

# School Leadership Review

---

Volume 8 | Issue 2

Article 7

---

2013

## Holistic, Ethical Leadership for the 21st Century

David C. Barrett

*Texas A&M University, Commerce*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

[Tell us](#) how this article helped you.

---

### Recommended Citation

Barrett, David C. (2013) "Holistic, Ethical Leadership for the 21st Century," *School Leadership Review*. Vol. 8 : Iss. 2 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/slr/vol8/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in School Leadership Review by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu](mailto:cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu).

## ***Holistic, Ethical Leadership for the 21st Century***

David C. Barrett<sup>i</sup>

Mesquite ISD

Texas A&M University-Commerce

---

*The New Oxford American Dictionary* (2001) delineates two definitions for a leader: “1) The person who leads or commands a group, organization, or country; a person followed by others. 2) A short strip of nonfunctioning material at each end of a reel of film or recording tape for connection to the spool.” How often does the latter definition seem more applicable for many of our educational leaders than the former? What are the philosophical foundations of leadership? What does a modern, ethical leader look like? These are just a few questions that will be explored in this article. The challenge beset for the educational leaders of the present and the future is one that will require a bridging and blending of old and new paradigms. A mere paradigm shift may not be sufficient—the term shift is still too mechanistic and linear to adequately describe this new approach. Rather, the modern ethical leader must create a paradigm blend. In the circular way of knowing, akin to the epistemology of the Lakota Sioux (Stolzman, 1986), this article will explore four aspects of modern educational leadership. First, the criticisms and attacks on the educational system will be addressed. Second, the aim of education will be analyzed through three lenses: axiology, epistemology, and ontology. Third, systemic education will be discussed. Fourth, the role of the modern/future educational leader will be explored: specifically regarding the need for him/her to address the concerns of the critics and bridge the divide between two paradigms of education. This essay is a brief exploration that delves into the shortcomings of the modern educational system, the core purposes of education, systemic educational paradigms, and the role of the 21<sup>st</sup> century ethical leader. The author’s goal is not to provide answers, nor propose a prescription for ethical leadership. Rather, the intent is to aid in focusing the direction which leaders must follow in order to be effective in this millennium. Similar to the manner in which Descartes shared his method of inquiry, the author will share part of his experience in learning and growing as an educational leader. “Thus my purpose here is not to teach the method that everyone should follow in order to conduct his reason correctly, but merely to show how I have tried to conduct mine” (Descartes, 1637/1980, p. 2).

In the end, this exploration may amount to nothing more than what Nietzsche characterized the nature of philosophy to be: “Little by little I came to understand what every great philosophy to date has been: the personal confession of its author...” (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 8). However, it is the hope of the author that through his confession and scholarly exploration of the nature of leadership that something will be contributed to the greater whole. Indeed, this may be precisely what leadership is.

### **The Attack on American Public Education**

Public education has constantly incurred criticism and controversy even during the days of the one room schoolhouse romanticized on *Little House on the Prairie*. For example, the role of religion, funding, equity, qualified teachers, and discipline were all divisive issues in the late 18<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>i</sup> Dr. David C. Barrett may be reached at [d Barrett@mesquiteisd.org](mailto:d Barrett@mesquiteisd.org).

century (Hlebowitsh, 2001). Further, a historical overview of this system reviews a host of inequalities, ineffective practices, and other blemishes. Indeed, the Roman Catholic school system was founded by Bishop John Joseph Hughes as a response to the anti-Catholic and anti-Irish sentiments that were so engrained in and perpetuated by the U.S. public schools in the 1800's (Concannon, 2003).

The present criticisms, modern variations of these long-lasting complaints, were largely evoked 30 years ago when the federal government issued "A Nation at Risk" in 1983. This modern attack has fueled mistrust and generated a large blame game with many participants: parents vs. teachers, teachers vs. administrators, students vs. teachers, educators vs. politicians, etc. A dynamic much like Senge (2006) described in the business scenario known as "the beer game."

Gross (1999) echoes the attacks of A Nation at Risk and purports to "prove conclusively that the education of American children, from kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, is a poorly cast and poorly delivered product." (p. 12). Much of the division among educational pundits is illustrated by Gross's choice of language. The view of education solely as a product, without respect for it as a process, is a major source of the problem. Moreover, there are several fallacies with the assertion by Gross and other reformers that education should return to the "old rigor" of the past. This exploration is not intended, however, to languish in an argument attacking the attackers and defending the present system. Indeed, the author recognizes many of the valid criticisms espoused by Gross and others. These criticisms highlight the need for new educational leadership in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Indeed, the symptomatic arguments themselves aren't even as important as the two disparate perspectives which are the focus of this exploration. The proffered solution here is substantively different from that espoused by Gross and other traditionalists who want to take education back to the "good ol' days," back into a safe, dogmatic, black and white view of the world. Through an exploration of the original intent of education, its underpinning philosophies, and new findings in science and technology, this paper will examine what is required of educational leaders in order to expand the educational system and learning and teaching inherent in it rather than contracting it. Core, long-term solutions are needed, not faddish, or quick-fix reforms. As the attacks and criticism of education highlight, there is a strong need within education which leadership must rectify.

### **The Aim of Public Education**

Learning is innate; it is natural. Humans are hardwired to learn. Indeed, it could be argued that there are two primary drives for education: survival and curiosity. The first drive is rooted in survival; the goal is to generate a citizen who contributes to society and the workforce. The second drive is rooted in more abstract thought and the brain's natural instinct to ask "why?"

Joldersma (2011) discussed the first drive and used the term *conatus* to describe humankind's striving to live. This striving is the primordial need for understanding. Certain knowledge must be passed on to one's offspring in order to help them survive. As Christian (2011) illustrates, learning is necessary to survival; survival depends on knowledge that is passed down or learned through experience. This is true whether we are speaking of a bass darting under a rock retreating from an approaching shadow, a fawn lying motionless in the grass when it hears a rustling of leaves, or a man learning to swim or studying the slide-rule – knowledge and know-

how mean survival. Thomas Jefferson viewed public education as the means of satisfying this educational need in America. In order to sustain a healthy democracy, the citizens must be educated and informed. Jefferson promoted the idea of free, universal public schooling as essential to an enlightened citizenry (Hlebowitsh, 2001). Similarly, John Dewey echoed this sentiment over 100 years later when he spoke of the importance of studying history and civics, “Knowledge of the past is the key to understanding the present. History deals with the past, but this past is the history of the present” (Hlebowitsh, 2001, p. 175). Dewey’s progressive school movement also helped facilitate the accomplishment of both aims of education. His vocational schools taught students practical life and job skills. Meanwhile, students were engaged, challenged, and encouraged to explore and learn for knowledge’s own sake.

While Plato certainly understood this aspect of education – his utopian republic was based on a survival of the fittest model – he also described what could be called a higher purpose of education, “The ultimate end of all education is insight into the harmonious order (cosmos) of the whole world” (Cornford, 1941, p. 88). Learning as a means of satisfying curiosity also seems to be innate. It seems that since the dawn of humankind, people have looked for ways to explain the unexplainable. Every culture has a creation myth. Every culture has found ways to explain the seasons, dramatic changes in the weather, and other aspects of nature and reality. While the first drive is a more mundane and preliminary goal: survival – both physical and social. The second goal is more abstract and deals with facilitating the understanding of the understanding – to borrow a phrase from the Lakota Sioux chief, Leonard Crow Dog.

These aims seem to be successive in nature and are likely akin to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Before teaching a pupil the “understanding of the cosmos” it would behoove the teacher to educate the pupil in the ways of physical and social survival. A person is less likely to be interested in the nature of the universe when he or she is unemployed and starving. The question for the present educational leader is this: what purposes (if any) are we fulfilling with our present system? Are we meeting the survival needs of our students? And, are we encouraging students to gain that ultimate understanding? How does public education balance these two drives? As ethical educational leaders, how can we balance this yin and yang within the realm of public education? Given the legal and historical foundations for American public education, what are the philosophical underpinnings that continue to guide and shape it?

### **Philosophical Underpinnings: Ontology, Epistemology, and Axiology**

Hodgkinson (1996) wrote that the study of philosophy is technically and conventionally divided into three parts: ontology, epistemology, and axiology. It is through these three lenses that this article examines those philosophies which have shaped, and continue to shape, our modern educational system. These lenses can even be viewed as successive in nature.

Ontology, also known as metaphysics, explores the nature of reality. It asks the question: What is real? This question, which has been wrestled with throughout the ages, seems to be becoming even more difficult to answer. New technologies persistently challenge our notion of what is real. When the ancients gazed at their navels, they did not have to consider virtual reality, nanotechnology, or more and more advanced computers and robots. With the creation of smarter

computers and robots that learn and perhaps even experience emotion, this age-old question becomes ever more complex.

Moreover, advancements in the human genome project, cloning and medicine generate further ontological and ethical questions regarding the nature of life, the existence of God, and our role in the universe. For Deists such as Voltaire, these advancements may not cause concern since their belief in God is based upon reason and not on faith (Durant, 1961). For others, such scientific advancement negates the existence of God. Yet for many, the existence of God is not a matter of reason or proof but of faith. The questions of the existence of a supreme being and the nature of this being (should one exist) have perplexed philosophers, scholars, and people in general throughout the ages. It has also been a topic of intense controversy. This controversy is oft manifested in public education today within the issue of the science curriculum. What should schools teach: intelligent design, creationism, or evolution? This ontological debate was even the cover story for *Time* (November 13, 2006) aptly titled, “God vs. Science: A spirited debate between atheist biologist Richard Dawkins and Christian geneticist Francis Collins.”

So, what is real? Is reality merely electrical impulses and glandular secretions in our brain? Is reality objective or subjective? Perhaps reality is elusive and evolving. Once one thinks he or she has a full grasp on it, new, contradictory information will be found. Even mathematics, once the lifeboat for consistency in a seemingly inconsistent world is changing. Indeed, it almost ironic that Bertrand Russell turned to mathematics to find clarity, simplicity, beauty and order to explain a reality that was too messy in appearance. Now, new findings in math over the past century are “even weirder than physics” (Lanier, 2006). Twentieth century mathematicians like Kurt Godel, Alan Turing and Gregory Chaitin have demonstrated that the more math one learns, the weirder it gets. Math is becoming seemingly more mystical in nature; precisely what Russell was simultaneously condemning and drawn toward.

Russell stated, “Do not fear to be eccentric in opinion, for every opinion now accepted was once eccentric” [as cited in Arnold (2004, March), p. 80]. An excellent example of this is the Ptolemaic notion that the sun revolved around the earth. Based on observation, this was a very logical assumption of reality. Copernicus, however, postulated the eccentric opinion that the earth revolved around the sun. His opinion was so eccentric, in fact, that he was excommunicated from the Catholic Church and even served time in jail. Now, thanks in large part to the work of Galileo, Copernicus’ heliocentric theory is commonly accepted.

Plato’s allegory of the cave is a good example of his ontology and epistemology. All that we can know of reality are shadows of the true form. Henri Bergson echoed this sentiment when he wrote that knowledge of reality is hindered by the mind’s habit of chunking, classifying, and chopping reality into fragments (Christian, 2011). Time is a prime example of this. Think of daylight savings time and the practice of “falling back” in autumn. Does the sun come up earlier because people set their clocks back? Of course not, but daylight breaks earlier according to one’s watch. Bergson purported that reality is a continuum in motion, a continuous flow. Scientific (objective) views of reality are merely snapshots of the truth. These photographs aren’t real, they are only an abstraction of reality. Reality isn’t a series of pieces, it is the motion in its entirety.

Another obstacle to the quest for a definite truth, is that there are always exceptions to rules. No matter how much people try to order, structure, predict, and standardize the universe, there is always an exception – even in the animal kingdom (ergo the duckbill platypus). Life will always persist despite humanity’s best efforts to control and stifle it (think of the image of a flower growing up through a crack in the concrete). Christian (2011) wrote that in order to know reality we must metaphorically turn off the artificial lights and allow the stars to shine. Reality merely is.

Perhaps Plato’s allegory of the cave is a self-imposed state. Perhaps the chains that bind could be broken and those individuals could truly see what creates the shadows. In his famous poem *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, William Blake (1975) wrote, “If the doors of perception were cleansed, everything would appear to man as it is, infinite. For man has closed himself up till he sees all things through the narrow chinks of his cavern” (Blake, 1975, p. xv). Has humanity’s rejection of the Garden of Eden (by eating the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil) limited our perspective?

Are those people who think they can absolutely identify reality the ones who have truly lost touch with reality? Buddhist philosophy addresses this. There is a saying in Buddhism, “If you see the Buddha on roadside, kill him.” This saying is actually very Socratic. The Buddhists believe that once you have formed an idea of what the Buddha is, you must destroy it to allow for new understanding. Similarly, Socrates taught that when we think we know everything, we are fools. The more we learn, the less we know.

Immanuel Kant also explored this dilemma. “Things which we see are not by themselves what we see... It remains completely unknown to us what the objects may be by themselves and apart from the receptivity of our senses. We know nothing but our manner of perceiving them...” (Durant, 1961, p. 170). The aim of Kant's philosophy was to move beyond what he viewed as the traditional dichotomy between rationalism and empiricism. The rationalists (e.g. Descartes) tried to show that one can understand the world by careful use of reason. The empiricists (e.g. Locke), on the other hand, had argued that all of our knowledge must be firmly grounded in experience. Kant asserted that both approaches had failed because both were based on the same false premise: we can bring ourselves to understand the world. This is not the crucial question, Kant argued, rather one must frame the epistemological problem in an entirely different way. Instead of trying, by reason or experience, to make our concepts match the nature of objects, one must allow the structure of our concepts shape our experience of objects. This is the purpose of Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason*: to show how reason determines the conditions under which experience and knowledge are possible (Munzel, 1998-1999).

While Plato asserted that humans are born with all knowledge and that learning is merely recollection, John Locke asserted the opposite. A newborn baby is a *tabula rasa*, a blank slate upon which experience leaves its mark. The realist and positivist philosophers tended to lean in the direction of Locke with their thinking. Francis Bacon built upon Aristotle’s method of classification and helped create the system of epistemology known as the scientific method.

Contrary to this approach by the realists and positivists, is that of philosophers such as Henri Bergson and Thomas Merton. Bergson wrote about a deeper kind of knowledge that he called

intuition. Similarly, Thomas Merton (1948) – whom this author asserts could be described as a modern idealist – wrote in his autobiography, *The Seven Storey Mountain*:

...all men who live only according to their five senses, and seek nothing beyond the gratification of their natural appetites for pleasure and reputation and power, cut themselves off from that charity which is the principle of all spiritual vitality and happiness because it alone saves us from the barren wilderness of our own abominable selfishness. (p. 133).

This quote resonates strongly in antithesis to the many works of the realists, especially when one considers just how ambitious and power hungry Francis Bacon was.

So, what is real, true, and good? To answer these questions the idealist philosophers Plato and Descartes both delved inward. “I made up my mind one day also to study myself and to spend all the powers of my mind in choosing the ways which I ought to follow. For me this procedure was much more successful, it seems, than if I had never left either my country or my books” (Descartes, 1637/1980, p. 6). Did scholars take his relative perspective of what truth/reality is for him and impose it on the rest of the world? It obviously resonated at the time: the world was dangerous and mysterious. This model provided comfort and safety: just as naming things gives us a sense of control over them.

While this method worked for Descartes in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it does not fully stand up to modern tests. Descartes’ internal search is only half of the equation, the search must be within and without – similar to Buber’s (1958) concept of I & Thou. Important information can be garnered from both processes. Descartes’ journey led him to the famous discovery, “*Cogito, ergo sum*” (“I think, therefore I am”). A more relevant phrase may be, “I think *and feel*, therefore I am.” This approach may be more balanced, just as Thomas Merton (1958) wrote:

Living is not thinking. Thought is formed and guided by objective reality outside us. Living is the constant adjustment of thought to life and life to thought in such a way that we are always growing, always experiencing new things in the old and old things in the new. Thus life is always new. (p. 19)

Merton’s words are reminiscent of the four things that Wheatley (2006) discussed that all living things do, specifically self-renewal and self-transcendence.

While the phrase, “I think and feel, therefore I am” may be more balanced it may also fall short of adequately describing one’s own existence. For, as Wolinsky (2003, p 8) argues, “the ‘I’ is a by-product of these [social] structures, and the ‘I’ does not exist separate from them. The self is a conglomeration of structures. *AND there is no self that is separate from these structures!!!*” Wolinsky’s words provide a nice segue to the discussion of systems thinking.

### **New Science & Systems Thinking**

“To understand is to perceive patterns” Isaiah Berlin (Kim, 2006, p. 74). In the introduction, this article asserted that education needs more than a paradigm shift, it needs a paradigm blend. The

word paradigm comes from the Greek word *paradeigma*, which means pattern. Our brains naturally perceive these patterns and are highly complex adaptive systems (Jones, 2013a). The manner in which we (as an educational system) perceive patterns must dramatically alter in order to better correspond with how our brains naturally function and with what systems theory and complexity theory have demonstrated for over 30 years. Senge (2006) described this type of shift/blend as *metanoia*, which means a shift of mind. Even in 1975, Capra lamented the lack of such a shift despite emergence of new scientific findings, sadly that status quo largely remains,

I believe the world-view implied by modern physics is inconsistent with our present society, which does not reflect the harmonious interrelatedness we observe in nature. To achieve such a state of dynamic balance, a radically different social and economic structure will be needed: a cultural revolution in the true sense of the word. The survival of our whole civilization may depend on whether we can bring about such a change. (p. 307)

Research in the world of quantum physics and even biology is revealing a greater interconnectedness among all living systems. Cartesian mechanism was purposeful in bringing us to this point, but the model breaks down (no pun intended) with findings at the sub-atomic level. It is a model that has run its course and must now be integrated into this new understanding. This will be difficult for many individuals and organizations as it is a world-view that is deeply entrenched in our way of knowing.

Our intellectual capacity for abstract thinking has created a fragmentation that is not only superficial it is deeply engrained within our modern epistemology. The social construction of race is a prime example (Omi & Winant, 1998; West, 1993). There is no biological foundation for more than one human race. Yet, our culture is so attuned to making this delineation that even the mandates of *No Child Left Behind* disaggregate test scores along these lines as part of its accountability system. Capra (1996) elaborates on this phenomenon and argues that this false view of the world has disconnected us with nature and with our own humanity. We must reconnect with the experience of the entire web of life. As Lynn Margulis articulated, “Independence is a political, not a scientific, term” (Capra, 1996, p. 296).

Similarly, Theobald (1997) advocates for this perspective as necessary for redeeming public education. He utilizes the term *intradependence* to describe our connection to community and place. These perspectives, however, fly in the face of the American cultural myth of rugged individualism. This perspective requires that one view humanity as a part of nature rather than its master. This is a fundamental shift of mind contrary to the backbone of our culture’s worldview. A worldview based on a logic premise with strong roots in the philosophies of Aristotle, Descartes, Bacon, and Locke. “Henceforth, the earth was there for any person with the wherewithal to use it profitably, and this, Bacon and Descartes argued, was how it should be” (Theobald, 1997, p. 70). It is a classical dichotomy of Cowboy versus Indian. The rugged, mechanistic individual who “ain’t askin’ nobody for nothin’, if I can’t get it on my own.” (Daniels, 1974) versus the systemic member of a community who lives more according the natural rhythms of the earth. The strong advocate of private property rights versus the person who believes that land belongs to the creator. The modern, ethical leader will need to address these opposing views in a manner benefiting to the greater whole.



## The Role of the Modern Ethical Educational Leader

“Where you come from is gone, where you thought you were going to never was there, and where you are is no good unless you can get away from it” (O’Connor, 1952, p. 165). America’s educational past is gone. The goals for this system are largely antiquated and out of touch, and the present system is not only broken, it is breaking those within it. The challenge beset for today’s leader (and tomorrow’s) is to bridge the divide between the entrenched mechanistic and dualistic paradigms in which the American Public Educational System is rooted and the new paradigm which is more systemic and holistic. This must be accomplished in order to prepare our students for the present and the future. Starratt (2004) addresses this very need and describes the virtues of responsibility, authenticity, and presence as essential for the modern educational leader.

The present system isolates teachers and students into what amounts to a series of one-room schoolhouses under one roof (Jones, 2013b). This is a major concern associated with *No Child Left Behind* and the increasing correlation of test scores with accountability. Cochran-Smith (2006) described this as a major worry: viewing teachers as saviors,

some policymakers are positing teachers as *the* determining factor in students’ success while ignoring other complex variables: school resources, leadership, and investments in teachers’ capacity building and professional development, not to mention such student related factors as family structure, economic status, housing, health, and employment. But the problems of schools are much bigger than teacher quality, and the problems of society are much bigger than imperfect schools. (p. 24)

As educational leaders we must focus on a two-pronged approach to education: 1) pass on knowledge essential for survival (in our current society) and 2) evoke learning that is more insightful and intuitive – akin to Plato’s ultimate aim for education.

The modern leader will need to create a shared vision. A simple ‘vision statement’ or mission statement is not sufficient. This shared vision must be palpable. This vision must help the learning organization self-organize, self-renew, and self-transcend. This shared vision must have a life of its own, a living system which is greater than the sum of its parts. Great leaders have had a great vision. Senge (2006) uses *Spartacus* as a good illustration of a leader who inspired others with a loyalty not to him but to a vision. Chief Black Elk was a leader of the Oglala Sioux whose authority came from his vision for his people (Niehardt, 1961).

How does the modern leader create this shared vision? How does one avoid becoming a useless strip of film? Just as our epistemological and ontological understandings are hindered by perception, perspective also creates an obstacle with sharing one’s vision. The modern, systemic leader may relate to the character Meg in Madeleine L’Engle’s *A Wrinkle In Time* (1962) when he or she tries to create this shared vision with those who cling to the Cartesian value system. Meg tried to explain light and dark to an alien creature who lacked the sense of sight. “How can you explain sight on a world where no one has ever seen and where there is no need for eyes?” (p. 174)

Bushman (2006, p. 60) asked this question in the context of teacher evaluation, “How could I get teachers to see what I saw daily?” To answer this, he developed a more collegial walk-through model that was less hierarchical resulting in a much more beneficial system of evaluation. Bushman (2006) essentially integrated a concept that many businesses have begun to institute: a flattened structural model rather than a top-down structure (Friedman, 2005). Indeed, B.F. Skinner’s *Walden Two* (1948) was a utopian society built upon a similar organizational structure.

One method of sharing vision may be simply to be *real*. Raiten-D’Antonio (2004) used the children’s story of *The Velveteen Rabbit* as a guide to help herself and her clients become real. To be real is to strip away those doors of perception of which William Blake (1975) wrote. To be real is to embrace the natural flow of life, to practice the Taoist philosophy of *wu-wei*, which means to refrain from action which is contrary to nature (Capra, 1975). To be a *real* leader is to act as more of a facilitator. A real leader will create a shared vision, rather than impose his or her vision on an organization. A real leader will remove the barriers that prevent the natural flow within the organization. The real leader will reshape the images of the traditional roles of students and teachers, of classrooms and schools. The real leader will need to lessen the barriers between schools and communities. As Johnston (1984, p. 367) wrote, “We should see the walls of the school becoming more permeable.” Schools should be seen more as community resource centers. The real leader will need to reconnect the fragments created by the mechanistic system of education.

Systemic thinking is the current zeitgeist in physics, biology, mathematics, business, psychology, counseling, and social work. Perhaps, even, the greater use of qualitative research in education is a reflection of this zeitgeist, this effort to become real in an increasingly unreal world. Public education as a whole has yet to embrace this zeitgeist, however. The real leader must help education shatter tradition in order to maintain continuity with its origins and goals of the past. Indeed, it is the only ethical thing to do.

## References

- Arnold, K. (2004). Hot death. *Adbuster’s: Journal of the Mental Environment*, 52, 80.
- Blake, W. (1975). *The marriage of heaven and hell*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Original work published in 1790).
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou*. New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Bushman, J. (2006). Teachers as walk through partners. *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 58-61.
- Capra, F. (1975). *The Tao of physics: an exploration of the parallels between modern physics and eastern mysticism*. Boston, MA: Shambala.
- Capra, F. (1996). *The web of life: a new scientific understanding of living systems*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Christian, J. L. (2011). *Philosophy: An introduction to the art of wondering* (11th ed.), Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006). Ten promising trends (and three big worries). *Educational Leadership*, 63(6), 20-25.

- Concannon, K. (2003, March). 'Dagger John' and the 'Gangs of New York.' Retrieved from <http://www.catholicherald.com/articles/03articles/dagger-john.htm>.
- Cornford, F. M. (1941). *The republic of Plato*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Daniels, C. (1974). *Long haired country boy. Fire on the mountain*. Nashville, TN: Kama Sutra Records.
- Descartes, R. (1980). *Discourse on method*. (D. A. Cress, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company (Original work published in 1637).
- Durant, W. (1961). *The story of philosophy*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Gross, M. L. (1999). *The conspiracy of ignorance: The failure of American public schools*. New York, NY: Harper Collins
- Hlebowitsh, P. S. (2001). *Foundations of American Education: Promise and purpose*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1996). *Administrative philosophy: Values and motivations in administrative life*. Tarrytown, NY: Pergamon.
- Johnston, C. M. (1984). *The creative imperative: A four-dimensional theory of human growth and planetary evolution*. Berkeley, CA: Celestial Arts.
- Joldersma, C. W. (2011). Education: Understanding, ethics, and the call of justice. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30, 441-447. doi:10.007/s11217-011-9246-7
- Jones, T. B. (2013a). Complexity theory. In G. Brown, B. Irby and R. Lara-Alecio (Eds.), *Handbook of educational theories*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Jones, T. B. (2013b). *Education for the human brain: A roadmap to natural learning in schools*. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Kim, S. (2006, November). It's magic. *Discover*, p. 74.
- Lanier, J. (2006, October). Raft to the future. *Discover*, p. 54-55.
- L'Engle, M. (1962). *A wrinkle in time*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Merton, T. (1948). *The seven storey mountain*. New York, NY: Harcourt.
- Merton, T. (1958). *Thoughts in solitude*. Boston, MA: Shambala.
- Munzel, G. F. (1998-1999). Menschenfreundschaft: Friendship and pedagogy in Kant. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 32(2), 247-259.
- The New Oxford American dictionary* (2001). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Niehardt, J. G. (1961). *Black Elk speaks: Being the life story of a holy man of the Oglala Sioux*. Lincoln, NE: Bison.
- Nietzsche, F. (1998). *Beyond good and evil*. (M. Faber, Trans). New York: Oxford University Press (Original work published in 1886).
- O'Connor, F. (1952). *Wise blood*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1998). Racial formations. in P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Race, class, and gender: An integrated study* (4th ed., pp. 13-22). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Raiten-D'Antonio, T. (2004). *The Velveteen Principles: A guide to becoming real*. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications Inc.
- Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Skinner, B. F. (1948). *Walden two*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishers.

- Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stolzman, W. (1986). *The Pipe and Christ: A Christian-Sioux dialogue*. Chamberlin, SD: Tipi Press.
- Theobald, P. (1997). *Teaching the commons*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press
- West, C. (1993). *Race matters*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Wolinsky, S. (2003). *Walden III: In search of a utopian nirvana*. Aptos, CA: Quantum Institute Press.