EDUCATING SOULS, SELVES, OR MINDS?

Margaret Carmody

A dissertation submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy in the School of Education (Culture, Change, and Curriculum).

Chapel Hill
2019

Approved by:

Madeleine Grumet

Lynda Stone

Suzanne Gulledge

Cheryl Mason Bolick

Stephen Sagarin

© 2019
Margaret Carmody
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Margaret Carmody: Educating Souls, Selves, or Minds?
(Under the direction of Madeleine Grumet)

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the term "soul" was virtually deleted from curriculum theory and replaced with the categories of "self" and "mind" from the learning sciences. This dissertation is a hermeneutic study undertaken to explore inviting the term back as a structuring concept in curriculum theory without privileging specific religious beliefs and to address those aesthetic, subjective, moral, and somatic dimensions of human experience that often do not get addressed in curricula focused on minds and selves. I explore how a fusion of Waldorf School founder Rudolf Steiner's theory of soul, Waldorf curriculum theory, psychotherapist Mari Ruti's theory of a post-humanist soul, and philosopher Kieran Egan's curriculum theory may provide a new horizon to which curriculum theory may direct its efforts to educate human beings to be more open to what is unknown and learn to respond to difference in caring, creative, and conscious ways.

Keywords: Soul, Rudolf Steiner, Mari Ruti, Kieran Egan, Elementary School Curriculum Theory, Waldorf Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Difference and Democracy 1

Soul and Education 3

Soul as Mind 4

Soul as Self 5

Thesis Question 6

Research Method 6

Chapter Outline 10

CHAPTER 1: DISCOVERING STEINER 13

Texts 13

Education 14

Engaging Sensory Curiosity 14

Personal Engagement with the Material 15

Minds, Meaning-Making, and Learning 17

A Process of Observation, Reflection, Conversation, and Composition in Student-made Texts 18

Artistic Representation of Concepts 21

Difference 23

Multiple Viewpoints 23

Reconciling Contrasts 26

Science and Religion: Seen and Unseen Worlds 28

CHAPTER 2: STEINER'S THEORY OF SOUL 36

Texts 36

The Structure of a Human Being: Body, Soul, and Spirit 37

Sensing as Meaning-Making 40

Structure of Soul: Sentient, Intellectual, and Consciousness Soul Members 42

The Sentient Soul Member 42

The Intellectual Soul Member 43

The Consciousness Soul 45

Soul Dynamics 46

Implications for Educational Curriculum 50

Conclusion 52

CHAPTER 3: THE CURRICULUM OF THE FIRST WALDORF SCHOOL 54

Texts 54

Aims of the Curriculum 57

Aesthetic Curriculum and Soul Development 57

Issues, Problems, and Adaptations 67

Content of Curriculum 70

Yearly Content 71

Daily & Weekly Content 73

Issues, Problems, and Adaptations 76

Enacting Curriculum: Pedagogical Processes 78

Issues, Problems, and Adaptations 81

Conclusion 83

CHAPTER 4: A POSTHUMANIST THEORY OF SOUL 85

Texts 86

The Posthumanist Soul 88

Agency and the Decentered, Constructed Subject 88

Psychic Transformation 89

Soul as Mediator of Social, Individual Interaction 92

Implications for Education 95

Cultural Recapitulation as Curriculum Guide 96

Maturation as Metamorphosis, not Mastery 99

Soul versus Mind 100

Conclusion 102

CHAPTER 5: A NEW HORIZON 104

New Horizon for “Soul” 105

Curricular Implications 107

Soul in Teacher Education 110

Conclusion 113

REFERENCES 116

INTRODUCTION

I began this dissertation wondering how the shift from "soul", a category common in educational discourse until early in the 20th century, to "self" and "mind" has influenced the theory and practice of education in contemporary schools and whether or not bringing that term back into discourse may help solve some of the persistent problems we have in curriculum theory, schools, and society. I asked this question because my own experience in Catholic and Waldorf schools was rich in reference to "soul" but my study in graduate school lacked a way to include the term meaningfully and consistently in the secular, positivist, or post-modern perspectives that have enriched contemporary educational discourse throughout the 20th century. I hoped that I could reconceive the term by researching how Rudolf Steiner, founder of Waldorf Education, and Mari Ruti, a Lacanian psychotherapist, conceptualized and wrote about the it.

The religious, ephemeral, and essentialist connotations of the word "soul" are unwanted baggage to many educators. I understood these concerns. However, it seemed to me that ignoring the moral, organic (as in living), affective, and aesthetic connotations of the word "soul" may be castrating vital curricular thought and detrimental to teaching the next generation that difference is something to be open to, to consciously deliberate, and to protect.

Difference and Democracy

One of the most troubling things today is how people treat people different from them—whether that difference be in appearance, gender, thought, belief, ability, or other

distinction. Often, this difference is perceived as a threat with violence and harm inflicted on the other. But difference is not always a threat. I have often encountered difference and been nourished, inspired, and/or strengthened by that encounter in ways that I had not imagined possible. Difference can be novelty, variety, complement, and/or correction.

How is it that human beings judge difference as a threat, novelty, variety, complement, or correction? I ask this question at a time of polarity in politics in the United States, international terrorism, unbridled racism and anti-Semitism, and worldwide xenophobia. Is learning how to respond to difference a legitimate concern of school education? In his book *Good Education in an Age of Measurement,* philosopher of education Gert Biesta (2010) proposed thinking of democracy as a deliberative decision-making process by as many participants as possible to *transform* individual and collective wants and needs into a common good for each. By seeing this process as deliberative, he invited dialogue which sees difference as variety and complement, not opposition, thus enlarging experience rather than oppressing it.

Biesta also discussed the chaos and violence that often accompany the disruption brought on by transformations of old into new orders. He suggested that to minimize this conflict, one should be open to “what cannot be known to be excluded in terms of the existing order” (Biesta, 2010, p. 125). In other words, openness to the unknown should be an important part of the perspective of democratic cultures and individuals. Deliberative democracy needs a space that allows for something new, something not previously known, to become present while allowing each speaker to continue to exist: a space which not only welcomes the unknown but also protects plurality and difference. For democracy it is important for educational experience to help the next generation learn how to judge if

difference is a threat, novelty, complement, variety, or correction and promote other responses to difference than fight or flight.

In the high-stakes testing and accountability environment rampant in today's schools, curriculum goals are often limited to information processing, vocational sorting, and passing standardized tests. Learning to recite, recall, and regurgitate rules and information is more important than exploring the unknown. There is little time for observation, reflection, dialogue, and decision-making that are not pre-determined, predictable, and pre-scripted for teachers and students, and no time to pursue difference as novelty or variety to supplement one's own perspective. This lack is a significant problem if those in the next generation are to learn how to treat those different from themselves without violence or harm.

Can we design children's experiences of the disciplines of knowledge so that difference is not threatening? To address this question, I will examine the concept of soul as a space, or process, or energy which can link cognition, emotion, sensation, and relation in the construction and teaching of knowledge.

Soul and Education

Our contemporary focus on teaching minds and/or actualizing selves has not always guided curriculum principles. Early schooling in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in this country linked schooling to religious practices. In the nineteenth century, conditions within which school curriculum was enacted changed drastically in the United States: "common" schools were founded by local communities to provide opportunities for children to learn reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and geography in public spaces that were required to be nondenominational as mandated by the separation of church and state stipulations in the constitution; schooling for all children from approximately six to twelve years of age became compulsory and available tuition-free in most states; and scientific

studies from geology and biology cast doubt on theological and mythological explanations of the creation and ontology of human beings (Croce, 1995; Nord, 2010; Reed, 1997; Rury, 2002).

As educational psychology became a more empirical, scientific, and professional area of expertise, "soul" was relegated to religious discourse to refer to a part of human ontology which felt moral (or immoral) impulses and lived on after the body died. By the beginning of the twentieth century, "mind" became the favored term for one's inner life; thinking became a physiological activity of the brain; and "self" the preferred term for one's individual personality or one's identity (Crabbe, 1999; Reed, 1997; Wozniak, 1995).

Soul as Mind

Education psychologist Edward L. Thorndike described the mind as "a kind of switch-board with innumerable wires (bonds) connecting discrete points… [rather than] capacities such as memory and reasoning waiting there to be developed" (Kliebard, 2004, p. 91). Learning occurred when a particular stimulus provoked an identified, correct response; trained association thus sidelined imagination and memory. Curriculum theorist Elliot Eisner (1994) noted that a result of this concept was that teachers became responsible to "define the appropriate unit to be learned and to employ a reinforcer appropriate to it" (p. 9). Tests became an authoritative measure of learning, and teachers accountable for good student test scores.

Today, educators are likely to think the brain is like a computer in that it stores files of information for later use, and so they work to design experiences which build connections between the brain synapses of their students so they can hold more information. Brain chemistry is important to this process. Images of brain activity provide physiological demonstrations of learning. While this thinking expands the automatic stimulus-response

theory advocated by Thorndike and his followers, it continues mechanical, positivistic descriptions of learning. More stimulation results in more brain development which results in more learning. High test scores measure this kind of learning. In our schools, “how tests function in schools is to shock, interrogate, shame, and finally to abstract individuals from their contexts by translating them into numbers ... [and hollow out] the emotional and psychic life of teachers and students” (Taubman, 2009, p. xi). I wonder if this hollowing out of our inner lives has weakened our ability to see difference as novelty, supplement, or variety?

Soul as Self

The other term which replaced “soul” in 20th century curriculum theory is “self”. Curricula which target student selves vary greatly in content and methods. In their book *The Education of Selves: How Psychology Transformed Students,* researchers Jack Martin & Ann-Marie McLellan (2013) summarized the result of the various curricula aimed at educating selves: “a detached, masterful self that is focused on its own interior experience and its instrumental expression … the expressive, enterprising, and entitled student inwardly self-focused and outwardly strategically self-interested” (p. 198-9). What does such a self do when its interests conflict with others’ interests? How does it deliberate difference as anything other than a threat?

Criticisms of these kinds of curricula that focus on *mind* and *self* include a lack of expertise in disciplinary subjects, a lack of attention to social responsibilities, and a feeling of entitlement in students (Martin & McLellan, 2013). What effect would these consequences have on seeing difference as other than a threat? Would a lack of basic information and skill in disciplinary subject material prevent one from being able to process information which disagrees with one’s experience or belief-system? Would a lack of attention to social

responsibilities lead to less participation in democratic processes of exploring the unknown and deliberation of differences? Would a feeling of entitlement give full reign to corruption and greed?

Curricula which attend to positivistic minds and individual selves are unlikely to nourish the inner lives of the next generation and support the social practices needed to dialogue in creative, caring, and generative ways when encountering difference.

Thesis Question

Did curriculum theory lose a vital aspect when soul was evicted from educational discourse and relegated to religious discourse? I do not want to bring religion back into all schools, but I do want to bring in feelings, values, imagination, and support for the inner lives that children construct as they grow older. I am calling these qualities "soul" in this study. I will explore this concept and approach to education, critically evaluating its capacity to generate conscious, caring, and creative ways to respond to difference.

In the first part of the dissertation I will examine two theories of soul that I will draw from in developing an approach to curriculum that protects difference. First, I will examine the life and work of Rudolf Steiner who thought soul necessary to educational discourse and developed the curriculum for the first Waldorf School to realize it in classrooms. Then I will investigate the work of Mari Ruti, a Canadian psychotherapist, who sees soul as necessary to decentered subjects and agency in the construction of knowledge. In the final phase of the dissertation I will present my synthesis of Steiner and Ruti's ideas and consider its application in elementary school curriculum.

Research Method

I have approached this work hermeneutically through the study of texts by Steiner and Ruti, a consideration of their historical contexts and philosophical assumptions, and

finally from a perspective of contemporary educational practice. Hermeneutics is a field of research that uses dialogue with texts to understand phenomena. As Sartre (1981) noted in his autobiography *The Words,* writing down stories allows the reader to read the same story over and over again. Telling stories does not have the unchanging, predictable exactness of a written story. Having the story in writing allows one access to that story when one is alone, time to stop reading to reflect on what is being said, opportunity to take it into oneself as one takes in food savoring the meaning and image brought to mind by the story, and then to let it go, back to the page and to others. Even released, however, the story has impressed itself on one's memory and insight.

Wendy Atwell-Vasey (1998) speaks of this nourishing aspect of words, the living quality of text turned to conversation, and of the ability for text to become "the very presence of thought being said" (p. 75). Because of text, I can read the thoughts of people who lived long ago, discuss those thoughts with people I will never meet, and share my direct experience with others who can imagine similar experience.

Health Education researcher Elizabeth Anne Kinsella (2006) discussed the conversational aspect of hermeneutics. She cautioned that the goal of the hermeneutic conversation is to understand what an author is saying through interpretation, not by analysis or explanation. Interpretation is sensitive to how language and perspective are situated in the time and place of both the author and the reader and thus is critical, partial, and ambiguous (Kinsella, 2006). Keeping that context in mind, I can question the relevance of the thoughts of others in relation to my own time and place. Moreover, as in this study, the work of different authors may be included and differences that are noted may not be resolved. Such research seeks to be open to new conversations welcoming new information and transcend

the limitations of both then and there, or here and now (Kinsella, 2006). The understanding achieved through hermeneutic research can thus broaden and deepen our knowledge of complex phenomena without fixing it in certainty and exclusion.

As philosopher Luis Schokel (1998) noted in his text *A Manual of Hermeneutics,* there are three levels to interpretation in standard hermeneutic study: reproductive, explicative, and normative (pp. 14-18). Reproductive interpretation is concerned with performing the text, giving it presence and life. Explicative interpretation mediates possible meanings to understand what the author of the original text may have meant, or what the interpreter thinks is important to understand from the text. Normative interpretation aims at defining a certain understanding or action that the interpreter wishes to advance.

Reader unfamiliarity with both Steiner's and Ruti's theories of soul required that I fully involve the reproductive aspects of interpretation to make these theories present to readers. Neither depend on religious conceptions of soul, although Steiner's rests firmly in a spiritual discourse known as anthroposophy that he forged from Catholic, Protestant, Freemason, Hindu, and Buddhist traditions. Because I have been most interested in the explicative and normative implications of the theories for curriculum discourse, I selected the aspects of Steiner's and Ruti's theories that were useful in arguing my point that the aesthetic, moral, and organic connotations of the word soul validate inviting it back into curricular discourse. I wished to advance a new idea, and this is an acceptable agenda for hermeneutic research (Schokel 1998; Kinsella, 2006).

I have chosen this method because I have had a difficult time finding a place for my voice to speak in curricular discourse, and a requirement for hermeneutic study is a fusion of standpoints that results in a new horizon of understanding (Gadamer,1975; Mueller-Vollmer,

1985). I realized that I needed a new horizon to speak from, and that educational curriculum theory needs a new horizon from which to understand and to which to direct its efforts.

When I chose teaching as a profession I knew the stance I viewed education from was not in line with mainstream or Roman Catholic educational theory and practice. I knew I did not wish to teach perpetuating a prime shortcoming in both mainstream, public school classrooms and Catholic classrooms: rigid conformity to intellectual achievement as soon as possible. Three of my five siblings struggled with school, especially in learning to read. Mathematics and algebra were trouble for four of my siblings. Although the religion classes I had throughout my Catholic School years (grades 5-12) included quite a lot of social justice work plus theoretical questioning and exploration, I understood that Roman Catholic theology was not open to harboring believers like me who could not accept some of the basic tenets of the faith based on their individual experience and construction of truth. The specifics of those tenets did not involve “soul” at that time; now they might. I no longer consider myself Roman Catholic and do not know current Catholic teaching about soul.

Waldorf Education as described in a book by Waldorf educator John F. Gardner (1975/1996), *The Experience of Knowledge*, promised to have a theory and practice that would enable me to teach differently from how I had been taught. Especially appealing to me was how Gardner explained the ways in which Waldorf educational curriculum theory and practice acknowledged that children learned in different ways and thus included practical, kinesthetic, and aesthetic activities to teach holistically. The curriculum had distinctly Christian roots but attempted to interpret Christianity free of dogma and any denominational doctrine.

Still, when I became a Waldorf School teacher, I found that these different ways of teaching and learning were not enough to guide children to respond to difference in caring, conscious, and creative ways. Furthermore, other teachers were not as respectful or tolerant of difference as I expected them to be based on my interpretation of Steiner's work. My graduate studies have acquainted me with post-modern, feminist, and post-structural standpoints about difference, but these standpoints speak in very different languages from Steiner's work. The text by Ruti (2006) called *Reinventing the Soul: Posthumanist Theory and Psychic Life* provided a way to dialog about soul from these standpoints.

In this thesis, I explore how a fusion of Steiner's theory of soul, Waldorf curriculum theory, and Ruti's theory of soul through textual interpretation may provide a new horizon for curriculum theory which addresses how human beings respond to difference in caring, creative, compassionate, and conscious ways.

Chapter Outline

Rudolf Steiner, who formulated the arts-integrated curriculum of Waldorf Schools, was a scientist, philosopher, artist, art critic, architect, and lecturer who lived from 1861-1925. My elementary school teaching experience was in Waldorf schools. It is the curriculum with which I have the most experience as a theorist and practitioner. Its arts-integrated curriculum will allow us to explore a role of the arts in contemporary curriculum.

During Steiner's lifetime, "soul" virtually disappeared in educational discourse after centuries of being central to that discourse. Why did Steiner (1961/1983), educated and interested in the science and philosophy of his time, not just ignore this orientation but claim that all education "depends upon what passes from the soul of the teacher to the soul of the student" when he founded the first Waldorf School in 1919 (p. 17)? This school began with 256 students enrolled in grades 1-8. Five years later the school had 784 students in grades 1-

12 (Oberman, 1998). This phenomenal growth indicates there was something happening at the school which people found appealing. The fact that the Waldorf School curriculum is still used in some public and private schools on every continent demonstrates its continued success and relevance today.

Another reason to begin this dissertation with Steiner is his emphasis on respecting difference in all social relationships. People remember him as a man of great sociability. Accounts compiled in *A Man Before Others: Rudolf Steiner Remembered* (1993) describe a man kind, compassionate, warm-hearted, and sincerely interested in people. One biographer, Stewart Easton (1980), asserted that Steiner "was well provided with what Austrians call *gemutlichkeit*, a kind of soul warmth that enabled him to make friends easily and keep them" (p. 31). However, being sociable is not enough to transfer this quality to others or to instantiate it in curriculum. Is there a connection between Steiner's attitude about difference and his theory of soul? I will attempt to understand if and how sociability and soul are related in a way that can inform curricula.

After looking at Steiner's biography in Chapter One to explore how his lived experience provided context for his theory of soul, attitude towards difference, and educational curriculum, I will examine his assertion that a healthy soul life develops by a continual integration of sensory engagement, affective encounter, and living-thinking through aesthetic experience in Chapter Two and if his theory of soul might help us to understand how it is human beings sense, judge, and respond to difference in ways selves and minds cannot. I will investigate Steiner's application of his theory of soul in the educational curriculum of the first Waldorf School in Chapter Three to make explicit the ways in which it

might encourage caring, generative, and creative responses to difference and an openness to the unknown.

In Chapter Four, I will dialogue with a second and contemporary theory of soul to connect Steiner's ideas to contemporary educational discourse. Psychotherapist Mari Ruti (2006) suggested that soul can join a post-humanist critique of Kant's ideal of a rational, autonomous subject if soul is reinvented to be a kind of psychic energy which "sustains the individual's inner agility and resourcefulness" (p. 18). Her argument is helpful in addressing knowledge as a social construction and a post-humanist sense of human agency and imagination, concepts not part of Steiner's discourse but important in today's educational contexts.

Curriculum theory requires that a theory or philosophy of education be placed in a specific context. I will look at soul and some of these contexts in Chapter 5. I argued above that citizens in a democracy need to perceive difference as other than a threat, and to be able to deliberate a response to difference open to the unknown and proactive of plurality. I believe that it is in this realm that inviting soul back into educational discourse will have its greatest impact with its aesthetic and moral connotations. While many have investigated the use of the arts in curriculum (Ahmad, 2008; Bennett, 2008; Egan, 2005, 2008, & 2010; Fresne, & Louk, 2013; Levstik, 2011; Petrash, 2002; Santoli & Vitulli, 2013; Turner, 2013; Weissman, 2004 among others), I focus on what is necessary to be addressed in general elementary school curriculum to develop the souls of the next generation and whether that will help children learn how to understand people who are different from them and generate caring, creative responses to difference.

CHAPTER 1: DISCOVERING STEINER

In this chapter, I explore Steiner's autobiography for his thoughts and lived experiences to provide context for his educational curriculum suggestions and theory of soul. I will discuss the relevance of his ideas to my understandings of contemporary educational curriculum throughout the chapter.

Texts

The main text for this reading is *Rudolf Steiner: An Autobiography*. Steiner wrote his autobiography as articles appearing in a weekly newsletter from December 1923-April 1925. Although his death led to its premature ending, he covered his life in detail until about 1907 and mentioned things that happened up to 1912, with the intention of giving readers "an objective description of [his] spiritual path" (Steiner, 1925/1980, p. 17). By "objective" here, Steiner means his autobiography would be factual and free of personal interpretation. While today we suspect this aim is virtually impossible, it was a common undertaking in Steiner's time. This intention makes it an ideal text for my purposes because it is an account of his reflections and actions in response to those events he identified as important to his work and thus provides context for his ideas and deeds. Readers today can see how, despite his disclaimer, his feelings slip in at times. Biographers of Steiner all seem to agree with Ullrich (2008) that "*Mein Lebensgang* must be considered the most important source of any intellectual Steiner portrait" (p. xvi) with extensive references to it in their accounts (Barnes, 1997; Easton, 1980; Lachman, 2007; Lindenberg, 2012; Meyer, 2015).

Steiner's wife Marie edited the seventy newsletter articles after Steiner's death into a book of thirty-eight chapters published as *Mein Lebensgan*g, first translated from German into English in 1928 as *The Story of My Life*. In 1951, a revised translation was published as *The Course of My Life*. In 1977, Rita Stebbing translated the seventh edition of *Mein Lebensgang* and renamed it *Rudolf Steiner: An Autobiography*. I use the 1980 edition of this translation. Although some of the subtleties of Steiner's German text, circa 1924, may have been lost or refined through translation and editing, it is fair to assume that translators and editors remained as faithful as they could to the original text to give a just account of how and what Steiner wrote of his experience. I will also refer to a lecture Steiner gave in 1913 published under the title "Self-Education: Autobiographical Reflections, 1861-1893" and supplement from other texts as necessary to understand the contexts within which Steiner lived.

Education

Steiner described formal and informal educational experiences as a student, tutor, and teacher in his autobiography. He often discussed how these experiences helped him to form the pedagogy he exhorted teachers to use in the first Waldorf School. Whereas I will examine the implications for curriculum theory to address soul development in Chapter Three, in this chapter I will connect Steiner's personal experience with those aspects of Waldorf Curriculum that I am familiar with through my training and experience as a Waldorf School teacher.

Engaging Sensory Curiosity

Steiner began school in a small Austrian village in the mid-1860's. His father withdrew Steiner from the school and took over his education when the schoolmaster's wife accused Steiner of a prank her son had committed. After completing the reading and writing

exercises his father assigned to him, Steiner (1925/1980) had many opportunities to observe and engage in practical activities about which he was curious (p. 23). He learned how to use the telegraph, and observed how the railcars and a local grain mill worked. Having access to these machines sparked a lifelong interest in both the advantages and dangers of technology. Practical activities, observation, and fostering curiosity play a major part in his later educational theories and practices.

This focus on practical and worldly experiences provokes these questions about current schooling: Do we give children enough time today to explore the things in their environment, things they are curious about? What do children miss by being fed answers all the time instead of being allowed to wonder and then connect their own dots of experience, thoughts, and words? I wonder how their powers of observation grow if they are only observing digital images and sounds of others, not the real things with their attendant textures, smells, tastes, and size. I suspect that an attitude of wonder and curiosity toward difference and the unknown is curtailed rather than nurtured in these conditions.

Personal Engagement with the Material

One of the wonderful developments in educational curriculum theory since progressive era reform is that engagement by students has been taken more and more seriously**.** Schools that claimed to be "progressive" more or less followed the basic principles of child centered curriculum established by American philosopher John Dewey:

> educators start with the needs and interests of the child in the classroom, allow the child to participate in planning his or her own course of study, advocated project method or group learning and depended heavily upon experiential learning. (Semel, 1999, p. 6)

Open classrooms and service learning programs sought to enlist direct student involvement in choosing and applying content to learn. Engagement of teachers is a topic to which less attention has been given.

Steiner (1925/1980) reflected that he was drawn to teachers who were actively engaged in the subject they were teaching, often from personal experience. He noted that the warmth and style that an engaged teacher brought to class made lessons "come to life" (p.51). As an example Steiner recounted his experience with a teacher in middle school who read from the History textbook in class, giving the appearance he was lecturing. Steiner read the text at home in less time, understood the material, and stuck pages of work by philosopher Immanuel Kant into his history text to read during class. A few years later, this same teacher taught Steiner geology. There was no reading from the text in this class! The teacher held the attention of the students by telling stories of his adventures on walks in the Alps. He illustrated vividly the rock formations he had seen on the blackboard. His personal interest and experience with the subject made all the difference in how engaged he was with the subject material and how interesting he made it to his students.

Scripted curricula, in use in some school systems today, are blatant in employing prescription and control measures to hold teachers accountable for covering necessary content. Neither student nor teacher imagination is kindled if teachers do not enact these scripts with the art and craft of skilled actors, engaging feelings and inspiring curiosity, and if enactment rather than selection of material is the extent of a teacher's professional agency. In addition, these syllabi and pedagogies do not encourage the deliberation and openness to the unknown that Biesta (2010) argued as necessary for democracy.

Many teachers teach what, how, and when as dictated by a textbook. This practice has been increasingly questioned, especially in social studies and literacy courses. If a text is used, teachers supplement it with projects, other texts, and frank discussion about how the ideas in the text relate to issues in their communities (Brophy & Alleman., 2008; Halvorsen, 2013; Levstik, L., 2008). Steiner challenged the teachers in the first Waldorf school not to rely on textbooks for content or order of topics, but to consciously decide what they think is important for students to know and how they would creatively engage students in the material, to be open to learning new things when researching the topic, and to think through why they are teaching what they are teaching.

This approach would be difficult to employ in public schools where each year brings teachers new students to prepare to pass standardized tests. In addition, as Kliebard (2004) argued, the history of school curriculum in the United States has been a struggle among various groups of people interested influencing school curriculum such as administrators, parents, businesspersons, and community leaders. These people will not give up regulation of what goes on in classrooms easily (Kliebard, 2004; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995). Nor should they; their voices need to be part of the deliberation that teachers consider when planning what will happen in their classrooms. Teachers should not lose their voice and agency, however. A point of this dissertation is to investigate how teaching soul-to-soul can nurture and guide teacher agency to include deliberative practices, openness to the unknown, and generative, responsible, and caring responses to difference while implementing whatever syllabus a community expects its teachers to follow.

Minds, Meaning-Making, and Learning

Steiner found evidence of the effect one's inner life of thinking, feeling, and willing had on educational processes as a tutor. While still a young student himself, he began

tutoring other students in middle school to offset the cost of his schooling for his parents. He reported that tutoring was beneficial in waking him up to the subject he tutored in new ways (Steiner, 1925/1980, p. 47), familiarizing him with practical psychology, and acquainting him with "how minds other than his own functioned" (Easton, 1980, p. 26). Steiner (1925/1980) reported that tutoring students in a variety of disciplines while he was in college "kept me from becoming one-sided" (p. 95). After college, he supplemented his wages as a tutor for the children of two families. One child, a boy with hydrocephaly, was considered uneducable by the standards of his time. After two years with Steiner, the boy passed the exam to enter the grade for children his own age. He was killed serving in the Great War as a medical doctor.

I have tutored other students since I was in sixth grade. Like Steiner, working one-on-one as a tutor allowed me to see that different approaches are required at times to make the material meaningful to the other person and that a block in the student's thinking, feeling, or willing can impede the learning process. Working one-on-one, I had time to address the blockages. Ignoring them as a class teacher thwarted my attempts to build and sustain a healthy relationship with my students. I will show in Chapter Two how Steiner placed these activities in one's soul in Chapter Three how teachers can address them in classrooms through curriculum.

A Process of Observation, Reflection, Conversation, and Composition in Student-made Texts

Steiner modelled all classes in the first Waldorf school after the way he was taught chemistry in secondary school:

- a demonstration of the principles of chemistry through an experiment performed by the teacher,

- time for students to reflect on their own observations of the demonstration,
- conversation between teacher and students formulating the tenets of chemistry from the shared reflections of the individual observations,
- pictorial and written documentation of the demonstration and class findings in their own books.

Such texts made by the students themselves in all subject areas have become a hallmark of Waldorf Education.

Could these skills help one to learn to judge whether difference is a threat or a support to one's own understanding, and to respond to it in creative ways? One's senses are engaged, a "pause" is practiced, reflection ensues, one speaks what one sensed and reflected about, and hears what others sensed and reflected on in conversation. Accuracy and completeness is a group effort when the text is composed from experience and knowledge, not just repetition of a rule. Everyone can participate, if their participation is encouraged, invited. Difference in this safe, controlled setting can be experienced as helpful, instructive, and not a threat. Through conversation and an artistic representation of the concepts involved, interaction and collaboration become habits which support the skills needed to deliberate issues in a democracy and foster comfort with the unknown.

However, conversations are not necessarily clear or orderly, and can be even less so when they occur in a classroom of a teacher and 20-30 students. Teachers need to be committed to inviting everyone to participate and ensuring a safe setting for that participation. They need to have a variety of practices available to them to achieve success by culling desired content from conversation and being open to new ways of looking at

familiar material. I will refer to my experience teaching parenting classes at Social Services to expand on what I think is important about what Steiner said here.

A primary aim in our classes was to teach prospective parents how to think on their feet; a skill they would need once children were in their homes. Each of the ten class sessions involved activities which required prospective parents to imagine themselves in common foster care or adoption situations. We co-facilitators conducted group conversations about what people had imagined, how they had resolved the situation, and the reasoning which connected the two. Because the possibilities of what class members would report were endless and hence unknown, our training as facilitators emphasized how to listen to every response and focus on the reasoning the class member reported. We had to be open to hearing the different reasonings prospective parents brought with them, and to be sure the parents understood the kinds of reasoning likely to help them in the moment, in the future, and that our agency could support. This understanding is more possible to develop in conversation than in lecture. For the conversation to be meaningful, however, we as facilitators needed to know our material, ask clarifying questions, and order the conclusions about the topic at the end of the discussion.

This aim is similar to what we as teachers in schools with the next generation are responsible for: to be sure students understand the kinds of reasoning likely to help them in life, work, and social situations, which their community will and will not support, and why. This aim includes informing other minds of what we know through the academic disciplines and encouraging the development of talents and interests of individuals, but goes beyond these practices into an exploration of thinking, feeling, and willing appropriate to the age of the children in the class in conversation.

A problem here is that societies support multiple and sometimes contradictory kinds of reasoning; communities may not be sure that it is the job of teachers to explain multiple points of view in clear and orderly ways. This insecurity may be based in fear that the community will lose its cohesion and social control if its way of thinking is challenged, in complacency that it has already figured out the correct answers, or in ignorance of unknown factors. Complacency, fear, and ignorance are not values upon which communities should depend, especially those communities striving to be deliberate democracies. For this very reason, it is necessary for teachers to be people who are able and willing to conduct this process in schools. I will look at how curricula aimed at teaching souls aid this process in Chapters Three and Five.

Artistic Representation of Concepts

Artistic drawings were used to illustrate principles in many of Steiner's classes. He mentioned drawing as an activity employed in the one-room schoolhouse he attended when his family moved to Neudorfl, a Hungarian village, when he was eight. In the secondary school he attended in Weiner-Neustadt, Austria, Steiner (1925/1980) enjoyed the hours he spent completing exact geometric drawings and noted that the attention necessary to replicate these complicated sequences, the feeling of pleasure with the finished product, and the discipline needed to stick to the directions strengthened his inner life out of real experience and effort (p. 41).

Steiner (1925/1980) asserted that art "is a realm where the spiritual is transferred into the sense-perceptible world" and transforms "those soul-powers which work upon matter through the artist, into sense-free, purely spiritual powers of perception" (p. 128). The soul-powers he referred to here are thinking, feeling, and willing, and spiritual perception the imagination of the unseen, the unknown. Scientists employ all three to understand how

something already present works in the world; artists employ all three to produce a work of art which manifests something new in the world. Artistic activity thus bridges physical and spiritual worlds by strengthening one's imagination and agency; this bridging is central to Steiner's approach to education.

Although some tend to think of art as an activity of an individual, Dewey (1934) avowed that the arts have their origins in communal activity, as "part of the significant life of an organized community" (p. 7). The arts communicate in ways that break "through barriers that divide human beings, which are impermeable in ordinary association" (p. 244) and which allow one "to put [oneself] imaginatively in [another's] place" thus fostering empathy (p. 348). Furthermore, Dewey (1934) pointed out that

> Only imaginative vision elicits the possibilities that are interwoven within the textures of the actual. The first stirrings of dissatisfaction and the first intimations of a better future are always found in works of art (p. 345-6)

Empathy and possibilities are needed to deliberate social change. In addition to Steiner's insight about the arts bridging the seen and unseen, Dewey's insights help to establish a connection between aesthetic processes and democratic deliberation and response to difference.

Arts Integration is a recent curricular concept which attempts to raise the status of both the arts and the aesthetic in educational practice (Bresler, 1995; Grumet, 2004; Noblit, Corbett, Wilson, & McKinney, 2009). Art operates in the immediate, the particular, and the emotional life of human beings, makes learning an experience that engages a child's senses and feelings, and allows the expression of feeling and value so that students can become literate in understanding the feeling and values of themselves and others. Furthermore, bodies are engaged when the arts are used to learn something. As curriculum theorist

Madeleine Grumet (2004) stated: “the visual, aural, tactile, vocal, and kinesthetic experiences of art stimulate, exercise, and enhance our embodied and our cognitive ways of knowing our world” (p. 53-54). The arts help us to understand multiple meanings, different perspectives, and how knowledge is socially constructed.

Difference

How Steiner spoke about difference throughout his autobiography is instructive to how curriculum works to develop the soul. Steiner (1925/1980) portrayed an attitude of respect and protection toward difference and related personal experiences that supported this attitude. Two aspects of Steiner’s relation to difference relate directly to this thesis: that difference resulting from multiple viewpoints is meaningful and to be valued, and that reconciling contrasts should not be a levelling out of difference.

Multiple Viewpoints

Steiner began talking about difference in the first chapter of his autobiography. He described heated political debates between his father and another employee of the South Austrian Railway. Steiner commented that they seemed to disagree about everything, but somehow they sustained a friendly relationship. Steiner (1925/1980) closed this description by saying of his father: “he likes to hear what others have to say, but he acts according to his own determination” (p. 36). Steiner carried away from witnessing such conversations how respect and interest for a perspective different from one’s own could enhance one’s understanding of an issue.

It seems to me that in order to stay friendly and for Steiner to come to this conclusion, his father and colleague had to separate their identities from their opinions, be open to information they may lack and the other might have, and be able to act according to a new understanding without losing face. By separating one’s self from one’s thoughts, beliefs, and

ideals, one can act with integrity and pragmatically in particular situations rather than as an ideological zealot unable to see a perspective other than one's own. Is it enough to separate identity from ideology for one to act with integrity and authenticity? I think not.

Seeing an object, a feeling, or a thought from many sides encourages a mobility of thought which Steiner (1925/1980) claimed was important for an "inner schooling in overcoming the "either-or" judgement of the intellect" (p. 245). To see a thing's true nature, Steiner noted, one has to walk all around it, see it from various viewpoints (p. 208). Steiner gave as an example that one can tell a lot about a house from a photograph, but one can tell more from a series of photographs taken from multiple sides, and even more by actually visiting the house and going inside of it (p. 209). Seeing something from many sides encourages what Steiner called sense-free, living thinking. This kind of thinking can grow and develop into imagination, inspiration, and intuition necessary to allow for the unknown or unseen to be considered and for deliberation to be inclusive of as many perspectives as possible.

Adjusting one's understanding by valuing multiple viewpoints is difficult, however. I think this continual re-evaluation and appreciation of multiple points of view did not result in insecurity of Steiner's own point of view because he did not see difference as a threat to him, but as something which could supplement, complement, or correct his own view. Throughout his autobiography, Steiner (1925/1980) talked about how thoughts of others which opposed his own "acted as a strong stimulus to reevaluate" his own ideas (p. 78) and that he did not fail "to appreciate even when [he] had to oppose" the thoughts of others (p. 101). He could accept new information and change his own view, and he could agree to disagree without losing interest in the other.

This attitude toward difference is just as essential as not identifying one's self with one's ideas for one to be free to listen and learn from others. One must be able to form a standpoint that is one's own, and one must be able to trust that others are speaking truthfully from what they see. Steiner (1925/1980) acknowledged that to work with others in the way he sought, "one must assume people to be honorable till the opposite has been proved or else be distrustful of the whole world" (p. 392).

Why is this reflection important? Steiner (1925/1980) remarked: "One who rejects everything that does not accord with his own way of thinking need not trouble himself about the relative justification of the various world-views" (p. 208) but such a person is not able to reach a full understanding of a thing. Steiner used the word "visiting" to describe how he welcomed other people's standpoints by setting his own standpoint aside and inviting theirs into his own thinking, feeling, and willing (p. 206). Later, upon reflecting on what others said, Steiner used different viewpoints to stimulate his own thought in his meditations, broadening and deepening his understanding of others and the world around him (p. 207).

Philosopher Hannah Arendt used the term "visiting" in her work to describe interaction in politics (in Biesta, 2013, pp. 115-116). Arendt insisted that one visit others as oneself, hearing the other but not putting one's own standpoint aside. Her "visiting" is truly visiting, a going to another place. I think "hosting" would more accurately describe the phenomenon Steiner sought to explain, because it is welcoming how another person sees something into one's own inner life.

Whether hosting or visiting, many assert we can never put our "selves" aside, and see things from a different point of view. This assertion conflates "self" and "soul" to the detriment of each. Steiner understood the two to be related, but not as the same things. He

avowed that one's inner life is constituted by a self, the agent of one's destiny, and a soul, the cauldron in which one integrates one's thinking, feeling, and willing. I will make this distinction clearer in Chapter 2. Here I am wondering if bringing "soul" back into educational discourse as a name for this other-than-self in one's inner life may help the next generation to create such an enlarged inner life space and be able to use multiple standpoints to expand their own viewpoints.

Reconciling Contrasts

Working with contrasts was as important as multiple perspectives in meeting difference for Steiner. In what Steiner (1925/1980) called "objective idealism", polarities become alternate states offering multiple points of view from which to observe something instead of extremes that oppose, exclude, and result in dead ends (p. 88). Living-thinking allows one to move between extremes, understand each, and not level them to a fixed mean, mode, or midpoint between the extremes.

Steiner (1925/1980) noted:

> If contrasting factors are leveled out, what is left is no longer living. Where there is life the disharmony of contrasting factors is also active. Life itself is but a continuous overcoming and re-creation of opposites. (p. 278)

When reading this statement, I was reminded of the way philosopher John Dewey (1934) discussed the way an organism interacts with its environment to sustain life in his text *Art as Experience*. Dewey (1934) claimed that an organism experiences need as a lack of "adequate adjustment with its surroundings" which demands "a reaching out into the environment to make good the lack and to restore adjustment by building at least a temporary equilibrium" (p. 14). But he observed this equilibrium is "never mere return to a prior state, for it is enriched by the state of disparity and resistance through which it has successfully passed" (Dewey, 1934, p. 14).

In the above quote about contrast and life, Steiner seemed to indicate that a re-creation of opposites is the immediate result of an overcoming of opposites. I think adding the equilibrium noted in Dewey's insight into the process of adjustment is an important perspective to seeing difference as variety and not as a continuous flip-flopping between extremes. In the equilibrium, one has a standpoint one's self can identify and hold on to, order within his life experience, and have rest from continual change and movement. These standpoints accumulate to form what we sense and others see as our selves. There does not have to be anything fixed about these standpoints nor are they necessarily consistent; remembering them as "temporary" is one of Dewey's assertions. Noticing the moment of equilibrium allows us to frame change and adaptation as growth and development rather than chance, obsequiousness, or instability.

It is my experience that the overcoming and re-creating Steiner and Dewey referred to here occurs in the soul as one thinks, feels, and wills one's interaction with one's environment. As feeling, it is overcoming fear or anger when meeting difference and the creation of caring concern, or of overcoming one's own happiness to take an interest and wonder about another's misfortune. As will, it is the overcoming of flight/fight/freeze and creating fraternity or solidarity with another. As thinking, it is overcoming blind faith to create a new thesis by deliberating a thesis, its antithesis, and forming a synthesis from the deliberation. These shifts encourage us to believe that responses to difference can be taught, influenced by new experience, deliberated in communities, and that one can be open to the unknown in ways which feel safe, are logical, and just.

An example of how Steiner applied these two tenets of seeking multiple points of view and not leveling contrast to an area of difference in his time can be seen in how he related to science and religion in his autobiography.

Science and Religion: Seen and Unseen Worlds

During the nineteenth century, the relationship between science and religion underwent a significant change. While many remember that this relationship was one of conflict which one had to resolve by choosing one or the other, historian John Brooke (1991) discussed how many felt that science and religion co-existed with each other as fields concerned with distinct and separate subject matter. He also identified a third kind a relationship, one in which "interaction between religion and science, far from being detrimental, can work to the advantage of both" (p. 4). Steiner sought this mutual interaction between spiritual and scientific principles all his life. He maintained that "at the foundation of what manifests as spirit in man and also in nature lies something which is neither spirit nor nature but a perfect union of the two" (Steiner, 1925/1980, p. 314). He referred to the things that one perceives with one's senses as the "seen" and those one perceives with one's thoughts as the "unseen".

I have discussed above how the seen world, the world of the senses and practical matters, was important to Steiner throughout his life. He was also convinced that an unseen world was as real as a physical world. In studying geometry on his own when he was eight, Steiner (1925/1980) became aware of an inner world of thinking, feeling, and willing that was unique to him, and that "one can work out forms which are seen purely inwardly, independent of the outer senses" (p. 28). These forms are not "seen" in the world of the senses, but do exist. As a boy, he referred to spiritual things as things which were real but unseen.

By the time he was twenty, Steiner (1925/1980) had adopted a worldview that there was a physical world that he could know through his senses, a spiritual world he could know inwardly through his thinking and everyone else had access to through thinking, and a soul world in which he made meaning of his experiences in the physical and spiritual worlds through his own thinking, feeling, and willing (p.28). His description in *Theosophy*, the text I will interpret in Chapter Two, is clearer and I ask the reader to pause in judging the reality of these three worlds until we can really explore the details of his theory. In this chapter, I am just tracing the roots of that theory in his life experiences.

Neudorfl's Catholic priest, Father Franz Maraz, was a devoted Hungarian patriot and interested in practical aspects of life in the village. When he taught at the village school, he modeled an integration of religion, science, politics, and life that helped Steiner to see that knowledge of the spiritual and physical worlds could complement and further understanding of each other. Maraz impressed Steiner with his zest for life and by how he conducted the sacred ritual of the Mass "mediating between the sensible and the super-sensible world as a celebrant" (Steiner, 1925/1980, p. 34). Steiner's father, who was raised Catholic, had become a "free-thinker" as an adult and withdrew Steiner from participating in Mass when Steiner began attending secondary school in Wiener-Neustadt, Austria, two and a half miles from Neudorfl. Thus, at age eleven, Steiner's formal religious instruction ended. His spiritual experiences, however, did not.

In his autobiography, Steiner related his study of works by philosophers Kant, Fichte, and Hegel to explain to readers the philosophical territory he traveled through to make sense of these spiritual experiences. Rather than separating him from the reality of things around him as Kant propounded in *Critique of Pure Reason*, Steiner (1925/1980) felt that thinking

was the “power which takes hold of the things and processes in the world directly within itself” (p. 44). Steiner adapted Fichte’s idea of consciousness as an activity of an “I,” or ego, able to transcend sensory experience to pursue knowledge of seen and unseen worlds (p. 53). Reading Hegel furthered Steiner’s understanding that thinking was a spiritual activity because the “I” is a spiritual being, and that thinking was “an experience within which one lives, not an experience which meets one from outside” (p. 63).

Steiner had taken up this philosophical journey in the summer before beginning study at the Technische Hochschule (Vienna Institute of Technology) to become a mathematics/ science teacher. While a student there, Steiner met Karl Julius Schroer, a German Literature and Language scholar committed to German Idealism as interpreted in Goethe’s aesthetics. Schroer’s pedagogical text *Unterrichtsfregen* (Problems in Teaching) explored the idea that education was more than “the mere imparting of information… and spoke of the necessity of a comprehensive development of human nature” (Steiner, 1925/1980, p. 95), ideas that Steiner was later to include in his own program of education in the Waldorf School.

Steiner also struck up a friendship with an herb-gatherer traveling on the train from home to Vienna. In the lecture “Self-Education”, Steiner mentioned that this fellow introduced Steiner to a master teacher of esotericism, a scientific, experiential, historical exploration of the unknown as open to spiritual explanations as it is to empirical ones. This teacher acquainted Steiner with “a book that could stimulate one to follow special spiritual paths and steps” (Steiner, 1913/1985, p. 25). Steiner did not give the master’s name or connect him to a particular esoteric tradition to the rather small group attending the lecture.

Why would Steiner not mention this teacher in his autobiography? It would not have been unusual for an esoteric teacher to ask for a vow of secrecy from a student in the late

nineteenth century. Secrecy was a hallmark of European esotericism because of how its adherents were often part of the counter-culture of the times in which they lived, persecuted by whatever religious or political system was in power at the time. Copernicus was dismissed because of his study of Hermes Trismegistus, an ancient Egyptian, pagan magician. Astro-physicists Bruno, Galileo, Newton, and Kepler kept their studies of alchemy and astrology secret to be respected as scientists in their time (Wertheim, 1995).

Also, esotericism was often equated with superstition in Steiner's time. Steiner's intention of giving credibility and justification to his work would have been undermined if esotericism was central in his autobiography. Esotericism is now an established field of study in some universities connecting religious studies, theology, and philosophy (Asprem, 2014). It compares Pythagorean thought, Hermetic tradition, the Jewish and Christian versions of the Kabbala, Mysticism, Eastern religions, alchemy, astrology, and magic.

Professor Antoine Faivre (1994) identified four characteristics which are necessary to be present to qualify a system of thought as esoteric:

1. a study of correspondences between different categories of reality (e.g., visible and invisible worlds);
2. an emphasis on the living nature of these realities;
3. identification and interpretations of the symbols needed to understand those realities;
4. an explanation of how one reality metamorphosizes to the other.

Relationships in an esoteric system of thought are thus dynamic, creative, and allow for multiple interpretations. These qualities also distinguish esoteric systems of thought from sociological, theological, scientific, or anthropological systems of thought: relationships are

not restricted (specialized) to those between human beings, between human beings and spiritual beings, between human beings and physical objects, or between human beings and cultures. Esoteric thought studies all of these relationships and is thus interdisciplinary.

Faivre (2010) suggested that modern esoteric systems should be considered not as counter-stories to modern, scientific understandings of experience but as responses to a scientific way of thought increasingly positivistic and limited to a study of visible, or empirical, reality. It is a rejection of *only* linear, consistent, and universal ways of understanding truth, beauty, or goodness. Correlation, paradox as in irony, and particular differences can act as important qualifiers for evolving concepts of truth, beauty, and goodness as archetypes, equal to and not as less than or rare exceptions to other qualifiers.

From the way Faivre explained it, I see esoteric thought as a way of holistic understanding, including what is *and* what is not. Idealistic? Yes. Practical? Also, yes. An advantage of this way of thinking is that what we believe as either/or reality can become both/and realities. Unity can arise out of diversity without differences being erased or leveled out. The “unity” is not homogenized, totalitarian, or an oppressive assimilation by a dominant entity. Unity is more like the aesthetic concepts of balance, composition, and contrast rather than like the mathematical concepts of equaling one by multiplying reciprocals, or equaling zero by adding an inverse. The whole is more than the sum of its parts and not whole if one of the parts is missing. The post-feminist notion of intersectionality fits well here as an example. While there may be some things only women can share, there may be other things only those of the same race, religion, etc. can share and thus when different categories intersect in an individual human being, the resulting permutations are multiple and relative rather than singular and causal. The wholeness of an

individual or a group is complex and complicated, textured by these interacting, diverse permutations.

Can esotericism help education to move forward inclusive of scientific, aesthetic, and spiritual theories and practices, without getting caught in scientism, technological craft, and religious dogmas? Important for us here is that "soul" is important in esoteric discourse and has different qualities from mind or self and that Steiner's work sprung from esoteric, philosophic, and scientific ways of knowing perhaps more than from religious ways of knowing.

Esoteric study was not only influential for Steiner's development of philosophical and religious thought, but also for his relation to science, an increasingly positivistic endeavor in his day. Steiner grew dissatisfied with how science was taught at the Vienna Institute of Technology. He felt that applying the same principles to organic and inorganic phenomenon was incorrect and found a more meaningful distinction between organic and inorganic principles in his esoteric studies. When Schroer recommended Steiner to publisher Joseph Kurschner as someone to edit Goethe's scientific works for publication, Steiner found Goethe's scientific processes and principles also helpful in making this distinction.

Steiner (1925/1980) found that Goethe grasped the idea of mobile concepts in his theory of metamorphosis, and took the view that "what is at work in organic nature must be thought of as being akin to the spirit" (p. 104). Connecting the living, growing, reproducing aspects of organic matter to spirit was easy for Steiner and more logical given his experience, esoteric studies, and nascent understandings of the spiritual world.

Steiner realized that "the Goethean way of observing nature: tracing the development from the inorganic to the organic, becomes a science of nature that leads over into a science

of spirit" in a way that Darwinism and Newtonian physics, based in a materialism that denied spirit, could not. Because the growth and development of living things is influenced by many conditions, one needs to be able to "see" the unseen, remember what has passed, imagine what was before or what may happen, out of observation of what is present in the moment in one's soul.

In 1891, Steiner submitted a thesis about truth, knowledge, and consciousness to Professor Heinrich von Stein, a philosopher known for his work on Plato at the University of Rostock, for a PhD degree. In his thesis, Steiner connected Fichte's concept of a transcendent ego to thinking and what he called spiritual truth. Steiner later developed these ideas in a text currently published as *Intuitive Thinking as a Spiritual Path: A Philosophy of Freedom.* Steiner completed his thesis without advisement and without formal education in philosophy or academic writing in a university setting. Professor Stein accepted the thesis because the content was satisfactory, but noted that it was "not written in the style one usually expects" (Steiner, 1925/1980, p. 177).

Steiner's work before 1898 is esoteric and philosophical, not religious. Contemporary scientist Margaret Wertheim (1995) asserted in her book *Pythagoras' Trousers:*

> personal experience of occult arts allowed both Kepler and Newton to accept something their supposedly more rational peers could not. Through this "magical" notion, the science of physics was advanced. (p. 118)

Steiner's esoteric studies allowed him to accept things theologians and philosophers of his time could not. In Chapter Two, we will see how his esoteric, scientific, and philosophic

studies shaped a theory of soul that integrated spiritual and physical worlds so that priests, poets, scientists, and educators can keep talking with each other about how the human soul responds to difference.

CHAPTER 2: STEINER'S THEORY OF SOUL

In Chapter One, I explored Steiner's autobiography for personal, social, and historical contexts for his theories of soul and practices of education. I also identified his attitude toward difference and the unknown. In this chapter, I will examine how he described the nature of and the relationship between body, soul, and spirit in human beings so readers gain familiarity with Steiner's terminology and philosophical framework. I will then explore aspects of Steiner's theory of soul and end with a discussion of what it may offer curricular theorists as a way to connect curriculum and processes of deliberation, openness to the unknown, and conscious, creative, and compassionate responses to difference.

Texts

The primary text for this chapter is *Theosophy: An Introduction to the Non-physical Knowledge of the World and the Destination of Man (Theosophy* henceforth). Steiner wrote *Theosophy* in 1904 to explain his theory of soul and to connect it with the nature of being human and human development. The edition of *Theosophy* that I use for this thesis is a 1988 reprint of the third edition published in German in 1922, translated by Henry B. Monges in 1961 and revised in 1971 by Gilbert Church.

Theosophist Emily Sellon and Philosophy Professor Renee Weber (1992) trace the European esoteric stream known as Theosophy back in time to Pythagoras, Plato, Neoplatonism, Kabbalism, and Islamic Sufism. Esoteric scholar Andre Faivre (1994) applied the term to those who study the work of Swiss physician, astrologer, and alchemist Paracelsus (1493- 1541) and Christian mystic Jacob Boehme (1575- 1624). In 1875, Helena

P. Blavatsky and Henry Olcott founded the Theosophical Society in New York City to broaden spiritual and scientific understanding across religious, scientific, and cultural boundaries. This organization sought to incorporate Hindu and Buddhist meditative practices and beliefs in reincarnation into Judeo-Christian interpretations of material and spiritual worlds, natural and spiritual beings, and moral development of human beings using scientific methods.

Steiner served as the General Secretary of the German Branch of the Theosophical Society from 1902-1912 headquartered in Berlin. His membership in the Society was revoked in 1913 for his refusal to acknowledge a young Indian guru as a reincarnation of Jesus Christ. Steiner's followers established the Anthroposophical Society in 1914 to support his work which addressed what Faivre (2010) identified as the three central concerns of Christian Theosophy: speculation on the relationship of God, Nature, and human beings; the ability of human beings to directly experience a spiritual world; and interpreting the Bible as myth rather than historical or literal truth.

At the end of this chapter, I use the text *The Education of the Child in the Light of Anthroposophy,* Steiner's only text on education, to link Steiner's general theory of soul to the aims and purposes of education as he saw them. Other books by Steiner on education are collections of transcribed lectures or discussions. I will refer to many of those collections in Chapter Three when curriculum is the central theme.

The Structure of a Human Being: Body, Soul, and Spirit

We saw in Chapter One that Steiner was interested in seen and unseen realities even as a child. As an adult, he referred to *seen* realities as physical, material, sensible, or natural realities; *unseen* realities as supersensible or spiritual realities; and identified a third set of realities, *sensed* realities which he called soul realities. Put simply, Steiner's soul realities

are the subjective thoughts, feelings, and desires of sentient beings. One can objectify one's thoughts, feelings, and desires, but one *experiences* them subjectively. Soul realities are unseen, but are sensed physically and so are not supersensible or spiritual. Since one's thoughts, feelings, and desires influence how one responds to difference, exploring how Steiner connects and differentiates soul from body and from spirit in human beings may be helpful when designing a curriculum charged with helping students and teachers learn conscious, creative, and compassionate ways to respond to difference.

To illustrate body, soul, and spirit realities and the relations between them, Steiner (1904/1988) asked readers to imagine that he has returned to a field of flowers he had visited a previous year (p. 3). He sees flowers like those he saw the year before in the field. They are not the same flowers, but they have grown from the seeds of last year's flowers. Steiner then made his point about how three realities correspond to human bodies, souls, and spirits:

> Through his body [a human being] is able to place himself for the time being in connection with things; through his soul he retains in himself the impressions they make on him; through his spirit there reveals itself to him what the things retain for themselves. (p. 4)

Steiner pointed out here that a human being can know natural things (the flowers in the meadow) when in their presence through one's senses because one has a physical body. These same things have a phenomenal existence, that which a human being feels and remembers by experiencing the thing in one's soul through one's feelings, desires, and thinking (the joy one feels when seeing new flowers and remembering the daisies one saw last year). The noumenal existence of a thing, the thing it retains for itself or the thing-in-itself, is not its physical manifestation but its spirit. This spirit is also independent of human presence, consciousness, naming, or understanding.

Steiner's interpretation of the "thing-in-itself" is similar to Plato's idea of "form" but instead of objects *reflecting* a form or concept that exists elsewhere, the thing-in-itself *lives in and is expressed* by the object as Aristotle professed. Spirit is understood in the Hegelian sense; it is not a material thing but is an immaterial essence that is the "thing-in-itself," that which it has in common with things like it and which distinguishes it from things not it. In human beings, spirit is expressed in one's "I", or what Steiner referred to as one's ego. Steiner use of word "ego" is better understood by today's readers as that which philosopher Martin Buber referred to as one's "I Am", rather than Freud's use of the word as a function of one's consciousness. For Steiner, one's ego is the spiritual being who orders one's soul's thinking, feeling, and willing in one's body. It is similar to other spiritual beings and different from things which are not spiritual. I will use the word "ego" in this sense throughout this paper.

Kant claimed that the "thing in itself" was unknowable; Steiner claimed that human beings can, however, know, understand, and make meaning of the noumenal nature of things through thinking, an activity of spirit operable in a human being. One's ego uses all three aspects of one's nature, that is, body, soul, and spirit, to sense, understand, know, and interact with visible and invisible worlds around and within one. By claiming the thing-in-itself knowable, Steiner is part of a long tradition of philosophers and theologians who extended what a human being can know beyond the world of the senses and validated roles for imagination, inspiration, and intuition in making sense of the world.

This extension is important when confronted with something different from what we have encountered before, or different from what we expect. We can "know" this different thing if we pause, and then interact with it in our thinking, feeling, and willing. We can

speculate about this unfamiliar thing from our observation of it, experiment and "play" with it to see what qualities it has, talk with others about it, ask what they know about it and what they see from their point of view. We can be open to what happens, to surprise, and to wonder. We can compare it with things we already know. We can be other than afraid or ignorant of it. The seen, the unseen, and the sensed aspects of the unknown thing are all knowable and can be understood by us in time through our own effort (Steiner, 1904/1988, p. 58).

Furthermore, Steiner (1904/1988) pointed out that the basis of learning is that when a human being encounters something with which it is familiar, one can "take up an attitude towards it quite different from … facing it for the first time" (p. 58). In other words, the interaction our thinking, feeling, and willing that develops as we engage with the unfamiliar can be applied to the familiar to discover new things about what we already know about the other. With thinking, feeling, and willing engaged, knowing something is never finished. As long as one keeps being open to difference, one can encounter the unfamiliar and the familiar and both broaden and deepen one's knowledge empirically, affectively, and cognitively.

Sensing as Meaning-Making

Because a human being has a body, soul, and spirit, one can make meanings out of one's experiences subjectively *and* objectively. Let's go back to the field of flowers. If I am with a friend, we both see the same field of flowers. I may feel pleasure in seeing the colors in the field, think it is the inspiration for a great painting, and be grateful to the farmer for leaving the field fallow. My friend may feel displeasure that there are flowers in the field instead of corn, think the field is being wasted by not being cultivated for food, and deprecate the farmer for not growing an edible crop on it. Why does food come to mind for my friend,

a painting for me, and an image for the relation between body, soul, and spirit in human beings for Steiner?

It is encountering and exploring just these kinds of differences that are at the heart of educational experience. The field is not a thing of beauty, a source of food, or an image for one's ontology, but all these things and more. The field is the field; it is a place where things grow. The meaning of it is personal to each of us, but can be made more objective and less subjective by becoming multiple once we talk, see it in other contexts, become aware of other possibilities, require different things from it, and adopt other perspectives.

Many influences other than feelings affect the meanings we each make: customs, memory, imagination, life experience, values, and knowledge are several other factors. The greater the range of factors the soul can hold for an ego to consider while making meaning of an experience, the richer and more deliberate that meaning will be. Because these factors are outside of us, and are considered in our feeling, thinking, and willing (one's soul), our knowledge and our identities are not limited to the meanings we have made in the past. Are they limited by the meaning we make of them in the present? Not if the soul is open to receiving new information through sensing and thinking. One's knowledge and identity, and one's ability to make sense of one's experience, is always in flux. It is the ego's responsibility to order one's knowledge, identity, and meaning-making. One's soul enlarges (or limits) the space for deliberation and allows things other than one's own experience and what is consciously known to enter into that deliberation.

Whenever we create curriculum, we are developing and structuring it to coincide with assumptions, both explicit and implicit, that we hold about human consciousness. A closer look at how Steiner characterized the structure of a human soul may help curriculum theorists

design curricula by which children and educators can be open to the unknown, deliberate seen and unseen realities, and respond to difference in caring, conscious, and creative ways.

Structure of Soul: Sentient, Intellectual, and Consciousness Soul Members

Steiner (1904/1988) pictured the soul as a growing, living plant but I think imagining the soul as a bridge will be helpful for us to examine its structure. The living, growing aspects of this structure will come into play when we look at the dynamics of the soul below. If we imagine the soul as an entity like a bridge, we see ramps on two sides of an abyss. One ramp is on the side of the abyss representing the physical world and is what Steiner (1904/1988) called the sentient member of the soul. The ramp on the other bank (the side representing the spiritual world) is what he called the consciousness member. What he called the intellectual member of the soul is the connecting span over the abyss. A bridge is not just the ramps or just the span; it is all three. Likewise, a soul is not one member but all three.

The Sentient Soul Member

As its name indicates, the sentient soul member is active in the senses. It allows one's ego to travel into the physical world and interact with that world through the senses. When something feels smooth to the touch, sounds loud, looks colorful, and tastes or smells delicious, something other than ourselves attracts our perception to itself and our soul draws our ego's attention to that object. It is not one's eye, ear, arm, nose, or tongue that becomes aware of the object; it is our ego that becomes aware of it. However, an ego would not perceive the object without one's soul being attracted or repulsed by the object through our physical sense organs.

If a person does not make meaning of his sensations, just experiences them, he lives according to the natural drives and biological needs of his physical body as animals do (Steiner, 1904/1988, p. 21). Human beings are able to have different sensations than

animals, plants, and stones because of their ability to be conscious of more than perceiving the object itself. Human beings can be conscious of the feeling within them that arises in the experience. We saw above that this feeling influences the meaning (the sense) we make of the experience.

Habits form when one responds in the same way repeatedly to familiar stimuli. However, as Steiner pointed out, a human being can respond to an outside stimulus in a different way from habit, out of a new consciousness. Whether one's response is out of habit or out of a new consciousness, it is willed from one's inner life of thinking, feeling, and willing. We are here rejecting the reflex arc interpretation of response being a matter of nerve-muscle interaction only: one can use consciousness to interrupt and choose one's response. A functioning sentient member of soul allows one's ego to gather information about the physical world and make sense of that information in a way meaningful to one.

Reflective thinking assists the ego to build an inner life of meaning through memory and imagination. The more a human being builds an inner life retaining impressions and imagining different possibilities, the more one's ego is able to connect living thinking, passionate feeling, and focused willing to sensory experiences in novel, purposeful ways and to build the span of the intellectual soul member.

The Intellectual Soul Member

Through living-thinking, passionate feeling, and focused willing, one's ego can transcend its immediate physical conditions and transform those conditions by manipulating material things to fulfill its desires for safety, control, comfort, and pleasure. Once blooming flowers attract the attention of a sentient soul and one's ego strives to understand how flowers bloom, one can calculate what can be done to enhance or deter the blooming of the flowers. This understanding and calculation occur in the imagination of the intellectual soul.

It is here that human beings play with possibilities; one is, so to speak, free of natural and spiritual compunctions.

Just as the sentient soul builds memory and imagination from its thinking, feeling, and willing through the senses of a physical body, the intellectual member of a soul builds a certain separation between one's self, others, and objects in either spiritual or physical worlds. This separation allows one to observe the "in itself" of the other without being overwhelmed by it.

A problem arises because the intellectual soul is "entangled in the sensations, impulses, and passions" of a human being's personal, inner life (Steiner, 1904/1988, p. 25). A human being seeks to "know oneself" and may live "only and entirely according to one's own inclinations, likes and dislikes" (Steiner, 1904/1988, p.26). One seeks only physical or spiritual activity that enhances one's own life. To overcome the alienation brought on by this separation inherent in the intellectual soul member, a human being must consciously direct one's attention to interest in others, one's thinking to eternal truths, one's will to act justly in terms of others, and one's feelings to love and care for others: what we call moral development.

For centuries, religions used concepts of spiritual beings, ritual, mystery, and rule to guide the moral development of groups and individuals in those groups. For many, the dogmas and doctrines of a certain religion or general spiritual path still provide this guidance. Steiner avowed that the evolution of humanity requires that individuals work out these codes and understandings themselves in particular contexts, not to further one's own power of influence but to increase one's capacity for love and freedom. Steiner's ethical individual is a human being who responds to any situation freely, lovingly, and creatively not because one

is following a rule or one's instinct but because one recognizes the truth, beauty, and goodness of one's response in the particular situation. To act morally, the ethical individual must be striving to incarnate spiritual ideals (or archetypes) that are true, beautiful, good, and appropriate for the human beings time and place. From these moral efforts, the ego travels into the third member of the soul, the consciousness soul.

The Consciousness Soul

Steiner (1904/1988) described the consciousness soul this way:

> Everyone knows how a man at first counts as true what he prefers in his feelings and desires. Only that truth is permanent, however, that has freed itself from all flavor of such sympathy and antipathy of feeling. That part of the soul in which this truth lives will be called the consciousness soul. (p. 25)

It is only when the consciousness of an individual surpasses his own and his social group's likes and dislikes can the eternal, universal truths about an object, process, or relation be understood and respected in specific contexts. Social constructions of truth, beauty, and goodness live in the sentient or intellectual soul members because of their utility and predictability, not in the spiritual world of the things-in-themselves. In the spiritual world, things are universally, absolutely, and eternally true, beautiful, and good. Human beings sense them as archetypes. Granted, human beings can and have erred in formulations of absolute truth, beauty, and goodness. Steiner (1904/1988) asserted these errors occur in human thought, in the perception of the thing in-itself, or the conception of the relation, not in the thing-in-itself (p. 166-7). Eventually, something will disrupt the perception or conception and a new articulation of the truth will better state the truth of the thing-in-itself.

The ability to perceive the things-in-themselves accurately and ethically outside of the object's usefulness or appearance lies in the strength of the ego to form conclusions only after an understanding of the spirit of the other has been achieved (Steiner, 1904/1988). To

know this truth, individuals cannot stay locked in their personal world of experience. They must seek other points of view and other experiences to know truth, beauty, or goodness. This commitment to being open to other perspectives from one's own is necessary for one's ego to understand the spirit of a thing as archetype.

Neither the archetypes nor the manifestations of truth, beauty, and goodness are singular, non-existent, or dependent on human understanding; they are multiple, evolving, and intuited by human understanding. Openness to a relationship between the archetype, the physical conditions in which it is found, and the individual manifestation of it is nourished by the powers of thinking, feeling, and willing imagination alive and alert in one's consciousness member of soul.

Herein is the beauty of Steiner's framework for me: archetypes are not the static, limited, or particular ideals that led Modernity into totalitarianism, dominance, polarity, and exclusion. Nor are they the equivocal, random, uncertain particularities which may lead Post-Modernity into anarchism, alienation, and meaninglessness. New paths open up connecting here-to-for unconnected aspects of physical and spiritual reality, the known becomes unknown and the unknown becomes knowable, and neither certainty nor doubt are paralyzing. How a human being walks this path is dependent on the dynamics of the soul in which her human ego is able to function. To understand this dynamic, we will explore how Steiner saw the soul as the mediator between thought, felt, and desired realities.

Soul Dynamics

Functionally, the soul is the mediator (bridge) between a human being's body (living substance) and a human being's spirit. Steiner (1904/1988) asserted that more than conscious observation or conscious feeling, conscious sensation seeks to attribute meaning to experience. Steiner placed the soul between physical and spiritual worlds because it interacts

with both. Here again, Steiner is similar to and different from Plato. Plato used the term "soul" for that part of the human being that curbs appetite (want) and spirit (passion) by implementing reason (rationality). For Steiner, thinking (reason/ rationality), willing (appetite/want), and feeling (spirit/passion) all exist in a soul and are clarified and ordered by an ego seeking sensation, experience, understanding, context, and meaning. The ego uses much more than reason to mediate appetite and spirit: emotion, memory, imagination, intuition, and logic each have a role.

Steiner used the words "sympathy" and "antipathy" to characterize the forces of attraction and aversion which operate in the soul. His definitions:

> The force with which one soul formation attracts others, seeks to fuse with them and to make its affinity with them effective, must be designated as *sympathy*. *Antipathy* is the force with which soul formations repel, exclude each other in the soul world. It is the force with which they assert their separate identities. (1904/1988, p. 80)

Steiner thus used these terms to mean more than like and dislike; they apply to the way in which one's soul, one's feeling, thinking, *and* willing, is engaged by something other. As feeling, it is immediate, subjective, and influences the response of the person to the experience even if the person does not think or will the feeling consciously.

We are not at the point where something other is judged a threat, a support, or something else. We are only at the point of perceiving something. This perception is an important moment for on it depends the direction the attention of one's ego will take: toward or away from the thing. Too much antipathy in the feeling life of one's soul will result in turning one's attention away from the thing whether it is an object in physical or spiritual worlds or another's point of view. This turning away will deprive one of information with which one can make sense of the object, archetype, or point of view. This lack leads one to being unable to satisfy one's desires and an insatiable greed to achieve satisfaction or to a

general feeling of apathy and despair regarding one's ability to satisfy one's desire. Too much sympathy leads to one losing one's own point of view and meaning-making ability, thus taking up that of the other. This enmeshment may lead to an inability to discern truth from falsehood, beauty from the sublime, and goodness from bias.

In Chapter 3 of *Theosophy,* Steiner discussed what it takes for an individual to transform antipathy and sympathy to love and freedom through curiosity, exploration, cooperation, and criticism of the physical world, others, one's culture, one's spiritual beliefs, and one's actions as a moral being necessary to improve one's understanding of truth, beauty, and goodness. He outlines the path in Chapter Four. Too little sympathy *or* antipathy results in too little interest to engage in these activities, or apathy. Engaging in curiosity, exploration, cooperation, and criticism increases one's capacity for empathy and conscious awareness of truth, beauty, and goodness.

Today, we are used to applying empathy to social relationships, and to being open to understanding the subjective world of another human being. Contemporary psychologists Kurt Albrecht (2006) and Daniel Goleman (2006) discussed empathy as a measure of social intelligence. For Steiner, empathy is a soul gesture that must also be extended to physical and spiritual realities; one's ego must be involved in a way that uses the soul activities of thinking, feeling, and willing to express and maintain interest, be open to the unknown, deliberate about any conclusions it forms, and seek understanding of the in-itself of the other whether that other be another human being, the climate, or an idea someone proposes as a solution we do not agree with to a problem we do not see.

One's ego struggles with sympathy and antipathy in each soul member as an initial reaction to the worlds with which it interacts, and this struggle accounts for the continual

movement the ego within the soul. In the sentient soul member, the ego struggles with the conditions of the physical world: is it too hot, too cold, or just right? Are these plants safe to eat? The intellectual member struggles with how to create desired conditions: what kind of a shelter can I build and how can I warm or cool it? Can I plant seeds for food rather than migrating to places where these foods grew by chance? The consciousness member struggles with the justice, balance, and consequences of how I satisfy my desires: Should I trade some food I have for the wood my neighbor has in abundance, or can I hoard my food and take his wood because I am stronger?

One's ego must also struggle with habits one has formed to respond quickly and efficiently to familiar situations. This struggle is important when encountering difference. If one has experienced difference as harmful through trauma, one may have formed habits of flight, fight, and freeze. If experienced in safe, calm, protected environments, a human being learns that difference can be interesting, supportive, adaptive and can develop habits to respond with blind, naive trust. Not all things that are different harm us; nor do all things different help us. To distinguish those that harm and those that help, the ego must struggle to put aside these habits and pause to accurately observe the particular situation it is in.

Steiner (1904/1988) pointed out that by refraining from immediate judgment, the ego uses the soul's capacities of thinking, feeling, and willing to transform the soul's forces of aversion and desire into knowledge. One's senses, feelings, and ways of thinking must be awake, receptive, and engaged to make a judgment whose meaning is accurate. If one can learn to suspend judgment of difference until all three soul members have taken in the necessary information, processed it according to one's understanding of as many points of view as possible, and checked it with archetypes for truth, beauty, and goodness, one's

response will be deliberate, conscious, and creative. This process is what one must take to cultivate any kind of knowledge.

Implications for Educational Curriculum

In *The Education of the Child,* Steiner (1909/1975) claimed that the culture in which a child lives nourishes the desires and impulses of the child's soul through stories, pictorial images, imaginations, and sensory experiences that engage the child's feeling life while her capacities to reason and to judge for herself are maturing. As an adult, a human being needs to be able to consider cultural and social customs in light of her own experiences. Similar to twentieth century educator Paulo Freire's (2001) avowal that *conscientizacao*, "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions" (p. 35) belongs to an individual's consciousness of his own reflection and action, Steiner emphasized how knowledge of truth, beauty and goodness belongs to an individual's consciousness through his own thinking, feeling, and willing.

Steiner (1909/1975) noted in *The Education of the Child* how the foundations for certain soul activities are laid in three periods of childhood: the time between birth and the loss of one's baby teeth about age 6, age 6 until puberty, and from puberty to age twenty-one. In the first period, the proper development of organs and physical processes lays a solid foundation for strong and healthy *willing*. In the second period, the proper development of imagination lays a solid foundation for warm and moral *feeling*. In the third period, the proper development of judgment lays the foundation for intelligent and true *thinking*. Because I am most concerned with elementary school curriculum in this thesis, I will limit this discussion of the soul's development and curriculum to the second period, that of imagination and moral feeling.

According to Steiner (1909/1975), the task of education from the seventh to the fourteenth year is to guide

> the moulding and developing of the inclinations and habits, of the conscience, the character, the memory and temperament… through pictures and examples—i.e. by carefully guiding the imagination of the child. (p. 30)

Steiner is using "imagination" here in the sense of "living pictures that are comprehended inwardly" (p. 32). He exhorted the teachers to tell stories of people accomplishing great deeds and those suffering the consequences of bad habits to instill living pictures for moral behavior in children. Building up memory by story, picture, or image is vital for children at this age.

In addition to being true, stories and symbols should be given to the child as seeds from which to make multiple meanings of his experience over time. Steiner (1909/1975) asserted that the soul forces of feeling and willing need attention and nourishment during this time of life in order for the soul force of thinking to develop in a healthy way. He did not mean that teachers must thwart logical thinking but encouraged the use of picture-making thinking supplemented by aesthetic and practical activity. Steiner cautioned that giving children the dry, finished concepts arrived at by intellectual thought dries up their imagination and enthusiasm for learning and is unnecessary, and perhaps harmful, in this age period. Children need to work things out according to their own observation, reflection, conversation, and creation, not given the end result as a fact to be memorized.

We do not need to take Steiner's word for any of this. We can see for ourselves whether children are enlivened and invigorated by curricula that deposit concept after concept in the brain files of students and/or perfects skill after skill in their bodies. Cognitive and technical abilities are not enough to secure healthy bodies, souls, or spirits. Aesthetic,

somatic, emotional, and moral abilities need to also be nourished so that they mature in the soul of the child and his ego has multiple ways of understanding the complex world around and within him. More on the specifics of this approach in the next chapter.

Conclusion

Imagination, feeling, and sensitivity are necessary components to respond to difference in caring, creative, and conscious ways open to and not afraid of the unknown. Rudolf Steiner placed these components of experience in the human soul. To summarize, Steiner's theory of soul is that soul is an inner, subjective world of impulses, instincts, feelings, thoughts, passions, wishes, desires, and longings that is attracted to and repelled by physical and spiritual worlds because of its connections to body and spirit in a human being. Furthermore, a soul is constantly receiving and seeking information from the world of the senses and the world of spirit, processing this information in thought, emotion, and desire, and doing something that expresses the meaning it has made of the experience. Through habit, memory, and imagination, a human ego makes sense of physical and spiritual experiences and thus builds up its own capacities to think, feel, and act in response to these experiences according to the meaning it gives them.

Clearly, Steiner distinguished one's soul from one's self, unlike curriculum theorist Dwayne Huebner when Huebner (1999) said "soul refers to who we are, and necessarily, to what we make of ourselves" (p. 405). In Steiner's lexicology, who we are and who we are becoming, or one's self, is one's ego, and one's soul is *how* we become that self, the cauldron of one's thinking, feeling, and willing activities.

The way Steiner described the three-fold nature of the soul gives it depth and breadth. Gathering sensory information from multiple senses broadens the powers of the sentient soul member to be able to engage with the world and not just blindly follow instinct, social

convention, or religious dogma. Building up an open, flexible inner life from memory, reason, and imagination strengthens the power of the intellectual soul member to transcend and/or transform experience in and of the world and imagine responses that are purposeful rather than instinctual or impulsive. Being open to perceiving the "thing-in-itself" of others extends the powers of the consciousness soul member to be able to creatively understand a phenomenon from multiple perspectives and in light of universal, evolving truths.

Knowledge is the fruit of the acquisition and construction of meaning-making about physical or spiritual realities. I respectfully assert, as Steiner did, that knowledge is the result of a process of observation, reflection, conversation, and composition one's ego carries out in one's soul. This process is physiological and conceptual; it includes feeling and willing, and other kinds of thinking than reason such as imagination, inspiration, and intuition.

Since educational curriculum has a responsibility to protect, calm, awake, and nourish all students' abilities to clarify and order their own feeling, thinking, and willing in ways such that they find balance between themselves and others to meet needs without causing harm to either, understanding the structure of the human soul can help to deepen and broaden our understanding of how children of different ages have different thinking, feeling, and willing capacities as they mature. Steiner's suggestions for how it can fulfill this responsibility follow in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER 3: THE CURRICULUM OF THE FIRST WALDORF SCHOOL

In 1919, a group of anthroposophists in Stuttgart, Germany founded an elementary school for the children of the workers at the Waldorf-Astoria cigarette factory and for the children of people connected to anthroposophy. The school became known as The Free Waldorf School (FWS) because of this connection and because it was independent of state funding and religious affiliation. The FWS was one of the few schools of the time in which boys and girls from different religions and socioeconomic classes were taught in the same classrooms in Germany.

In this chapter, I will examine the curriculum Steiner proposed to examine how it aimed to enhance the development of soul, and to consider if these enhancements might help children learn ways to be open to the unknown, and deliberate, protect, and respond to difference in caring, creative, and conscious ways. I will also discuss the issues, problems, and adaptations to the ideal curriculum during the first five years of the FWS in terms that are relevant to curriculum theorists today.

Texts

During the two weeks before the school first opened, Steiner met three times a day with the people recruited to teach at FWS. The seven male and five female teachers came from all walks of life, various educational backgrounds, and different socio-economic classes. Steiner lectured about human development from an anthroposophical perspective. These lectures were published with the name *Study of Man.* I am using the second impression of the second edition, published in 1975 when a translation done by Daphne

Harwood and Helen Fox was revised by A.C. Harwood. After a brief break, Steiner lectured on practical pedagogical considerations with regard to how teachers were to engage content, their students, and each other. This lecture series was published as *Practical Advice to Teachers.* I use the second English edition published in 1976.

In the afternoon, Steiner finished up thoughts from the morning lectures and conducted a question and answer session with the teachers. Published as *Discussions with Teachers*, this text refers to presentations made by selected participants about education, and homework assignments he gave to the potential teachers. It is unfortunate that only Steiner's answers have been translated in current editions. One can make sense of Steiner's answers and suggestions, but those other contributions would enrich the text with voices other than just Steiner's. I use the first English edition, reprinted in 1983, and translated by Helen Fox.

On the final day, Steiner gave three lectures which focused on the content covered by the ideal curriculum, indicating when certain disciplines were to be introduced from Grade One through Grade Eight. These lectures appear in *Practical Advice to Teachers* in editions printed after the one I am using in this thesis. I accessed them online through the Rudolf Steiner Library. In Steiner's time, curriculum referred to the syllabus and timetable for subject material. Today, curriculum applies to everything that happens in a classroom.

Dramatic growth in the first five years of the Waldorf School meant that new faculty did not always have the anthroposophical background the most of the founding faculty had. A weekly meeting of all faculty to study anthroposophical works and its educational implications became the tradition in Waldorf Schools. This custom persists in many Waldorf schools today. In addition to material from the three foundational texts, I have used two texts to investigate this work at the school: *Faculty Meetings with Rudolf Steiner* (1998) and

Rudolf Steiner in the Waldorf School: Lectures and Addresses to Children, Parents, and Teachers (1996). The latter text speaks of efforts Steiner made to work with parents and students.

Steiner also met with the teachers for preparation work at the beginning of each school year. We can expect that difficulties encountered as the curriculum was enacted each year might be reflected in these lectures. The lectures pertaining to the elementary school curriculum that I used for this interpretation are *Balance in Teaching* (1947/1990), the course Steiner gave in 1920 before the school began its second year, and *The Essentials of Education* (1926/1997) given in 1924, the fifth year of the school and the last time Steiner was able to actively prepare teachers. I have also reviewed the two week course he gave in Dornach, Switzerland in 1921 to educators from all over Europe who wished to understand the tenets of Waldorf Education. It is published as *Soul Economy and Waldorf Education* (1986).

In later years, two of the founding teachers, Caroline von Heydebrand and Karl Stockmeyer, published Waldorf School curriculums based on their experiences as teachers at the first school. They document how the ideal curriculum was actually scheduled and then adapted for use in British schools. I used an account that was published in 1926 of the impression the school made on a state inspector, Herr F. Hartlieb, to explore what was being said about the school at that time by someone not directly involved in anthroposophy.

Steiner's curriculum is an example of what Pinar & Grumet (1976) called a "poor" curriculum, an adaptation of Jerzy Grotowski's theater methodology in which an actor "confronts his own habitual orientation and responses to the world" (p. 88) and experiences the story he is enacting afresh, in the moment of performance. Pinar and Grumet encouraged

such classroom curricula so a student would experience the symbols of the academic disciplines "as extensions into his own world view, a foundation for his own actions in the world" (p. 99) and not just objective measures and descriptions of abstract knowledge disconnected from life. As such, a poor curriculum is particularly suited to serve soul development by focusing on educational experience which is embodied, affective, intelligent, and conscious experience. It is both reflective and performative.

Aims of the Curriculum

Steiner felt strongly that children attended schools to learn what adults knew about living good, happy, meaningful lives and the skills necessary to live such lives themselves. Therefore, Steiner recommended that disciplinary divisions of knowledge which relied on abstract generalizations from narrow, one-sided perspectives were best taught at older ages after an aesthetic approach to knowledge and life was learned in elementary school.

Aesthetic Curriculum and Soul Development

As an adjective, the term "aesthetic" refers to perception by the senses; the perception, appreciation, or criticism of the beautiful; or a thing of pleasing appearance (http://www.oed.com 3/16/18). While sensory perception of the material world is undoubtedly important in contemporary curricula, Steiner's focus on the "beautiful" and "pleasing" invites us to consider the status of aesthetic pleasure against the ground of our current emphasis on objective reason so valued in our culture.

In Chapter One, I connected Steiner's life experience and Dewey's thoughts to show how the aesthetic, the engagement of one's senses in the pursuit of beauty and pleasure, can affect one's openness to the unknown and how one responds to difference. We often conflate "aesthetic" with "artistic". Are they the same? Steiner would answer "yes". He is emphatic in these texts that a child needs to learn how to establish an aesthetic relation to the world

before doing so scientifically and declared that it is important to wait until after puberty to develop an objective, scientific relation to the world. We saw that science was important to Steiner in Chapter One, but that he felt the mechanical, positivistic practices of the sciences in his time were inadequate to understand evolving phenomena. In this section I will explore the reasons he gave for recommending an aesthetic curriculum through artistic activity in terms of soul growth and development, openness to the unknown, and creative, compassionate, and conscious responses to difference in contemporary classrooms.

In Chapter Two, I explained Steiner's assertions that the soul was the bridge between the sense organs of the physical body and the consciousness of the spiritual ego and that the function of the soul was to transform perceptions into sensations that mean something through its activities of thinking, feeling, and willing. In these pedagogical texts, he discussed how each art works with sensory experience and spiritual archetypes in both unique and common ways.

Sensory experience, integration, and understanding. Our senses have an important role to play in education because our senses, Steiner (1932/1975) pointed out, are "what brings us into contact with the external world" (p. 44). When we think of sensory experience today, we usually think of five senses (touch, smell, taste, sight, and hearing). Steiner discussed twelve senses studied in medieval esotericism with the prospective teachers:

1. life	5. warmth	9. hearing
2. balance	6. smell	10. speech
3. movement	7. Taste	11. thought
4. touch	8. sight	12. ego

I will briefly describe the additional seven senses because expanding our understanding past the five commonly thought of today has pedagogical implications important to sensory integration, emotional intelligence, and social intelligence.

What Steiner (1932/1975) referred to as the life-sense has to do with feeling physically healthy. The senses of balance and movement have to do with standing erect and the ability our limbs have to move our bodies in space. These senses are conflated and referred to as the "vestibular" sense in occupational therapy today. The warmth sense is one which is related to a physical sensation of warm or cold, such as when one puts a hand in water and senses if it is warm or cold in relation to our inner sense of warmth.

The sense of speech is that which recognizes and communicates in language form; the sense for thought is that which perceives thoughts of other people expressed in speech, image, or gesture; and the sense of ego is that which perceives an ego of another being. These senses are particularly interesting in that the activities Steiner associated with them are not usually considered as having physical but psycho-social origins, and Steiner claimed they had spiritual origins. The advantage to looking at these things as senses is that the performance of listening, speaking, thinking, and perceiving the ego of another can be connected to both one's body and spirit through one's soul.

Through the literary and social arts, one's culture influences what one hears, speaks, thinks, and perceives, but is not determinate of these things. One can get outside one's social mores by going inside to one's soul; one can get out of one's inside judgments by going outside to social interaction. Conversation can take on an art form when it focuses on retelling a story or reenacting a scientific demonstration. This process clarifies for children the importance of that pause necessary to hold off judgment when engaging with others I

note throughout this thesis. Thinking will be alive and open to multiple meanings, perspectives, and possibilities. In these group endeavors, the senses of ego and thoughts of others would be employed and nourished, strengthening student ability to tune into what others are feeling, thinking, and willing. Both Goleman (2006) and Albrecht (2006) include the ability to attune to others in this way as a key element of social intelligence.

Steiner (1932/1975) celebrated this complexity:

> how infinitely important it is that [human beings] be so educated that one sense should be developed with the same care as another, for then the connections between the senses, between the perceptions, will be sought quite consciously and systematically (p. 123).

Steiner pointed out here that the curriculum must engage the use of all the senses, not just the five we are used to thinking about; see that all are nourished; and provide enough information for the soul/spirit to re-unite those perceptions into a full picture of the thing to be understood. The more senses teachers involve in creating this picture, the more correct and complete that picture will be in the way that we saw in Chapter One the more standpoints one considered when trying to understand something, the fuller and more meaningful one's understanding would be.

Do Steiner's assertions hold? "Sensory Integration" is a technique used extensively by physical and occupational therapists to remedy many learning, behavioral, and physical disabilities with children younger than school age (Devlin, Healy, Leader, & Hughes, 2011; Hyatt, Stephenson, & Carter, 2009; May-Benson, & Koomar, 2010). While the empirical research design of these kinds of studies has been questioned and the results determined to be inconclusive with special needs populations, occupational therapists and teachers report these methods are helpful for all children (May-Benson, & Koomar, 2010).

Understanding that is an integration of feeling, willing, and thinking. Because we must bring consciousness to the sensory information we perceive in order to make meaning, it is not just experiencing sensory information that is needed; awareness of the feeling and thinking we connect to the experience is also important. Steiner (1937/1976) encouraged educators who teach students from age seven to fourteen to "permeate with feeling the whole way we teach our lessons" (p.194). He asserted that sensory experience of one's inner world of soul occurs through an interplay of attraction-repulsion, pleasure-pain, connection-alienation in one's physical senses, one's emotions, and the images one associates with an experience from one's past memories or imaginations into the future. Steiner (1932/1975) pointed out to the teachers that it is this connection between feeling and sensing that allows a person to have confidence in what he knows (p. 78) yet remain open in his judgment to include new feelings and sensations.

In "Care of the Senses: Neglected Dimension of Education," Robert Sardello and Cheryl Sanders (1999) discussed connections between the physical senses and one's emotional life. Sardello and Sanders are psychotherapists who have written extensively about psychological and educational implications of Steiner's work. They point out how the life, balance, and movement senses, when supported by a healthy diet, an active daily routine and enough sleep, engender feelings of well-being, equanimity, confidence, and resilience in one's feeling life. Touch, smell, and taste alert us to things outside of our bodies that impact our sense of safety and pleasure when they enter into our bodies. Through the sight, warmth, and hearing senses, the flow of information from the outside world stimulates feelings of belonging, harmony, and cohesion. In the speech, thought, and ego senses we are able to connect, relate, and communicate with others are able to understand more than just our own

experience. While sensory experience alone does not cause these feelings to occur, remembering and reflecting on them leads into an overall attitude about life that does.

In artistic activity, we lift the unconscious emotional life into a conscious feeling life by expressing our own articulation of an experience. Imaginations that the child engages in through his own activity enliven his feeling life. Steiner cautioned that too strong an imaginative life may mire the child in fantasy and desire without the motivation to raise his instincts, impulses, and desires into wishes that become motivations and resolutions to act and recommended that teachers always connect lessons to practical activity to prevent the imagination of his students from becoming too fanciful. As more and more practical activity is taken over by machines (such as being driven gets us places instead of walking, or worksheets replace actual manipulation of objects), I wonder if the imaginations of children for social life today are being challenged and creative resolutions being fostered enough to instill habits of deliberation and creativity in those of the next generation.

Art allows feeling to be included in educational experience in ways which illuminate truth, beauty, and goodness without obscuring or high-jacking one's thinking and willing. Steiner (1932/1975, 1937/1976) discussed how the repetition needed to master the techniques of any art form help to strengthen an individual's will if done joyfully and in ways that refresh one's spirit instead of tiring it out as does intellectual thinking on its own.

Steiner called for the teacher to spark the students' interest through her own enthusiasm for the subject material and art form. Her imaginative life must be active and alive. She and the students must be sensitive to when enough practice is enough. This is why cultivating the will adds to one's ability to see that the right thing is done "because the circumstances demand it" (Steiner, 1932/1975, p. 69)—not as a result of personal or social

preference. The groundwork for ethical individualism begins in the ability to feel and understand what is needed in the situation according to many perspectives, not just those of individual desire or social convention.

We have seen how important imaginative thinking is to soul growth and strength. Steiner asserted that concepts, given fully formed in mathematical or scientific rule and principle, arise out of the past and deaden the feeling life. An education that emphasizes abstract concepts prematurely undermines the ability to imagine "that a thing can in reality be so transformed that it will pass away and another thing will arise" (Steiner, 1932/1975, p. 55); in other words, that one thing can be transformed into another like a stem passes way to become a blossom or a leaf.

Steiner was concerned that only materialistic, mechanical thinking was being used to understand the world of living things. While this kind of thinking does lead to an understanding of the unseen principles that govern mechanical, material things, Steiner pointed out that materialism could not understand the wise, loving, and living worlds of soul or spirit which were governed by the spiritual principles of truth, beauty, and goodness. Furthermore, Steiner was concerned that human beings would never be free of moral or natural compunction to pursue lives marked by liberty, fraternity, and equality without understanding spiritual principles.

If we think of knowledge as just another possession, something that accumulates rather than circulates, educational curriculum is reduced to stimulus-response machinations, information to be deposited and processed in student brains, or scripts of standardized norms that can be enacted and tested in efficient and predictable ways. A curriculum that focuses on the growth and health of a human soul offers more possibilities to find practical ways to

bring ideal values into everyday life for all. The integration that Steiner proposed supports my contention that proper education requires content to be connected with praxis dedicated to inspire the inner life of students and teachers to direct their interest and effort consciously and with understanding from more than one point of view.

The dangers of limiting our conscious, intellectual efforts to material conditions that can be addressed mechanically are more obvious, however, in the failure to eradicate hunger and disease, documented environmental damage, and continued political and economic oppression all over the world. While none of these problems will be solved without technological innovation, focus on technological change will continue to be insufficient to solve these and other problems. Literacy in social intelligence and its counterpart emotional intelligence is vital to address these kinds of social problems as well as the cultural issues of misogyny, terrorism, racism, and xenophobia.

In the longest training course for teachers that he offered after the first foundation courses in 1919, Steiner (1986) spoke at length about using feeling to integrate the other two soul forces of thinking and willing. He described the metamorphosis of sentient to intellectual to consciousness soul without using these terms, but by referring to how feelings of gratitude, love, and duty (in the sense of responsibility, not blind obedience) can effect cognition and action because they move one's understanding of dogma and convention into one's private domain of freedom (Steiner, 1986, pp. 286-292). We refer to this domain as one's agency in today's discourse and no longer see it as exclusively private. This discussion is much clearer and succinct than in the foundational lectures and probably benefited from his seeing the teachers at the school struggle to engage their own feelings and those of the children in positive ways.

Openness to the unknown. Throughout time, the arts have bridged the conventional and the creative by being open just as much to what *can* happen as it is to what *has* happened in shaping the medium to express what is intended. John Dewey (1934) discussed this function of art thoroughly in *Art as Experience.* The intention of art is not to build a better mousetrap, landscape, or feeling but to author and explore multiple representations and expressions of the meanings of things. An artistic approach to learning allows for more than one conclusion, reserved judgment, and an accumulation of possible outcomes from which to draw new conclusions that are open to future experience.

In Steiner's curriculum, the teacher models how to work aesthetically with subject knowledge and then provides opportunities for the students to author authentic expressions of what s/he has learned in her/his own aesthetic activity in many art forms. This transformation of substance impresses on children the need for consciousness when acting and negotiation when one's efforts encounter resistance. Dewey (1934) pointed out how every artist must learn the qualities of and become technologically proficient with his medium. When an artist creates a work of art, she transforms a canvas, a block of wood, or some other thing into something that expresses what she knows in a form that supports the meaning she intends. The moment an artist paints a stroke of blue, or an actor turns his arm in a certain gesture, the paper or the drama is changed in ways that cannot be undone. Mitigated, perhaps, but not undone. The end product must be recognized by someone else to be effective as a work of art that conveys meaning. However, it is not required that the audience see only the meaning the artist intended to portray as mentioned before. Seeing something different from what was intended can add to the artist's ability to create future works of art and the audience's understanding of experience.

Even if a class of forty students all paint a version of the same picture, each is different. Some will have vivid colors, others will have strong lines, and another definite shapes. But all will have a version of the desired image. By seeing how others incorporate ideas in images, tunes, or movement, the imagination of students grows beyond their own abilities, is introduced to things unknown to them, and sees how people respond differently to this unknown. Difference becomes possibility to expand knowledge instead of a problem to solve or an exception that is unduly privileged or marginalized.

Responding to difference. Learning to find movement from direction, cohesion from diversity, rhythm through beat, and balance through contrast is different from learning to categorize through reason or judge through rule; it requires understanding of how the parts and the whole inter-relate. Another significant aspect of an aesthetic lens that Steiner (1937/1976) discussed with the teachers is the way it deals with the relation of whole to parts.

In any work of art, not only is each piece unique but each piece is an integration of elements that results in a whole which is greater than the elements used in its composition. A script is not a play; the actor's voice, tone, gesture is as needed as whatever set and props are used to provide time and place for the events depicted in the play. Even the most minimal set design provides this context in a way that supports the overall meaning of the play as the director means to convey it.

This relation of whole to parts is a significant aspect of how Steiner believes groups and individuals should interact and form cultures, and how I think democracies should work. Individuality should support a living, changing culture through ordered harmonies that balance, measured rhythms which move, and cohesive relations that unify elements without

erasing difference. Biesta (2010) has pointed out that at times of change, disorder, disequilibrium, and dissonance may be experienced by many. The senses often need to adjust to new stimuli and thoughts will need to synthesize new forms. Cultural archetypes change in their specificities as time goes by. Our souls need to know how to seek balance, movement, and cohesion in these novel experiences and transform traditions to support new relationships and understandings of the known and unknown.

Experiencing these relations, working them out in one's own dance or piece of music, is important to be able to recognize it in works of art or politics. By engaging in drawing, painting, singing, playing an instrument, moving in eurythmy, carving wood, modeling clay year after year from ages seven-fourteen, children can develop habits and sensitivities for transformation and integration of the unknown and different from what one is accustomed to.

Issues, Problems, and Adaptations

When reading *Faculty Meetings with Rudolf Steiner* (Steiner, 1975/1998) and *Rudolf Steiner in the Waldorf School: Lectures and Addresses to Children, Parents, and Teachers* (Steiner, 1996) I was reminded of the difficulties and challenges enacting this curriculum that I struggled with myself or heard other teachers describe encountering. I felt reassured that those teachers considered legends according to Waldorf lore were also lacking in skill, knowledge, or resources when they began teaching. Steiner's insights into why they struggled, his compassion in addressing the shortcomings he observed, and his calm acceptance that sometimes one must simply do the best one can and move on were salves to the wounds I bear from my personal experience teaching at two Waldorf schools and cautions those inspired to enact a soul-imbued curriculum today should consider.

Those teachers who grasped the implications of teaching "soul to soul" had to master new ways to engage the interest of many children long enough to connect them with subject

material in living and practical ways and provide the conditions for integration of student thinking, feeling, and willing. One problem with introducing any new form of teaching is that in classrooms, teachers often repeat what they have experienced as students (Lortie, 1975). Few, if any, of the teachers had experienced the aesthetic education Steiner insisted they employ at FWS, and conversing in elementary school classrooms was virtually unheard of at that time.

Steiner (1975/1998) criticized the amount of lecturing that he observed (pp. 250, 403, 437, 782), the insufficiency of some of the material presented to spark curiosity and interest in the children and teachers themselves (p. 210, 336), and the lack of participation by the children (p. 203, 546). Steiner noted that lack of preparation seemed to be an ongoing theme and urged teachers to decline other obligations if they found that their preparation time was being compromised (p. 333), discussed with teachers how to better prepare (pp. 231-2, 504-6), and stressed the importance of preparation: "you should have worked through the material so completely…that you can give all your attention to *how* you are teaching" when in the classroom (p. 665). Acknowledging their attempts to use the Socratic method of posing questions to engage students in conversation, he suggested their trivial, "obvious and unimportant questions" (p. 437) provided only an illusion of their intent to involve students in learning. In the later years, he continually exhorted the teachers to bring more enthusiasm and humor into lessons.

Steiner warned teachers that the students in the older classes would be too intellectualized and weak in artistic ability because they had not had their early years shaped in the way the ideal curriculum expected for the most part. He suggested extra classes in drawing, painting, and music for the first few years to allow time for students to develop skill

in these areas. When this additional instruction proved inadequate, “Deportment Class” was held for a few weeks in the first and second years of the school to cover “essential tact and living habits, so that the children will realize that one thing is acceptable and another is misbehavior” (Steiner, 1975/1998, p. 70). These classes were held within the general admonition that the consciousness of the students to do the right thing should be engaged and instructed through stories and explaining historical contexts for customs, not through recitation of rule.

Rituals were introduced to help teachers and students work in a more aesthetic way. At the second faculty meeting that Steiner attended after school started, a teacher suggested they have a prayer to begin each day. Steiner (1975/1998) replied that the Lord’s Prayer would be alright to begin with, but should be replaced by certain verses Steiner wrote, nondenominational in character, after the teachers had learned them. These verses are still used in Waldorf classrooms all over the world.

Another ritual established the first year is that once a month, the classes would meet together and each class would share something of what they had been learning in a performance of a poem, drama, song, or demonstration. The opening and closing days of each school year evolved into a certain form of having a keynote address by Steiner or another respected anthroposophist in the area, words from the teachers to the students about what would be or had been covered during the school year, and some music and eurythmy. These rituals helped to build a sense for what children could expect in years to come, an accountability of sorts for what was happening in classrooms, and a way to focus everyone’s efforts on aesthetic ways to learn and share understanding.

Content of Curriculum

Steiner felt every subject needed to be consciously connected to human beings and their knowledge of themselves and their relationships with each other and with things of physical and spiritual worlds. All schooling should be "social" study, fostering respect for how human beings have met past challenges and understanding of the constraints within which they lived.

What Steiner saw as the aim of elementary school curriculum could fall under the domain of "social intelligence" and "social literacy" in contemporary educational discourse. In 2006, two eminent psychologists, Karl Albrecht and Daniel Goleman, published books on their ideas of the skills, knowledge, and capacities which constitute social intelligence: consciousness about the kinds of physical, cultural, linguistic, and personal spaces one finds oneself in and how they affect relations between human beings; awareness of and skill in presenting one's own point of view clearly & concisely; being able to attune to points of view of others; and the ability for empathy. The soul as Steiner characterized it plays a leading role in mediating these skills and content, as well as its enactment in social literacy.

"Social Literacy" is a concept referring to the ability to make meaning through reading and writing *society*. It is the ability to be aware, understand, and participate in different social contexts. Educators in New Zealand coined the term in connection with multicultural education in the 1980s (Arthur, Davison, & Stow, 2000). I see social literacy as such a possible organizing principle to Social Studies as an interdisciplinary field of history, geography, civics, and the social sciences in the way "literacy" has become for reading, writing, and speaking: a larger whole, consisting of its parts *and* a deliberative, open, and unifying integration that is more than their sum and which promotes maturation of caring, creative, and deliberative souls.

Yearly Content

Recapitulation curriculum, based on the idea that a child develops in the same way that human beings evolved historically summed up in the phrase "ontogeny follows phylogeny", appears to have been the basis of the content in the FWS curriculum. However, Steiner (1937/1976) claimed he suggested the curriculum he did because it nourished and enlivened the soul, not because it mirrored cultural development (p.18).

Steiner maintained that folk stories and fairy tales are the stories appropriate for Grades One, fables and stories of medieval Christian saints for Grade Two, and Old Testament stories for Grade Three while children learn to write, read, and do arithmetic calculations. These tales grip the feeling life of a child and stir his thought and will to act with excitement and interest (Steiner, 1937/1976, p. 23). They also describe evolution from a spiritual point of view compatible with Steiner's epistemology. The images from the stories encourage understanding of complicated moral and spiritual truths without defining them analytically.

We must ask ourselves today, however, if these are the images we wish to use to impart meaning to children. I am not confident that the successes of simpletons, the kind, and the good shine brightly enough to overcome the arrogance, greed, and laziness of the privileged in these tales. It was not my experience that telling these kinds of stories alone operates in the way Steiner intended, that is, to guide the moral behaviors of those in the class to be true, kind, and good. I also wonder if the medieval, aristocratic, Judeo-Christian, European character of the content Steiner proposed in 1919 is so tied up with the misogyny of patriarchy, terrorism of religious righteousness, racism of white supremacy, and xenophobia of ethnocentrism that these stories may exacerbate tropes that are no longer appropriate.

Are there other stories rich in sensory experiences, affective encounters, and spiritual concepts not tied to misogyny, terrorism, racism, and xenophobia? Certainly the "Here and Now" and "Dick and Jane" tales used in the twentieth century were not rich in the qualities Steiner suggested for suitable stories. Furthermore, do children need exposure to these stories to fit into contemporary culture as advocates of "cultural funds of knowledge" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) argue or as a base from which to criticize when students have matured and are imagining societies in which equality occurs without marginalization, colonization, or erasing difference? These questions are ones I think individual teachers, community school boards, and curriculum theorists need to grapple with on an ongoing basis for schools to be interesting and inspiring places.

Steiner suggested that Norse, Hindu, Persian, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman mythologies were the stories that supplied the spiritual images appropriate for children in grades Four, Five, and Six. Biographies of historically significant people were to be introduced to balance the spiritual images of mythologies by describing how people interacted with the earth around them. In middle school, biographies of important people used in previous years can be referred to "in a way that will allow [the students] to perceive the historical impulses and historical links involved" in the times in which these people lived (Steiner, 1937/1976, p.117).

In today's social studies curricula, schools usually look at the sociologies of family and local communities in Grades 1-3, and then combine geography, history, economics, and civics of the local community in Grade 4, of the nation in grade 5, the world in Grade 6, and repeat national social studies in Grades 7 and 8 but in more detail. Mythology, fairy tales, fables, and legends are sometimes taken up in literacy classes as fodder for learning to read,

but not in any organized way as far as I am aware, and certainly not as evidence of spiritual evolution or to provide spiritual archetypes to nourish imagination and moral development.

Science fiction, crime mysteries, historical fiction for children, and stories of the here and now are genres used in these classes that did not exist in Steiner's times and much more is known about the mythologies, geographies, histories, and economies from Asia, Africa, and indigenous tribes all over the earth. Do students need to be familiar with these writing genres and global archetypes? Who is to decide and how is there to be enough time?

These are the perpetual issues of curriculum development, always implicated in the question of what knowledge is of most worth. How would a curriculum fostering soul development encourage the social intelligence and social literacy needed to propose answers to these questions? Educator Mary Cowhey (2006) provided many powerful examples of how one can teach social studies with these aims in mind. She used the stories of people involved in current events to engage her students in dialog that "changes the perception of reality from static entity into something that can be transformed" (p. 100). I think her work is inspirational in a way Steiner would approve because of its integration of thinking, feeling, and willing, its practical effects, and way conversation is used to identify social problems and respond compassionately, consciously, and creatively.

Daily & Weekly Content

The everyday syllabus Steiner proposed was very different from other schools of his time—and ours. Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, History, Geography, the Sciences, and higher Mathematics—in other words, "subject disciplines" or "academics"—were taught using an interdisciplinary approach to a topic such as "Farming" or "Fables" for a "block" of 2-4 weeks during a 2-2 ½ hour "main lesson" time each morning. I will look at this

innovation to the school day and its relationship to soul first, and then discuss how Steiner conceived of the rest of the school day.

The main lesson block has two advantages for soul growth: first, it concentrates the child's attention on one topic without interruption on a daily basis for a healthy and adequate length of time for the engagement of a child's thinking, willing, and feeling life around a topic in an interdisciplinary way. Second, the time in between blocks allows content to settle into a child's memory and then be called on from a fresh perspective weeks later. Interest, disinterest, confidence, and anxiety about specific subject matter have time to balance out within the child's soul. The reader will acknowledge how the novelty of a subject area presented in this way may engage the interest of a student in a different way from meeting it every day, making it seem blasé, common, and perhaps overwhelming (or underwhelming).

It occurs to me that allowing time between also provides time for a student to absorb any difficulty encountered in a specific subject area and not be overcome by it. "Late bloomers" do not stand out so much in such a schedule. Steiner mentioned that a review at the beginning of each block and a review of the year's work at the close of the year revive in the child real experiences that have happened over time and strengthen his memory. Learning is a living, ongoing experience with deeper dimensions than daily routine. Habits are formed to shape the way one learns, not the way one resists learning.

The rest of the school day was filled out with subjects that have to do with life in its practical and concrete activities: languages, religion (required by the state in 1919), fine and practical arts, and movement. Watercolor painting, clay modeling, and drawing were separate classes which supported the topic of the main lesson as well as being subjects in themselves. Both boys *and* girls learned the practical arts of knitting, crochet, embroidery,

hand and machine sewing, gardening, and woodworking with other practical arts added in the high school. Chorus and instruments such as recorder, violin, and percussion were introduced. Eurythmy, a dance-like art developed by Steiner's wife Marie and others, began in Grade One and Gymnastics was added in fourth grade. I discussed above how the aesthetic sensitivities and principles conveyed in these arts support soul development; here, I am pointing out the advantage of a weekly and daily schedule that is practical.

The daily and weekly schedules allowed time for a rigorous curriculum whose content complemented disciplinary content by offering ways to understand conceptual material in concrete experiences. The attention paid to the number of stiches in your knitting improved your counting ability in first grade, and modelling clay supplied a sensory context for the abstract ideas of density and gravity encountered in a sixth grade science lesson. Being acquainted with various styles of music gave students a feeling for the cultural contexts of history and geography when they discussed these ideas in seventh and eighth grades. Cultural foods, music, ways of dressing could be introduced in the language courses so that the students already had a feeling for the cultural contexts of history and geography. Most importantly, the children learned new knowledge themselves from experience, not as an abstract, dogmatic rule. In 1919 and today, this coursework was being cut back to make room for scientific and mathematical content in mainstream schools, or only offered to students with natural talent in these areas.

While not having a balanced daily curriculum is rarely recognized as a criticism of schooling today, could having soul as a curricular category highlight the relation between student interest and activity and perhaps do more to improve graduation rates and cut the school-to-prison line than focusing on student deficits or results of normative testing?

Students who are interested in what happens at school attend class and graduate. If students are able to practice learning in which they are authors of their own activity and perspective, they are able to develop a self-consciousness that has confidence and curiosity, not compliance or control issues.

Issues, Problems, and Adaptations

Steiner was aware that his ideal timetable for certain subjects could not be implemented in Stuttgart in 1919 before he began the meetings with the prospective teachers. To get the school licensed by the state, he had made compromises regarding when certain subjects would be introduced by agreeing that students in the Waldorf School would be expected to know what children in a state school were expected to know by the end of third, sixth, and eighth grades. These compromises meant children were expected to be proficient in reading text by third grade rather than fifth grade, some principles of grammar were introduced before fourth grade, and some principles of mechanics introduced in sixth grade rather than seventh. By arranging these compromises, teachers in grades one, two, four, five, and seven had more freedom to arrange their lessons in accordance with the ideal curriculum.

In the United States, private schools such as Waldorf schools are often exempt from accountability and high-stakes testing measures public schools are required to meet, and thus become a refuge for those who do not want their children subjected to those measures. However, one must be able to afford private schooling. In areas in which charter or magnet schools are offering Waldorf-inspired curriculum, compromise is made on a case by case basis.

Concern about the main lesson block way of teaching was expressed by parents the first few years of the new school (Steiner, 1996). In a lecture to parents given in June 1920, Steiner explained that the abstract, intellectual conceptualizations organized by subject

matter introduced in the academies and universities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were not appropriate for elementary school age children. He asserted that "the inattentiveness that appears is a means of self-defense" for students at this age (Steiner, 1996, p. 44) because they were needing to develop their will and feeling forces between the ages seven and fourteen, and letting their intellectual forces arise from within, rather than called from without prematurely. He explained to the parents how the main lesson format provided for interdisciplinary coverage of material and the daily timetable allowed time for the proper focus in elementary school on languages and the arts.

Steiner (1996) reiterated the argument he had given to the teachers that the time between blocks allowed the natural rhythm of waking and sleeping important to human growth to take place in regards to knowledge, and asserted that in a few years, the parents would see for themselves that this space between blocks allowed the children to more thoroughly take possession of the subject matter. Concerns for this way of approaching subject matter do not arise after the first couple of years in the school histories I reviewed. Whether its disappearance was because parents saw for themselves that main lesson blocks were an effective way to educate their children or because they accepted that this aspect of the curriculum would not change no matter how much they complained is not stipulated. The increase in enrollment might lend credence to the effectiveness of the idea.

There were remarkably few other compromises to the timetable in the first five years of the school. These adjustments were made necessary by practical considerations such as funding, space, available teachers, and rapid increases in enrollment. Building renovations made before opening the school turned out to be inadequate for the number of eurythmy or

gymnastic classes called for in the curriculum. Room size was a critical problem until a new wing was added to the building in 1921.

Enacting Curriculum: Pedagogical Processes

I mentioned in Chapter 1 that Steiner used the way he was taught Chemistry and Geometry in secondary school as a model for the way students should be engaged in learning subject material in Waldorf Schools: observation, reflection, conversation, and documentation. In the elementary school, "demonstration" was replaced with the telling or recalling of a story. I will look at each of these steps individually to examine how each strengthens soul activity and quality.

To get a student to observe something, a teacher must engage the student's interest and attention. Steiner suggested two things teachers should be aware of when planning a lesson that would encourage this engagement: tell a story that is rich in sensory images, a variety of feelings, and dramatic action; and include elements in the story which will appeal or disgust students according to the four basic temperaments.

Sensory images, a variety of feelings, and dramatic action engage the willing and feeling life of a child. Stories which include all three give children vocabulary and context to name and express their thoughts about their feelings and desires and those of others. While teachers today are accustomed to looking at their students in psycho-social ways, this concept was unusual in Steiner's day. To help the teachers to value such "labeling", Steiner fused a familiar concept (temperament) with the then new fields of child development psychology and child-centered classrooms in a way that would help them to refer to how a child engages with the world while his/her ego personality and soul formation are maturing.

There are four general temperaments: sanguine, choleric, phlegmatic, and melancholic. Although Steiner portrayed many aspects of each temperament to the teachers,

I will characterize each according to the soul gestures of attraction and interest as an example of how one aspect of temperament brings diversity into the classroom and may be addressed pedagogically. Children attracted by the variety and excitement of what goes on around them with little interest in engaging with them deeply are sanguine; children attracted to engaging the world around them with intense interest to interact with it are choleric. Children captivated by understanding their own inner world with intense interest are melancholic; those interested in ease with little intensity are phlegmatic.

Thus, through the play of antipathy and sympathy in his temperament, the elementary school aged child extends himself to and withdraws himself from the worlds around him and within him from a sense for his own safety, pleasure, comfort, and well-being. A proper education guides this process by attending to the child's inner feeling life and consciously connecting it to an active, focused will and reflective, living thinking. These connections form the basis for emotional self-awareness and self-control needed to practice empathy with others.

One's temperament has strengths that help one to make sense of worlds inside and outside one. However, carried to an extreme, this strength can be harmful. For example, a choleric's focused feeling, willing, and thinking on fulfilling his own desires may blind him/her to another's point of view. If s/he does not consciously cultivate an interest in others, s/he may live a life in conflict with people who do not see the world as s/he does.

The way that Steiner encouraged teachers to pay attention to a child's temperament can be helpful to teachers if they are ever mindful that one's temperament is not "a fault to be overcome" (Steiner, 1961/1983; p. 31) and that "the human being is constantly "becoming" therefore, a temperament is not fixed or impervious to change (p. 33). Temperaments may

also shift according to the subject area one is engaged in; a child intensely interested in reading may be interested in mathematics not at all. These cautions are important for teachers to heed so that they do not neglect to see that any individual member of a group may not exhibit all the common traits of that group, and may have qualities usually associated with another temperament. The teacher should direct a child's overall development towards a mobility of thinking, feeling, and willing which undertakes interest in, understanding of, and empathy with others and oneself. Steiner (1961/1983) advanced that teachers do this by telling stories which addressed the habits of each temperament, both in its strengths and weaknesses and let the children have more than one opportunity to relate to a story.

While having only four groupings for temperaments may seem limited to us today, Steiner's intention was to make teachers aware that there would be differences in the interests, engagement practices, and follow-through capacities of the children in their classrooms. He was making a case that a one-size-fits-all approach to teaching was thoroughly inappropriate in Waldorf classrooms. This idea was very uncommon in Germany in 1919; some educators today still resist its implications. Other educators exhaust themselves by having tailor-made daily expectations for each child. The four general categories, flushed out by other characteristics than attention, were most helpful to me as a teacher when planning lessons because they allowed me to make sense of the diversity of my students in practical ways.

Steiner proposed that seating children of like temperament together for grades one-three makes it easier for children to feel both attraction and aversion towards the habits they enact unconsciously and consciously cultivate the habits they wish to have for themselves. A child becomes aware there are others who have similar interests to his own. He can relax and

grow in confidence. When the teacher is telling a story in which the heroine's kindness brings her rewards, s/he can pique the interest of the phlegmatics by the way the melancholics heave a sigh of relief. The atmosphere in the room becomes charged in a dynamic way, and the teacher can orchestrate the overall feeling to keep the children interested and engaged in the story.

Teachers must reflect on their own temperaments and strive to cultivate their strengths and the strengths of other temperaments less strong (Steiner, 1961/1983). This transformation is important since the children will be with the same class teacher from grades one through eight. The teacher thus demonstrates to the children in an indirect way that one's temperament is fluid, open to adaptation, and transformed through one's own efforts so that one may become a free person of initiative by knowing himself and seeking growth in his capacities of thinking, willing, and feeling to better connect and understand inner and outer worlds of experience. S/he is also reminded how difficult this transformation is.

Issues, Problems, and Adaptations

How did Steiner's interpretation of temperaments play out in the FWS during its first five years? In his report, State Inspector Hartlieb (1926) was impressed by the special attention given to different temperaments at the school and recounted at length a conversation he had with a teacher about "the way a knowledge of the temperaments may be used in education" (p. 37). He noted the living picture of a child's temperament a teacher formed from the child's artistic and practical activities and how honoring the perspectives from those of different temperaments can overcome one-sidedness and yield a more complete understanding of things than a person can achieve on their own. To be so instructive to an outsider, the concept must have been meaningful to the teachers.

This meaning evolved over time, however. Steiner (1975/1998) mentioned the temperaments when discussing the discipline of individual children in various meetings, treating the class as a whole (p. 20), and assessing children's health (p. 533). A question was raised about what to do when teachers differed in which temperament they thought a child was exhibiting. Steiner's answer as translated acknowledged that "it is possible that one person has a point a view and another, another point of view" and concluded by saying "Don't think you should discuss it." (p. 90). I think the translation should read "Don't you think you should discuss it?" In speaking about conflict in his autobiography and as a way to understand something in *Theosophy*, Steiner *encouraged* discussion in order to see another's point of view and extend one's understanding about phenomena. There is no reason to think he would see understanding a person's temperament differently. The discussion he would want teachers to have would not be a debate about who is right but about seeing a child's behavior from different points of view so that each teacher might gain a broader and deeper picture of the child. This discussion can also lead to better understanding of how each teacher is enacting the curriculum; one of the teachers involved may not be doing what is needed to engage the interest of all four temperaments in her class and adjust her/his style accordingly.

It is interesting to me that the main difficulty Steiner addressed over and over with the faculty was their lack of connection to their students; that the soul-to-soul connection he placed such great emphasis on did not always develop. He (1975/1998) acknowledged the teachers' efforts and some success in this area (pp. 213, 474, 778). He encouraged the teachers to "lay more and more stress on psychology" (p. 106), that is, to how temperament affected the relationship between the child and teacher, and to have more conversations with

students and less lecture. In the teacher preparation courses Steiner (1926/1997) gave in 1924, he discussed on the effects a teacher's temperament can have on children and the need for teachers to "control our own temperaments…[and] educate ourselves in relation to our own temperament" (p. 7). This admonition may be an indication that he thought the teachers had grasped the fundamentals of understanding student temperaments but not their own.

Conclusion

In Steiner's ideal curriculum for children aged 7-14, rule and principle are not the emphasis; the cultivation of a healthy feeling life is. Steiner claimed that it is during these years that the child's ego is learning to consciously regulate the forces of feeling (sympathy and antipathy) within a physical body. Engagement with the arts of storytelling, drawing, painting, eurythmy, and drama would allow a child to mature in her habit life, reflect on her experience and improve her memory, and nourish her imagination in ways that would fertilize the growth of her intellectual powers. These indications are helpful for setting a stage upon which education can happen, but leave a lot to develop in the script, acting, and direction necessary for a full curriculum.

In this chapter, we have seen how important Steiner thought aesthetic experience, a balanced timetable, and understanding one's personal perspective and those of others were in designing a curriculum that would nourish the soul's capacities to form habits, attitudes, and ethics compatible with his personal and cultural destinies. Steiner's theory of soul is important because of its attempt to explain how it is that human beings make meaning out of their experiences with physical and spiritual worlds. Steiner asserted that in the human soul, sensory experience with the physical world and conceptual experience with the spiritual worlds are used to imagine, inspire, and intuit meaning by one's ego to think, act, and feel in ways that are a part of and apart from each. In other words, she can see more than the

familiar, tolerate unfamiliarity with difference without being threatened, and create new contexts for the familiar and unfamiliar which complement rather than erase either. In this way, human beings can know and understand other points of view and enlarge their own understanding of the world around them.

CHAPTER 4: A POSTHUMANIST THEORY OF SOUL

Since Steiner's time, philosophers, public intellectuals, and social scientists have sought to decenter, deconstruct, and demystify cultural discourses in an attempt to understand how language games within and across cultures investigate, interrogate, and validate knowledge as a commodity (Lyotard, 1984; Harvey, 1990; Longstreet, 2003). Key to this concept is the idea that language is not a medium of expression or representation but "a tool for doing something which could not have been envisaged prior to the development of a particular set of descriptions, those which it itself helps to provide" (Rorty, 1989, p. 13). In this scheme of things, truth, beauty, and goodness are seen as social constructions and not universal ideals as espoused by religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the past. American philosopher Richard Rorty (1989) concluded that philosophy should be "one of the techniques for reweaving our vocabulary of moral deliberation in order to accommodate new beliefs" (p. 196). "How to respond to difference" is one of these vocabularies we should be reweaving.

"Reweaving" implies using old terms as well as new terms in our vocabularies. We must do this for several reasons. I will use a deliberation familiar to many to illustrate some of these reasons. With the election of Barak Obama as the first African-American man to the presidency of the United States in 2008, many claimed the U.S. had entered a post-racial period in its history. "Post" as a prefix implies "afterwards" or "subsequently" and would apply in the U.S. if everyone no longer saw race as an important indicator of one's abilities or rights. Subsequent events such as a rise in visibility of white supremacist activities have

checked the “post-racial” claim. Not everyone’s vocabulary, or their reality, has been reconstructed. Terms from the past thus remain relevant reality structures when deliberating new vocabularies. We are actually living in a country in which racial superiority has merely undergone a transition in how racism is expressed (Alexander, 2012; Bonilla-Silva, 2001, 2018; Matias, 2016).

In this chapter, I will consider how a notion of “soul” can aid our understanding of the language games involved in responding to difference and the unknown in caring, conscious, and creative ways and may help us to develop educational curricula that will bring such games consciously into contemporary classrooms. Steiner would see this examination of language and knowledge as a cultural result of the development of the consciousness soul in human beings, the part of the human soul which searches for understanding by adding context and the perspectives of others to its own perspective. While he promoted relationships and conversation in ways unusual for his time, Steiner did not address the idea of the construction of knowledge through language. To connect soul to that discussion, I will use the works of Lacanian psychotherapist Mari Ruti and Philosopher of Education Kieran Egan.

Texts

In her text *Reinventing the Soul: Posthumanist Theory and Psychic Life,* psychoanalyst Mari Ruti (2006) explored the role of language in cultural and personal meaning-making. Ruti noted that post-modern, post-structural, and post-human insights have helped us to enlarge narrow assumptions of modern, structural, and humanistic ideas, but:

> our increasingly sophisticated understanding of the self as ideologically saturated has not necessarily enhanced our ability to consider those facets of inner experience that are most closely related to the subject’s attempt to weave a convincing narrative of what it means to live in the world in imaginative and ethically compelling ways. (p. xvi)

In other words, seeing one's self as a discursively constructed identity does not explain a one's ability to imagine and ethically enact stories about one's own life in agreement with or resistant to such social discourses.

Employing ideas from thinkers Jacques Lacan, Friedrich Nietzsche, Michel Foucault, Kelly Oliver, and Julia Kristeva, Ruti argued that just as insights into the social construction of one's "self" have helped us to see a relationship between language and psychology, modifying our understanding of one's "soul" through these lenses is necessary to have a complete picture of the inner life of human beings. Ruti (2006) theorized "soul" as a psychic structure or energy which regulates "creative agency, psychic transformation, and the subject's dynamic relationship to the socio-symbolic structures that surround it" (p. xv). She concluded that agency is not denied but rather required by a post-humanist concept of self and that freedom is not negated but expressed through social construction. Soul is important in that it enlivens, broadens, and deepens a self that is not a fixed identity and "remains open to [the world] without being overly dependent on it" (Ruti, 2006, p. 105). I will argue that this ability is necessary for individuals to be open to the unknown, to respond to difference as other than a threat, and that developing and nourishing this ability should be an aim in educational curricula.

In the second part of this chapter, I examine contemporary philosopher of education Kieran Egan's work on language, cognitive tools, and curriculum. *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape Our Understanding* (1997), *getting it WRONG from the beginning* (2002), and *The Future of Education* (2008) are the main texts I will investigate. While Egan used the term "mind" throughout his work, I will connect his ideas to Steiner's and Ruti's

theories of soul and argue that "soul" is a more accurate term for his ideas and can connect curriculum theory, language, and response to difference and the unknown in important ways.

The Posthumanist Soul

Agency and the Decentered, Constructed Subject

One of Ruti's central themes is that one aspect of human subjectivity is constructed by economic and socio-symbolic discourses that de-center one's self by situating its constitution outside of oneself. She claimed that by merging the fields of psychoanalysis and linguistics, Jacques Lacan's work shifted the focus of psychoanalytic discourse from a focus on the physiological and psychological effects of sexual desire to one on language by asserting that it is speech, part of a larger symbolic order of the culture in which a person lives, which structures one's relationship between one's "self" and the "other" (Ruti, 2006). A common interpretation of Lacan's assertion is that the child gives up his own meaning-making ability when he adopts the language of others that follows laws and traditions not his own, and gives up his oneness with himself by repressing desires objectionable or invisible to others when uttering his passions in the language of others.

Ruti (2006) pointed out, however, that just as this use of the language of the other curtails the person's capacity for autonomous self-authorship, the language of the other is what "engenders the possibility of signification in the first place, enabling the subject to constitute itself as a being that possesses the ability to actively reflect on the modalities of its existence" (p. 119). In other words, by using the language of the other, a person is able to express, reflect on, make various meanings of, and share one's experience with others; connect the experience of others to one's own; and form relationships with others necessary for one's well-being. This ability to use the language of others enables one to connect with

others and offers ways to overcome the separation we experience by having different bodies, souls, and spirits from them.

Ruti (2006) asserted that a second aspect of subjectivity, "an intricate psychic reality with specific needs, desires, and motivations" (p. 9), is how one's self makes sense of its experiences within the context of such discourses. This aspect may resist final determination by discursive positionality, and therefore "counter the economic and socio-symbolic forces that seek to constitute it as a hegemonically determined identity" (p. 9). Ruti noted that affective states are often important for the subject to "create the conditions for active self-constitution—for transformative acts of reinterpretation and self-mythologization" necessary to accept identities that are "fragmentary, incomplete, and paradoxical" (p. 10).

Rather than eviscerating the inner life, Ruti (2006) insisted that a decentered self *requires* imagination and agency, terms from the humanist stream of thought and ongoing concerns in educational psychology. She pointed out that to resist or transform the socio-cultural inscriptions veiled in human habit and tradition one needs to be able to imagine that life and the world can be different. She claimed that one's agency is the ability to perceive and actualize possibilities that address one's own needs, desires, and motivations within the constraints of one's socio-symbolic discourses. Both agency and imagination are necessary for one "to deconstruct hegemonic and exclusionary practices and construct new practices to guide social change" (p. 47). She built her case by an examination of Nietzsche's self-poetizing subject and Foucault's analysis of power.

Psychic Transformation

Citing Nietzsche's self-poeticizing subject as an example of how one uses language to consciously deliberate and perform one's own stories about one's life, the truths one believes, and make new meanings of previous experiences and conclusions, Ruti (2006)

proposed that the self becomes "the gradual accumulation of meanings, all equally metaphoric… a layered depository of former performances" (p. 57). The self is formed over time, by one's actions, and only "like" itself (metaphorically). This depository is discursively shaped and identifies one as "oneself", but is not one's self, per se. One's self is like, but is not, one's identity. It is always "becoming" itself, evolving over time, and has many "identities". One's self is visible to others, stable through repetition, and contingent on both old and new performances.

Ruti (2006) asserted that the agency such a self can exhibit depends on its "capacity to creatively bring to life the metaphors of its existence" (p. 199). While Foucault brought attention to the outer forces in the culture that influence and condition the self, Ruti (2006) pointed out that Foucault described power as "not merely what censors us, but also what mobilizes and motivates us, and what enables us to act in the world … giving rise to various discourses and self-enactments" (p. 60). The circuits of power flow in two directions: from inner to outer and from outer to inner. One could say a person is *both* creator of and created by discourse. Each person signifies within her inner world, within subjective confines, as both a subject directing that discourse and subject to that discourse. Desire and passion cause the stabile and complacent self to question the meanings the self has made of experience and identified with over time. One can engage with different metaphors and create new meanings through ongoing performances of socio-cultural truths one believes, resists, or transforms.

To relate Ruti's ideas to education, let us look at how a student may identify as a good student. This process is influenced by the discourse around her, but is not determined by it. She must know how "good student" is defined in the discourse, define for herself what

is a “good student”, desire to resolve any conflicts between the two, imagine a narrative in which she can do what good students do, and then do such. For example, she may transform the discourse’s “A good student gets good marks on her report card” into “Good students try hard to learn more about something than they knew yesterday.” She can rely on marks to identify her as a good student and do well in the subjects she finds easy and not so well in those she finds difficult, or she can actively participate in learning more, and let the marks be indicators of how much of what other people think is important she has mastered. Her “story” and identity as a good student undergoes more transformation as she performs “good student” if further conflict arises. She can imagine a new narrative for “I am a good student” and act in accordance with this new identity, creating a new layer to her self.

I see that one of the primary aims of education is learning how to create these kinds of stories about identity and self in creative, conscious, and caring ways. A person’s agency is a result of her own inner activity of sensing, reflecting, and making meaning of the outer forces in the culture she experiences using the language of her time and place to make her subjectivity present to others. This agency is not autonomous, rigid, or even consistent but it is reasoned, felt, and enacted. It is embodied and alive. This agency responds to change, stability, and difference and is thus in line with the post-structural agenda to “loosen strictures of what society deems right and proper” (Ruti, 2006, p. 4). It does not necessarily pursue a quest for absolutes or universals, nor is it restricted to self-interest. It is the kind of agency we should expect our schools to be fostering as children learn to make sense of the world around and within them in order to see difference as other than a threat. It is vital to being able to distinguish the narratives we or others weave as helpful or harmful to both us and them.

One of the most significant curriculum conversations throughout the 20th century was that which discussed how much self-knowledge and understanding were necessary for students to attain while also learning the academic disciplines of the arts, sciences, and humanities (Egan, 2002; Kessler, 2000; Martin & McLellan, 2013; Pinar & Grumet, 1976). Self-knowledge and academic expertise have gotten lost as the use of public funds for schooling today is often justified for two reasons: socialization, that is, familiarizing students with social customs and traditions; and sorting people into fields of work compatible with their interests and society's needs.

Ruti's analysis of self can prove helpful to teachers and curricular theorists who agree with curricular theorist Maxine Greene that an aim in education is to help students articulate the stories of their lives and "to keep posing questions about the why" so they can participate in society "without losing consciousness of who they are" (Greene, 1995, p. 165). I contend that fear of losing consciousness of who one is, or of one's self as one has come to construct and understand it, is a significant reason difference is seen as a threat. If selves can be seen as more flexible, agentic, and creative, deliberation of problems like misogyny, racism, and terrorism can be helpful in the construction of new identities that are more just and ethical. A primary aim of education must be to help students to question and enact the articulation of their discourse in imaginative and ethical ways.

Soul as Mediator of Social, Individual Interaction

One needs a category, a structure, an imagination of something which can dynamically integrate the self as creator and created. Ruti (2006) suggested, and I agree, "soul" as that word because of the term's historic connection to life, breath, passion, and consciousness (see Goetz, & Taliaferro, 2011; Miller, 2000; and Osmond, 2003 if interested in this history). Ruti did not dispute the term's connection to an afterlife but put any

connection of that sort aside and concentrated on the soul's function as a signifier of ordered chaos which can generate something new through making room for other possibilities than those already incorporated in one's performed self. The self is thus enlivened, deepened, and broadened by soul activity. It is the soul, Ruti argued, that enables "care of the self" that allows one to sustain a self which has the power to resist, renew, embrace, or surrender identities in Foucault's analysis of power relations.

The soul is what allows a broad, open connection to others, and a deep connection to the self that "is robust and self-contained enough to survive the withdrawal of the other" (Ruti, 2006, p. xvi). The soul is able to forge this kind of connection because it is "a dynamic entity that connects the individual to the world at the same time it provides a space for self-reflexivity" (Ruti, p. 18). One's instincts, needs, and drives are the somatic anchors for soul capacities and for language (Ruti, p. 174). Ruti identified the transformative, imaginative, and creative aspects of soul as what allow the self to "incorporate what resides outside of itself and, in so doing, to renew and revitalize itself" (p. 175). I would add that soul enables one's self to also survive imposition of social discourse or of another's will on one.

Ruti also asserted that it is by strength of the person's soul that the negotiation of these paths of power affects self-actualization, social relationships, and the quality of one's life. Having a soul is what allows the self to be aware of its own lack, feel separate from what is already present in the world, and desire connection or alienation from that world in ethical ways. One is able to respond ethically by responding in the way that Kelly Oliver named "witnessing." Witnessing recognizes that one's well-being and ability to enact agency is dependent on sustaining relationships with others that "takes the humanity of both

the self and other for granted" (Ruti, 2006, p. 87). Furthermore, witnessing sees response to the suffering of others as an obligation. Witnessing re-writes the conversations of domination, denial, and assimilation when encountering difference, offering another, more ethical, creative, compassionate, and conscious response that protects rather than erases difference.

From Ruti's assertions, I picture "soul" as a bridge that has anchors on each side of the divide between human beings and cultures and a span that maintains connection and resists conflation with the other in the way Steiner described soul as a bridge between physical and spiritual worlds. The individual and the culture are different from each other, and they encounter each other in a space that affects only a part of each and can respect the wholeness of each. One way it does so, as Ruti asserted, is through the poetic use of language. Education can support an ability to construct and maintain this bridge by focusing on experiences which allow students and teachers to explore cultural narratives of time and place to see how they impacted the individuals and cultures of the past, and how might such narratives influence individuals and cultures in the present and future.

Ruti (2006) argued how psychoanalysis provides opportunities for individuals to construct new narratives about their experiences of the past and present in order to live a life of well-being, and acknowledged that any activity which stirs the imagination cultivates the potential for authoring such possibilities (p. 196). Artistic work, meditation, and relationships are examples she mentioned. Educators John Miller (2000) and Rachel Kessler (2000) have written about how to do so in high schools. It is my contention that elementary school education must provide these opportunities as part of its general curriculum to support the growth of imagination, agency, and passion in students and teachers. This growth

requires a curriculum focused on understanding complex relationships and conversation, not just information accumulation, mastering technological skills, or mastery in a particular academic discipline.

Ruti's exploration into the workings of a person's inner life is stimulating in that it provides an alternative to human development as a natural, predictable, quantifiable social construction of certain nature/nurture proportions and conditions or directed by omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient spiritual beings. She described how agency and imagination are able to affect language and meaning-making and allow human beings to go beyond mechanics into the dynamic relativity of contemporary physics in their interactions with each other and the environments in which they live. Philosopher of education Kieran Egan made a similar argument about language, meaning-making, agency, and imagination that are helpful to connect Steiner's and Ruti's theories of soul to educational curriculum theory.

Implications for Education

Egan (2002) noted that progressive curriculum reforms in 20th century schools have failed to resolve the contradictory aims policy-makers have imposed on public education in their efforts to socialize heterogeneous masses of students, transmit the accumulated knowledge of truth, beauty, and goodness through academic disciplines to the next generation, and actualize the potential of all students. He concluded that progressive reforms were based in faulty assumptions that human development is natural and abides by natural scientific principles inherent in cultural factors. His argument is similar to Ruti's in that he sees these explanations as necessary but insufficient to describe the development of a human being's inner life because they ignore the imagination and agency a human being can assert in that inner life to accept, resist, or adapt natural and cultural influences. In the next section, I will explain Egan's "big, new idea" aim in education, argue why "soul" would be a more

inclusive term for what Egan referred to as “mind”, and explore curriculum theory implications.

Cultural Recapitulation as Curriculum Guide

Drawing on the work of Lev Vygotsky, a psychologist who was interested in language, cognition, and nineteenth century recapitulation theories that investigated the extent to which individual development reflects human development as a species, Egan’s big, new idea for education proposes that the aim in education should be certain kinds of *understanding* which occur through the use of cognitive tools that accompany linguistic capacities. Egan (1997) suggested that this new idea would connect “cultural development in the past and educational development in the present” (p. 27) in a curriculum more cohesive, stimulating to the imagination, and appropriate to contemporary conditions of life than curricula caught in negotiating the limited aims of socialization, fulfilling individual potentials, matching corporate needs, or a pursuit of Truth through an accumulation of information.

The following chart summarizes the kinds of language practices, cognitive tools, and understanding that Egan described in various texts (1997, 2002, 2005, 2008) to order educational curricula.

Kinds of Understanding	Linguistic Practice	Cognitive Tools
Somatic: uses the body and the senses to make sense of experience	Pre-linguistic, nonverbal looks and gestures	Interpreting what others want you to know or do by their facial expressions, sounds, & gestures
Mythic: uses words and sentences to name and order experience	Vocabulary and Grammar of Oral Language(s)	Metaphor, articulating emotional binaries, jokes, stories, mental images, mystery, rhyme
Romantic: uses symbols to record experience, reflection, and imagination	Written Texts, Literacy	Memory, Reflection, Narrative sequencing and order, Imagining heroes confronting their limits in reality

Philosophic: uses text analysis and conversation to order, regulate, and evaluate experience	Rules, Codes of Behavior, Abstract Generalizations	Formation of universal principles, dogmas, and systems of thought (theory); Noticing anomalies
Ironic: recognizes paradox, doubt, and relativity and uses any of the previous kinds of understanding in a particular situation	Values context and acknowledges the gap between meaning and language's ability to communicate that meaning	Consciousness of more than one answer, understanding, or meaning; Requires deliberation to determine which is important in present situation

The chart makes it obvious that Egan is tracing both cultural and personal development. A lack of historical records makes it difficult to be certain that the first human beings communicated through gesture and other non-verbal means. However, many assume human beings evolved so as a species, and babies do follow this pattern. We are certain that oral languages have evolved over time, and in fact, continue to evolve. Stories, metaphors, and rhymes were used to explain and remember experiences as cultures evolved and are instrumental to individual learning. Having them written down allowed groups and individuals far and wide to notice commonalities and theorize about different causes and effects free from personal experience. Ideals were conceived as possibilities to be striven for, and heroes provided examples of how individuals could negotiate the limits of reality in creative ways.

Methods involving empirical and mathematical proofs promised universal and absolute systems by which human beings (as individuals and in groups) could control and manipulate their environments to increase safety, comfort, and convenience for themselves and their groups. As more and more contact was established between different groups, the quest for universal principles became less and less justifiable or practical. Ironically, Religion, Math, and Science have all failed to deliver absolute, universal, and eternal

principles acceptable to all. Paradox and conflict must be resolved by understanding the contexts in which events occur. Differences cannot be denied or dominated; differences which are deliberated to enlarge understanding of context and generalized codes are far more effective in searching for truth, beauty, and goodness.

A problem presents itself immediately. This scheme uses European-American cultural and individual development as its measure. As anthropologist Brian Street (2003) clarified, this assumption

> works from the assumption that literacy in itself—autonomously—will have effects on other social and cognitive practices… Research in NLS [New Literacy Studies] challenges this view and suggests that in practice literacy varies from one context to another and from one culture to another and so, therefore, do the effects of the different literacies in different conditions. The autonomous approach is simply imposing western conceptions of literacy on to other cultures or within a country those of one class or cultural group onto others. (p. 77)

It is good to acknowledge this limitation. It is still useful as an example with which many of readers, educators, and parents in North America would be familiar with to grasp Egan's central point that cultural understandings shape linguistic practices and cognitive capacities, and that linguistic practices and cognitive capacities shape cultural understandings. If we are aware that the understandings Egan noted are culturally limited, we have gained information about the relationships in one culture. Research can document how the relationships differ in other cultures, and if the vocabularies, grammars, and customs of Asian, African, and/or Indigenous peoples offer understandings, linguistic practices, and cognitive tools which may address the limitations of European/American understandings and of other cultures.

Efforts to multi-culturalize curricula with voices of others has proven difficult (Banks, 2002; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995; Nieto & Bode, 2008). Doing so, however, promises to be worth the effort and attention when we are aiming at understanding at the soul

level of thinking, feeling, and willing. As Ruti and Steiner emphasized in their work, the soul has room for other experiences, perspectives, and meanings than just those of one's self, or a particular identity. One's self and one's culture can grow and thrive when one can use one's soul in such a manner. Having soul as a concept in curriculum theory can help scholars of the future be more inclusive and sensitive to difference in social constructions of knowledge.

A significant problem with all twentieth century reform in American schools that I see is the insistence that children become textually literate and employ abstract thinking at younger and younger ages. Soul development and Egan help me to understand why: contemporary textual literacy and abstract thinking are expected without developing the cognitive tools necessary to address student somatic, mythic, and romantic understandings or the integration of thinking, feeling, and willing to nourish sentient, intellectual, or consciousness soul growth. By introducing the academic disciplines already formed and tested without a firm grounding in embodied experience, affective encounter, and cognitive curiosity, the inner lives of students do not have time to grow broad and deep roots that will sustain their efforts to question the assumptions of the culture in which they are growing. Students disengage, alienated by abstraction, without the linguistic skills of speaking, listening, and conversation. I wonder if this disengagement can be avoided if "soul" as interpreted in this paper is important in the construction of curricular reform.

Maturation as Metamorphosis, not Mastery

Egan argued that each kind of understanding metamorphoses from a previous kind, validating or adapting the way a person understands without negating the other. The way I think of it is that these understandings color our personal meanings of experience according to the principles to which we give priority. Hence, we can understand that smoking is bad

for us with regard to living a long life on a philosophical level but reason that it is good for us on a physical level to avoid painful withdrawal symptoms today. We then set smoking three cigarettes a day as a personal limit based on our romantic acceptance of personal risk and mythic understanding of cause and effect—luck, or chance, may prevent cancer from happening to me. This processing allows us to consider ourselves "reasonable" since some thinking did occur as part of our prioritizing. Another person may prioritize her long-term health over short-term comfort and give up smoking to eliminate the risk of developing cancer from smoking. This person's process may be judged by some as more rational since it appears to give more attention to scientific evidence rather than personal feeling. If this second person drinks excessive amounts of alcohol to relax instead of smoking to relax, however, the consequences may be just as drastic!

By connecting and not conflating cognitive tools, linguistic practices, and sentient, intellectual, and conscious understandings, Egan demonstrated what he called one's "mind" as a place for negotiation and mediation. I wonder though if Egan's use of "mind" limits his theory's potential in ways that would be more complete if he looked at one's soul as that place.

Soul versus Mind

While Egan argued convincingly that the way he uses the term "mind" includes affective and imaginative connotations, for many it remains the organ for rational reason as exemplified in the objective sciences. However, in the psychological interpretation I am striving for in this thesis, in which soul is where we integrate thinking, feeling, and willing as we adapt to and interpret new and familiar sensations, ideas, and experience, I propose that soul can add much to enlarge discursive restrictions placed on "mind" in psychology, philosophy, and education.

Sensation, memory, imagination, cognition, calculation, reason, communication, emotion, and intention each have roles to play in meaningful interpretation of experience as tools of the agent to validate, resist, or deny meanings ascribed to phenomena by others. These activities operate in the spaces between self and identities, and between self and other people, objects, ideas, mores, etc. These tools are found in one's soul, not one's self, one's brain, or what most people refer to as mind. While soul has other connotations to many people, most people do see it as the place people struggle with right and wrong, recognize beauty, and understand the meaning of what is being discussed. Warm hearts and cold minds can complement or contradict each other in one's soul, and one's self must deliberate a resolution based on that relation and what is possible to achieve in the world within which one lives.

By stressing either knowledge accumulations as did the Back to Basics, standards-based curriculum reform, or by emphasizing skill based accumulations as did the drive in the sixties and nineties to "do" the disciplines as if students were young scientists, historians, or journalists (Evans, 2015; Gardner, 2000; Taubman, 2009), twentieth century reforms did not focus enough on understanding in any of the ways Egan characterizes the term. None of these reform strategies addressed the inner lives of students, their imaginations and emotions, and do not address the boredom felt by students in curricula that ignore their emotions, imaginations, or agency.

Neo-liberal curriculum reforms of standards-based testing and matching student interest and job requirements make the same mistake (Evans, 2015). In wonder, creativity, and understanding, the soul integrates human thinking, feeling, and willing so an individual may consciously, creatively, and compassionately make meaning of experience.

Information, skills, and standards are necessary elements in these meanings but are insufficient to accomplish the agency and imagination needed to mobilize and motivate selves to deliberately signify their own meanings inclusive of the experiences of others and citizens to work together for the common good.

Conclusion

Ruti developed a picture of soul that is similar to Steiner's in that soul is living, connective, unseen, and separate from one's self. She assessed mobile, generative, and balancing qualities of the soul as allowing the self to openly engage the world and encounter difference without being subsumed by the world. Characterizing the self as Ruti has seems to privilege social-cultural influence and constructivist abilities over an inherent essence that we saw in Steiner's conception of self.

I assert that conceptions of self such as Ruti's do not deny conceptions such as Steiner's but in fact extend our understandings of how a human being's self as spiritual essence and self as social construction can combine to foster open-ended narratives about identity, truth, beauty, and goodness and influence how one responds to difference. Each can accommodate an openness to the unknown and an inner life of agency, reflection, and imagination. Each calls for a place in which one can hold "that which is other than oneself" while assessing how to respond. While Steiner elaborated on the time and feeling needed for the growth and development of this place and Ruti focused on the energy and resilience required in such a place, both called this space of transformation one's "soul".

Ruti's and Egan's attention to the way a human soul uses language to make sense of its experiences can aid educators in their efforts to develop curricula that nourish a deliberative, compassionate, and empowered agency rather than one focusing only on self-expression, self-enterprise, and self-entitlement. Steiner's attention to the way the arts

integrate one's thinking, feeling, and willing in wholes which do not negate variety, contrast, and harmony can aid educators to implement such curricula.

Curricula that only focuses on information, on measuring one's aptitudes for certain skills, can ignore, and urge children to ignore, the needs, instincts, and passions with which they identify. Self-formation often becomes a labeling, not a process; a sizing up of something rather than an exploration of it. Knowledge and perspective are connected by experience. Experience is thought, felt, and willed as a matter of personal choice, random opportunity, and/or social prescription. Children need to learn that there are at least two sides to a story, and that they can sort out priorities, differences, and conflict. Children also need to know that they can be empathetic without losing or gaining something they treasure. To do so, curricula need to foster interest, curiosity, and care necessary for subjective growth and development that is empathetic, socially aware, and culturally proficient.

For this development to be the case, social intelligence and emotional intelligence must be consciously addressed in curricula. These intelligences live, grow, and mature into the areas of understanding noted by Egan in one's soul, not in one's mind or self. Seeing education as an endeavor which takes place in the souls of teachers and students can help curriculum theorists imagine and design curricula that include the study of emotional and social intelligences with the aim of promoting social and emotional literacy.

CHAPTER 5: A NEW HORIZON

An important function of a dissertation is to situate a new scholar in a field of knowledge as demonstrated by his/her own research. From the initial selection of topic and method through to the final written product, the dissertation is meant to be a way one brings one's own voice into a professional discourse. Not being sure I would find a place, or master a method, or create anything original, I have struggled mightily to speak. I am a listener and a reader. I think. I question. I am comfortable living in the space of not knowing. I use questions to clarify what it being said, and I wait to understand the other before speaking. I have often qualified my understanding by using other people's words to hide behind. I am not comfortable making mistakes, misinterpreting someone else, or offending others.

Given these limitations, it is not surprising that hermeneutic research appealed to me. The skills of reading, thinking, and questioning are required. They are skills my education nurtured and I excel in. Interpretation and examination of one's own assumptions and prejudices are also necessary. It took me many months and many drafts to gain limited proficiency in these two skills. I have always been able to provide enough information to demonstrate knowledge in the past, and my habit is to write according to a recipe to order that information. Hermeneutics does not work in either manner. I have wondered often if I had bit off more than I could accomplish while writing.

A commitment to complete what I had started, curiosity about the topic, and the support of my advisor and friends when my energies flagged have kept me going. I kept

reading books that were fascinating and that already said something I wanted to say. I fell in love again with Steiner's work when researching the cultural, historical, and political contexts for Steiner's life, his personal struggles with the philosophies of his time, and the aims and methods he set out for Waldorf education. I became aware of key elements that I had not understood about many of his ideas; soul was one of these. When I had to make explicit the similarities and differences between Steiner's and Ruti's ideas, I realized how simply I had identified with Steiner's tenets and read them into Ruti's ideas without having really grappled with either. The languages were so different! I soldiered on. Writing was excruciating. There were connections; there were disconnections. Only by accepting each, and letting them be in relation to my question about responding to difference could I begin to see something neither said, but felt true to my own thinking, feeling, and willing. In other words, something original, a new horizon.

New Horizon for "Soul"

Horizons are observed from far away. They appear as a meeting of two distinct entities that touch but do not penetrate each other. The most common horizon is that between earth and—hmm? Is that sky? space? heaven? Do we know? Can we say it is the boundary between earth and not-earth? When experienced close at hand, isn't this boundary the atmosphere within which we live, walk, talk, eat, die, sense, struggle? This paradox is another notable element in hermeneutics, expounded on by Gadamer (1975) in his classic, *Truth and Method.* In seeking to understand horizons that are far away we deepen and broaden our understandings of the atmospheres within which we live.

The nearest of these near atmospheres may be that which is created by the meeting of our consciousness and the physical world. An esotericist would argue that the horizon between one's consciousness and the spiritual world is equally close. I am saying that the

horizons to both the physical and spiritual worlds is one's soul, a possibility that is present in any duality one can situate oneself in: past/future, right/ wrong, known/unknown; teacher/student; art/science; self/other; mind/body, to name just a few that are of importance to educational curriculum.

Based on the theories of soul expounded by Rudolf Steiner and Mari Ruti, I have attempted to reconceive the term "soul" as a place in one's inner life in which one integrates one's thinking, feeling, and willing to engage in observing phenomena one experiences with curiosity and to reflect upon one's memories of past experiences and one's imagination of possibilities for the future. One's soul is thus more inclusive than what is considered mind or self. Not only is soul a place for rational, logical, cognitive thinking, it is also the place for subjective, sensitive, emotional feeling and value-driven, energized, passionate willing. Additionally, soul is the place in which one can set aside one's identity or self, and make room for other thoughts, feelings, and wills one experiences in conversation with others who have different points of view from their own experiences.

Soul carries out these functions by allowing differences to co-exist rather than being erased or oppressed; by being open to the unknown, to something that is new, or to something new about the already-known; and by creating new relationships between the extremes of any experience. In one's soul, one's self and one's mind can be open to what is unknown or different and respond to it as other than a threat to one's self or mind. The response can be as creative, compassionate, and conscious as one's soul allows.

Philosopher Gert Biesta (2010) explained how deliberative democracies require these capacities and encouraged school curriculum to focus on developing them in the next generation. It follows, then, that curricula devoted to developing souls would also develop a

citizenship which could deliberate difference, be open to the unknown, and create connected communities rather than divided ones.

Curricular Implications

Re-institution of "soul" as a curricular category would broaden the purposes of schooling beyond that of mastering academic disciplinary knowledge in one's mind, actualizing one's own interests, rights, and privileges, or producing competent workers and elite experts, thus reproducing the economic, social, or political status quo. Soul can bring to these frameworks an awareness and acceptance that the unknown can be threatening, intriguing, or elusive and that there are established ways people have investigated and deliberated these unknowns that provide safety, guidelines, and criteria for justification for the explorers into the unknown. Understanding as Gardner (2000) and Egan (1995, 2005, 2008) portrayed it is the aim, not mastery. Imagination, agency, and an integration of thinking, feeling, and willing are necessary to sustain interest and effort until one can use one's own understanding in sensitive, intellectual, and conscious ways.

Educating soul requires:

1. Sensory stimulation of the body senses of life, movement, balance, and touch; the soul senses of warmth, smell, taste, and sight; and the social senses of hearing, speaking, thinking, and perceiving the spirit of an "other" (a different thing, person, place, time, feeling, thought, etc.).
2. Engaging the curiosity, wonder, and interest of students and teachers to construct open, interpenetrating, and meaningful atmospheres between themselves and the world around them.

3. Acknowledgment that feeling energizes thinking and willing, a lack of feeling enervates thinking and willing, and that regulation of feeling is necessary, not its repression or domination.
4. Recognition that knowledge is constructed of the subjective elements languaged in the arts, social elements languaged in the humanities, *and* objective elements languaged in the sciences. The arts, the humanities, and the sciences thus need to be included in educational experiences.
5. Practice and understanding of the arts because it is through aesthetic activity that human beings learn to integrate feeling, thinking, and willing in ways that are both expressive and representative of their individual points of view and those of others. In other words, it is through the arts that one gains emotional literacy of one's own feeling life and that of others and why I feel the arts are a separate category from the humanities.
6. Practice and understanding of the humanities because it is through the study of how people conceive of what it means to be human that human beings learn to integrate their individual values, ideas, and actions with their surroundings. It is through the humanities that one gains social literacy of the arts and sciences created in, valued by, and related to the cultures within which and outside of which one lives.
7. Practice and understanding of the sciences because it is through the sciences that one can learn the principles by which absolute, universal, and eternal archetypes manifest in incomplete, constrained, and evolving phenomenon that we as humans make sense of in order to live our lives with agency. In

> other words, it is through the sciences that we learn what possibilities can be made actual in our own time and place.

Because soul powers mature and vary from individual to individual, a curriculum attentive to soul would be broad in exposure to the arts, humanities, and sciences throughout one's years in school, and allow for depth in certain areas according to individual interests and community needs. I do not, therefore, offer a one-size-fits all curriculum with respect to content, pedagogy, timetable, or environment. I do, however, think the preceding requirements must be met for a curriculum to successfully encourage creative, compassionate, conscious, and continual responses to difference.

Multi-culturalism theorist James A. Banks (2002) suggested many of the concepts and practices I have connected to "soul" in this thesis in his characterization of transformative multi-cultural education curriculum: realizing that knowledge is both subjective and objective (p. 15); that "[a]lthough knowledge, caring, and action are conceptually distinct, in the classroom they are highly interrelated" (p. 32); that it is important that content be "significant and meaningful to students" (p. 4); that reflection and value inquiry skills are important aspects of any curriculum in democratic cultures (p. 67); that "the more perspectives we have, the more closely we approach accuracy" in understanding the past and the present (p. 98); and that identities lodged in "selves" (such as "white" as "male") can and need to be reconstructed to be more open, accepting, and understanding of difference (p. 108).

Without clarifying what soul as a category encapsulates as I have tried to do in this paper, educators must talk around the need to address integration of thinking, feeling, and willing necessary to confront "in an honest and direct way the negative aspects of history, the

arts, and science" required for transformative education (Nieto & Bode, 2008). They must continually justify agency and imagination as helpmates to educational processes; and endlessly deliberate what from the canon is necessary, who needs to learn what about others, and why diversity is important to preserve and respect. Inviting soul back into educational discourse in the way I have reconceived in this paper would allow for transparent, open, and contextual resolutions of the deliberations conscious of the past, sensitive to the present, and open to future needs and conditions.

I think Steiner's assertion that an emphasis on the aesthetic in one's younger years is more developmentally appropriate than a scientific emphasis needs more research. However, since one's ability to experience, language, and understand one's emotional life is basic to being able to express one's interests in social situations such as classrooms, it does make sense to me to begin with the arts and the aesthetic approaches I discussed in Chapter 3 while we are researching. Introducing both the sciences and the humanities through an aesthetic lens and with aesthetic activities will be a significant challenge to educators guided by self or mind development. To do so, I think the aesthetic, affective, moral, and organic aspects of the human soul have to be addressed in teacher education programs. textbooks, and school boards. The issues and problems that were experienced during the first five years of the Free Waldorf School (FWS) may be instructive to teacher education organizations in what may be most needed to address soul as I have conceived it in their programs for prospective teachers.

Soul in Teacher Education

Primary among the difficulties was that teachers had not had the kind of schooling that prepared them to carry out at the FWS, and thus they could not just reproduce their own experience. They needed adequate time and skills to prepare for each lesson, especially if it was subject matter they had not learned in school such as watercolor painting or biology.

They had to break the habit of instructing through lecture and learn how to engage the curiosity of their students in subject material. In order to encourage student reflection and conversation about what they were learning, teachers needed learning experiences which welcomed their questions and doubts, celebrating inquiry instead of certainty. These skills must be addressed in today's teacher education programs consciously and creatively so that today's teachers can be successful in their efforts. Teacher educators need to model these skills for and encourage their practice by students rather than lecturing and testing only content that is already known.

While the processes of observation, reflection, conversation, and conclusion are addressed in science education to some extent, students are usually tasked with applying these processes to confirm what is already known and will be helpful for students to know as fundamental to scientific discourse. The arts, if taught at all, are also bounded by the application of tried and tested principles fundamental to aesthetic discourse. Teacher education programs need to make the rationales of these discourses explicit in the way I and my fellow co-facilitator had to make parental rationales likely to have the desired results understood by prospective adoptive/foster parents in our parenting classes. The way these discourses are taught cannot infringe on or leave vulnerable the agency and imaginations of students. This aim requires the thinking, feeling, and willing of teacher educators to be integrated enough to honor and respect difference within their classroom, to be open to the unknown when it comes through the door, and to acknowledge with humility and honesty when they fail to do either. In other words, the soul of the teacher educator must be capable of seeing difference in conscious, creative, and compassionate ways. They must be striving

for emotional and social literacy. I thus assert that study, practice, and conversation in the arts and humanities have to be as thorough as in that of the sciences for future teachers.

Content had to meet community and state requirements despite what the students at FWS were interested in or for which they might be ready given their individual development. Community and state requirements must be made more sensitive to the need for aesthetic and affective aspects of content and pedagogy for souls to be adequately nourished in schools, and for the next generation to become socially and emotionally literate. I think this is the area of greatest challenge in today's schools, and why "soul" as I have conceived of in this paper must be invited back into contemporary curriculum theory. Curriculum theorists speak to textbook publisher's, teacher educators, local school boards and administrators, and state policy makers. If change is to happen in our educational system, conversations are critical between these groups about the need to address more than a student's mind or self and the community's need for certain kinds of workers. This change has significant social implications and must have general social support to be successful.

Parents (and probably some teachers) had difficulty initially with the idea of an interdisciplinary main lesson to cover academic content at the FWS, and parents and teachers had difficulties with it in my experience as a Waldorf School teacher. As at FWS, complaints and concerns diminished over time. If this aspect of Waldorf Education is adopted in mainstream curricula, prospective teachers need to understand why it is effective. A study of graduates from Waldorf Schools may be helpful.

I shared concerns and questions about the daily and yearly schedules of FWS in Chapter 3 and will not repeat them here. Using storytelling as the preferred way to convey information is advocated fiercely in standard educational discourse by philosopher Kieran

Egan (1986). That it is easy to incorporate sensory images, affective experiences, and different cognitive capacities as well as multiple points of view and contrast in story form is a given to most people, but so are the observations that stories often are used to reinforce the status quo, simplify complex phenomena to the point that the complexity is lost and truth unrecognizable, and may be more fantasy than fact. Teacher education institutions need to thoroughly address this practice so that teachers can stand behind it if they choose to use it.

Conclusion

As I mentioned in the Introduction, I began this research wondering if reconceptualizing "soul" could help to address issues in contemporary curriculum theory. Specifically, I hoped I could find a way to connect my ideas about "soul," founded less in Catholic theology and more in the work of Rudolf Steiner and Mari Ruti, to how one might teach openness to the unknown, capacities to judge difference as other than a threat, and responses to difference that were creative, compassionate, and conscious. I chose a hermeneutic study to investigate my question. I have struggled with my own assumptions to interpret Steiner's and Ruti's work to forge a new horizon for what we might mean when referring to "soul".

This research has strengthened my confidence in these assertions:

- that mind and self are not the only categories one can use to structure one's inner life
- that a reconceptualization of the word "soul" is possible so that somatic, aesthetic, moral, subjective, and creative aspects of knowing can be addressed in educational curricula;

- that an aesthetic approach to learning before puberty is a better foundation to emotional and social intelligence—perhaps every kind of intelligence—than a scientific approach;
- that early emphasis on textual literacy and abstract generalizations may be short-changing the imagination and agency we need as human beings to be open to the unknown and deliberate difference as it is encountered rather than as habit.

I recognize that this new horizon may not persuade educational communities preoccupied with accountability and empirical evidence. It includes Steiner's recognition of spiritual truths as evolving and thus never resolved or extant in the physical world but inspirational and influential to us who can act in that world. This new horizon will be uncomfortable for those who want unequivocal, clear, and foundational truths because it holds that when a particular manifestation of a truth is understood, it must remain open to unknown possibilities that make order and clarity difficult. One must be alert to meanings which may serve one's purpose better, serve other purposes and have no bearing on this experience, or create an entirely new purpose. Therefore, difference is to be welcomed and deliberated, not ignored, and not accepted blindly. This new horizon calls for understanding that truth as we "know" it is as sensorial, social, spiritual, and subject to change. Soul as I have reconceived it in this paper is all four processes; it includes minds and selves, and should thus be invited back into the discourse.

These ideas and realities are especially important to the social sphere. Curricula aimed at minds and/or selves undermine the development of social and emotional literacy in today's classrooms because the truths such curricula are looking for do not recognize that truth is *and* is not; that there is mystery and unknown once a particular truth is manifested,

and that each instance is unique. There are increased odds something predictable will happen the more one knows, senses, and is open to considering. But these orientations tell you nothing about what will happen. Only what might. Tomorrow, we may have clearer understandings and be surprised. Curricula which aim at developing souls should be devoted to habits which foster openness to the unknown, protect differences, and are necessary for democratic deliberation. In place of certainty, it may offer something more true, more beautiful, or more just.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, I. (2008). Art in social studies: Exploring the world and ourselves with Rembrandt. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 42*(2), pp. 19-37.

Albrecht, Karl (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of success.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Alexander, M. (2010, 2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness.* San Francisco, CA: The New Press.

A man before others: Rudolf Steiner remembered (1993). Bristol, England: Rudolf Steiner Press.

Arthur, J.; Davison, J.; Stow, W. (2000). *Social literacy: Citizenship education and the national curriculum.* New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Asprem, E. (2014). *The problem of disenchantment: Scientific naturalism and esoteric discourse 1900-1939.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Atwell-Vasey, W. (1998). *Nourishing words.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Banks, J.A. (2002). *An introduction to multicultural education.* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Barnes, H. (1997). *A life for the spirit: Rudolf Steiner in the crosscurrents of our time.* Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press.

Bennett, L. (2008). Elementary students quilting through social studies. *Journal Aesthetic Education, 42*(1), 90-99.

Biesta, G.J. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, and democracy.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Biesta, G.J. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001) *White supremacy and racism in the post-civil rights era.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018) *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence Of racial inequality in America.* (5th ed.). Lantham, MD: Rowen & Littlefield.

Bresler, L. (1995) The subservient, co-equal, affective, and social integration styles and their implications for the profession. *Arts Education Policy Review*, May/Jun95, Vol. 96, (5), 31-37.

Brooke, J. H. (1991). *Science and religion: some historical perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brophy, J. & Alleman, J. (2008). Early elementary social studies. In L.S. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 33-49). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cornbleth, C. & Waugh, D. (1995) *The great speckled bird: Multicultural politics and education policymaking.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Cowhey, M. (2006). *Black ants and Buddhists: Thinking critically & teaching differently in the primary grades*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Crabbe, J.C. (1999). Introduction. In J.C. Crabbe (Ed.), *From soul to self* (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: Routledge.

Croce, P. J. (1995). *Science and religion in the era of William James*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of NC Press.

Devlin, S., Healy, O., Leader, G., & Hughes, B. (2011). Comparison of behavioral intervention and sensory-integration therapy in the treatment of challenging behavior. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders,* 10/2011, Volume 41, Issue 10, 1303–1320.

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience.* New York, NY: Minton, Balch & Company.

Easton, S. C. (1980). *Rudolf Steiner, herald of a new epoch.* Spring Valley, NY: Anthroposophic Press.

Egan, K. (1986). *Teaching as storytelling: An alternative approach to teaching and curriculum in the elementary school.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Egan, K. (1997). *The educated mind: How cognitive tools shape our understanding*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Egan, K. (2002). *Getting it wrong from the beginning: Our progressivist inheritance from Herbert Spencer, John Dewey, and Jean Piaget*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Egan, K. (2005). *An imaginative approach to teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Egan, K. (2008). *The future of education: Reimagining our schools from the ground up*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Egan, K. (2010). *Learning in depth: A simple innovation that can transform schooling*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eisner, E. W. (1985/1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan College Publishing Co.

Evans, R. W. (2015). *Schooling corporate citizens: How accountability reform has Damaged civic education and undermined democracy.* Routledge: NY, NY.

Faivre, A. (1994). *Access to western esotericism.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Faivre, A. (2010). *Western esotericism: A concise history.* (C. Rhone, Trans.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Freire, P. (2001). *The pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group, Inc.

Fresne, J. & Louk, D. (2013) Traveling the world through the vehicle of music. In T. Lintner, (Ed.). *Integrative strategies for the K-12 social studies classroom* (pp. 127-148). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Gadamer, H. (1975). *Truth and method. (2nd ed.).* (Sheed & Ward, Ltd., Trans.). G. Borden & J. Cumming (Eds.). New York, NY: The Seabury Press.

Gardner, H. (2000). *The disciplined mind.* New York NY: Penguin Books.

Gardner, J. F. (1975/1996). *Education in search of the spirit.* (2nd ed.). Originally published as *The experience of knowledge.* (1975). Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press.

Goetz, S. & Taliaferro, C. (2011). *A brief history of the soul.* West Sussex, GB: Wiley-Blackwell.

Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The revolutionary new science of human relationships.* New York, NY: Bantam Dell.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change.* New York, NY: Josey-Bass.

Grumet, M. (2004). No one learns alone. In N. Rabkin & R. Redmond (Eds.), *Putting the Arts in the picture: Reframing education in the 21st century* (pp. 49-80). Chicago, IL: Columbia College Chicago.

Halvorsen, A. (2013) *A history of elementary school social studies: Romance and reality*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Hartlieb, F. (1928) *The Free Waldorf School at Stuttgart.* (E. Collison, Trans.). New York, NY: Anthroposophic Press.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publ., Inc.

Huebner, D. E. (1999). *The lure of the transcendent: Collected essays by Dwayne E. Huebner*. V. Hillis & W. Pinar (Eds.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hyatt, K. J., Stephenson, J., & Carter, M. (2009). A review of three controversial Educational practices: Perceptual motor programs, sensory integration, and tinted lenses. *Education & Treatment of Children*; Pittsburgh Vol. 32, Iss. 2, (May 2009): 313-342.

Kessler, R. (2000). *The soul of education: Helping students find connection, compassion, and character at school.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kinsella, E. A. (2006). Hermeneutics and critical hermeneutics: Exploring possibilities within the art of interpretation. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7(3), Art. 19, http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114- fqs0603190.

Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Lachman, G. (2007). *Rudolf Steiner: An introduction to his life and work.* New York, NY: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin.

Levstik, L. (2008). What happens in social studies classrooms? Research on K-12 social studies practice. In L.S. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 50-62). New York, NY: Routledge.

Levstik, L. (2011). *Doing history.* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lindenberg, C. (2012). *Rudolf Steiner-a biography.* (J. McAlice, Trans.). Great Barrington, MA: SteinerBooks. (Original work published 1997).

Longstreet, W.S. (2003). Early postmodernism in social education—Revisiting "decision-making: the heart of social studies instruction." *The Social Studies,* (Washington, DC), 94 (1), 11-14.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Martin, J. & McLellan, A. (2013). *The education of selves: How psychology transformed students.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Matias, C. (2016). *Feeling white: whiteness, emotionality, and education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

May-Benson, T. A & Koomar, J. A. (2010). Systematic review of the research evidence examining the effectiveness of interventions using a sensory integrative... *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 05/2010, Volume 64, Issue 3, 403-414.

Meyer, T.H. (2015). *Milestones in the life of Rudolf Steiner and in the development of anthroposophy.* (M. Barton, Trans.). Forest Row, England: Temple Lodge.

Miller, J. P. (2000). *Education and the soul: Toward a spiritual curriculum*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.

Mueller-Vollmer, K. (1985) Introduction. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.), *The hermeneutics Reader,* (pp. 1-53). New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Nieto, S. & Bode. P. (2008) *Affirming diversity.* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Noblit, G.W., Corbett, H.D., Wilson, B. L., & McKinney, M.B. (2009). *Creating and sustaining arts-based school reform the A+ schools program.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Nord, W. A. (2010). *Does God make a difference?: Taking religion seriously in our Schools and universities.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Oberman, I. (1998). *Fidelity and flexibility in Waldorf education, 1919-1998*. (Doctoral dissertation).

Osmond, R. (2003). *Imagining the soul: A history.* Gloucestershire, GB: Sutton Publishing Limited.

Petrash, J. (2002). *Understanding Waldorf education: Teaching from the inside out.* Beltsville, MD: Gryphon House, Inc.

Pinar, W. & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum.* Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co.

Reed, E. (1997). *From soul to mind: The emergence of psychology, from Erasmus Darwin to William James*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rury, J. L. (2002). *Education and social change: Themes in the history of American schooling*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Ruti, M. (2006). *Reinventing the soul: Posthumanist theory and psychic life.* New York, NY: Other Press.

Santoli, S.P. & Vitulli, P. (2013) Picture this: The integration of art and social studies. In T. Lintner (Ed.), *Integrative strategies for the K-12 social studies classroom* (pp. 15-38). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Sardello, R. & Sanders, C. (1999). Care of the senses: Neglected dimension of education. In J. Kane (Ed), *Education, information, and transformation: Essays on learning and thinking* (pp. 223-248). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sartre, J. P. (1981). *The words.* (B. Frechtman, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Schokel, L.A. (1998). *A manual of hermeneutics.* Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Semel S. F. & Sadovnik, A. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Schools of tomorrow, schools of today: What happened to progressive education.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Steiner, R. (1904/1988). *Theosophy.* (H.B. Monges, Trans. revised for 1988 ed. by G. Church). Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press, Inc. (Original work published 1904).

Steiner, R. (1909/1975). *The education of the child.* (2nd ed.). (G. Adams & M. Adams, Trans.). Letchworth, Hertfordshire: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published in 1909).

Steiner, R. (1913/1985). Self-education: Autobiographical reflections. (A. Wulsin, Trans.). Spring Valley, NY: Mercury Press.

Steiner, R. (1925/1980). *Rudolf Steiner: an autobiography.* (2nd ed.). (R. Stebbing, Trans.). Blauvelt, N.Y: SteinerBooks (Original work published 1925).

Steiner, R. (1926/1997). *The essentials of education.* London: Anthroposophical Publishing Company. (Original work published 1926)

Steiner, R. (1932/1975). *Study of Man*. (2nd ed. revised by A.C. Harwood). (D. Harwood & H. Fox, Trans.). London: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1932).

Steiner, R. (1937/1976). *Practical advice to teachers*. (J. Collis, Trans.). London: Rudolf Steiner Press. (Original work published 1937).

Steiner, R. (1947/1990). *Balance in teaching*. (R. Pusch, Trans.). Spring Valley, NY: Mercury Press. (Original work published in 1947).

Steiner, R. (1961/1983). *Discussions with teachers: fifteen discussions with the teachers of the Stuttgart Waldorf School, August 21-September 6, 1919.* (Helen Fox, Trans.). Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press. (Original work published 1961).

Steiner, R. (1975/1998). *Faculty meetings with Rudolf Steiner.* (R. Lathe & N. Parsons Whittaker, Trans.). Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press. (Original work published 1975).

Steiner, R. (1986). *Soul economy: Body, soul, and spirit in Waldorf Education*. (R. Everett, Trans.). Spring Valley, NY: Anthroposophic Press.

Steiner, R. (1996). *Rudolf Steiner in the Waldorf School: Lectures and addresses to children, parents, and teachers.* Hudson, NY: Anthroposophic Press.

Stockmeyer, K. (1969/1991). *Rudolf Steiner's curriculum for Waldorf Schools.* (R. Everett-Zada, Trans.). Worcester, England: Billings & Sons.

Street, Brian (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol.5 (2) 77-91.

Taubman, P. M. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Turner, T. T. (2013). The play's the thing: Integrating drama with social studies. In T. Lintner, (Ed.), *Integrative strategies for the K-12 social studies classroom* (pp. 39-62). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Ullrich, H. (2008). *Rudolf Steiner*. New York, NY: Continuum International Pub. Group.

von Heydebrand, C. (1944/1966). *The Curriculum of the first Waldorf School.* (E.M. Hutchins, Trans.). London: Steiner Schools Fellowship. (Original work published in 1944).

Weissman, D. (2004). You can't get much better than that. In Rabkin, N. & Redmond, R. (Eds.). *Putting the arts in the picture reframing education in the 21st century* (pp. 17-48). Chicago, IL: Columbia College Chicago.

Wertheim, M. (1995). *Pythagoras' trousers: God, physics, and the gender wars.* New York, NY: Times Books/Random House.

Wozniak, R. H. (1995). "Mind and Body: Rene Déscartes to William James" http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/Mind/; Bryn Mawr College, Serendip 1995. Originally published in 1992 at Bethesda, MD & Washington, DC by the National Library of Medicine and the American Psychological Association.