveal the epistemological premises of the learning construct that are within the context of the novel, and to derive from these premises specific learning principles that can be applied to educational theory. Goethe's concepts of the human will, the self, responsibility, choice, and growth are defined and subsequently utilized as the skeletal frame from which to construct the working principles of his thought process. By focusing on Goethe's actual thinking and how he comes to know, the novel becomes a means, or mode, with which to illustrate the epistemological functioning of his mind. (1980, Abstract)

Beckham asserted, "Within this short novel, the inherent potentiality for learning theory is substantial" (1980, Abstract). He claimed to have found six educational principles that "have

evolved from Goethe's epistemological premises as they were examined within the context of the novel." I have distilled Beckham's six principles to the following four: (1) Goethe realized that the subject matter of education is man, and he emphasized the nature of man and his characteristics as a self-determiner; (2) Because the self is a unity, education must recognize the value that man places on his self in his demand for self-cultivation; (3) Man is always in relation to that which confronts him as a determiner. All learning is creative because the learner is the creator of further learning. In his role as creator, the learner makes a multitude of decisions and must subsequently accept the inherent responsibility for the choices. Goethe was fully aware that the self becomes an active agent in the process of learning; and (4) The learner must understand the social nature of man. Relationships require dialogue and communication as part of a learning process.

The educational principles represented by Beckham are similar to those I have identified in *Faust*: Man is self-determined, capable of self-cultivation, a creator of knowledge, and he learns through dialogue. Beckham has identified these educational principles in *The Sufferings of Young Werther*, but in *Faust*, Goethe showed that these principles are embedded in the life process of the character Faust. Educators can note, as Dewey explicated, learning takes place not only in schools, but in all experiences in life. In *Faust*, Goethe revealed why he privileges the cultivation of autonomy over satisfaction of desires and impulses, community of autonomous individuals over inertial individuals, and a democratic deliberation over decisions based on external authority or self-interest.

Faust as a Model Democratic Actor

The principles of autonomy, community, and deliberation are inextricably intertwined. Autonomy without deliberation risks becoming dogmatic if individuals cannot revisit choices based upon new knowledge or perspectives. A community without autonomous individuals is

subject to desires and impulses, self-interests, or may fall prey to an external authority.

Deliberation without autonomous individuals can become a tyranny of a majority if members do not realize that their well-being is bound to the well-being of the community, and indeed who they are or become is related to the operation of their community. There may be multiple normative goals of democratic deliberation; autonomous individuals are best equipped to reach them.⁹ I have analyzed each component as a discrete part of an education for a democratic citizen, and I have introduced how each component might be fostered through education for *Bildung*. Prominent educators for democracy have criticized NCLB because it fails to adequately prepare students for becoming citizens capable of democratic decision-making and democratic action. *Faust* offers a model of an education that may prepare students for democratic society.

I have identified the criteria of each component of democracy. Autonomous individuals (a) have self-control over impulses and desires, (b) possess an ability to set their own purposes, and (c) engage in a reflective process to maintain these elements. A community has individuals who a) communicate b) are transformed through their interactions c) have their autonomy enhanced and d) interact and agree upon an organizing principle for determining a collective will. Deliberation involves a) autonomous participants b) who communicate with each other c) in order to arrive at mutually acceptable decisions. A democratic actor is an autonomous individual who deliberates with others in a communal spirit.

Faust is capable of being a democratic actor by the end of the play. He gained salvation through self-control; he set his own purpose culminating in the land reclamation project; his experiences with Mephisto led him to engage numerous individuals over the course of his life,

⁹ Ideological goals may be determined by a majority, but that does not guarantee the goal is democratic. It is difficult to determine if any goal autonomous individuals decide to pursue is automatically democratic, but without autonomous individuals the determined goal may be the product of inertial forces. More research is required to determine which goals ought to be considered democratic, but it is clear there are some goals that are not democratically determined.

transforming him into an autonomous, deliberative actor seeking mutually acceptable, autonomously arrived at, decisions for his community. Faust may not have become a democratic citizen in terms of participating in a democratic government. However, according to the definition delineated in this study, he was more capable of being a democratic actor than he was at the start of the play.

Final Thoughts

I have shown over the life of the character Faust that individual development through transformational experiences educates students to become potentially democratic actors by cultivating habits conducive to developing components of democracy- autonomy, community, and deliberation. Being taught information about democratic principles, or having rules externally imposed, may impede the development of democratic actors by restricting the experiences necessary for students to develop habits of democratic practice. A *Bildung* education is designed to execute the former process, and legislation such as NCLB often results in the latter.

Legislation such as NCLB intends to promote mastery of some core knowledge, itself a seemingly worthy goal. Who would argue that mastering knowledge of a subject is something to be avoided? I have discussed one detriment to such an approach- the loss of experiences in democratic habits- but there is another criticism, voiced by Wiggins, who reminded educators:

There is, alas, such a thing as ‘thoughtless mastery’ (as I have elsewhere termed it) and our syllabi and assessments tend unwittingly to reinforce it. Many of our students are quite good at this thoughtless mastery....Paradoxically, many professions *require* unthinking mastery- and run the risk of an amoral technical approach to life.

We have a moral obligation to disturb students intellectually. It is too easy nowadays, I think, to come to college and leave one’s prejudices and deeper habits of mind and assumptions unexamined. (Wiggins, 1990, p. 2)

As Apple had warned, our consumer culture may desire unthinking mastery in an effort to populate a capitalist workforce and consumer base. But these are not the traits of democratic actors. According to Freire, a banking conception of education deprives students of the opportunity to develop into their individual selves through “the lack of creativity, transformation, and knowledge” (1970, p. 72). Freire claimed, “The more completely the majority adapt to the purposes which the dominant minority prescribe for them (thereby depriving them of the right to their own purposes), the more easily the minority can continue to prescribe” (1970, p. 76). These prescriptions of the dominant minority are reminiscent of Gutmann’s admonition to avoid a process that restricts further democratic expression. If a minority prescribes for others, and actually denies expression to others, any semblance of democratic practice is lost.

Wiggins recognized the danger is not as much in a lack of mastery of knowledge as it is in dogmatism: “The philosopher Gadamer (with an explicit homage to our friend Socrates) argued that it is the dominant opinion that threatens thinking, not ignorance” (1990, p. 7). He claimed, “To postpone developing student’s ability to ask important questions in the name of ‘mastery’ is to jeopardize their intellect. Good judgment and aggressive thinking will atrophy if they must be endlessly postponed while professors profess” (Wiggins, 1990, p. 8). Good judgment and thinking inform democratic practice; dogmatism and compliance impede it. As Postman recognized in his advocacy of “error detection” (1995) and Greene recognized in her curriculum prescriptions (Beane, Ed., 1995) mastery of prescribed material does less to promote democratic free thinkers than responsive habits of thinking. Democratic practice is not an embracing of democratic rules, but a reaction to them and a process of developing and reassessing them. According to Wiggins, “It is not the student’s errors that matter but the student’s response to error; it is not ‘thoroughness’ in a novice’s work that reveals understanding but awareness of the

dilemmas, compromises, and uncertainties under the arguments one is willing to stand on” (1990, p. 10).

Multiple voices and perspectives can inform a free, democratic discussion. It is clear that legislation such as NCLB, which imposes an approved core of knowledge and sanctions non-compliance, limits such free expression. Even if citizens engage in democratic processes after formal schooling is completed, their education may have formed restrictive habits of thinking if they have not become autonomous actors. Goethe claimed, “Things in heaven and earth form a kingdom so wide that only all the organs of all beings could grasp it” (Stawell & Dickinson, p. 10). In the same manner, a democratic society gains autonomy through additional knowledge and every voiced perspective. Cottrell explained, “Goethe’s world outlook is concerned less with absolute judgments than with the processes of transformation and becoming” (1976, p. 63).

Viewing democracy as an evolving process helps educators recognize the difference between ossifying and liberating pedagogical practices. A passive learning process, such as Freire’s banking conception, leads to passive recipients of knowledge and can limit democratic practice. Democratic practice is dynamic, not static. Individuals in a democratic society must themselves be capable of development if they are to continuously evolve and create a democratic community. Faust is an excellent model for democratic educators because it reflects Goethe’s philosophy of *Bildung* education. Cottrell explained, “Goethe’s view of man’s faculties of cognition is itself in an upward sense ‘evolutionary....The thought organism itself grows and develops ever more refined organs of insight’” (1976, p. 83). Goethe recognized that the development of individuals leads to autonomy, which informs community and deliberation. These are the main components of a democracy.

Goethe's *Faust* reveals a *Bildung* education toward the development of autonomous individuals in every aspect of their lives. Within this education lies the transformative capacity for individuals to become democratic actors. I conclude with the words of Barber whose explication of strong democracy admonishes individuals to practice democracy:

The right of every individual to speak to others, to assert his being through the act of communication, is identified with the precious wellspring of human autonomy and dignity. ... Democracy, if it is to survive ... will have to rediscover its multiple voices and give to citizens once again the power to speak, to decide, and to act; for in the end human freedom will be found not in caverns of private solitude but in the noisy assemblies where women and men meet daily as citizens and discover in each other's talk the consolation of a common humanity. (1984, p.311)

APPENDIX A
FAUST: A SYNOPSIS

Goethe's *Faust* is a play based upon an historical figure, Faust, born toward the end of the fifteenth century. Faust had practiced magic and allegedly told a monk he had made a deal with the Devil which he had signed in his own blood. According to the legend, Faust exchanged his soul to experience many wonders. Numerous literary works are based on the Faust legend. A popular example is Christopher Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, in which Dr. Faustus sold his soul to the devil to gain knowledge and power.

Goethe began writing *Faust* while in his early twenties, after having published several popular novels. His early version of *Faust* was completed when he was twenty-six years old, though he added to it and modified it throughout his life. Goethe's treatment of the Faust theme is different than most of his predecessors, most notably in the ending of the play. Faust is saved at the conclusion of Goethe's version, and Goethe's *Faust* is considered by many scholars to be much more nuanced and far reaching than previous versions of the legend. I will provide a brief synopsis and overview of Goethe's *Faust*.¹

Faust begins with a dedication seemingly to the memory of a life of accomplishments, and with an eye toward writing the play to follow. The next scene is entitled "Prelude in the Theatre." Three characters, a clown, a poet, and a director, each discuss their respective roles in the performance of a play. This scene is generally thought to be a foreshadowing of major themes in *Faust*. Following the Prelude is "Prologue in Heaven." Here the Lord gives permission for Mephisto to try to clasp Faust's soul, but warns that man may err but through continuous striving will eventually remember "the right road."

¹ My synopsis is based on Walter Kaufmann's translation of *Faust* (1961).

Faust is divided into two parts. The first follows Faust from contemplating suicide, through his love affair with Margaret, up until Margaret's death in prison. The second part finds Faust spiritually transformed and ready to engage the world, reclaim land to create a village, and eventually attain salvation in death.

In the First Part of the Tragedy, specifically "Night" and "Before the City Gate," Faust is revealed as a character unsatisfied with his place as a professor, having mastered knowledge but lacking what he termed "the macrocosm." He tries other-worldly means to get beyond his state, but decides suicide is his best option. Just before he drinks poison he hears church bells signaling Easter. Faust remembers his youth and feels renewed enough to walk among the townspeople. Wagner, a pedant, accompanies him on his walk.

In "Study" and "Study, cont." Faust and Wagner represented in their conversation, respectively, a professor seeking creative abilities and a pedant seeking knowledge mastery. As they arrived at Faust's study they noticed a poodle had followed them. Wagner saw nothing strange, but Faust suspected something. It turns out the poodle was Mephisto in disguise. Mephisto and Faust entered into a wager where Faust declared that if he ever found a moment that brought satisfaction, Mephisto could get his soul. The rest of the play is filled with experiences Mephisto facilitates for Faust. For example, in "Auerbach's Keller in Leipzig" Mephisto brings Faust to a tavern to enjoy revelry. In "The Witch's Kitchen" Faust renews his youth through a potion. Throughout the scenes "Street," "Evening," "Promenade," "The Neighbor's House," "Street," "Garden," "A Garden Bower," "Wood and Cave," "Gretchen's Room," "Martha's Garden," "At the Well," "City Wall," and "Night," Faust engaged in a love affair with Margaret, affectionately referred to as Gretchen. His feelings for her vacillated between lust and love, with Mephisto acknowledging only the lust and encouraging Faust to act

on only this aspect of his relationship with Margaret. Margaret's brother recognized his sister's fall from virtue and duels with Mephisto, who kills him.

In "Cathedral" Margaret tries to find release from the torment of her sins of becoming pregnant while being unmarried, having her brother lose his life over the loss of her virtue, and accidentally killing her mother with a sleeping potion provided by Mephisto. While she is alone, yet in a crowded church, Faust sees a vision of her torment. Faust experiences supernatural charms in "Walpurgis Night," but remembers Margaret's torment and becomes distressed. The scene "Walpurgis Night's Dream" follows as an interlude.

Faust desired to help free Margaret in "Dismal Day," but Mephisto at first refused to help, claiming she was not the first person to be punished for transgressions. Mephisto asked whose deeds landed her in that state, intimating that she deserved her fate. Faust insisted on helping her and did try. In "Night," Faust set out to find Margaret and attempt to free her. In "Dungeon" he found her, but she refused to leave and accepted her fate. Faust moaned, "That I had never been born!" Margaret recognized Mephisto as a devil and prayed. Mephisto claimed she would be damned in judgment, but a voice declared her "saved."

The Second Part of the Tragedy opens with "First Act: Charming Landscape Open Country" where Faust has become spiritually renewed. Through the next few scenes, including "The Court of the Emperor" and numerous scenes omitted from Kaufmann's translation, Faust helped an emperor win a battle, avert a financial crisis, view Helen of Troy, and he watched Mephisto perform magic. In subsequent scenes Faust witnessed Wagner create a little man, Homunculus, in a test tube. Homunculus helped Faust visit Helen of Troy, with whom Faust fathered Euphorion, a child representing the synthesis of vital Germanic life with classical restraint.

In the Fourth Act, “High Mountains,” Faust has found nature to be impressive, but Mephisto did not see it as such. Mephisto offers Faust instead a way to help an emperor win a battle. With the victory the emperor gives Faust some land near a sea shore. In “Open Country,” Faust finds success with his land reclamation project but desires its completion and requires land from Baucis and Philemon, an elderly couple. The couple refuses Faust’s offer of a trade for a grander estate on his new land. In “Palace,” Faust begins to see that evil deeds can accompany a project like his in the sense that power begets power, seemingly regardless of what is right. Still, Faust is frustrated that he does not have the couple’s land.

In “Deep Night,” Mephisto dispatches underlings to displace the couple. In the process the couple is killed and their house burned down. At this same time, in “Midnight,” Faust is visited by Want, Guilt, Care, and Need, but only Care can find its way into Faust’s house. Care then blinds Faust, but he is more enthusiastic than ever about completing his land reclamation project. He declares, “One mind for a thousand hands will do.”

The sound of lemures digging Faust’s grave opens “Large Outer Court of the Palace,” but Faust mistakes this sound for the completion of his project. Faust is excited that his community will live and care for the land he had reclaimed from the sea. At this moment he utters words of satisfaction, seemingly ceding his soul to Mephisto under their original deal.

In “Entombment” Mephisto waited for Faust’s soul to leave his body in order to claim it under his interpretation of the deal he had made with Faust. As Faust’s soul ascended, the Lord dispatched angels to carry Faust’s soul to heaven. Mephisto is befuddled, wondering how he lost Faust’s soul. In “Mountain Gorges” Faust’s soul encounters numerous spiritually significant figures, including the soul of his former lover, Margaret. Margaret’s soul calls out to Faust’s soul, which follows Margaret’s soul toward the heavens.

APPENDIX B PEDAGOGICAL EXERCISE FOR KNOWLEDGE CREATION

The following example will illustrate the difference between exercising faculties to acquire or to create knowledge. The example summarizes an event in the science classroom of Adrienne Thieke at Lincoln Middle School in Gainesville, Florida in 2005.

A group of fifth grade students in a science class were shown a Styrofoam cup extracted from the package in which it was purchased. The teacher asked the students, “What is in this cup?” The students responded, “Nothing.” The teacher then took the cup, taped a piece of cotton inside the cup at the bottom, turned the open side of the cup facing down, and submerged the cup in water. The teacher withdrew the cup and showed the students the cotton, asking if the cotton was wet. The students saw that it was not wet, and the teacher asked the students why the cotton remained dry.

Of the three classes that participated in this experiment, one class answered within two hours, one took the rest of the day, and another took half of the week. The teacher’s aides were impatient and wanted to inform the students as to the reason the cotton remained dry, but the teacher was adamant that the students should figure it out for themselves. Why? The teacher could have stopped “wasting the students’ time” by telling them immediately after the initial experiment, and then all of the students would have known what was in the cup and why the cotton remained dry. But the purpose of the experiment was not solely to have the students, as budding scientists, know what kept the cotton dry. The stated purpose of the experiment was to create scientists and not merely transmit knowledge already discovered.

If students wanted to know the answer to this experiment, the students had only to look up the answer in a textbook, on the internet, or have a teacher explain the answer to them. But a main purpose of scientists is to have the ability to find answers to a problem when the answers

do not yet exist in a textbook, online, or in a teacher's brain. So by concealing the answer to the experiment and allowing the students the opportunity to think through the problem, the teacher had exercised the faculties of the budding scientists rather than simply informing them of what scientists had already discovered. When a student figured out that it was air in the cup that kept the water out, rather than nothing, that student had gone through numerous processes to eliminate false answers and to coordinate logical possible answers until a solution was created. This exercise would have been lost had the teacher only informed the student about the correct answer. A further consideration is to ask how much of what we inform students about is made up of right answers?

REFERENCES

- Apple, Michael W. (2006). *Educating the “right” way: Markets, standards, god, and Inequality* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Aristotle. (1973; 1947). *Politics* (Benjamin Jowett, Trans.). In Richard McKeon (Ed.). *Introduction to Aristotle* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 583-667.
- Barber, Benjamin. (1996). *Jihad vs. mcWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world*. New York: Ballantine Press.
- Barber, Benjamin. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press.
- Barnard, F.M. (Oct., 1981). Accounting for actions: Causality and teleology. *History and Theory*. Vol. 20, No. 3, 291-312.
- Beane, James A. (2005). *A reason to teach: Creating classrooms of dignity and hope*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Beane, James A. (Ed.). (1995). *Toward a coherent curriculum: The 1995 yearbook of the association for supervision and curriculum development*. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Beckham, Mark Allen. (1980). *An epistemological study of Goethe’s novel “the sufferings of young Werther”*: An examination of Goethe’s educational philosophy as reflected in an analytical study of the character Werther. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Dakota, 1980).
- Berman, Marshall. (1982). *All that is solid melts into air*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bishop, Paul (Ed.). (2001). *A Companion to Goethe’s Faust parts I and II*. Rochester: Camden House.
- Broudy, Harry S. (February 1979). Tacit Knowing as a Rationale for Liberal Education. *Teachers College Record* 80, No. 3, 446-462.
- Brown, Jane. K., Lee, Meredith, & Saine, Thomas P. (Eds.). (1994). *Interpreting Goethe’s Faust today*. Columbia, South Carolina: Camden House.
- Cottrell, Alan P. (1976). *Goethe’s Faust: Seven essays*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Crocker, Linda. (Fall 2003). Teaching for the test: Validity, fairness, and moral action. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*. Vol. 22, Num. 3, 5-11.

- De Nicolas, Antonio, Ed. (1989/2001). *Habits of mind: The practice of philosophy as education*. San Jose: Authors Choice Press.
- Dewey, John. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Dewey, John. (1929, December). My pedagogic creed. *Journal of the National Education Association*, 18(9), pp. 291-295. In David J. Flinders *Curriculum and teaching dialogue*. Greenwich: 2005, Vol. 7, Issue ½, pp. 1-9.
- Dewey, John. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, John. (January 16, 1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal*, Vol. LIV, Num. 3, 77-80.
- Dieckmann, Liselotte. (1972). *Goethe's Faust: A critical reading*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Draghi, Annick Stephens. (2006). *Liberal education and the intellectual and moral preparation for life in a democracy*. (Ed.D. dissertation, California Lutheran University, 2006).
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. (1951; 1926). *Emerson's essays: First and second series complete in one volume*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Flinders, David J. (2005). The failings of NCLB. *Curriculum and teaching dialogue*. Greenwich. Vol. 7, Issue ½, 1-9.
- Freire, Paulo. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gaier, Ulrich. Dialektik der Vorstellungsarten als Prinzip in Goethes *Faust* (abstract summary). The title translated into English is "The Dialectic of Perceptual modes as a Principle in Goethe's *Faust*." In Brown, Jane. K., Lee, Meredith, & Saine, Thomas P. (Eds.). (1994). *Interpreting Goethe's Faust today*. Columbia, South Carolina: Camden House.
- Goethe, J.W. von. HAXII, 441, No. 555. Cited in Zajonc, Arthur G. (Winter, 1983). Facts as theories: Aspects of Goethe's philosophy of science. *Teachers College Record*. Vol. 85, Number 2, pp. 251-271.
- Goethe, J.W. von. Ueber Newtons Hypothese der diversen Refrangibilitaet. In *Chromatic*, II Abteilung, 5 Band of Goethes Werke (Weimar: Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger, 1897), p. 170. Cited in Zajonc, Arthur G. (Winter, 1983). Facts as theories: Aspects of Goethe's philosophy of science. *Teachers College Record*. Vol. 85, Number 2, pp. 251-271.
- Greene, Maxine. (1995). Ch. 13: Notes on the search for coherence. In James A. Beane, Ed. *Toward a coherent curriculum: The 1995 ASCD yearbook*. (pp. 139-145). Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gutmann, Amy. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Habermas, Jurgen. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hagen, Fred & Mahlendorf, Ursula. (Summer, 1963). Commitment, concern and memory in Goethe's *Faust*. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. Vol. 21, No.4, 473-484.
- Hendel, Charles. W. (Dec., 1949). Goethe's *Faust* and philosophy. *Philosophy and Phenomenological research*. Vol. 10, No. 2, 157-171.
- Hewitt, Randall S. (2001). *Renewing the democratic faith: A philosophical analysis of John Dewey's idea of power*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 2001).
- Horvay, Frank D. (Autumn, 1970). Attempt of relevance in discussing Goethe's *Faust*. *Die Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German*. Vol. 3, No. 2, 79-87.
- Jantz, Harold. (1978). *The form of Faust: The work of art and its intrinsic structures*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jantz, Harold Stein. (1951). *Goethe's Faust as a renaissance man: Parallels and prototypes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kaestle, Carl E. (1983). *Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society, 1780-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Kant, Immanuel. (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals* (H.J. Paton, Trans.). New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Goethe, Johann W. von (1961). *Goethe's Faust*. (Walter Kaufmann, Trans.). New York: Anchor Books. (First part originally published in 1790)
- Kaufmann, Walter. (1959). *From Shakespeare to existentialism: An original study*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kingsley, Donald J. (April 1941). The Teaching of Politics. *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 211-214.
- Kozol, Jonathan. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Kravatz, Tanya Devra. (2007). *Critical pedagogy and oppositional politics in education: Developing critical consciousness and building civil society in the classroom*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.)
- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996, 1962). *Structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lepenies, Wolf. (2006). *The seduction of culture in German history*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Martin, Jane Roland. (1985). *Reclaiming a conversation: The ideal of the educated woman*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McGuinn, Patrick J. (2006). *No child left behind and the transformation of federal education policy, 1965-2005*. Kansas: The University Press of Kansas.
- McLaren, Peter. (2003). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Meier, Deborah & Wood, George, Eds. (2004). *Many children left behind: How the no child left behind act is damaging our children and schools*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mozdzenska, Malgorzata Halina. (1994). *Faustian foibles: An examination of Faust and the feminine*. (M.A. thesis. University of Alberta, Canada).
- Murchland, Bernard. (2000). *Voices of democracy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- O'Hair, Mary John, McLaughlin, H. James, & Reitzug, Ulrich C. (2000). *Foundations of democratic education*. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Parker, Walter C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Plato. (1967). Phaedrus (A. Nehamas and P. Woodruff, Trans.). In John M. Cooper (Ed.). *Plato: Complete works*, pp. 506-556. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Plato. *Phaedrus*, 274e-275b.
- Postman, Neil. (1995) *The end of education*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Prange, Klaus. (2004). Bildung: A paradigm regained? *European Educational Research Journal*, Volume 3, Number 2, 501-509.
- Ravitch, Diane. (Ed.). (2005). *Brookings papers on education policy*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Roth, Michael S. (Ed.). (1994). *Rediscovering history: Culture, politics, and the psyche*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (1967). The social contract. In Lester G. Crocker (Ed.), *The social contract and discourse on the origin of inequality*, pp.7-147. New York: Washington Square Press. (Originally published in 1762)

- Sadker, Myra Pollack & Sadker, David Miller. (2005). *Teachers, Schools, and Society, Seventh Edition: Florida Version*. Boston: McGraw Hill Custom Publishing.
- Sagarra, Eda & Skrine, Peter. (1997). *A Companion to German literature: From 1500 to the present*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Salm, Peter. (1971). *The poem as plant: A biological view of Goethe's Faust*. Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve University.
- Schweitzer, Albert. Trans. Charles R. Joy. (1961). *Goethe: Five studies*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Seamon, David & Zajonc, Arthur (Eds.). (1998). *Goethe's way of science: A phenomenology of nature*. New York: S.U.N.Y. Press.
- Sepper, Dennis. (1988). *Goethe contra Newton: Polemics and the project for a new science of color*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shafer, I.H. (December 2005). The Faust challenge: Science as diabolic or divine. *Zygon*. Vol. 40, Issue 4, 891-915.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de (1969). *Democracy in America*. (J.P. Mayer, Ed.; George Lawrence, Trans.) New York: Harper Perennial. (Originally published in 1850)
- Ungar, Frederick (Ed.) & Norden, Heinz (trans.). (1963). *Goethe's world view: Presented in his reflections and maxims*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company.
- Wiggins, Grant. (1995). Curricular coherence and assessment: Making sure that the effect matches the intent. In *Toward a coherent curriculum: The 1995 yearbook of the association for supervision and curriculum development*, pp. 101-119.
- Wiggins, Grant. (1990). The truth may make you free, but the test may keep you imprisoned: Toward assessment worthy of the liberal arts. In *The AAHE Assessment forum. Assessment 1990: Understanding the implications*. Washington, DC: The American Association for Higher Education, 17-31. Retrieved from http://www.maa.org/saum/articles/wiggins_appendix.html.
- Williams, Forrest. (1953). Faust as a renaissance man. *The Personalist*, v34, 393- 398.
- Wilson, W. Daniel. (1999). *Das Goethe-Tabu: Protest und Menschenrechte im klassischen Weimar*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Wolk, Steven. (1998). *A democratic classroom*. New Hampshire: Heinmann.
- Zajonc, Arthur G. (Winter, 1983). Facts as theories: Aspects of Goethe's philosophy of science. *Teachers College Record*. Vol. 85, Number 2, 251-271.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Carl Colavito was born on Long Island, New York in 1966, where he lived for twenty-six years before moving to Saint Augustine, Florida. In New York, Carl had encountered numerous individuals from various cultures, each representing a world-view from which Carl learned to appreciate the great diversity of perspectives. Upon moving to Saint Augustine, Carl encountered an entirely different world-view, leading him to consider how all of these views could be reconciled. While living in Florida, Carl operated several small businesses. His eventual return to graduate school marked the beginning of his journey toward understanding life's myriad expressions, along with an opportunity to teach philosophy, political science, and education courses as an adjunct instructor.

Carl earned a bachelor's degree in philosophy from S.U.N.Y. at Stony Brook in 1987. After moving to Florida, he earned a master's degree in political science in 1997 and a Ph.D. in education in 2009, both from the University of Florida. The combination of these areas of enquiry and methodologies has helped Carl to understand the value of education, and communication, in understanding and reconciling world-views.