From *Adult Education Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 4, Summer 1984, pp. 185-196. Copyright © by American Association of Adult and Continuing Education. Reprinted by permission.

ADULT EDUCATION QUARTERLY
Volume 34, Number 4, Summer, 1984, 185–196

THE CONTRIBUTION OF EDUARD LINDEMAN TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY IN ADULT EDUCATION

STEPHEN BROOKFIELD

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to assess the extent to which Eduard Lindeman has created the framework of discourse and analysis predominant in adult education. Six contributions to the development of conceptual frameworks, philosophical imperatives and substantive foci are identified: (1) the conceptualization of adult education as a collaborative, informal, yet critical exchange between learners and teachers, (2) the critical theory of adult learning in which adults become aware of the historicity of their individual existence and social environment, and through which adults discover the roots of their personal and social conduct, (3) the introduction and articulation of the concept of andragogy into the American literature of adult education, (4) the emphasis on the social mission of adult education, (5) the identification of the small discussion group as the pedagogic mode unique to adult education, and, (6) the specification of a curricular domain for adult education.

Tracing the links between the central tenets of a thinker's work and the subsequent development of analytic paradigms in a discipline presents the ultimate challenge in epistemological analysis. It is simple enough to develop quantitative indices providing seemingly objective assessments of a writer's importance. We can count the number of books published by, or written about, a particular author, or we can record the number of times an author is cited by fellow writers in professional journals. Such an analysis of citation patterns in the American *Adult Education* journal has been undertaken by Boshier and Pickard (1979). What is far more difficult, however, is to assess the extent to which an author, who was writing when a discipline was in a pre-paradigmatic state, came to create the framework of discourse for subsequent analysis in that discipline. Weber, Durkheim, Freud, and Keynes, for example, can be considered major figures in their respective social sciences because the questions they asked and concepts they generated to answer those questions still command the attention of contemporary thinkers.

Because adult education as a field of academic study is relatively recent, the problem of assessing the influence of early theorists is particularly difficult. Indeed, one could argue that adult education is still in a pre-paradigmatic state, or, at best, that it is characterized by paradigmatic plurality. In terms of the philosophical perspectives informing practice, for example, Elias and Merriam

---

Stephen Brookfield is an assistant professor of Adult and Continuing Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. The author would like to thank Edward Rielly for his assistance during this research.

(1980) identify six schools of thought which still exert considerable influence. There are vigorous debates concerning the proper realm of adult education practice, particularly between those who advocate that adult education must ally itself with movements for social change (Healy, 1981; Joyce, 1974; Lovett, 1975; Thompson, 1980) and those who believe that such practice represents an unwarranted invasion by educators into the arena of political activism (Even, 1981; Lawson, 1983; Paterson, 1973). There is even serious disagreement concerning the uniqueness of the adult learning process and the empirical accuracy of the central concept of andragogy.

It is also instructive to remember that many professional adult educators do not even allow theoretical or philosophical elements to enter into their consideration of practice. As Monette (1979) has commented, "There seems to exist in adult education a fear of unmasking the value choices underlying adult educational practice, as if once identified they might prove embarrassing to this "service oriented" profession" (p. 87).

This paradigmatic plurality, this lack of agreement regarding the proper form and realm of adult education practice, and this lack of attention to value and ethical questions in the professional literature, mean that an assessment of the work of the chief philosopher in American adult education, Eduard Lindeman, is made particularly problematic. The purpose of this paper, nonetheless, is to attempt such an undertaking.

Lindeman's writings on adult education span the inter-war decades and attest to the relevance of adult education to the war effort and to post-war economic and social reconstruction. He offered a conceptualization of practice which still guides many adult educators; he outlined a critical theory of adult learning; he introduced the concept of andragogy into the American literature; he argued constantly for the social relevance of adult education; he identified what he regarded as the distinctive method of adult education; he defined what he felt to be the proper curricular domain of adult education. An indication of his importance to leaders in the field is provided in a recent study by Ilsley (1982) in which Lindeman's *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926a) was nominated by ten professors of adult education as the most important contribution to the literature of the field, along with *The Modern Practice of Adult Education* (Knowles 1980). In two other papers published on Lindeman's work (Brookfield, 1983; Brookfield, 1984) this writer has discussed the contemporary relevance of Lindeman's most renowned philosophical treatise, *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926a). In the present paper the whole range of Lindeman's published writings are reviewed as well as a number of unpublished papers and speeches consulted by the author at the Lindeman archives of the Butler Library, Columbia University (New York) and at the Social Welfare History Archive of the University of Minnesota.

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ADULT EDUCATION

In one of his first writings on adult education, Lindeman (1925) warned against the dangers of faddism and linguistic debauchery confounding attempts to define adult education. A discussion of workers' education and public libraries (1926b) offered the opportunity for an early differentiation of adult education

from other forms of education. Hence, adult education emphasized the primacy of personal experience, had as its aim the interpersonal exchange of such experience, and relied for the analysis of this experience upon the technique of discussion. In this discussion, the group leader acted as guide and stimulator rather than lawgiver. Indeed, Lindeman (1926a) argued throughout his life that the emphasis on interpersonal exploration of experience meant that "adult education must be confined to small groups and that lectures and mass teaching are automatically eliminated" (p. 11). This methodological imperative will be discussed later in the paper.

Lindeman identified two opposing paradigms of thought extant within American adult education concerning the proper realm of practice. The first of these, what he called the mechanistic school, held adult education to be the extension of existing forms of education to the illiterate and underprivileged. Lindeman (1938) regarded this as a "naively instrumental" and "philanthropic" (p. 2) approach which was essentially static and quantitative. In contrast to this was the organic conception in which adult education represented "a new quality and a new dimension in education" (1938, p. 3). This qualitative dimension was one in which adult education was "a right, a normal expectancy" rather than a charitable extension of existing privilege to a new population.

The best known statement of Lindeman of his view of adult education is contained in *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926a) in which adult education is held to be a lifelong activity, to be non-vocational, to concern itself with situations not subjects in teaching, and to place primary emphasis on the learner's experience. Of these four cardinal principles, three still predominate in respect to the conduct of adult education in the United States. The importance of lifelong learning is commonly asserted, and the emphasis on situations and on the importance of learners' experiences underly the pedagogical prescriptions of radical Freireans as well as those subscribing to the concept of andragogy. It is the emphasis on the essentially non-vocational character of adult education, the belief that "adult education more accurately defined begins where vocational education leaves off" (Lindeman, 1926a, p. 5), which stands today as the most defiantly radical of Lindeman's characterizations of adult education. Indeed, in one of his last publications he reaffirmed his conviction that adult education "is wholly lacking in coercive or compulsive elements" and that it was "an act of free will" (Lindeman, 1953, p. 18). Such unequivocal declarations concerning the centrality of the volunteer principle comprise a valuable source of justification for current opponents of mandatory continuing education.

A CRITICAL THEORY OF ADULT EDUCATION

The most succinct (though little known) definition of adult education offered by Lindeman is contained in a paper entitled "*What is Adult Education?*" written in 1925. In this piece Lindeman describes adult education as,

> a co-operative venture in non-authoritarian, informal learning the chief purpose of which is to discover the meaning of experience; a quest of the mind which digs down to the roots of the preconceptions which formulate our conduct; a technique of learning for adults which makes education coterminous with life,

and hence elevates living itself to the level of an experiment (Lindeman 1925, p. 3)

In the same paper Lindeman offers his earliest outline of a critical theory of adult education. In an analysis which predated Freire's critique of banking education (Freire, 1970) by forty years, Lindeman condemned the "merely additive process" of education in schools whereby the teacher "gets from his students what he has already imparted out of his academic repository" (Lindeman, 1925, p. 2). Adult education was the antithesis of this additive process and represented "a new technique for learning . . . a process by which the adult learns to become aware of and to evaluate his experience" (Lindeman, 1925, p. 3). The adult learner was not regarded as "merely engaged in the pursuit of knowledge; he is, in short, changing his habits, learning to live on behalf of new motivations" (Lindeman, 1937, p. 6).

Lindeman ascribed to adult education the necessity of furthering the discovery of the meaning of experience, assisting in the critical evaluation of such experience, and attempting to understand the preconceptions underlying such conduct—all of which find a ready echo in the writings of current critical theorists of adult education. The chief of these, Paulo Freire, proposes dialogic, problem-posing education as the antithesis of the narrative or banking system of education (Freire, 1970). More recently, Mezirow (1981) has fused Habermas' emancipatory domain of learning with his own notion of perspective transformation to construct a critical theory of adult learning and education. At the heart of this theory is the process of "bringing psychocultural assumptions into critical consciousness to help a person understand how he or she has come into possession of conceptual categories, rules, tactics and criteria for judging implicit in habits of perception, thought and behavior" (Mezirow, 1981, p. 20). The philosophical congruence between the ideas of Lindeman and Mezirow is apparent here.

Lindeman also emphasized the futurist dimension of education so important to Freire. Repeatedly in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 1970) Freire affirms the "revolutionary futurity" (p. 72) of problem-posing education and he writes that "problem-posing theory and practice take man's historicity as their starting point" (p. 71). In a paper written toward the end of World War II, Lindeman declared that "adult education is always futuristic" and "a daring challenge to life that is to come" (Lindeman, 1944, p. 116). Adult educators were seen as "heralds of the future" (p. 117) rather than as commentators on history and the starting point for adult educational analysis was "not history but rather the contemporary situation" (p. 116). Hence, adult education began with the present, demonstrated that present circumstances resulted from specific historical antecedents, and affirmed the possibility of humankind to change the future. Again, the similarity between these ideas and Freire's emphasis on stimulating individuals' awareness of the historicity of their situations, and hence their potential for change, hardly needs stating.

ANDRAGOGY

Currently "andragogy" is perhaps the most favored of adult educators' shibboleths. As a term summarizing a number of central beliefs concerning the

unique character of adult learning, it has gained great favor ever since its initial exposition by Malcolm Knowles (1968) in *Adult Leadership*. Although adult educators such as John Elias and Cyril Houle have challenged the view that adult learning is different in kind from that of children, the concept remains the single most important contribution to a uniquely adult theory of teaching and learning. It is not the intention of this paper to comment on the empirical veracity or explanatory power of andragogy. Rather, the intention is to show that the term was employed by Lindeman to differentiate adult from childhood learning some fifty years before what is usually considered to be its introduction into the American literature.

In tracing the conceptual and linguistic roots of andragogy Knowles (1968, 1977, 1978, 1980) cites a number of Germanic, French Canadian and Yugoslavian sources. His correspondence with Merriam-Webster dictionaries (Knowles, 1980, pp. 253–254) reveals that Webster's can find no previous use of the term in English. It is all the more surprising, therefore, that despite the best investigatory efforts of Knowles and the Merriam-Webster researchers, the first use of the term in the English language (that of Lindeman) has remained undetected for so long.

In the mid-1920's, Lindeman, together with Martha Anderson, undertook an interpretative translation of literature describing the folk-high school system in Germany. Under the title *Education Through Experience* (Anderson & Lindeman, 1927a), the authors outlined the methods of the Academy of Labor in Frankfurt-am-Main and early in the work introduced a section entitled "Andragogy". That same year this section of the work was excerpted and published in an issue of the *Worker's Education* journal (Anderson & Lindeman, 1927b). One of the authors whose words received interpretative translation as part of the *Education Through Experience* monograph was Eugen Rosenstock, recognized by Knowles (1978, p. 49) as a user of the term in Germany in the 1920's, thus it is likely that Lindeman and Anderson drew on his writings in their exposition of andragogy. At any rate, in their own formulation of this concept the authors declared,

> Schools are for children. Life itself is the adult's school. Pedagogy is the method by which children are taught. Demagogy is the path by which adults are intellectually betrayed. Andragogy is the true method of adult learning. In andragogy theory becomes fact; that is, words become responsible acts, accountable deeds, and the practical fact which arises out of necessity is illumined by theory. (Anderson & Lindeman, 1927a, pp. 2–3).

Lindeman further elaborates the distinction between childhood experience and adult maturity by viewing adult experience as located within the realm of purposeful action. Hence,

> between the child and the adult lies the field of action. The adult enters history and becomes a link in the chain of guilt, entanglement, want and pain. (p. 3)

The attainment of adulthood is characterized by a growing awareness of self and by a readiness to make existential choices. The adult learning process is held to constitute "an effort toward self-mastery". (p. 3) and this perceptual

journey comes to resemble a Hegelian quest for synthesis through a conflict of thesis and antithesis.

> The adult comes from public life with his needs and questions; he brings with him a world of unarranged and untested conceptions, terms and elements of education. The rudimentary principle of forceful intelligence is conflict; in adults this conflict is consummated in opposition, criticism, discussion. The adult can accept only when at the same time he eliminates; his education is a living intellectual interchange of the substance of thought (pp. 3–4)

This exposition of andragogy is more similar to Freire, Fromm, and Habermas than it is to Knowles. Knowles uses the term as an empirical descriptor, summarizing what he considers to be deriving the chief features of adult learning and development, and, from this summation, a set of teaching (facilitating) procedures to be used with adults. The language used by Lindeman in his description of an adult entering history and becoming a link in a chain of guilt, entanglement, want, and pain is imbued with a kind of existential *angst* and recalls Freire's emphasis on encouraging human awareness of historicity discussed in the previous section. In his development of a charter for andragogy, Mezirow (1981) emphasizes the fostering of a self-corrective, reflexive approach to learning and the development in adults of habits of critical perception, both of which exhibit similarities to Lindeman's original articulation of this concept.

THE SOCIAL NATURE AND PURPOSE OF ADULT EDUCATION

Perhaps the most overlooked element in Lindeman's philosophy of progressive liberalism concerns the social nature and purpose of education. Such neglect can probably be explained by the comparatively early publication date of *The Meaning of Adult Education*, the work best known to modern day adult educators. The book was published in 1926 and therefore represents an early stage in Lindeman's thought. It elaborated pedagogic principles, urging a form of artistic democratization, and the fostering of individual creativity and freedom. Even here, however, Lindeman commented on the gratuitous nature of calls to overcome individualism. Adults were caught within social milieu, were forced to be social by virtue of their enlarging needs, and adult education itself was acknowledged to have a collective dimension.

It was in the 1930's and 1940's, however, that Lindeman wrote with increasing force and clarity on the irreducibly social purpose of adult education. In this attention to social relevance, Lindeman was, of course, reflecting the emphasis on community development, a central feature of the adult education movement in the depression era ar[illegible]he inter-war years. In the introduction to a pamphlet on *Adult Education for S[illegible]ial Change* (Lindeman, 1937) he declared that "adult education is learning associated with social purposes" (p. 6) and that "The complete objective of adult education is to synchronize the democratic and the learning processes" (p. 6). This pamphlet also contains the first example of the interchange of the terms 'adult education' and 'social education', which increasingly characterized Lindeman's writing in the 1930's and 1940's. In a 1938 address to the Pennsylvania State Association for Adult Education, he declared that "the goals of adult education are to be social in nature" (Lindeman, 1938,

p. 5), and in 1945 he wrote that "what distinguishes adult education is the fact that its purpose is definitely social" (Lindeman, 1945a, pp. 8–9).

The social purpose of adult education was the preservation of democracy in the face of demagoguery and dictatorship. In emphasizing the threat to democracy posed by various forms of totalitarianism, Lindeman was reacting to the advent of fascist regimes in Italy, Spain and Germany. Repeatedly he affirmed that "Social education is the operating alternative for dominance, dictatorship, and violence" (Lindeman, 1937, p. 6) and that "adult education is the answer to blind prejudice and demagoguery" (Lindeman, 1944, p. 115). At the time when Fromm and other Frankfurt school social critics were documenting the *Fear of Freedom* (Fromm, 1942) in reaction to the contemporary European susceptibility to totalitarian regimes, Lindeman urged that the primary task of adult education be to assist adults in making informed choices about important social and political issues. Towards the end of World War II, he wrote that "Without a sense of responsibility towards choice-making among the adult citizens, there can be no effective democracy" (Lindeman, 1944, pp. 115–116). In his analysis of the reasons for the war, he asserted that a large measure of responsibility must be borne by those whose political illiteracy had made them susceptible to the diversionary stratagems of skilled politicians.

The most lucid statements of Lindeman regarding the immutable connection between adult education and the survival of democracy appeared in two articles published in 1945. In *The Sociology of Adult Education* he reaffirmed that "Adult education is integral to the democratic struggle" and that "Without adult education we are subject to the increasing influence of demagogues" (Lindeman, 1945a, p. 10). Adult education was one means of ensuring that citizens learned to use their collective power wisely through the emphasis on shared learning, shared authority, and the collaborative determination of curriculum characterizing an adult education class. In *World Peace Through Adult Education* he declared that "The only reliable instrument for establishing confidence among nations is adult education" (Lindeman, 1945b, p. 23). The neighborhood discussion group was the specific medium through which such confidence would be realized, in that it allowed for the combating of propaganda, for the change of opinion without loss of face, and for the emergence of natural (rather than arbitrary and artificial) leadership.

In his continued emphasis on adult education as a force to counter the threats posed by demagoguery, dominance, and dictatorship, Lindeman recalls not only Erich Fromm, but also Paulo Freire. In his description of the role education played in combatting the process of massification in Brazilian society, Freire wrote that the educator must promote "a critical education which could help to form critical attitudes" (Freire, 1973, p. 32). This acquisition of critical thought would help people to resist the mythical explanations of reality peddled by the mass media. Only through participation in democratic activities such as influencing the management of schools and involvement with labor unions, clubs, councils, associations, churches and neighborhood groups, would an authentic education for democracy take place. Freire wrote of the Brazilian people that "They could be helped to learn democracy through the exercise of democracy; for that knowledge, above all others, can only be assimilated experientially" (Freire, 1973, p. 36).

Nearly thirty years previous to these comments Lindeman had declared that the participation of citizens in informed social action was the hallmark of a democratic society. Since social action was, in essence, the use of force or coercion, such force had to be derived from the application of intelligence and reason. To Lindeman this meant that "Adult education thus turns out to be the most reliable instrument for social actionists" (Lindeman, 1945a, p. 11) since it ensured that any action taken was authentically democratic. The clearest statement regarding the irreducible conceptual and practical connection between social action and adult education was contained in the declaration that "Every social action group should at the same time be an adult education group, and I go even so far as to believe that all successful adult education groups sooner or later become social action groups" (Lindeman, 1945a, p. 12).

ADULT EDUCATION METHODS AND CURRICULA

We have already seen that Lindeman rejected the notion of education as a merely additive process and that he felt lectures and mass teaching should be automatically eliminated as adult education methods. Discussion was the method unique to adult education and the only setting appropriate for the adoption of discursive techniques was the small study group. In *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926a) Lindeman wrote enthusiastically of the study circles and tutorial groups characteristic of the Danish folk-high schools and the British workers' education movements. The discussion circle was proposed as "the setting for adult education, the modern quest for life's meaning" (1926a, p. 31). In this setting small groups of aspiring adults learned through the analysis of pertinent situations while reflecting upon their experience rather than resorting to texts and secondary facts.

In his entry to the *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (Lindeman, 1930) he declared that "If there is anything distinctive about method in adult education, it is derived from the growing use of discussion" and that "The discussion method has come to be the accepted learning process for large numbers of adult classes" (p. 465). It was a method admirably suited to adults since teacher and learner enjoyed a level of experience which could be utilized as educative material. Discussion was also a collaborative method of learning which confirmed the democratic nature of adult education.

This concentration on the method unique to adult education was characteristic of Lindeman's early work. In *The Meaning of Adult Education* (1926a) he deplored the emphasis on curriculum development at the expense of pedagogic method and expressed surprise that "schoolmen now find their center of interest in curriculum-making", an activity he held to be "the process of transforming the school into a department-store bargain counter" (p. 11). To him the emphasis on curriculum development reflected the unfortunate centrality of subject teaching in American education, a practice he attacked as being "compatible with a perverted and shallow pragmatism and profitable to an industrial order which requires technicians, not educated men and women" (p. 15). Hence, it is not surprising that in 1926 he advised adult educators to devote their major concerns to method rather than content.

This aversion to developing a curriculum grounded in, and suited to, the

unique concerns of adulthood has, in general, typified the writings of adult educators since that time. Verduin (1980) and Griffin (1983) have given recent attention to this issue, but studies of participation, program development manuals, or descriptive surveys of practice predominate within the literature of the field. It was not until the 1940's, nearly twenty years after the publication of *The Meaning of Adult Education*, that Lindeman, in anticipation of the post-war peace, recanted his earlier assertions and devoted his attention to the question of what should be an appropriate curriculum for adult education. Between 1944 and 1947 he published four articles outlining the role adult education could play in post-war reconstruction, both in terms of promoting democratic habits through small discussion group participation and in terms of the substantive focus for such discussions. In *New Needs for Adult Education* (Lindeman, 1944), education was conceived of as "a mode of social adaptation" (p. 115) which helped adults "to learn how to make important choices reflecting the issues they are obliged to confront." The twofold program for adult education suggested in this piece was designed to address the problems caused by post-war adjustment. Firstly, the function of the liberal arts within the adult education curriculum was deemed to be in need of critical review. Secondly, and more importantly, adult educators had to devote considerably greater attention to education occurring within labor unions. Lindeman regarded workers education as one of the most vital phases in the education system and believed that labor unions were now viewing workers as citizens and humans beings as well as workers.

The central curricular question to be addressed by workers, and by citizens generally, concerned the desirability of the mixed economy as an economic arrangement most suited to a democratic society. Although not explicit in his own support for the mixed economy in this piece, Lindeman's condemnation of discussion which led people to make absolute choices between free enterprise and socialism clearly revealed his preference. He felt the creation of "a more tolerant and pluralistic conception" of economic affairs to be "a formidable educational task" and one which provided "an opportunity for adult education and higher education to engage in an exciting mutual enterprise."

A further elaboration of the curricular concerns of adult education was provided in *The Sociology of Adult Education* (Lindeman, 1945a). Lindeman identified three additional issues—"what is to be done about our deep-seated habits of racial discrimination, how we are to democratize our vast educational equipment, how we are to play an appropriate role in world affairs" (p. 12)—the discussion of which would "furnish adult education with its program and its mission" (p. 13). If groups of ten to twenty adult American citizens were to discuss these questions "in an atmosphere of freedom and under the guidance of skilled leaders" then "there would be no cause to fear for the future of democracy" (p. 13).

It is salutary to compare the curricular agenda proposed for adult education by Lindeman toward the end of the war with the program content of the 1970's and 1980's. Three of the four curricular issues identified above are largely absent or, at the very least, are severely under-represented in the curriculum of contemporary adult education programs. Debate on such questions as the merits of free enterprise, socialism, and the mixed economy, or on the elimi-

nation of racial discrimination are rare indeed in public adult education programs. The discussion of how to democratize the stock of educational equipment is felt to be a question for 'professional' educators rather than for community consideration. Finally, the discussion of questions of foreign policy and the role of the United States in world affairs has, since the 1950's, largely disappeared from the curriculum of adult education. The kind of initiative represented by the recent creation of a study circle movement in New York state to discuss questions of public policy (Osborne, 1981) is rare indeed. As Phyllis Cunningham (1983) noted in a recent book review, current North American thought tends to be embedded firmly in psychological approaches and to ignore the political setting of adult education.

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to outline Lindeman's unique and significant contribution to the development of theory and philosophy in adult education. Six important themes are apparent throughout his work.

First, there is the conceptualization of adult education as a collaborative, informal, yet critical exercise in which participation is non-coercive and the learner is of prime importance. Adult education is declared firmly to be a non-vocational enterprise set against the mechanistic and naively instrumental pursuit of vocational ends. Judging by current practice, in which continuing professional education, staff development, and other forms of vocational education for adults are generally subsumed within the category of adult education, this element of Lindeman's thought has lost some of its force. It has, however, comprised a valuable rallying point for contemporary opponents of mandatory continuing education.

Second, the critical theory of adult learning and education developed by Lindeman can be seen to anticipate the later work of, amongst others, Freire and Mezirow. The task of adult education is to make adults aware of the historicity of their individual existence and their social environment. In this quest for awareness, adults can discover the roots of their personal and social conduct. It should be emphasized, however, that neither Freire nor Mezirow use Lindeman's work as a conceptual foundation for their theoretical edifices. We cannot assume a causal connection between Lindeman's ideas and those of these other writers, simply because Lindeman's work preceded their efforts by some forty years. It is not uncommon for studies in the sociology of knowledge to reveal instances of intellectual isomorphism. Ideas generated in quite separate intellectual and social milieu, and in different historical periods, may nonetheless display a singular degree of similarity. In an area as specific as adult education, we should not be surprised if the philosophical questions addressed by different writers in different periods, and the curricular and pedagogic solutions generated in response to these questions, sometimes exhibit a remarkable congruence.

Third, in collaboration with Anderson, Lindeman introduced the concept of andragogy into the literature of American adult education and, in his articulation of the concept, stressed the pain of making existential choices inevitable to the realization of adulthood. Lindeman did not develop the idea beyond its

mention in *Education Through Experience* (1927a), and it was not until Knowles's work in the 1970's that the term was adopted as the conceptual anchor from which was derived a set of teaching-learning behaviors appropriate to adults.

Fourth, Lindeman argued firmly and unequivocally that, through empirical necessity and philosophical imperative, adult education was a social enterprise. The goals of adult education were social in nature, and in its fostering of democratic habits of thought and action, adult education was a major force set against demagoguery, prejudice, and dictatorship.

Fifth, he identified the small discussion group as the pedagogic mode unique to adult education.

Sixth, he devised a curricular program for adult education which focused upon analysis of the merits of various economic arrangements, combatting racial discrimination, discussion of the societal use of educational resources, and the international role of the United States. Had this curriculum been adopted, the criticisms of Monette (1979) mentioned earlier in this paper would probably never have been made and neither would London (1972) have been able to lament the absence of ethical discussion regarding the Vietnam war among adult educators in the late 1960s. In a field which suffers from a preoccupation with technique and in which the search for the quintessential format of program planning is sometimes mistaken to be the supreme intellectual quest, we can ill afford to ignore the contemporary relevance, intellectual elegance, and inspirational vision of the major American philosopher of adult education.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. L., & Lindeman, E. C. (1927a). *Education through experience.* New York: Workers Education Bureau.

Anderson, M. L., & Lindeman, E. C. (1927b). Education through experience. *Workers Education: A Quarterly Journal, 4,* 33–34.

Boshier, R., & Pickard L. (1979). Citation patterns of articles published in Adult Education 1968–1977. *Adult Education, 30,* 34–51.

Brookfield, S. (1983). Adult education and the democratic imperative: The vision of Eduard Lindeman as a contemporary charter for adult education. *Studies in Adult Education, 15,* 36–46.

Brookfield, S. (1984). The meaning of adult education: The contemporary relevance of Eduard Lindeman. *Teachers College Record, 85,* 513–524.

Cunningham, P. M. (1983). [Review of *Adult education for a change*]. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33,* 257–259.

Elias, J., & Merriam, S. (1980). *Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education.* New York: Robert E. Krieger.

Even, M. J. (1981). Adult educators should not necessarily be involved in social intervention. In B. R. Kreitlow & Associates, (Eds), *Examining controversies in adult education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Fromm, E. (1942). *The fear of freedom.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Griffin, C. (1983). *Curriculum theory in adult and lifelong education.* New York: Nichols Publishing Co.

Healy, G. M. (1981). Adult educators should help citizens become involved in social reconstruction. In B. R. Kreitlow & Associates, (Eds), *Examining controversies in adult education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ilsley, P. (1983). The relevance of the future in adult education: A phenomenological analysis of images of the future. *Proceedings of the Adult Education Research Conference, 24*, 124–129.

Joyce, P. (1973). Education and social change. *Adult Education (UK), 46*, 170–174.

Knowles, M. S. (1968). Andragogy not pedagogy. *Adult Leadership, 16*, 350–352, 386.

Knowles, M. S. (1977). Adult learning processes: Pedagogy and andragogy. *Religious Education, 72*, 202–211.

Knowles, M. S. (1978). *The adult learner: A neglected species.*(rev. ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (rev. ed.). Chicago: Follett.

Lawson, K. H. (1983). *Analysis and ideology: Conceptual essays on the education of adults.* Nottingham, England: Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham.

Lindeman, E. C. (1925). *What is adult education?* Unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, Butler Library Lindeman Archive, New York.

Lindeman, E. C. (1926a). *The meaning of adult education.* New York: New Republic.

Lindeman, E. C. (1926b). *Workers education and the public libraries.* New York: Workers Education Bureau of America.

Lindeman, E. C. (1930). Adult education. In *Encyclopedia of the social sciences*, 1. New York: Macmillan.

Lindeman, E. C. (1937). Introduction. In T. K. Brown (Ed.), *Adult education for social change.* Philadelphia: Swarthmore Seminar.

Lindeman, E. C. (1938). *The need of prepared leaders in adult education.* Unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, Butler Library Lindeman Archive, New York.

Lindeman, E. C. (1944). New needs for adult education. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 231*, 115–122.

Lindeman, E. C. (1945a). The sociology of adult education. *Journal of Education Sociology, 19*, 4–13.

Lindeman, E. C. (1945b). World peace through adult education. *The Nation's Schools, 35*, 23.

Lindeman, E. C. (1953). Evaluating your program. *Adult Leadership, 4*, 13–20.

London, J. (1972). Reflections upon the relevance of Paulo Freire for American adult education. In S. M. Grabowski (Ed.), *Paulo Freire: A revolutionary dilemma for the adult educator.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education.

Lovett, T. (1975). *Adult education, community development and the working class.* London: Ward Lock Educational.

Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education, 32*, 3–24.

Monette, M. L. (1977). Need assessment: A critique of philosophical assumptions. *Adult Education, 27*, 116–127.

Osborne, K. Q. (1981). Informal adult learning and public policy issues: The study circle approach. In H. W. Stubblefield (Ed.), *Continuing education for community leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Paterson, R. W. K. (1973). Social change as an educational aim. *Adult Education (UK), 45*, 353–359.

Thompson J. L. (Ed.). (1980). *Adult education for a change.* London: Hutchinson Education.

Verduin, J. R. (1980). *Curriculum building for adult learning.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.