

尾形尚子基金レクチャー報告 3

2004 年度尾形尚子レクチャー報告

生田 久美子

東北大学大学院教育学研究科

2004年11月2日(火)午後4時20分から5時50分にわたって、東北大学文系総合研究棟202教室において、マサチューセッツ大学名誉教授であるジェイン・ローランド・マーティン(Jane Roland Martin)氏による講演が行われた。講演タイトルは”School As a Moral Equivalent of Home”であり、マーティン氏の著書である”*The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families*”における議論を基にしている。講演には、学部学生、大学院生、留学生、教官ら多数の参加を頂いた。

マーティン氏は、アメリカの著名な教育哲学者、フェミニズム哲学者であり、アメリカ教育哲学会の会長を務めたこともある。マーティン氏によるカリキュラムや学校教育を対象とした哲学的研究は、ジェンダーを視点とする研究の中でもより原理的かつ根本的な研究として高い評価を受けており、当講演は教育に対する新たな視点と切り口とを与えてくれるものであったと言える。

講演は、家庭の要素を導入した新たな学校像—スクールホーム—を模索する試みを通して、「学校」と「家庭」という概念についての再吟味を要請するものであった。特に、マーティン氏による“home”概念に対する考察と分析は、教育学という領域そのものに対する再考を促すものであり、参加者にとって有益な示唆、問題提起を含むものであったと推察される。

講演は、英語の草稿を資料として配付し、マーティン氏の講演は英語で行われた。また、学部生の理解を深めるために、マーティン氏の英語に続いて日本語による訳を読み上げるという形式をとった。さらに、参加者全員にコメントペーパーを配布し、講演内容に対する意見や質問を書き込んでもらい、その場でマーティン氏からの解説および回答を頂いた。講演後には簡略な懇親会の席を設け、参加者とマーティン氏との間により深い交流がなされた。

以下、マーティン氏による講演内容を報告するため、実際に講演時に参加者に配布された英文の原稿を掲載する。

School As a Moral Equivalent of Home

by

Jane Roland Martin

Preface

This lecture is based on my book *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families*¹. When it was published this book did not seem to apply to the Japanese context, but I have been told that now it does. So I ask you to think about Japan as I talk mainly about the U.S.

1. School and Home

School and home are partners in the education of a nation's young. In the last decades of the twentieth century "the" American home changed radically. In 1960 the norm of the two parent household in which father goes out to work and mother stays home with the children accurately represented 70 percent of American families. Yet by 1986 only 7 percent of U.S. families consisted of a male breadwinner, a female housewife, and dependent children.

This was not the first time in United States history that home and family have changed form. In 1899 the philosopher John Dewey wrote that the Industrial Revolution had irrevocably transformed the American home by removing the production of such things as clothing, furniture, soap, candles, and cooking utensils from the household. Remarking that it is useless to mourn the good old days as if the past could be brought back by exhortation, he added: "It is radical conditions which have changed, and only an equally radical change in education suffices."

In the first decade of the 21st century Dewey's insight that home's history has educational ramifications could scarcely be more apt. The actual proposal Dewey made in *The School and Society* does not address the present situation, however. The radical change in education he proposed was to put in school the occupations of the earlier home. But the critical factor in this second transformation of America's homes is the removal of parents, not work.

Dewey wrote that before the Industrial Revolution industry, responsibility, imagination, and ingenuity were the basic elements of home's curriculum. Perhaps so, but afterwards it was considered home's particular function to teach an "ethics of care." Serving to curb the selfishness and dampen the pugnacity of those whose days were spent in the workplace, the moral education extended by the home was supposed to keep American society as a whole from slipping into a war of every man against every man. As the nations of nineteenth century Europe were deemed able to keep the peace so long as the balance of power among them was maintained, the members of U.S. society were considered able to live together harmoniously so long as the moral equilibrium between

private home and public world was preserved.

The changes in both make the continued reliance on home for education in an ethics of care anachronistic. In May 1989 this letter appeared in The Boston Globe:

I am concerned about the rise in teen violence. I am 16 years old and I am getting a little bit scared. In the last six months I have noticed things I never had to worry about. The first thing that happened was that kids were carrying knives, which I have gotten used to. Now the people I hang around with are carrying guns.

Now that both fathers and mothers are leaving home to go to work we have to ask anew, what radical change in school suffices? In reply to this question I want to present to you a new idea of school. I call it The Schoolhome.

1. Montessori's Casa dei Bambini

When in 1907 Maria Montessori spoke at the opening of her second school in Rome, she had home on her mind. At the time Montessori gave her speech new housing had been constructed. Upon its completion the authorities found themselves facing an unexpected problem, however: the children under school age living in the very nice new buildings were running wild while their parents were at work. Deciding to solve their dilemma by establishing a school in each building, the Association turned for help to Montessori, then a university lecturer on education as well as a physician and psychologist. Convinced that these children were neither being cared for properly nor learning what they should at home, she designed the Casa dei Bambini.

Reading The Montessori Method 80 years after Montessori delivered her Inaugural Lecture, I found myself wondering why "Casa dei Bambini" had been translated into English as "The Children's House" or "The House of Childhood." The more Montessori described her idea of school, the more it sounded to me like a home, not just a house. Recalling from my high school Latin classes that "casa" means either "house" or "home," I checked to see if the word has both senses in Italian. It does. Montessori's speech meanwhile confirmed my hypothesis. On that opening day Montessori said, "We Italians have elevated our word 'casa' to the almost sacred significance of the English word 'home,' the enclosed temple of domestic affection, accessible only to dear ones."

With my translation of "casa" verified, the question I still had to answer was whether the mistaken translation of Casa dei Bambini really mattered. I soon discovered that the accounts Montessori gave of her schools and the published reports of visitors to Rome only make sense when "casa" is read as "home." But that is the least of it. The misreading of "casa" has effectively cut off generations from a new vision of what school can and should be.

Read "casa" as "house," and your attention is drawn to the child size furniture in the

schools Montessori established, the exercises in dressing and washing, the self-education. Read "casa" as home, and you perceive a moral and social dimension that transforms one's understanding of Montessori's idea of school. Once I realized that she thought of school on the model of home, the elements of her system took on a different configuration. Where I had seen small individuals busily manipulating materials designed especially for learning, there now emerged a domestic scene with its own special form of social life and education.

One dwells in a house. One feels safe, secure, loved, at ease in a home, at least in the kind envisioned by Montessori. She was well aware that not all homes are safe and loving. Thus she did not dream of modeling her school on just any home. Maintaining that the Casa dei Bambini "is not simply a place where the children are kept, not just an asylum, but a true school for their education," she indicated that even in its homelikeness it was to be educative. Feeling certain that the "ignorant little vandals" were receiving neither the care nor the education they should at home, Montessori designed the school she had been asked to establish in the renovated tenement for the building's children as the kind of home to which the resident poor should aspire. Making it their school by giving them collective ownership, she modeled it on a version of home with which many of them were not even acquainted.

First and foremost, it would provide a safe and secure, supportive and nurturant environment for children. Over and beyond this, the children in the Casa dei Bambini would have a double sense of belonging: they would feel that they belonged to this home and also that it belonged to them. Commenting on the fact that the children worked so incessantly one might think they were repressed were it not for "their lack of timidity, for their bright eyes, for their happy, free, aspect, for the cordiality of their invitations to look at their work, for the way they take visitors about and explain matters to them," Montessori concluded: "These things make us feel that we are in the presence of the masters of the house."

Having verified one implication of my reading of Montessori--that in her eyes the school building was treated as home--I checked out another. In Rome the affectionate relationship between the directress and the children was palpable. Montessori noted the fervor with which the children "throw their arms around the teacher's knees, with which they pull her down to kiss her face." A visitor saw one teacher looking at her children "with shining eyes...I could have sworn, with mother's eyes!"

The love that bound together the directress and the children of a Casa dei Bambini and also the children to each other served as both a precondition of the children's learning and an end point of their development. In the lectures on peace Montessori gave before World War II, she spoke of preventing adults from waging war by instilling in them as children "a love and respect for all living beings and all the things that human beings have built through the centuries." Long before those

speeches to European audiences, she had inserted family love into school.

Just as Montessori's model for school is an idealized version of home, an exemplary family serves as her model for the relationship in which those attending school stand to one another. Reports of the unselfish behavior of the children in Montessori's schools and of their genuine concern for their schoolmates abound. Misread "casa" and those observations have to be discredited. Yet the very events that cannot be understood--that indeed seem impossible-- when "casa" is translated as "house," make perfect sense, are even to be expected, when the Casa dei Bambini is seen as home and the children in it are seen as bound together by domestic affection.

2. William James's Idea of Moral Equivalency

As Montessori's name was becoming known around the world, the American philosopher William James wrote an essay called "The Moral Equivalent of War". Once I saw the connection between her idea of the Casa dei Bambini and the concept of moral equivalency that he introduced into American thought at almost the same time, I was well on my way to answering the question of what to do about the children who are being left behind when both men and women go to work each morning. Although James did not speak about school in his essay, the idea of moral equivalency he presented fits the Casa dei Bambini. On hearing James' title one naturally assumes that he was proposing peace as war's moral equivalent. In fact, James' moral equivalent of war is a war against nature.

James was able to call his metaphorical war against nature an equivalent because he gave it the same function that he attributed to actual war--preserving the martial virtues. Because he profoundly admired these "higher" aspects of militarism, he was able to call his war against nature a moral equivalent.

In respect to the worth of military "virtues" like intrepidity and obedience to command, James and Montessori were in fundamental disagreement. The point I wish to make, however, is that just as James considered war to foster valuable character traits, Montessori considered home to have an educative function. Just as he insisted that if war were to stop inculcating the martial virtues some other institution would have to take on the task, she believed that insofar as home stopped teaching its lessons, school should step into the breach. Perceiving that for extended periods of time each day the private homes of children in the poor quarter of Rome were bereft of adults, Montessori created a radically changed school in which children would receive the affection and experience the intimacy and connection otherwise missing from a big chunk of their daily lives.

Because home is the hidden partner in the education of our young, we tend to forget how much of who we are, how we act, and what we know was learned there when we were very young. Montessori understood that as children spend less and less time at home in the company of their

family, serious gaps in their learning will begin to emerge. In fact, she believed that among the small delinquents of Rome these already were in evidence. To her the remedy was obvious. Transplanting into school the domestic atmosphere and curriculum she found missing from the children's private homes for many hours each day, she insured their continued existence in the children's daily lives. Knowing how to wash and dress oneself, tell time, speak well and listen attentively, be gracious and generous to others, take care of younger children, work collaboratively, see a task through to completion: all this and more became the province of the Casa dei Bambini. Thus, by fulfilling some of the very same functions that home was expected to provide in early twentieth century Italian society but in the case of the poor increasingly did not, the Casa dei Bambini constituted a functional equivalent of home. Serving functions that Montessori believed ought to be preserved for the sake of the children, their parents, and the larger society, it was also a moral equivalent.

3. Itard's Victor

In June 1989 a school teacher wrote the Boston Globe:

"I used to wonder if my adolescent boys would remember my lessons once they left my classroom; now I wonder if they will live to remember them." The picture of human misery Montessori painted in her 1907 speech in Rome eerily resembles the situation of the homeless today in cities around the world. But the homeless are by no means the only ones who stand to benefit from a concept of school as a moral equivalent of home. Insofar as mothers as well as fathers are going out to work each day, it meets an increasingly pressing need more generally.

Elaborating on the claim that infants "are barely human and utterly unsocialized," the anthropologist Sherry Ortner has stated what every new parent knows:

like animals they are unable to walk upright, they excrete without control, they do not speak. Even slightly older children are clearly not yet fully under the sway of culture. They do not yet understand social duties, responsibilities, and morals; their vocabulary and their range of learned skills are small."

She makes the point starkly because children and parents alike tend to forget the unique contribution of the domestic "sphere" of society. She reminds us that it transforms newborns "from mere organisms into cultured humans, teaching them manners and the proper ways to behave in order to become full-fledged members of the culture."

Why was Montessori so much more aware of the extent to which the domestic context transforms creatures of nature into creatures of culture than contemporaries like Dewey? The fact that she was a woman may have made her especially attuned to home's educative function but I

would say that her deeper insight had another source as well.

Before she established her schools in Rome Montessori had discovered the writings of Jean-Marc-Gaspard Itard and Edouard Séguin. Itard is the physician who spent many years teaching Victor, the "Wild Boy" first spied in the woods of Aveyron in 1797, and who also developed instructional techniques to use with deaf youngsters. Séguin, his student, is the one who applied these methods to the education of retarded children. Montessori was so impressed with both men that she actually translated and copied by hand all their writings.

Just as Séguin extended his master's work to a new population of "deficient" children, Montessori extended the teaching methods developed by the two men to "normal" children. Imagine the impact that Itard's reports about Victor must have had on her when she first found herself establishing schools in the tenement buildings and one realizes that his legacy to Montessori did not stop there. Knowing Victor as she did, Montessori understood the domesticating function of home. Referring to Itard's treatise on Victor's education she wrote that in his pages "we find vividly described the moral work which led the savage to civilisation." And she added: "I believe that there exists no document which offers so poignant and so eloquent a contrast between the life of nature and the life of society."

Living for so many years in the woods, Victor had no exposure to the curriculum that inducts our young into human culture when Itard met him; not even to wearing clothes, eating food other than nuts and potatoes, hearing sounds, sleeping in a bed, distinguishing between hot and cold, walking rather than running. He had to be taught the things that educators other than parents of the very young and teachers of differently abled children assume they know. Montessori understood, however, that Victor was different from other children not because he had to be domesticated and they did not, but because their domestication occurred so early, so gradually, and so imperceptibly as to appear natural. "In the education of little children Itard's educative drama is repeated," she said. She also must have asked herself just how wild the children of the tenement might become--or at least how wild their children might be--if she did not build into the schools she was creating the domestic curriculum, affections, and spirit she perceived to be lacking in their private homes.

I suspect that Montessori's familiarity with Victor gave her the insight that others lacked. Shattering the illusion that what we call "second nature" is innate, Victor's case dramatically illustrates that what we adults learned at home as young children is far more basic than the school studies we call our basics. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are considered essential--hence basic--components of education because of their roles in preparing young people for membership in the public world; specifically, for enabling them to be citizens and economically self-sufficient individuals. In addition, we take the 3Rs to be fundamental because of the part they play in initiating our young into history, literature, philosophy, the arts--"high" culture or Culture with a

capital "C". Study the partnership of school and home, however, and one realizes that these three goals--achieving economic viability, becoming a good citizen, and acquiring high culture--only make sense for people who have already learned the basic mores of society.

In calling the 3Rs our basics, we assume that children have acquired at least the rudiments of culture with a small "c." Only if this learning is imperiled does it occur to us that it was the product of practice, patience, and directed effort. Only when we realize that children deprived of the curriculum the private home has been expected to teach may never acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values essential for full-fledged membership in human culture in the broadest sense of the term--or civilization, as Montessori preferred to call it--do we even begin to admit that our earliest learning was a critical part of our education.

4. From Schoolhouse to Schoolhome

What radical change in school suffices given the transformations of the American home and family in recent decades? We cannot transplant into 21st century soil the institution Montessori designed for 19th century Italian children. It would not take root. What we can do--what I did in my book, The Schoolhome--is treat Montessori's idea of school the way she treated the pioneering efforts of Séguin and Itard. Just as she integrated elements of their work into her bold experiment in Rome but then molded them to her own ends until they were effectively transformed, I incorporated aspects of her educational philosophy and practice into my own thought experiment, developing in the process a new concept of school appropriate to the here and now.

Not all aspects of the Casa dei Bambini are suited to this purpose by any means. Happily, a Schoolhome that adopts Montessori's experimental approach to pedagogy and exhibits her sensitivity to context will have a wide range of educational practice to consult. In the US, for example, there are private Montessori schools, community nursery schools, and public kindergartens; 4-H clubs, summer creative arts programs, and winter after school activities; neighborhood elementary and secondary schools and boarding schools for teenagers; Quaker colleges and institutes for school teachers.

An affectionate climate is, of course, a basic constituent of the Schoolhome. Another aspect of the Casa dei Bambini that cries out for preservation is the children's attachment to nature. One more ingredient of the Casa dei Bambini that I expect to see the Schoolhome make its own is joy. In Montessori's schools the type of joy that many young children experience at home as a kind of by-product of intense concentration was a familiar feature of daily life.

5. Conclusion

Some people in the U.S. totally reject the idea that school has to change because of the

vast changes in home. Holding women responsible for the plight of our nation's children, they intimate that mothers should not be leaving the house each morning. They do not seem to realize that in an age when many homes are headed by only one parent, a mother, and most families need two salaries just to maintain a home, the question of whether women should go out to work is beside the point. These social analysts make mothers feel guilty for doing what fathers have done since at least the nineteenth century. Ignoring history, they forget that it is not women's exodus from the private home each day that creates a vacuum in our children's lives. It is the exodus of both sexes. Had men not left the house when the Industrial Revolution removed work from the home--or had fathers not continued to leave the house each morning after their children were born--women's departure would not now be having the ramifications for children it does.

The question for us is not, who is to blame? We have to ask ourselves here and now, what are we as a nation, a culture, a society--and increasingly, as a world--going to do about the children who are being left behind?

The best answer I can give in my own country's case is to turn the American schoolhouse into a moral equivalent of home in which love transforms mundane activities, the 3Cs take their rightful place in the curriculum of all, and joy is a daily accompaniment of learning. This, I should add, is not the way school reformers in the US are now talking. Thinking of school as a special kind of production site--a factory that turns out workers for the nation's public and private sectors--government officials, business leaders, educational administrators focus on standards. As they see it, the products of our nation's classrooms, like the automobiles on an assembly line, should be made according to specifications. When minimum requirements are not met, the obvious remedy is to tighten quality control. For colleges and universities this is apt to take the form of higher entrance requirements. For America's public schools it translates into efforts to improve testing, hold teachers accountable for student failures to measure up, and standardize curriculum.

The new vision of education that the Schoolhome represents does not picture young children as raw material, teachers as workers who process their students before sending them on to the next station on the assembly line, and curriculum as the machinery that over the span of twelve or so years forges America's young into marketable products. The Schoolhome emphasizes domesticity and the 3Cs. Rather than focusing on abstract norms, standardized tests, generalized rates of success, uniform outcomes it sends attention in the opposite direction. Turning our gaze from the "big" economic picture onto the local level, it brings into sharp relief individual classrooms. Once the quality of life in school commands the foreground, questions arise about the classroom climate, school routines and rituals, relationships between teachers and children and among the children themselves, the teachers' modes of teaching and the children's ways of learning. And with this refocusing of attention comes a reorienting of practice.

"What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all children," Dewey said in The School and Society. I believe--and I am confident that Dewey would agree with me--that seeing how easily children who know no better can become violent and knowing how hard it now is for home to fulfill its traditional educative function, a wise parent will want school to start filling the domestic vacuum in children's lives wherever it occurs. A wise parent will want school to share responsibility with home for instilling in all children the ethics of care. In sum, a wise parent will want the schoolhouse to be transformed into the moral equivalent of home.

¹Jane Roland Martin, The Schoolhome. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992. This paper is drawn from Chapter I of that work.