Presidential Address

HUMANE INTELLECTUALS: BEING PRESENT TO HUMANITY AND THE WORLD

Angela Hurley
Transylvania University

Hannah Arendt asks the challenging questions of whether we love the world enough to take responsibility for it; and, if we "love our children enough not to expel them from our world and leave them to their own devices, nor to strike from their hands their chance of undertaking something new, something unforeseen by us, but to prepare them in advance for the task of renewing a common world."[1] Courageous intellectuals answer Arendt's well-known questions, daily, in the ways in which they interact with students and in the ways in which they engage in scholarship. Teachers' love for the world, ideas, and for students either shows, or it doesn't.

Parker Palmer calls this love "faithfulness":

> If you are here faithfully with us, you are bringing abundant blessing. It is a blessing known to generations of students whose lives have been transformed by people who had the courage to teach—the courage to teach from the most truthful places in the landscape of self and world, the courage to invite students to discover, explore, and inhabit those places in the living of their own lives.[2]

Palmer's words may sound "over flowery" to "objectively trained" ears, but that criticism is a part of the problem I wish to explore: modernity's omission of emotive language from intellectual discourse has severed thought from feeling, resulting in detrimental effects upon formal educative experiences, teaching, and human actions. Through schooling experiences, individuals are prepared for their lives in the wider community and the world in some form and degree; therefore, teachers have an important role in nourishing the human spirit and in encouraging the development of ethical and moral (humane) human beings, as well as attending to conceptual material. Hiam Ginott cautions:

> I am a survivor of a concentration camp. My eyes saw what no person should witness. Gas chambers built by learned engineers. Children poisoned by educated physicians. Infants killed by trained nurses. Women and babies shot and killed by high school and college graduates. So I'm suspicious of education. My request is help your students to be human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, or educated Eichmanns. Reading and

> writing and spelling and history and arithmetic are only important if they serve to make our students more human.[3]

Globally, educated people have perpetrated many atrocities and instituted demeaning policies, either consciously or unthinkingly. Their thought and actions appear to be divorced from a sense of respect for other human beings; otherwise, how could such violence be perpetuated?

Educators have a responsibility to consider the problem of humans' inhumane actions, caused purposely or by neglect. Students, in discussions of perplexing human problems and theorizing about possible actions, need to realize that reason may not be all that is required to act humanely. Humanitarians often act when reason would tell them not to. This phenomenon has been considered by numerous philosophers, historically, as they have noted that education, rationality, and appeal to rules seem to have their limits in relation to morality and moral actions. Something more is often compelling one's interactions with the world. Education for a purposeful, humane life, then, is more than the learning of information, rules, and arguments. Naming that "something," however, is difficult. In some way or other, the emotions and something more subjective than what currently counts as cognitive knowledge, play vital roles in ethical and mindful thinking, meaningful knowledge, and human conduct. Perhaps there is the need to be able to see the world "slant," in poet Emily Dickinson's language, by which she means seeing the world more holistically than through reason and rules.

Martha Nussbaum, one of the most prominent contemporary scholars analyzing emotion and morality, situates emotions as the grounding for individuals' thinking and social actions. Basing many of her claims upon Aristotelian thought, Nussbaum shows the interrelated nature of emotions, thought, and actions. In tying the emotions to actions, she asserts, for example, that "compassion cuts through the dehumanizing strategies that are frequently enlisted in the service of cruelty of many kinds."[4] Eva Brann, former Dean of St. John's College and another thinker currently concerned with this topic, concludes an essay on thought and emotion by claiming that the two are inseparable.[5] If Nussbaum's and Brann's arguments[6] (and others like them) are accepted, then, it seems that the development and role of the emotions have a place in discourses related to ideas and the putting of those ideas into the world.

However, current schooling narratives exclude the emotions as they are not important to the dominant behaviorist paradigm or to the current rhetoric about the value of formal schooling which tends to focus on narrow, pragmatic, utilitarian aims. For example, the editor of *Change* recently mused about "Contributing to the Public Good." After a somewhat promising start, stating that she would argue that universities "need to know not only how effective individual institutions are at advancing students' skills and knowledge but what their collective effort adds up to for the larger society whose welfare

depends increasingly on the intellectual capacities of its citizens,"[7] editor Margaret Miller then turns the discussion to educational capital and improving the economy. Not living up to the title of her essay at all, she does not consider the public good in other ways than in the trickle down of individual intelligence into economic good. Too many people speak of the purpose of formal education in this way. Calls for children, youth, and future citizens to be able to entertain big existential questions and to care for other sentient creatures and the earth, in the interest of the public good, are for the most part missing.

Therefore, I encourage a shift in the current schooling narrative to one that goes beyond the narrow categories of modernism into a realm of possibilities that consider the quality of life for *all* of humankind. Existentialist philosophers place value on the ability to *imagine what is not*. One such imagining could be recognizing and placing value upon the gift of *presence* that each individual brings into the world, especially if he or she were to engage in educational experiences, from an early age, that encourage reflecting upon the human condition, human possibilities, and the consequences of human actions. Perhaps more humane ways of being in relation with one another would follow. Therefore, *I am advocating for consciously entertaining the notion of the humanitarian[8] impulse in our work with students of all ages.* By humanitarian, I mean the belief that all human beings deserve to be treated with respect and dignity. Humanitarian acts consist of positive and benevolent regard and treatment toward other human beings. These actions can be on a small or grand scale.

Edward Said claims, "…the central factor of human work, (is) the actual participation of peoples in the making of human life."[9] Educators have a role in that project. Since the current notion of successful schools has been reduced to high numerical test scores, educators must push against that notion and argue the importance of experiences in which students can explore deep existential questions, complex academic concepts, and responsibilities related to being a human. The purpose of formal education should include helping individuals to be aware of the many possibilities available to their humanness and of how their presence in the world relates to and affects others and the environment.

With this in mind, in the remainder of this paper, in order to argue that the truly educated person should be a humane person, I will set my remarks in a context by describing current western conditions or the world into which our young are now being born; by positing how one is present in the world; and by proposing how schooling experiences offer paths for the expression of humaneness.

I.

So, what kind of world are American children and youth coming into the presence of? The historical condition known as modernism has and

continues to influence western life. Scholars often locate the grounding for modernity in Enlightenment thought, which changed the way of looking at time and space and also placed value on science as a way of thinking and solving "problems." Modernism occasioned the split between faith and reason, with spiritual matters being placed in theology and reason being delegated to philosophy (and later science). Then the two were turned into either/or categories. Many problems arise from this particular separation, but two main ones pertain to the thoughts of this paper: splitting the two (1) divides the human psyche and (2) relegates thinking to philosophy and science and to an elevated status, while conversation about the non-scientific and non-rational (spiritual matters) are truncated and considered inferior. In "the divorce," religion took "the soul" and the subjective life, and philosophy and science claimed objectivity and "ideas,"[10] with the "rational, objective" forces claiming superiority. Such a division privileges one basic way of thinking and of coming to know, negatively affecting western life and schooling practices.

For example, notions of who humans are were influenced by this dichotomy. Enlightenment thinking disentangled individuals from the collective, freeing them to use their wills and to be autonomous selves. Humans (certain humans) became the dominant, premiere forces in a world that was to be tamed and channeled into clockwork order. Newtonian science changed the conception of the world, ordering it through cause and effect principles, casting religion, fantasy, mystery, at-oneness with the earth, and ambiguities to inferior or non-status. Experiences, especially those that could be weighed, measured, and analyzed, became dominant. Anything that had occurred in the pre-modern age became suspected of being mere superstitution and wrong-mindedness. Being able to control and direct the forces of life became the goal of scientists and western individuals. Science (and its children, technology and scientism) became the dominant metaphor for living life, with pragmatism and functionality serving as standard methods of evaluating choices.[11] All of these changes affect how humans are thought of and how they perceive their roles in the world.

Late in the twentieth century, many of these modernistic notions began to be challenged and to unravel, with scholars using labels such as "postmodernism" or "liquid modernity" to rename current conditions. However, modernistic tendencies still exist in many areas, with a new overlay of thinking interacting with them. Even so, a few general observations of current changes can be made. Certainly accumulation of material goods is a hallmark both of current times and of modernity, but even that has changed so that flexible accumulation for large businesses is now the norm, spreading industrial sites around the globe, further fragmenting products from producers. Capitalism is working differently now than it has in the past.[12] For example, global outsourcing is a dominant feature of how business is conducted, with corporations having international boundaries that are not easily defined.

In addition, notions of time and space are revolutionized, collapsing past conceptions. Hyperspace, cyberspace, and other modes of fast travel have connected and disconnected global and local communities, destabilizing past notions, creating confusion and ambiguities about how to interact with others on both an individual and collective level. The recent change from being a print culture to a cyberspace, computer-based culture affects ways of thinking and interacting with symbols and other images. Those who can manipulate the images and produce the best sound bites are becoming the influential forces in the culture; hence, we have the rise of celebrity and the use of charisma in marketing and politics. Slogans abound and carry a weight in all kinds of every day decisions.[13]

Violence and aggression are also hallmarks of the western world. In terms of war, the twentieth century was the bloodiest in all of recorded time. Closely aligned to war, aggression and punitive action abounds. The United States has more people incarcerated than any other western country. Perhaps national and international destabilizing events have pushed individuals to seek safety, even more than they have in the past. Often individuals strike out against others in their quests for security. However, Parker Palmer claims that American culture has become "addicted to violence as a solution to our problems." He says:

> Violence comes in many forms, of course; war as a fix for international problems; incarceration as a fix for domestic problems; environmental pillage as a fix for consumer hungers; economic injustice as a fix for the insecurities of the wealthy; discrimination as a fix for fear of diversity; forcing children through the templates of high-stakes standardized testing as a fix for our need to pretend that we are improving education.[14]

Palmer argues that we, as a culture, use violence in these ways just as an addict uses drugs. Additionally, we refuse to see that violence begets more violence because we cannot quit "using the drug" and then participate in the difficult, required work that is needed for a nonviolent path.

Not only is violence being used as a drug, actual drug use, both legal and illegal, is at epidemic levels. The rise in the use of legal and illegal drugs and the growth of the importance of pharmaceuticals in the west is a dominant feature, as individuals reach for immediate fixes to the feeling of uncertainty. Copious amounts and kinds of drugs are being prescribed for children and youth for various conditions, even high cholesterol. Some critics claim that the United States is a nation of drugged children and adults, again pursuing quick fixes.

All of the preceding elements stand not in isolation, but interrelate, forming a cultural picture. But, perhaps one of the most forceful elements in western modernism is the penchant individuals have to compartmentalize not

only their own inner selves but also most of the activities of their lives. In a cult of modernistic thinking in which individuals seek to have stability in the midst of change and efficiency in the quest for progress,[15] individuals fragment their lives, thinking, and actions into discrete units so that the parts can be concentrated upon and completed. Individuals are not looking into the depths and interrelated aspects of their problems, but rather they glide on the surface of them. That is, the dividing of the self into "thought and other" (whether it be religion, emotions, whatever) fragments lives into isolated experiences. Also, the fragmentation or compartmentalization encourages an inclination to think of oneself first (and usually in economic terms) and of the community of sentient creatures very little if at all. Even religion has become an individualistic experience—one experience among many in one's life, often tailored to individual taste.

Life simply does not work on this fragmented model: human beings are unique totalities, not a mixture of isolated categories. Such a divided model encourages individuals to live "on the surface" of things, not acknowledging the depths of their existences. As Melvyn Matthews, a British theologian, expresses this thought: "The primary external symptom of this dislocation between our surface existence and our deeper, inner being is the amassing of 'capital,' things, possessions, insurances of one kind or another that we believe to be our own and to be inalienable and permanent."[16] Matthews' judgment is particularly affirmed by noting the ways in which individuals tend to identify themselves, either by the status of their home, car, or occupation.

Russian author Alexander Solzhenitsyn commented on this same "surface living" in an address he made in 1978 at Harvard University. Noting that people in the west strive for happiness through the accumulation of things, Solzhenitsyn went on to say: "The constant desire to have still more things and a better life and the struggle to obtain them imprints many Western faces with worry and even depression." Solzhenitsyn felt this pursuit substitutes for moral and character development.[17]

These cultural factors coalesce into a tendency to value competition and consumption. The ways in which individuals (and their family units), surrounded by their things, have almost taken an "us against the rest" stance is urged forward with the competitive nature of culture, in general, and in schools, in particular. The frenetic rhetoric and activity used by schooling officials to "motivate" students to perform well on exams; the prize-giving in all aspects of schooling curriculum; the "we must win" attitude adopted by school sports teams; the parental admonitions for all of their children to make straight "A's"; the cottage industries that have sprung up to prepare high school students for applications to prestigious colleges and universities all point to the emphasis placed upon individual success. As a result, children and youth are sent a constant message to be the best or perish![18]

This push to succeed combines with the message to consume. Those with the best and most "toys" are considered winners. Disney and other corporations send the message of "buy our products and you will have a joyful life."[19] Schooling success has become yet another product to achieve, and schooling curriculums are validated by how well they prepare students to be good consumers and successful in today's economy. Perhaps these characteristics (individualism, success, and consumerism) are not "bad" categorically, but when they affect the definitions of being well educated and good citizens, then, I think we have a huge problem, and I contend that we are operating in the "huge problem" area. We now live in a country in which twenty percent of children live below the poverty line.[20] Globally 1/3 of the population lives in substandard housing. One fourth of American workers (30 million people) complete jobs that pay less than the federal poverty level for a family of four.[21] The BBC reported that "the top 200 wealthiest people in the world control more wealth than the bottom four billion." The report also claims that "The United States is the most economically stratified society in the western world…"[22]

In discussing modernism, several authors suggest that formal schools have been used as the major "tool" for progress and economic development, propelling the capitalist system. Formal education, though, should not be used in this narrow, utilitarian way: schooling experiences or courses cannot provide quick fixes to societal problems, especially economic ones. However, long-term, working solutions for relational problems may be possible through careful planning. If children and youth participate in schooling experiences that help them to realize their own unique identity and spirituality, they may connect with their inner selves and with one another. In this way, meaningful and creative answers to societal problems *may be found* as individuals find connections, form relationships, and enter into critical dialogue with one another. As Mordechai Gordon envisions, "Education … aims at introducing a young person to the world *as a whole" (emphasis mine)*.[23] That holistic view of working with youth is missing in current schooling and cultural practices because of the truncated, product-centered rationale currently given for schooling. Yet, numerous theorists, such as Nancy Carlsson-Paige, contend that "The need for schools to become communities that embrace the wholeness of the human experience is greater now than ever before."[24] With that need in mind, let us now turn to the human being who comes into the presence of the world and imagine a more holistic narrative for educational experiences.

II.

"Does anyone know that I am here?" In one way or another, individuals ask this question from the beginning of life. Infants use their crying to signal this query. The question requires a responsible response: research indicates that young children who are lovingly cared for and responded to usually turn out to be loving, good people.[25] Twentieth century philosopher

Susanne Langer made the argument that feeling is the source of thinking, and she referred to infanthood as the commencement of the "felt life" from which thinking emanates.[26] Similarly, Martha Nussbaum claims emotions have a history.[27] Nussbaum states that the ways in which emotions are dealt with in infancy and childhood affect the manner in which emotions are utilized and understood in adulthood. The helpless infant responds well to a nourishing environment. In fact, biologist Sarah Hardy contends that "Human infants have a nearly insatiable desire to be held and to bask in the sense that they are loved."[28]

As infants mature, they also have an avid interest in exploring the things of the world. They have an innate interest in learning. Full of wonder, children explore by touching, feeling, verbalizing, trying out their bodies through movement, and so forth. Unless they are severely confined or reprimanded for their exploits, children, as they mature, continue to be fascinated with objects and patterns in their world. They question adults, explore objects, and compose stories that help them to make sense of their world. Children are on a quest for meaning.[29] Depending upon the responsiveness from others in their lives, children either continue to see the world in wonderment and fascination, or they, if not attended to well, begin to lose this natural curiosity.

As young children present themselves to the world, then, they are placed in the situation of defining themselves as they interact with others. British philosopher Gert J. J. Biesta calls this process "coming into presence."[30] As each unique individual comes into relation with others, who that person is becomes known. This concept is not unlike Hannah Arendt's concept of natality as Natasha Levinson's defines it:

> … the moments in our lives when we take responsibility for ourselves in relation to others. In this way, natality initiates an active relation to the world. It signifies those moments in our lives (and there are many) in which we attempt to answer the question that Arendt argues is at the basis of all action and that is posed to every newcomer to the world: "Who are you?'"[31]

"Who am I," along with the question of "How do I interact with others," forms a grounding for individuals' search for self-understanding and for understanding of others. Providing educational experiences that allow individuals to explore diverse answers to these questions opens the range of available possibilities. And through their answers, individuals can express their own creative uniqueness.

Maxine Greene, in evaluating the ways in which formal schooling experiences provide answers to these questions, suggests that schools function basically in three ways: as the agency for initiating children into culturally acceptable ways of behaving and thinking; as the agency that helps move the

child from innocent infancy into the "open plains of conceptual thought"; and as the agency acting on behalf of the community to recreate itself through the induction of each new generation.[32] Going beyond these, Greene particularly advocates for educative experiences that encourage individuals to become "fully awake," aware of their existential possibilities. Put another way, she wants people to be able to "break through the crust" of the commonplace and ordinary in their thinking.[33] Greene posits that individuals need not lose their own uniqueness in the demands of coming into the norms of the group.

Nel Noddings' work fits well with Greene's line of thought. In developing her ethic of care, Noddings most recently has applied her notions to schooling curriculum. Noddings suggests that schools can help children and youth to be contributing members of society while retaining their uniqueness as individuals. She advocates "attentive love" as schooling's dominant theme, for she sees the aim of schooling to be the encouragement of "the growth of competent, caring, loving, and lovable people."[34] As such, she sees the purpose of schooling experiences to be happiness.[35] Courageously, Noddings states: "We should have learned by now that both children and adults can accomplish wonderful things in an atmosphere of love and trust and that they will (if they are healthy) resist—sometimes to their own detriment—in environments of coercion."[36]

Noddings' valuing of love matches Nussbaum's claims of the importance of nurturing and love to the development of emotive life. Empathy, compassion, and altruism form from a healthy development of love. The ways in which these traits enable one to tend toward humaneness will now be explored.

In the current trend to live on the surface of things, *love* is an overused word that has been eviscerated of its deeper meanings. The word has almost lost its value because of its casual and sentimental uses. However, current philosophers, such as Noddings and Nussbaum, among others, are analyzing the concept and proposing useful ways of considering its possibilities. For example, African Studies and Theology professor James Logan imputes this power to love:

> This dimension and expression of love powers the creative and transforming power of a hope that is audacious; a hope that is foolishness to the world. This love values the dignity and worthiness of both ourselves as well as our neighbors, whether those neighbors are next door or on the next continent….It is the greatest of all spiritual gifts. Love (as a regard for self and the 'other,' whether you like the other or not) is a Divine gift…[37]

Although Logan's remarks emanate from within the Christian religion, they could have come from other religious traditions, as well as from a non-religious perspective. The power and elements of the concept of love cut across and are

a part of the existential condition. Noddings' attentive love and the love to which Nussbaum devotes an entire book, *Love's Knowledge,* is a forceful concept, certainly not of the weak sentimental ilk most often used in everyday life. Love is not a noun exclusively; it is a verb. That is, love is a powerful force that puts a positive regard for other individuals' welfare into action.[38] Love, at its best, helps individuals to truly "see" and respond to the other, to hear the other, and to attend to the other. Love is relational and connective, enabling individuals to go "out of and beyond" their own personal boundaries. Writer and philosopher Iris Murdoch, in describing love, theorized that it and its attention are at work at all times, even when individuals are attempting to be rational only, and she saw the attention to others that love brings about as one of the ways in which humans are constantly defining themselves. As she says: "This means, of course, that a person is 'a unified being' who sees and who desires in accord with what he sees."[39] Love for self, others, and for the earth provides a basis for well- wishing, action, and hope for the future; that is, it provides a forceful impetus for individuals to truly entertain and act upon these notions.

In addition, love for others engenders respect; a respect that improves relationships among unlike individuals, leading them to value difference, breaking down the boundaries that have separated groups into "us and them." Jonathan Sacks, a Jewish theologian, describes difference in this way:

> The world is not a single machine. It is a complex, interactive ecology in which diversity—biological, personal, cultural and religious—is of the essence. Any proposed reduction of that diversity through the many forms of fundamentalism that exist today--market, scientific or religious—would result in a diminution of the rich texture of our shared life, a potentially disastrous narrowing of the horizons of possibility….Because we are different, we each have something unique to contribute, and every contribution counts.[40]

Given that the world's people now live in closer contact with one another than previously, Sacks' idea is of special significance. Global closeness poses a threat if a new concept of community is not forged that will include the concept of respecting difference instead of fearing it. This respect for difference does not preclude disagreement. Therefore, love gives individuals the courage to form unlikely bonds and then to speak their truth in the face of difference and dissenting perspectives, enabling crucial dialogue.

Another important aspect of love is forgiveness. In a strife-centered world, the hope for deescalating violence lies with forgiveness, a powerful force. Jonathan Sacks claims that since forgiveness comes from love, it provides a way to empower and to regain the feeling of safety.[41] Think of the way in which the Pennsylvania Amish community forgave the horrible atrocity recently visited upon their schoolchildren by a deranged killer. The act of

forgiving not only helped the killer's family; it also gave psychological succor to the victims' families. The Amish used their existential freedom to act in a loving, unpredictable way, enabling them to refute the tragedy that had so impacted their lives. In the Greek Orthodox religious tradition the term for forgiveness is "synchoresis," and it has no connection to moral obligation. Rather, it signifies enlarging a place for other people or ways. Forgiveness, then, opens a space for healing wounds.

Love, used in these ways, also permits individuals to look into the "dark side" of life, into the nature of evil and violence. When individuals feel safe and cared for, they can encounter and consider frightening aspects of existence. Without such examination, individuals tend again to live only on the surface of these problems and of love. An attentive love gives individuals the courage to think about the unthinkable and to explore possible ways of pushing through or changing these horrible issues.

These thoughts apply to schooling and the education of children, youth, and university students in a most important way. The narrow, limited view of current schooling curricula must be discarded. Opportunities for students and their teachers to study the big existential questions should be provided. Subjects that have been truncated or moved to the margins warrant being moved back into the center. Here I am talking about literature, art, music, philosophy, religion.[42] The dominant paradigms of science and math are powerful ways of knowing, but there are many other ways to know, as well. Art and literature, for example, provide special symbolic forms that illuminate the felt life. Symbols and systems of symbols express powerful meanings pertinent to understanding life situations and the emotions. Therefore, students should have access to symbolic meanings that reside in music, art, literature, dance, in addition to those found in math and science.

Students may acquire expertise in analyzing varying perspectives and difference through the fine arts, humanities, and religion. Then, provided with safe spaces for discussions to occur, they can air conflicting notions and learn how to listen to others. Students should practice evaluating different perspectives, while at the same time not becoming dogmatic or relativistic in their positions. Emotions and their effects, both positive and negative, in private and public life should be a part of the discussion.

Curriculum theorist Elliot Eisner makes the point that schools take ideological stands that are revealed through the language and learning experiences that are utilized in schooling curriculums. He asserts that "the less visible an ideology is, the more insidious it can be, for in that form it often eludes scrutiny."[43] His point is important: currently, the dominant ideology in P-12 schools is competitive and pugnacious. As an example, consider how history is approached through the aspect of imperialistic nation states, wars, famous warriors, and dominant political leaders. The study of history from the perspective of peace-makers and people and groups that have engaged in

compassionate or humanitarian acts is almost totally absent. That absence is an ideological decision. Curriculum can be changed so that models of humaneness and humanitarianism are also explored or perhaps moved to the dominant position.

A curriculum that features the intersection between the lived experiences of children and youth and the "big ideas" of the various disciplines may "tune the students in" so that they recapture that desire to know in the intensity that they once had as young children.[44] In exploring the ways in which they act and interact with others in public spaces, students can perhaps discover their own authentic selves. Eisner states that "What is missing from American schools… is a deep respect for personal purpose, lived experience, for the life of imagination, and for those forms of understanding that resist dissection and measurement."[45] Schooling experiences should help students to consider the many possibilities of how to live life. In other words, by nourishing students' human spirit, they may learn to live life passionately, mindful of their own and others' humanity. Arendt's question of whether we love our children enough is answered through the ways in which we interact with them in our schooling settings, settings where they are dealt with as unified creatures who are exploring the significant question of being a human in relation with others.

In *Critical Lessons,* Nel Noddings argues for a new schooling curriculum that illustrates this love, as she uses life themes to organize the study of current disparate and separated disciplines. She claims that topics such as *friendship, war, sexuality*, and *families* can be used philosophically to structure the curriculum. She puts forth an engaging portrait of what schools could be like if schooling leaders had the courage to make them so. From the suggestions she offers, Noddings establishes fertile ground for the development of humane intellectuals, for she is uniting the split that I have alluded to throughout this paper: the split between reason (science) and the spiritual and/or emotional. The etymology of the word *courage* includes the notions of heart and spirit; Noddings' work reconnects to these early meanings through her courageous suggestions that learning occurs through the heart as well as the mind. Noddings' and other similar theorists' work allows for a vision of formal education that offers creative, thoughtful learning conditions where students locate creative possibilities in which to express their thoughts and humanness, humanely.

In this paper, I have tried to imagine what is not. I cling to the hope that educators will have the courage to teach children and youth in a narrative of love so that humanitarianism becomes a part of their ordinary being rather than an extraordinary activity in which they engage on occasion. Only then will the possibility exist for a more humane world.

NOTES

[1] Hannah Arendt. *Between Past and Future.* (New York: Penguin, 1954), 196.

[2] Parker Palmer. *The Courage to Teach*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998), 183.

[3] This quote is in the Holocaust Museum, but it appeared first in Ginott's Between Parent and Child.

[4] Martha Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought*, 395.

[5] Eva Brann, "Question: Are Human Beings Ultimately Affective?" *Expositions,* Vol. 1, No. 1.

[6] These two arguments are not exact, at all. In fact, they differ considerably, but they lead to a similar conclusion.

[7] Margaret Miller, "Contributing to the Public Good," *Change,* No. 31, Issue 4, 6.

[8] Humanitarianism can be seen as a way of being the world which values positive regard toward all. Translations of Confucian *jen* are close to the definition I am aiming for: "a compassionate love for humanity or for the world as a whole." T.R.Reid. *Confucius Lives Next Door* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999), 111.

[9] Edward Said. "The Politics of Knowledge," *Raritan*, Summer 91, Vol. 11, Issue 1, 2.

[10] For an explanation of how this is a split of modern times, please see John D. Caputo. *Philosophy and Theology.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006, especially pages 20-33.

[11] After I completed this paper, I found an essay by Wendell Berry, "Two Minds" that describes this split and privileging of reason very well.

[12] David Harvey. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd. 1989), 173.

[13] Neil Postman. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*. (New York: Penguin, 1985.)

[14] Parker Palmer. "Soul Making" in Circles of Trust, a Parker Palmer newsletter.

[15] Harvey. The Postmodern Condition.

[16] Melvyn Matthews. *Both Alike to Thee*. (Great Britain: Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 2000), 3.

[17] Quoted in Lexington Herald Leader. Thursday, August 7, 2008, section A11.

[18] Alfie Kohn's work, especially *Punished by Rewards*. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1992), speaks to these notions.

[19] Both Neil Postman and Henry Giroux have written extensively on the accumulation of materials goods, consumerism, and the Disney Corporation.

[20] Nancy Carlsson-Paige, "Nurturing Meaningful Connections with Young Children," in Linda Lanteiri, ed. *Schools with Spirit Nurturing the Inner Lives of Children and Teachers. (* Boston: Beacon Press, 2001), 24.

[21] Quoted from Holly Sklar in her interview with Bill Moyers on "Bill Moyers Journal", PBS, June 13, 2008.

[22] Quoted on the "Bill Moyers Journal", PBS, June 13, 2008.

[23] "Hannah Arendt on Authority: Conservatism in Education Reconsidered" in Mordechai Gordon, ed. *Hannah Arendt and Education*.(Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 2001), 52.
[24] Nancy Carlson-Paige, "Nurturing Meaningful Connections with Young Children." In Linda Lantierei, ed., 24.

[25] Nel Noddings. *Educating Moral People*. (Columbia: Teachers College Press, 2002), 154.

[26] Suzanne Langer. *Feeling and Form* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953) and *Philosophy in a New Key* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957).

[27] Martha Nussbaum. *Upheavals of Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 175.

[28] Quoted in Nussbaum, 187.

[29] Constructivist educators especially allude to students as meaning makers. Martin and Jacqueline Brooks and Howard Gardner, among others, write on the topic.

[30] Gert J.J. Biesta. *Beyond Learning*. (Boulder, CO: Paradigm, 2006), 34.

[31] Natasha Levinson, "The Paradox of Natality: Teaching in the Midst of Belatedness" in Mordechai Gordon, ed. *Hannah Arendt and Education*, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), 21.

[32] Maxine Greene. *Teacher as Stranger*. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Press, 1973), 3.

[33] Maxine Greene. *Landscapes of Learning*. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978).

[34] Nel Noddings. *Educating Moral People,* 94.

[35] Nel Noddings. *Happiness and Education*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.)

[36] Nel Noddings, *Educating Moral People,* 98-99.

[37] James Logan. Earlham College Baccalaureate Address, May 3, 2008.

[38] The notion of love that I am articulating is close to the description of Plato's notion of love that John Anthony McGuckin describes in *Standing in God's Holy Fire: The Byzantine Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 2001) when he states: "…he (Plato) understood that such a purified perception, frequently running against the current of human needs and self-referent desires, needed a dynamic motivating force to realize it, and, accordingly, posited love as the supreme virtue, or force, that gave the moral aesthetic sense its transcendent dynamic," 25. That perception of love as a dynamic motivating force is the concept I am attempting to describe.

[39] Quoted in Matthews, 38.

[40] Jonathan Sacks. *The Dignity of Difference,* (New York: Continuum, 2002), 22.

[41] Sacks. 181.

[42] Quite a few contemporary curriculum theorists make the claim for the value of these subjects. William Pinar, Elliot Eisner, and Howard Gardner are among the most prominent, and they make detailed arguments which this short paper cannot capture.

[43] Elliot Eisner. *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs*, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 52.

[44] Parker Palmer. *The Courage to Teach.*

[45] Elliot Eisner, 77.