

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Will S. Keim for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Counselor Education and College Student Services
Administration presented on January 12, 1990.

Title: The Education of Character: Implications of Buber
for the Student Services Profession.

Abstract approved:

Redacted for Privacy

Dr. JoAnne J. Trow

Martin Buber was an internationally known scholar, teacher, and author whose works covered education, communication, politics, theology, philosophy, counseling, and related fields. The purpose of this study was to discover the implications of Buber's philosophy of education for the student services profession. Previous attempts to relate Martin Buber's philosophy to student services were reviewed and a "Buber Primer" of useful terms for the student services professional was presented. The implications of education of character, dialogue, and educator-student relationship for four central questions for the student services profession were addressed: (1) Who are we as professionals?; (2) What are we supposed to do; (3) How?; and (4) Why?

Buber proposes that education is essentially the education of character. Student services professionals

should define themselves as educators; persons concerned with the development of the whole student.

Buber defines dialogue as a seven step process: a turning of the being, confirmation, a sense of empathy, authenticity, common fruitfulness, silence, and commitment. Professional educators are encouraged to engage students in dialogue. Dialogue is defined as the delivery mechanism for developmentally based student services and for the education of character.

Buber's concepts were related to the various activities of student services.

Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue and his 'education of character' should enhance the ability of professionals in student services to serve all students more intelligently and effectively. This study concluded that Martin Buber's philosophy belongs both in the vocabulary and the practice of student services.

Copyright by Will S. Keim III

January 12, 1990

All Rights Reserved

The Education of Character: Implications of Buber
For The Student Services Profession

by

Will S. Keim

A THESIS

Submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed January 12, 1990

Commencement June 1990

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of department of College Student Services
Administration

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of College of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented January 12, 1990

Typed by Dee Safley for Will S. Keim

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Martin Buber for his life, his writings, and the feelings his philosophy have stirred in me. I hope I have been faithful to his words. We have shared moments of blissful I-Thou relationship despite never having met.

"Thank you" is an inadequate way to acknowledge the work of Dr. Jo Anne Trow, Dr. Ed Bryan, Dr. Marcus Borg, Dr. Michael Beachley, Dr. Paul Kopperman, and Dr. Benjamin Murdzek. You have all contributed more than you can know to the development of my character. You are educators and I can give you no higher compliment! One could not ask for a better doctoral committee.

To Dr. Thomas Ambroggi, who introduced me to Martin Buber at the University of the Pacific and to my mentor Dr. Don Duns I give thanks and stand humbled by your ability to teach, to educate, to shape your students. Someday I hope to give a lecture that approaches the dignity of your presentations.

Blessings to my family, in particular Donna M. Keim, my wife. She is more solely responsible for me finishing this effort than anyone else. Thank you Donna. It would not have happened without you, and I am grateful and indebted. Special thanks to my mother Bettye, for her on-going faith and belief in me.

Thank you to Dee Safley, the manuscript consultant and typist. Acknowledgement is given to my fellow

graduate students who helped me clarify my dissertation goals (and life goals), particularly Tim McMahon, John McGuire, Jim Peacock, and Dan Ahern.

Finally, I dedicate this effort to my two fathers, now deceased, Will S. Keim, Jr. and Jack R. Wilhelm, and to the living, daughters Christa Keim and Samantha Keim. May this work in a small way create a better world for the children.

In dialogue,

Will S. Keim III

The Education of Character: Implications of Buber
For The Student Services Profession

"A house that is build on sand will not stand. But a house that is build on rock will last forever."
Gospel Paraphrase
(c. 90 A.D.)

"Events in higher education over the past two decades suggest that the profession of college student affairs is in a state of confusion, discordance, and doubt about its appropriate role in a changing environment."

Stamatakos & Rogers
(1984)

"For too long, our helping profession has struggled to survive with a shaky philosophical foundation, insufficient conceptual models, and little supporting research to evaluate the impact our services have on students."

Delworth & Hanson
(1981)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Martin Buber: A Brief Biography	3
CHAPTER ONE: THE GENERAL MALAISE	12
Martin Buber and Student Services	17
CHAPTER TWO: ON THE CUTTING EDGE	28
Martin Buber's Contribution to Student Services	34
CHAPTER THREE: A BUBER PRIMER	40
The Basic Assumptions	40
I-Thou and I-It: The Basic Attitudes	41
Dialogue	42
Characteristics of Dialogue	43
Components of Dialogue	43
Elements of the Interhuman	44
Essential Elements of Relation	46
Developmental Process of Relation	47
Education	48
Ethic of Responsibility	49
CHAPTER FOUR: FOUR ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS FOR THE PROFESSION	51
Part I: Who Are We? Toward An Understanding Of Our Professional Identity As Educators	51
Part II: What Are The Tasks of the Educator? What Are We Supposed To Do?	59
The Nature of the Character	60
The Whole Person Philosophy	64
The Instinct of Origination	65
Viaticum: The Instinct of Communion	72
Compulsion, Freedom, and Communion	76
Part III: Dialogue: The 'Delivery Mechanism' For The Education of Character	89
Turning Of The Being	92
Imagining The Real Of The Other	93
Confirmation	95
Authenticity	100
Memorable Common Fruitfulness	101
Silence	102
Commitment	103
Part IV: Why Do We Educate? Toward What End?	106
CHAPTER FIVE: BUBER, STUDENT SERVICES, AND A NEW POINT OF VIEW (How Martin Buber might have stated his case)	112
The Buber View of Student Services	112

	<u>Page</u>
Why Buber? Why Now? Some Final Thoughts	117
A Final Word(s)	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124

THE EDUCATION OF CHARACTER: IMPLICATIONS OF BUBER FOR THE STUDENT SERVICES PROFESSION

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is about the education of character. It is an attempt to introduce and relate Martin Buber's philosophy of education to the student services profession. Four essential questions will be addressed. They are:

1. Who are we as professionals in student services?
2. What are we supposed to do?
3. How? And...
4. Why?

An attempt will be made to present a case for Buber's inclusion into the theory base for the field.

The discussion will be of particular benefit to those educators concerned with developing the necessary skills to assist students in the development of character. An additional benefit will be the introduction of a valued "friend." Buber's philosophy will be shown to support the education of character by student services professionals.

Every attempt will be made to relate Buber's philosophy of education to existing theory in the field. Further, this dissertation may be of even greater value today as our nation wrestles with a lack of ethical behavior in nearly every institution within our culture. Buber's writings can assist in the presentation of

meaningful values to students and in creating educator-student relationships that promote growth and the development of character.

Five chapters follow a brief introductory biography of Martin Buber.

Chapter One: "The General Malaise"

A discussion about the seemingly endless debate in the profession regarding who we are, what we are about, and why we are not respected.

Chapter Two: "On The Cutting Edge"

A review of previous attempts to educate the profession about the philosophy of Martin Buber.

Chapter Three: "A Buber Primer"

A glossary of terms for the profession: terms relevant to the meaningful and educational-centered delivery of student services.

Chapter Four: "Four Essential Questions For The Profession"

Who are we? What are we supposed to do? How can we best do it? And, most importantly, why should we do it?

Chapter Five: "Buber, Student Affairs, and A New Point of View"

A student services point of view as Buber might have written it.

Martin Buber: A Brief Biography

As a person, philosopher, and educator, Martin Buber is of great potential significance for student services. He was born in Vienna in 1878. Moore (1974) observes that due to the separation of Buber's parents, young Buber lived in Austria with his paternal grandparents until the age of fourteen. Maurice Friedman (1981) writes, "In his first year as a student at the University of Vienna, Buber occupied himself with literature, the history of art, and philosophy" (p. 22). Buber's quest for knowledge was insatiable. He studied at the University of Leipzig and the University of Zurich during the period from 1897 to 1899. Friedman reports, "In Leipzig and Zurich he attended lectures on philosophy, history of art, history of literature, psychiatry, Germanics, classical philosophy, and national economy" (p. 22). As a student Buber was tireless in his search for knowledge. He eventually received his Ph.D. from the University of Berlin in 1904.

In 1916 Martin Buber founded Der Jude, a periodical which became the principal voice of German-speaking Jewry. From 1923 to 1933 Buber taught Jewish philosophy of religion and the history of religions at the University of Frankfurt. Moore states, "From 1933 to 1938 Buber was outstanding in his efforts in behalf of German Jews in their resistance to Nazi anti-Semitism" (p. xix). With the subsequent rise of Hitler and the Nazis, Buber was forced to leave Europe for Palestine. He was appointed

professor of social philosophy at the Hebrew University where he served until 1951.

Maurice Friedman (1981), Buber's foremost translator and biographer, states, "Martin Buber was a great philosopher, a consummate poet, and world-famous scholar of the Bible and of Hasidism--the popular Jewish mysticism that he almost single-handedly made part of the heritage of the Western world" (p. xv). Friedman continues, "He was one of the most learned men of his time, a universal scholar with an amazing command of languages and disciplines of knowledge. He was a genius with an inexhaustible store of creativity that produced a treasury of books, essays, poems, stories, a novel, and a play. But above all he was a wise man" (p. xv).

In fact, Schlipp and Friedman (eds.) tell of 852 items published by Buber from 1897-1965. Buber was an inquiring student, philosopher, poet, social critic, educator, and man of dialogue. His life and writings were amazingly far reaching in their scope.

Hodes (1971) reports that immediately following World War II, Martin Buber cooperated with Albert Schweitzer on appeals against the spread of nuclear weapons. Buber was twice nominated for Nobel Prizes; by Hermann Hesse in 1949 for literature, and by Secretary-General of the United Nations Dag Hammarskjold for peace in 1959 (pp. 136-152).

Martin Buber died in Jerusalem in 1965 at the age of eighty-seven. Upon his death, the United States Embassy

in Israel forwarded to Golda Meir, then Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs, the following message from then Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

The death of Martin Buber is a great loss to the American people and to all humanity. Martin Buber was a searcher of the mystery of existence and a lover of mankind. His spirit will always remain wherever men actively seek an understanding with their neighbors. I wish to express to you and to the people of Israel my sincere sympathy (Hodes, 1971, p. 224).

Martin Buber was a philosopher, educator, and statesman. His entire life was centered on the dialogue between the "forces of darkness" (ignorance) and the "forces of light" (education). He taught, organized schools for Jews, and published articles, books, and journals. He was an academician, but more importantly an educator.

It is important to note Buber's relationship to education because he is largely known by those not familiar with the breadth of his work and writings as a theologian. Buber did take the reality of God very seriously and lived his life as a relationship to God. For Buber, the notion of God has to be taken in its widest possible spiritual sense. Rather than denoting the god of a particular religious tradition, "God" was for Buber the "Eternal Thou" present in every finite "Thou" or relationship. Buber's religious orientation was not sectarian in any way, and his religious commitment did not separate him

from other people or orientations toward life. Rather, his understanding of God impelled him into dialogue with all of life.

It is, therefore, not surprising that Buber's writings have been adopted and adapted by religious and non-religious thinkers alike. Recognized in the fields of counseling, communication, philosophy, theology, existentialism, history, politics, and education, the scope of Buber's work is amazing and centers around the development of human beings. It remains clear that Buber's life was inseparably intertwined with education. Consider his ideas regarding education and instruction:

Can one educate through instruction? Instruction wants to influence the thinking of the pupil, education his being and life...It is not the instruction that educates but the instructor. The good teacher educates by his speech and by his silence, in the hours of teaching and in the recesses, in casual conversation, through his mere existence, only he must be a really existing man and he must be really present to his pupils; he educates through contact. Contact is the primary word of education. It means that the teacher shall face his pupils not as developed brain before unfinished ones, but as being before beings, as mature being before developing beings. He must really face them, that means not in a direction working from above to below, from the teacher's chair to the pupils' benches, but in genuine interaction, in exchange of experiences, experiences of a fulfilled life with those of a still unfulfilled one. For what is needed...is genuine dialogue. The teacher, to be sure, conducts and governs this dialogue, but even so he must also enter it with his own person, directly and candidly. This dialogue shall continue into silent being with one another, indeed undoubtedly only here will it first properly culminate. It is this which I call the dialogical principle in education (Buber, 1967, p. 102).

The dialogical principle in education served as the foundation of Buber's life as a teacher and educator from the late 1920's until his retirement in 1951. Buber's I-Thou philosophy of dialogue established the basic relationship between educator and student that was necessary for education to occur. Buber has said as early as 1939 that, "Education worthy of the name is essentially education of character" (p. 104).

It was Buber's understanding of the dialogical principle in education and the chronological proximity of his writings to the "Student Personnel Point of View" in 1937 that led to the conclusion that Buber's lifework might provide a pillar of stability for a field, student services, that had described itself as being on "shaky philosophical ground." The education of character is the "raison d'etre" of education; dialogue is the "elan vital" the delivery mechanism, for this education. Might Buber's understanding of education and his reputation as an educator, philosopher, and statesman lend credibility to the assertion that education can occur in and out of the classroom? Could the dialogical principle in education support existing student services philosophy? Was it possible that Buber might assist the field to set new agendas regarding the development of students? Buber's reputation and writings seemed to merit a careful consideration of these questions and others confronting the student services professional.

Buber's philosophy of dialogue can be used in establishing policy in the residence hall and in teaching fraternity men how to establish community. These two examples will serve to illustrate how Buber's philosophy can be significant to student services.

Buber's seven characteristics of dialogue are discussed later in Part III of Chapter Four. In the example of establishing policy in the residence hall, three of these components of dialogue were particularly useful. Buber proposes that for dialogue to occur, each participant must "imagine the real of the other" (Step 2); confirm the other person (Step 3); and be committed to the dialogue (Step 7).

Facing a residence hall of 400 new students, it would be easy to feel intimidated and "impose" policy on the students through a recitation of the residence hall handbook. University policy and hall rules presented in a parent-child interaction that might actually challenge the developing student to circumvent university policy. The Hall Director might be seen as a "parental replacement" setting down the rules as long as the student lived under his or her roof.

In designing the initial hall meeting the hall director would "imagine the real" of the other; namely the student. What was it like to be 18 and away from home the first time? What was it like in 1989 versus 1971 when one was in school? How could one confirm the students,

letting them know they mattered? How could one convince the students to be committed to the concept of the residence hall being their new home?

Through this process one could convince the students you were interested in their well-being; committed to serving them; and available to them as a resource. Using Buber's concept of dialogue as our guide, it was possible to convert one of the worst residence halls on campus into a residence hall with an active philanthropy; number two in grades in the system; and a hall in which two incident reports were written the entire year, when there were 113 incident report written in the ten other halls in the first two weeks that year. Buber's philosophy works in the residence halls at a medium sized state university.

The writer is often called on to assist fraternities to improve their systems. Again, Buber is helpful. Buber compares and contrasts community versus collective. Professional experience has taught that Greek houses flourish when community is established, but abuse their founding principles (and common sense) when collectivity is the model. What is the difference?

Community is established when five components of the interhuman are created:

1. Interpersonal relationships are encouraged
2. Members are empathic to the needs of others
3. "being" is encouraged: members are encouraged to be individuals and to discover their true selves

4. Rules are unfolded to members. Older members share the rights and responsibilities of membership with newcomers.
5. Each person is encouraged to be "whole;" that is, fully present to the other members (Buber, 1965, pp. 72-88).

Collections, on the other hand, are marked by:

1. Many social activities where few interpersonal relationships are fostered.
2. Group judgement of the rightness of individual action.
3. "Seeming" takes place; constant gamesmanship and posturing predominates.
4. The group imposes rules and rights of passage on neophytes.
5. The group focuses on rights of membership rather than on responsibilities. Partial adherence to philosophical principles is tolerated (Buber, 1965, pp. 72-88).

It becomes apparent to young men that most of their problems as Greeks occur in social settings where posturing and gamesmanship are rampant, and where behavior is justified by words such as "tradition" and "brotherhood" devoid of their real meaning.

Brothers begin to see that they don't know each other well (very weak interpersonal relationship); that they judge other houses very harshly; that they impose ritual

upon new members rather than explaining it; and that partial adherence to fraternal principles creates houses riddled by alcohol, drug, sex, and hazing abuse, and generally poor scholarship. Buber's concept of community can be used to teach brotherly behavior, ethics, and fellowship. One educates the character of students using Buber's philosophy of education, dialogue, and community.

Whether Buber's philosophy can be implemented on the mega-university campus remains to be seen. This thesis will be a basis for sharing the information with, and calling on, the professionals to implement and include Buber's philosophy in their daily practice. The two examples cited are from personal professional practice. Further dialogue between the professionals can result from elaborating on the case for Buber's relations with student services.

CHAPTER ONE:

THE GENERAL MALAISE

The "Student Personnel Point of View" (ACE, 1937) set forth a philosophical foundation for the profession. The report attempted not only to describe the purposes of higher education but also what role the student personnel professional might play in the education of students. It read in part:

One of the basic purposes of higher education is the preservation, transmission, and enrichment of the important elements of culture--the product of scholarship, research, creative imagination, and human experience. It is the task of colleges and universities to vitalize this and other educational purposes as to assist the student in developing to the limits of his potentialities and in making his contribution to the betterment of society (p. 3).

Colleges and universities were challenged to transmit the best of society's existing fabric while at the same time assisting the student in developing his or her potential to better society in those areas where society needed improvement.

The "Student Personnel Point of View" continued:

This philosophy imposes upon educational institutions the obligation to consider the student as a whole--his intellectual capacity and achievement, his emotional makeup, his physical condition, his social relationships, his vocational aptitudes and skills, his aesthetic appreciations, his moral and religious values, his economic resources. It put emphasis, in brief upon the development of the student as a person rather than upon his intellectual training alone (Series 1, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 3).

Institutions of higher education were called upon to do more than transfer information to the students. This sentiment was similarly expressed by Buber who said, "Instruction wants to influence the thinking of the pupil, education, his being and life" (1967, p. 102). Since 1937, the concepts of assisting students develop as "persons" and as "whole students" have served as philosophical bases for generations of student personnel, or student services, professionals.

Despite a growing body of research and publications relating to the profession, though, there remains no clear consensus of opinion establishing the appropriate role and function of the student services professional in higher education.

Saddlemire and Rentz (1983) observe, "One measure of the maturity of the student services profession is the body of literature that describes its origin, its growth and the concepts central to its role in higher education" (p. 1). Certainly the profession is growing as evidenced by the growing body of literature. Some of the field's professionals view this literature as much less than conclusive.

Stamatakis and Rogers (1984) report: "Events in higher education over the past two decades suggest that the profession of college student services is in a state of confusion, discordance, and doubt about its appropriate role in a changing collegiate environment" (p. 400). This

is particularly alarming when one considers that these two men, highly regarded in the profession, regularly participate in the training of the field's new professionals.

The confusion they refer to is in no better way illustrated by the profession's inability to consistently name itself. Labeled a variety of names including "Student Personnel," "Student Services," "Student Affairs," "Student Development," it is no wonder that there is a mild "professional schizophrenia" apparent in the literature and in practice. Delworth and Hanson declare, "For too long, our helping profession has struggled to survive with a shaky philosophical foundation, insufficient conceptual models, and little supporting research to evaluate the impact our services have on students" (1981, p. ix).

These statements would be of concern if they came from hardened critics of the profession from outside the field. They are even more alarming because they come from the student services professionals themselves. It is of greater concern yet because similar sentiments can be found in the profession's literature which indicates a pattern of confusion spanning decades.

As early as 1938 Lloyd-Jones and Smith wrote, "The failure of those writing in the personnel field to relate student personnel work to some understood philosophy of higher education has automatically deprived the many educators in the latter field of an interest in, and

appreciation of, what a student personnel program is and how it can contribute to the development of youth in our colleges and universities" (p. 3). Kuh (1977) adds that while the profession has voiced concern and interest in the use of developmental theory in professional practice, this has rarely become a reality (pp. 48-52). Rodgers and Widick explain, "As a field, we need conceptual models and guidelines for relating theory to day-to-day practice" (p. 5). Brown (1972) believes that, "While student personnel workers have professed themselves to be educators and to be interested in the whole student, they have served higher education essentially as housekeepers, activities advisors, counselors, and have been viewed by many in higher education as petty administrators" (p. 37).

These viewpoints span decades and consistently reveal a field struggling with a lack of professional self esteem. Criticism has been rendered by the professionals themselves about the way some view themselves within student services.

Rhatigan (1975) states, "Groping, floundering, and self-criticism may spur any human being or organization to necessary change but the self-denigration that has crept into the debate in our field has been non-productive" (pp. 51-59). Rhatigan reveals his concern over professional image. He continues, "One of the few times I feel badly about my work occurs at our national meetings, where every crisis looms larger than life and those selected persons

who have so little faith in what we do assume their predictable collective brooding" (pp. 51-59).

It would appear evident that the debate over the philosophy, role, and function of the field and its professionals is far from settled. Stamatakos and Rogers (1984) conclude, "We contend that until the profession addresses and deals forthrightly with the apparent incompatibilities, inconsistencies, and omissions that are implied with and between these two documents (The Student Personnel Point of View and The Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education Document of 1975) our profession will remain schizophrenic and tenuous in higher education" (pp. 400-401).

The Student Personnel Point of View placed the emphasis on the development of the whole student by attention to curricular and extracurricular dimensions of the student's life. Miller and Prince (1977) observe that the COSPA Document of 1975 is focused on the relationship of human development concepts to students in higher education. Stamatakos and Rogers (1984) write of the COSPA Document, "The major contribution...to the profession was its provision of human development underpinnings (theories) for application in student services work" (p. 402).

Among the human development theorists that have been appropriated by the student services profession are Erik Erikson, Jean Piaget, and Lawrence Kohlberg (Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker, 1981, pp. 75-76). It is evident

that the field has appropriated theory and related disciplines as they assisted in the work of the profession.

There is continued dispute about the role and function of the student services profession in higher education institutions. Further, new modes of thinking and concepts have been called for by the professionals themselves. Finally, the profession has "appropriated" scholars from related disciplines as those scholar's works have been deemed relevant as "underpinnings" for the field.

Martin Buber and Student Services

The American College Personnel Association (ACPA) is the largest national organization of student services professionals in the country with over 7,000 members. Under the auspices of the ACPA, Gerald L. Saddlemire and Audrey L. Rentz edited a book in 1983 entitled, Student Affairs--A Profession's Heritage: Significant Articles, Authors, Issues, and Documents. Fifty-five graduate program directors suggested materials to be included in their work. Saddlemire and Rentz stated one of their basic intentions for their work:

To identify early contributors and representative papers that help us understand the evolution of our profession. Some practitioners have entered the profession's heritage or may have come to the field by way of other specialty graduate programs (p. ix).

This was a monumental task that spanned nearly sixty years

of writing in the field. No mention of Martin Buber nor his philosophy was made in this excellent resource.

Many authors enter the field "by way of other specialty graduate programs." This "entry" is not always an easy process due largely in part to the "groping, floundering, and self-criticism" mentioned above by Rhatigan (1975). One wonders about a profession that continually questions its own philosophical base, role, and functions. It is even more trying to develop a positive professional esteem while attending conferences where, "...those selected persons who have so little faith in what we do assume their predictable collective brooding" (Rhatigan, 1975, pp. 51-59). This experience led to an examination of the philosophers that formed the basis of other "specialty graduate programs." Martin Buber's work had established a firm philosophical base for communication theory and religious understandings of human beings. The author began to search Buber's writings for potential answers to four main questions that seemed to appear frequently in the literature of the student services profession.

These questions are important to all professionals because they establish a justification; a reason, for the activities that are carried out by the individuals in that profession. Without a philosophy, one is left with mere functions, often disconnected, and functionaries to carry them out. Professionals are different. The questions

causing the most consternation in the profession appeared to be:

1. Who are we?
2. What are we supposed to do?
3. How do we accomplish our tasks?
4. Why do we do what we do?

But, why Martin Buber and his philosophy of education? Certainly there was a precedent for appropriating the work of theorists in other related disciplines. Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker identified Erikson, Piaget, and Kohlberg as examples of human developmental theorists whose work had been appropriated for the student services profession (1981, pp. 75-76). Ernst Simon (1967) wrote, "The pedagogic conclusions as drawn by Buber are of significance even for those who hold other pedagogical and terminological pre-suppositions" (p. 564).

Further investigation revealed that Matott (1971) presented a doctoral dissertation entitled, "Martin Buber's Dialogic Philosophy in Relation To College Student Personnel Work." (This will be reviewed in detail in Chapter Two.) Perhaps Buber's writings might be of great value to a profession in search of identity. Buber's philosophy of education seemed to address the four main philosophical questions listed above and provided a rationale for the profession that seemed to be missing in the literature of the field and in the beliefs of the professionals.

A closer examination of the literature of the field and the writings of Buber could reveal a new order of

concepts that would, as Stamatakos and Rogers requested, put more solid philosophical underpinnings at the base of a centuries old profession.

The results of this inquiry are the heart of this thesis. The author hopes to convince the reader that Buber's philosophy of education can be shown to be a formidable philosophical justification for what the profession says it is about; namely, the development of the whole student. A brief examination of the similarities between the early foundations of the field and Buber's writings should illustrate the implications of this point.

Buber (1926) wrote that educators must be concerned with the "education of the whole person" (p. 85). This coincides perfectly with the Student Personnel Point of View in 1937 and predates it by 11 years. R. C. Clothier (1931), proposed the following definition of personnel work:

Personnel work in a college or university is the systematic bringing to bear on the individual student all those influences, of whatever nature, which will stimulate him and assist him, through his own efforts, to develop in body, mind, and character to the limit of his individual capacity for growth, and helping him to apply his powers so developed most effectively to the work of the world (p. 9).

Buber (1926) offered, "Real education is made possible--but is it also established?--by the realization that youthful spontaneity must not be suppressed but must be allowed to give what it can" (p. 88). Clearly

Clothier's acknowledgment that the student, "through his own effort," and Buber's realization that students must be allowed to "give what they can," address the importance of involving the student in his or her own development.

Since Clothier's article was included in the ACPA book of significant contributions to the field, it would appear that Buber's work too might make significant contribution to the literature of the profession; that is, if the professionals were made aware of Buber's writings.

W. H. Cowley (1936) proposed, "Personnel work constitutes all activities undertaken or sponsored by an educational institution, aside from curricular instruction, in which the student's personal development is the primary consideration" (p. 9). Buber (1965) related, "Education worthy of the name is essentially the education of character" (p. 104). Further, Buber adds, "...in education, one can and one must aim at character" (p. 104).

The similarities between the focus on personal development mentioned by Cowley and the education of character called for by Buber are striking. Buber proposed, "A great and full relation between man and man can only exist between unified and responsible persons... Genuine education is genuine education for community" (p. 116). This is very much like Kohlberg's understanding that human development should be facilitated that moves the individual from egocentrism, or thoughts of the self in relation to the power or authority, to allocentrism,

where the self views itself as a responsible part of humanity (1981, p. 97). Kohlberg's interest in consistent, comprehensive ethical principles and Buber's allegiance to the concept of the education of character bear great similarity. Clothier (1931) then proposes, "The heart of personnel work lies in the genuine and intelligent interest of instructors and others in the individual student" (pp. 3-27). At the same time Buber declares, "Can we educate through instruction? Instruction wants to influence the thinking of the pupil, education, his being and life" (1969, p. 102). Clearly Buber's understanding of the importance of the entire institution's impact on the development of the whole student should ring true in the ears of a profession whose work is largely done outside of the classroom.

Buber (1939) believes character to be the chief goal of education and sees character as "...the link between what this individual is and the sequence of his actions and attitudes" (p. 104). This proposed consistency between what a student says he or she is about and what he or she does is akin to Marcia's (1980) understanding of the achieved-identity student and Chickering's belief that the establishment of identity is the chief developmental task of students (pp. 84-87).

Martin (1982) discussed the "College Of Character" in a book of the same name. He provides a definition of college and character that support Buber's contention that

education is essentially the education of character. Martin proposes that college is "The undergraduate institution that offers an education both sequential and cumulative, theoretical yet practical, specific and interrelated. Also, the college nourishes the mind without neglecting the needs and interests of the whole person" (p. 18). Character, writes Martin, is, "Disciplined, evident, enduring commitment to principle, usually to goals and purposes seen as moral or ethical, and expressed individually and institutionally...Character requires fidelity to duty under pressure, dignity amid controversy, courage in the presence of adversity" (p. 19).

In what forum are the students to develop disciplined commitment to moral and ethical goals? Where will the young learn to link action with attitude in an environment of trust and care? From what segment of the society will the necessary role models emerge that can guide, urge, and prod the developing student along? If these appear to be leading questions, they are meant to be. They, too, are intended to be more than rhetorical in nature.

Students will develop as whole persons in colleges that care about character with educators committed to dialogical relationship with students. This is an understanding recognized by educators throughout the entire history of the student services profession, other academicians and authors, and Martin Buber. Simply put,

why hasn't Buber been invited to the academy? It appears as if his work exists in a vacuum whose seal is impenetrable to student services professionals.

George Trow (1981) writes, "Life now gravitates toward the mass scale with its huge institutions and impersonal experiences or toward what is called the 'interior drama' of the solitary individual, the inner psyche or the soul" (p. 6).

Yet, Buber calls for the education of character for active and genuine participation in community. In the mass scale world of speed-of-light technological advance or change, is there time for the education of character? Time for more than the transfer of as much information as possible from one more knowledgeable sender to one, or many, less knowledgeable receiver(s)? In a world filled with increasingly self-focused and self-indulgent citizens committed fervently, almost religiously, to the acquisition of things, is there a need to encourage active and genuine participation in human community?

If there was information available to a group of educators that might assist them in seeing the magnificent scope and import of their lifework, would a responsible co-worker share it with them so all might benefit? It might be considered an act of professional responsibility or, dare it be said, duty!

Because we are human beings, and not things, we will continue to seek places to be that allow us at least a

modicum of individuality. We will actively search out, as student consumers, places where education involves us, challenges us, empowers us, as whole persons; not all, but those who seek to live in peace with self, other, community, nation, and world.

Martin Buber's philosophy of education and dialogue can assist us in the task of educating character, of building human community. Buber's central work predates our earliest work and compliments the rest of our appropriated theory. Buber's philosophy of education is consistent with both historical philosophical underpinnings of the field and current "appropriated" theories in student services and related disciplines. The problem is that the profession of student services appears only nominally acquainted with Martin Buber; a philosopher whose writings support its own and often predate its earliest philosophical justifications.

Buber's understanding of education as the "education of character" is not totally unknown in the field of education. However, his work has drawn the attention and study of scholars and students in education (Abrams, 1982; Baker, 1968; Cohen, 1979 & 1980; Dilling, 1974; Eakin, 1976; Friedman, 1967; Perharsky, 1982; Matott, 1971; Rosenblatt, 1971; and Schilpp & Friedman, 1967). Most encouraging, however, for the author was a personal conversation with Dr. Louis Stamatakos, Professor of Higher Education at Michigan State University and Dr. Russell

Rogers at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Convention in Chicago, Illinois in March of 1987. Both men were fully aware of Buber's writings, confessed that they have shaped their own ideas, and that more writing on Buber's philosophy and its implication for student services as a profession would greatly benefit the field and its practitioners. Buber's concern with the out-of-classroom experience and the total development of the student's capabilities and character would appear to be a natural addition to a professionally-professed "shaky" philosophical base.

While Buber may not be widely known in the profession of student services, he nonetheless has been recognized as a member of a select number of 20th century philosophers worthy of a volume in "The Library of Living Philosophers." Other volumes include the work of John Dewey and Alfred North Whitehead, two men who had much to say about the role and function of education. Buber's works have included writings on religion, education, counseling, politics, philosophical anthropology, communication, secular humanism, philosophy and peace. He would appear to be a needed addition to a field that borrows extensively from these and related disciplines.

It is the author's contention that the time has come for the field to appropriate the writings of Martin Buber into the profession's philosophical base. This is not only possible but essential in order to stem the tide of

"collective brooding" and "self-denigration" that continue to plague the profession. Stamatakos and Rogers (1984) propose,

"A profession's philosophy offers its members a means for perceiving themselves as professionals and, in turn, to be perceived by others as professionals. It transforms the work to be done from being maintenance driven to being purpose driven, and workers from functionaries (people who perform functions) to professionals (people who transform valued purpose into reality)" (pp. 401-402).

As to the real importance of a meaningful philosophy, Stamatakos and Rogers conclude, "A profession's philosophy, then, offers members the means to derive purpose for their productive lives as professionals and, in so doing, link their functions, skills, and understandings to the substantive meanings that integrate the profession and its contributions" (p. 402). Given Stamatakos and Rogers' understanding of student services as a profession in need of a philosophy, and Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker's recognition that human development models have been appropriated by the field of student services, it would seem logical to appropriate the philosophy of anyone who might lend greater clarity and vision to the ultimately important task of helping students to develop in higher education. The author proposes that Martin Buber is such a theorist and that a careful examination of his educational philosophy will provide an articulate philosophical justification for the profession and address an expressed need in the literature of the field.

CHAPTER TWO:

ON THE CUTTING EDGE

This chapter presents a review of selected literature describing the relationship of Martin Buber's philosophy to the profession of student services. Very little research has been conducted on this topic. Buber's work has been cited by Knepfelkamp (1980) in a meaningful way. Knepfelkamp proposed:

I believe that it is not only possible, but necessary for our survival as a community that we join in the rediscovery of generativity...What does generativity require? Not a victory of one group/one voice within the community over another, but a synthesis. Not alienation from our institutions, students, selves, not an accommodation to our difficulties, but an affirmation of our total educational purposes--the whole student--and an affirmation of the necessity of drawing upon our mutuality. Not a fragmentation or separation of our roles, but a recognition of our mutual need, what Martin Buber calls the "I/Thou." And finally, not a resolution of all our conflicts, but a resolution, a commitment to continue despite our conflicts (p. 17).

The only work on the importance of Buber's philosophy to student services was completed in 1971. Glenn Matott completed the dissertation, "Martin Buber's Dialogic Philosophy In Relation to College Student Personnel Work." This will serve as the centerpiece of the review of literature. Matott's work exhibits an accurate and insightful understanding not only of college student personnel work but especially of Martin Buber's dialogic philosophy. It contains a chapter devoted to education.

Matott's writing reveals several important facets of Buber's thought that will provide a context in which to examine Buber's philosophy of education and its relationship to the philosophy of student services.

Matott writes, "...Buber's philosophy of dialogue, or dialogic philosophy, may be of particular significance in personnel work because of the emphasis he places on interpersonal relationship" (p. 113). Dialogue is seen by Buber as the way an educator enters into the relationship with the student. Buber's philosophy of education establishes the identity of the educator, the subject matter of education, and the reason education is important. The dialogic philosophy of Buber is the "delivery mechanism" that brings the educator and the student together. It may provide us with a better understanding of how our services might be better delivered in many functional areas of student services.

Matott comments, "What is important is that Buber's ideas about human psychology are closely related to his educational theories" (p. 160). Buber's theory of education is not one severed from the core of human experience, but rather, he presents education at the center of the human experience of growth, identity, and participation in community. The centrality of education to human experience should impress all members of the educational community.

Buber is also of interest to student services professionals because of his writing that focuses on the "whole student." The profession's interest in the whole student dates back into the earliest writings in the field and has remained a central concern today. Since Martin Buber's philosophy of education and the education of the whole student predates the earliest writings in the field, it would appear to be reasonable and prudent to consider Buber's work in the context of student services. Matott (1971) observes, "It is moreover, one of the most successful efforts ever made to define what man-in-his-wholeness means. Consequently, personnel workers who constantly extol the concept of the whole student, need to make a decision concerning the significance of Buber's thought in this regard" (p. 176).

Buber clearly observed the development of the whole student in or out of class, as the foremost educational mission. It is interesting to recall Lloyd-Jones (1934) realization that "those who have attempted definitions of personnel work or administration have had some difficulty in distinguishing the personnel field from that of education itself" (p. 141-147). Buber, too, would have had trouble differentiating the student personnel point of view from his understanding of education as the education of character.

Noted philosopher, teacher, Nobel Prize nominee, Buber might have provided a more stable philosophical base

for the profession. Yet, despite the commonality of our early philosophers and Buber's own work, his work was never considered nor appropriated by a field mired in a never ceasing call for a more stable philosophical foundation. Matott (1971) urges, "What is needed, then, is a new philosophical basis for the entire educational enterprise, not just for a part. The 'whole' student deserves a 'whole' educational philosophy" (p. 178). Matott proposes a serious delineation of Buber's work as a starting point toward this "whole" educational philosophy.

The idea of an interrelated philosophy of education addressing the whole student in the context of the educational enterprise is not new. Bradshaw (1936) reported:

Arm chair thinkers day-dream of a release from this responsibility in order that the faculty members may receive the total income of the institution for salaries and supplies and are given in return scholarly lectures and occasional advice relative to their field of study. However, the student gets sick, has no money, goes slack because of vocational anxieties, encounters poor study conditions, becomes dissipated by unwholesome recreation, rebels against misunderstood university regulations, registers for the wrong level of French instruction, is harassed by debt, finds the moralistic religious universe of his childhood too rudely shattered, or homesick, lovesick; and any of these may entirely negate the best of instruction. The American College has been sufficiently practical-minded to realize the instruction itself demand allied services to the student. The student cannot be sent to college without bringing his body, emotional status, and moral make-up with him (p. 120-128).

The education of the student concerns more than just classroom instruction. Student development, conversely, becomes the concern of all members of the academic community, not just the student services professional. The

"whole" community ventures to educate the "whole" student. Cooperation is essential and the student is an active participant in the educational enterprise.

Since the early writers viewed the field of student services as intimately involved in the educational process, it would seem that the practitioners would logically view themselves as professionals in the educational effort. Yet, the literature addressed in Chapter One belies that professional confidence. It may be argued that Buber may well encourage professional educational confidence by his ability to tie out-of-classroom experiences of the student into the educational purpose of the institution or further, education itself into the purposes of meaning of life. Matott (1971) states:

Buber offers a stance in a dynamic conservatism; while valuing tradition, he also indicates new directions in human development. A dynamic conservatism is an appropriate stance for educators, in that education involves conserving the past as well as generating the future. His dynamically conservative stance rests upon his philosophical anthropology, his view of man as man. To the extent that unity in education always reflects a compelling view of man, Buber provides not only a stance but a viewpoint and a direction to go (p. 180).

The author proposes that student services professionals can discover greater meaning and purpose in their work if they can come to see what they do as integrally tied in with the essentials of education and fabric of American life. It might be possible then, as Stamatakos and Rogers (1984) propose, for workers in the field to view themselves as professionals rather than as

functionaries. This would be a valuable mind-set for professionals, institutions, and students alike. Careful consideration and appropriation of Buber's educational philosophy might result in better professional practice and quality educational experiences for students.

The author proposes that the field of student services is not in a position or state of mind to overlook anything that might address the lack of professional self-worth evident in the literature. Matott (1971) states, "...the conclusion is, then, that Buber is of prime importance to the modern philosophy of education in general" (p. 180).

W. H. Cowley, in his article "The Nature of Student Personnel Work: (1936) proposed the following as a desirable definition of the personnel point of view:

The personnel point of view is a philosophy of education which puts emphasis upon the individual student and his all-round development as a person rather than upon his intellectual training alone and which promotes the establishment in educational institutions of curricular programs, methods of instruction, and extra-instructional media to achieve such emphasis (p. 3-27).

Matott's concern rests with the increasing compartmentalization of the American University. He states, "...thus too, the concept of wholeness becomes inoperable in practice as specialists deal by turns with the various parts [of the student's life]" (p. 181, 1971). Specialization and compartmentalization are facts of life for the modern educator. But the concept of treating students as

unique persons being concerned with the development of the whole student is neither new nor out of date.

Cowley (1936) observes, "The emphasis 'upon the individual' student and his all-round development as a person rather than upon his intellectual training alone is not, it should be made clear, the private concern of personnel worker" (p. 9). Continuing, "As a matter of fact personnel people are merely subscribing to the point of view of a long line of philosophers dating at least from Socrates and leading to John Dewey and his adherent" (1936, p. 9). Cowley's realization is both humbling and exhilarating for a student services professional--humbling in that the philosophy is not new, yet exhilarating in that the field is rooted in the finest of educational philosophy. The author proposes to add Buber to the list of notables who have written the groundbreaking philosophy for the profession.

Martin Buber's Contribution to Student Services

Martin Buber's contribution to the field of student services falls into four major categories. The first of these is Buber's understanding the concept of wholeness. Matott (1976) writes, "By offering a counter-concept of wholeness, Buber becomes relevant to personnel work, and to education in general, on the most basic--i.e., the conceptual level" (p. 181). Matott explains, "For example, a Student Activities Director, while he special-

izes in social activities, is not dealing with the student's 'social part,' but is rather dealing with the whole student (i.e., his essence as a human being) in the social dimension" (p. 181). This appeals to the author as a particularly enlightening approach to working with students in a compartmentalized modern university. The student is viewed in the context of the area in which the professional meets the student. This understanding might link the varying functional areas of student services and the academic area in a cooperative venture.

Secondly, Matott points out that Buber's appreciation of the entire educational institution's impact on the student implies the importance of out-of-classroom experiences. Matott writes, "Perhaps most importantly the non-curricular spheres of education are legitimized [by Buber's writing]" (p. 181). There is a synchronicity of thought then between Buber's concept of wholeness and non-curricular importance with the early writings of the profession.

Thirdly, Buber includes the students' spirituality in his understanding of 'wholeness.' The reemergence of campus religious life is chronicled in the Danforth Foundation book, The Recovery of Spirit in Higher Education. Buber's early recognition of the spirituality of students may assist student services professionals to establish need and credibility to work with campus religious groups. Matott observes, "It must be taken into

account that Buber's concept of wholeness includes a spiritual dimension and a belief in eternal values and truths" (p. 182). More will be said about this in Chapter Four.

Fourth, and finally, Buber's writings on the importance of human community bear special significance for the student services professional. Buber understood universities to be communities of search; search for knowledge, truth, and human values. Matott (1971) clarifies, "...in that the college and university should, ideally, constitute human communities rather than collectives, Buber's thought on the subject of community is of special significance" (p. 185). For Buber, there is a significant difference between the community and the collective. Human community involves quality interpersonal relations marked by dialogue. Collectives formulate group thinking, control, and blind conformity. The "community/collective" polemic might assist student services professionals in helping Greek letter organizations on campus to form community centered brotherhood and sisterhood and eliminate or minimize destructive collective behaviors.

One must understand Buber's thinking in the context of his Jewishness and the context of his life. He was observing the build-up on what he termed the "mindless collective" in Hitler's Germany, and could see the widening distance between it and real community. For Buber, education holds the keys to real human community. Real

education prepares individuals for active participation in human community.

Kohlberg's understanding of the individuals movement from 'concern with self' to 'concern with universal ethical principles' is closely related to Buber's belief in the importance of educating human beings to be part of the community of all humanity. Education, for Buber, is unique in that it sets out intentionally to educate character for active and real participation in human community. The student in his or her wholeness is synonymous with the student engaged in community. Buber believes that one lives either in 'radical isolation' or in 'human community.'

Can one develop to the limits of one's potentialities and make a contribution to the betterment of society in isolation? Can an educator who transmits culture, enriches human experience, and assists others to develop potential view him or herself as a mere functionary?

Human beings do not develop without interaction and direction with and from other human beings and, as such, contributions to the betterment of society are accomplished in the context of community. Mohandas K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King are two dramatic 20th Century examples of individuals-in-community who contributed to the betterment of society. Buber's understanding of 'education as the education of character for participation

in genuine human community' bears special significance for student services, education, and life.

The writings of the early professionals in student services make it difficult to understand and explain the ongoing professional "self doubt" chronicled in the literature. To preserve, to transmit, to enrich the culture; to be scholarly and imaginative, vital; to assist others in developing and contributing to the betterment of society--these are our basic purposes, these are our professional challenges. How can it be that some still question our validity as a profession and see themselves as university functionaries? Have we forgotten the basic tenets of the Student Personnel Point of View?

The American Council of Education writers were convinced that the professionals were involved in a very important task with a long history and a partnership with other areas of the educational institution. Why, then, the existing confusion evident in the literature regarding the profession's identity, purpose, and place in the academy?

Martin Buber's philosophy of education and dialogue can aid establishing our professional identity, describing our purpose, illuminate how we can accomplish our tasks, and clarifying why we should concern ourselves with the education of the whole student.

It has been revealed in the review of literature that Buber writes about educating the "whole student." Buber

believes education should prepare students for genuine participation in human community. The profession of student services proposes to assist students in developing their potentialities so that the students can contribute to the betterment of society. Buber validates both in class and out of class experiences as educational and developmental. Student services claims its functional out-of-classroom activities have educational value to the student.

The literature reveals professional sense of doubt and lack of self worth. Buber proposes that educators alone stand between mindless collectivism and true human community.

The early philosophers of the field hail from the 1920's and 1930's period. Martin Buber's writings predate and parallel the writings of our earliest scholars. The professionals have asked for a more coherent philosophy of what student services is about. Martin Buber's philosophy of education and dialogue have been appropriated by education, communication, counseling, teaching, psychology, sociology, religion, and ethics, but not student services.

An examination of Martin Buber's philosophy of education and dialogue in their significance for the profession and its philosophy follows.

CHAPTER THREE:

A BUBER PRIMER

The purpose of this chapter is to identify and define the terminology of Buber that relates to the student services profession. This glossary of relevant terms will assist the reader in understanding Buber's potential significance for student services. The Buber Primer should be useful for the difficult work ahead in Chapter Four.

The Basic Assumptions

There are two statements by Martin Buber which establish the basic philosophical assumptions underlying his writing on interpersonal relations, education, and dialogue.

1. "All actual life is encounter" (Buber, 1970, p. 62).
2. "Man exists anthropologically not in his isolation, but in the completeness of the relation between man and man; what humanity is can be properly grasped only in vital reciprocity" (Buber, 1965b, p. 84).

These statements identify the importance Buber places on the interpersonal relationship. Human beings exist, and therefore, must be understood, in their relations with others. It would follow that the essential element of

education for Buber would be the educator-student relationship. Any attempt to consider, study, or analyze "human being" in isolation from others, in community, or in collective would be foolhardy and unfaithful to what he saw as the basic assumption of life.

I-Thou and I-It: The Basic Attitudes

I-Thou and I-It are word pairs that represent Buber's terminology to describe the values or attitudes the two persons bring with them to the interpersonal relation. The I-Thou word pair describes a dialogical relation between the I, or Self, and Thou, or Other. The I-It word pair describes a subject to object relation where the Self uses the Other for benefit of the Self. One may treat persons as a Thou, or significant other or as a thing, or It. It is possible to have dialogical relation with inanimate objects such as living plants and animals. One may also simply use wildlife, for example, for one's selfish purpose. What is important is the "attitude" one takes into the relation. This is particularly true of the educator student relation. The attitudes of the dialogical partners determine the authenticity of the relation. Genuine education depends on the establishment of an I-Thou dialogical relation between the educator and the student.

Dialogue

Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue is a statement of the essential importance of the dialogical relation between person and person. Buber identifies dialogue as the means of entering into relation. Relation is the fundamental fact of being human and the essential element of education. Stewart (1977) presents a summary of the characteristics of Buber's concept of genuine dialogue as one approach to interpersonal communication (pp. 274-29). Key words are underlined. The seven steps toward dialogical relation are:

1. Each person must turn toward and be open to the other, a 'turning of the being.'
2. Each must make present the other by imagining the real of the other.
3. Each confirms the other's being; however, confirmation does not necessarily mean approval.
4. Each must be authentically himself or herself.
 - a. Each must say whatever she or he 'has to say.'
 - b. Each cannot be ruled by thoughts of his or her own effect or effectiveness as a speaker.
5. Where dialogue becomes genuine, 'there is brought into being a memorable common fruitfulness which is to be found nowhere else.'
6. Speaking is not always essential; silence can be very important.
7. Finally, all participants must be committed to

dialogue otherwise, it will fail.

Dialogue is the essential relation in education and may establish trust between educator and student. Trust, writes Buber, is the only access to the student upon which the entire educational enterprise rests. Trust is established through dialogue.

Characteristics of Dialogue

Johannesen (1971) identifies six major characteristics which are common to virtually all research on the concept of dialogue. They are:

1. Genuineness
2. Accurate empathic understanding
3. Unconditional positive regard
4. Presentness
5. Spirit of mutual equality
6. Supportive psychological climate

These characteristics are important because they provide a context in which to consider Buber's concept of dialogue. Also, Friedman (1963, p. x), Dance (1969, pp. 14-21), and Matson and Montague (1967, p. 5) assert that Martin Buber is the primary person who places dialogue at the center of his view of human existence, and education.

Components of Dialogue

Poulakos (1974) proposes, "From a phenomenological point of view...it may be said that the components of

dialogue are three. They are the Self, the Other, and the Between" (p. 199). Poulakos identifies a "striking lack of inquiry" by scholars into the concept of the Between. He establishes four essential conditions that must be met to create Buber's concept of the Between:

1. Physical presence
2. Mutual awareness
3. Interaction
4. Willingness to be influenced (p. 212)

These conditions must be met by the Self and the Other. Interpersonal growth occurs in the "Between" in the philosophy of Martin Buber. The "Between" is the responsibility of the Self (I) and the Other (Thou) to create and maintain. The educator and student share responsibility for the creation of the Between.

Elements of the Interhuman

The "Elements of the Interhuman" are special considerations that effect the persons who are attempting to enter into dialogue. There are four major elements which may impede the growth of dialogue. They are:

1. The Social and the Interhuman. Buber identifies a distinct difference between "social" life and life between two persons called "interhuman." Membership in a social group does not necessarily mean that any interpersonal, or interhuman, relation takes place according to Buber. In his view, the social group often minimizes the interhuman

relation for the sake of group goals and objectives. "In no case," Buber observes, "does membership in a group necessarily involve an existential relation between one member and another" (1965b, p. 73).

2. Community and Collectivity. Human existence in the collective is lived or directed toward the group, its goals and objectives. In the community, life is lived toward each individual as a specific Other. The community binds individuals together; the interhuman relation being of utmost importance. Buber (1965) writes, "Collectivity is not a binding but a bundling together: individuals packed together, with only as much life from man to man as will inflame the marching step" (p. 31).

3. Distance and Relation. Persons exist, Buber writes, with some "distance" between them. That is, they are not in relation until they choose to be. Each living person is separate from every other living person; this is existential distance. Buber (1965b) proposes, "Distance provides the human situation; relation provides man's becoming in that situation" (p. 64). By entering into relation, persons overcome their existential separateness. Choice is a key element in the Self (I) and the Other (Thou) bridging the distance and creating the Between.

4. Problems Impeding the Growth of Dialogue. There are three problems which may impede the growth of dialogue. They are:

A. The duality of being and seeming.

B. The inadequacy of perception.

C. Two means of affecting others: imposing and unfolding.

These problems concern the interpersonal behavior and the communication style of the Self and the Other that either promote or impeded the growth of interpersonal dialogue. These impediments are particularly important to education and will be explained in detail in Chapter Four.

Essential Elements of Relation

There are seven essential elements, or components, of Martin Buber's concept of dialogical relation. These seven elements are "characteristics" of a dialogical relation according to Buber. They are:

1. Participation
2. Risk
3. Sacrifice
4. Exclusiveness
5. Will
6. Grace
7. Reciprocity

Information regarding the concepts above can be found in Martin Buber's I and Thou (pp. 58-168). The seven "essential elements of relation" were selected from Buber's writing and identified under that title by the author for the purpose of organization. These are

additionally formative criteria for the teacher/student relationship according to Buber.

Developmental Process of Relation

Martin Buber's (1970) concept of relation is a developmental process which is composed of five basic stages. The process begins in the prenatal life of the child and continues throughout the life of the individual. The stages are:

1. The pure natural association between mother and child; and a priori of relation (p. 78).
2. The longing for relation.
3. The detachment of the I from the You: the development of conscious selfhood.
4. The encounter with It.
5. The choices: I-You or I-It (pp. 78-85).

This process is very difficult to explain and likely more difficult to understand. It is presented in detail in I and Thou, Buber's most well known and difficult work.

Buber's contention is that our desire to relate to others is a fundamental drive and fact of human existence because we exist a priori in pure natural association [relation] with our mothers. We are separated by birth and have a lifetime longing for relation. An independent self emerges as the child grows up and becomes self conscious. The world of objects, of "mine" and "yours" is encountered and the choice between relation and using is

made time and time again. One chooses I-Thou to relate or I-It to use. One can only catch glimpses of true I-Thou relation and normally and naturally lives in the I-It material world.

The more one strives for I-Thou relations, the more one's life becomes humanized and personal. As one strives or settles for I-It encounters, one's life is marked by using and selfishness.

This will become evidently important as we discuss the concept of in loco parentis in Chapter Four. Briefly, if the child has never been made aware of the most primitive relation, i.e., mother-child, or has not developed conscious selfhood, or perhaps lives only in a world of things and objects, then the task of the genuine educator is very difficult if possible at all.

Education

"Education worthy of the name is essentially education character" (1965, p. 104). This is discussed in great length in Chapter Four. It is essential to view education through the basic assumptions, however. To Buber the subject matter would be secondary in importance to the dialogue and would serve as the "vehicle" or "medium" through which character is developed. The teacher/student relation is the determining factor in the development of character, and as such, education.

Ethic of Responsibility

Finally, Martin Buber proposes that human beings have an ethical responsibility to respond, or communicate, interpersonally. "An individual's responsibility exists only where there is real responding" (1965, p. 16). That is to say, people can be judged to be responsible only as they actively and genuinely enter into relation by responding with other. Why? Because if one accepts Buber's initial assumption that the fundamental fact of human existence is person with person, then the relation "game" has high stakes. It is, the relation, no game at all, but life or death to human beings. Buber writes, "The individual is a fact of existence in so far as he steps into a living relation with other individuals" (1965b, p. 16-17).

He concludes, "The idea of responsibility is to be brought back from the province of specialized ethics, of an 'ought', that swings free in the air, into that of lived life" (p. 16). An individual's response ability, or communication ability, is at the very center of Buber's philosophy of dialogue. Interpersonal responding and communicating are ethical concerns for Buber. Ethical because the very basis of existence is relation to Buber. Holding back, not responding fully, or responding inauthentically "robs" the Self and Other of the very staple of human existence, namely relationship. This will have even greater impact when one considers educators who

dislike teaching freshmen, use or abuse students, or who are not faithful to the charges of their office. To educate for Buber is an ethical responsibility; the highest. It is an honor, a privilege, and, as we shall see for Buber, it is also holy.

CHAPTER FOUR:

FOUR ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS FOR THE PROFESSION

Part I: Who Are We? Toward An Understanding Of Our Professional Identity As Educators

Martin Buber viewed education as the central influence in preparing human beings for meaningful participation in human community. Education for Buber, is essentially the education of character. Students are to be viewed in their 'wholeness' writes Buber and allowed to participate in their own education. Let us now turn our attention to the role of the educator in the writing of Martin Buber and consider the implications of Buber's thought for student services professionals.

Buber saw the modern educator as but one factor in educating the student. That is, with one major difference. Buber (1965) writes:

The world, that is, the whole environment nature and society, 'educates' the human being: it draws out his powers, and makes him grasp and penetrate its objections. What we term education, conscious and willed, means a 'selection by man of the effective world:' it means to give decisive effective power to a selection of the world which is concentrated and manifested in the educator. The relation in education is lifted out of the purposely streaming education by all things, and is marked off as purpose. In this way, through the educator, the world for the first time becomes the true subject of its effect (p. 89).

Buber believes that to work with students means to be an educator. An educator is someone who, by intention,

will, or conscious decision, decides to enter into relation with the student to share his or her 'selection' of what the educator has found to be effective; that is, right and true in his or her own experience and in his or her own field. The educator has responsibility for selecting the 'effective world' which implies the need to stay current in one's field or area of expertise. The educator, writes Buber, should have purpose, a plan, which guides professional practice. The educator guides the student through journey into self and life using the subject matter as a means to get there. The real 'ends' are self understanding, relation, and discovery of the effective world. The means are the individual disciplines, or for student services professionals, different functional areas within the division.

Buber (1965) raises an interesting point of justification for the professional educator. He writes, "There was a time, there were times, where there neither was nor needed to be any specific calling of educator or teacher" (p. 89). He relates that the world then had masters, philosophers, and for example, coppersmiths. The apprentice or journeyman not only learned a way of life, or trade, but, writes, Buber, "...the mystery of personal life: they received the spirit" (p. 90). What does he mean? The protege learned a skill or trade, but equally important, believes Buber, he or she learned how the mentor conducted him/herself personally. The mentor

received the human spirit of the master as well as the skill.

Buber, ever the dynamic conservative envisioned by Matott (1971) is very reticent to let the modern educator drift away from the mentoring master role. Read Buber's impassioned pleas for the 'master touch:'

Yet the master remains the model for the teacher. For if the educator of our day has to act consciously he must nevertheless do it 'as though he did not.' That raising of the finger, that questioning glance, are his genuine doing. Through him the selection of the effective world reaches the pupil. He fails the recipient when he presents this selection of the world with a gesture of interference. It must be concentrated in him; and doing out of concentration has the appearance of rest. Interference divides the soul in his care into an obedient part of the rebellious part. But a hidden influence proceeding from his integrity has an integrating force" (1965, p. 90).

Each move, each lecture, each interaction; these are all thought out and well planned by the educator. Why? Because education is willful and intentional. Because it has purpose. Yet, in order to allow for the student to experience a freedom in learning, the master teacher is so well prepared and ready that this conscious action becomes second nature; concentrated, focused, and giving the appearance of rest. This hidden decision, this intentionality lends itself as an integrating force between the master teacher and the learning mentor.

This may on the surface appear to be gamesmanship, a certain appearance of spontaneity concealing calculated responses and action. Buber, however, is so committed to the idea that education stands out from amongst all the

spontaneous forces of education that he calls for, preparation and pre-selection of the effective world to be presented in the class and on the campus. To further clarify this point, Buber (1965) writes:

The world, I said, has its influence as nature and as society on the child. He is educated by the elements, by air and light and the life of plants and animals, and he is educated by relationships. The true educator represents both; but he must be to the child one of the elements (p. 90).

The educator becomes to the student as natural as the elements but prepared with an agenda and selection of what he/she wants to teach. As Buber views education as the education of character--the world and life itself, becomes the topics of study; the educator, the guide; the student both the subject of the study and the journey; his or her life, its object.

Buber (1965) proposes that in effect, "The educator represents the world to the student" (p. 93). What an awesome responsibility. What a challenge. What a privilege. Buber firmly confesses that this was our easier task in times gone by. He differentiates between the old educator and the new educator for the purpose of explanation. The reader will soon recognize that the old educator and new educator have little to do with chronological sequences. Rather, the educator's attitude about life, education, and students determines the 'oldness' or 'newness' of their professional ways.

Buber defines the old educator with four characteristics. These are:

1. The old educator is a bearer of assured values.
2. The old educator is a representative of the past; the historical world.
3. The learner is viewed as an intruder.
4. The old educator is an ambassador of history to the intruder (pp. 93-94).

The inherent problem, writes Buber, with this point of view is that eventually the "...magical validity of tradition" disappears (pp. 93-94). Quite an insight for a man writing forty years before the Free Speech Movement or the loosening of the ties of the concept of *in loco parentis*. Sadly, the "ambassador of history" is seen as a human being; and "a static atom to the whirling atom" (p. 94). We need not go further than our own campuses to locate the "static atoms" and the "whirling atoms." We can look at enrollment, retention, or better yet, ask the students. It is knowledge that sets us free.

As a statement of belief and humility, Buber proposes, "...we have not to consider the myths of the philosophers, but the actuality of present life" (p. 94). This may seem like a strange statement for a philosopher/educator to make. Yet, Buber was committed to life lived fully and saw no value in philosophy that didn't emerge from it.

Buber was equally critical of the "new educator" of his day. The new educator he saw as motivated by love; love of teaching, love of students. He found this ineffective. Why? Eros, he wrote, involves choice, "...choice made from an inclination...This is precisely what education is not" (p. 94).

The question may now be asked what is the most compelling, compassionate, and thrilling answer to the question, "Who Are We?"

The modern educator cannot, and should not, choose who is to be educated. The genuine educator teaches whoever he or she meets in the classroom, gymnasium, or counselling office. "From this unerotic situation," writes Buber, "the greatness of the modern educator is to be seen--and most clearly when he is a teacher" (p. 94).

Buber reflects:

He [the educator] enters the school-room for the first time, he sees them crouching at the desks, indiscriminately flung together, the misshapen and the well-proportioned, animal faces, empty faces, and noble faces in indiscriminate confusion, like the presence of the created universe; the glance of the educator accepts and receives them all (p. 94).

Certainly the same assertion could be made for the residence hall, the voluntary member interest club or the intramural sports captain's meeting.

We, as educators, work with who comes. We do the best we can. Some are lovable, some are not. Some we would choose not to work with if we had a choice, but as educators, in Buber's world, we don't have a choice. The

work is unerotic, nerve wracking, and challenging. But it is real, like "the presence of the created universe" (p. 94).

One must not overlook the reality of the Eternal Thou (God or Spirit) in Buber's life or philosophy. This will be addressed in "difficult" detail in Part IV. Buber states, "He [the educator] is assuredly no descendent of the Greek Gods, who kidnaped those they loved...but he seems to me to be a representative of the true God" (p. 94). The reader is cautioned against reaching any premature conclusions about the "religiosity" of Buber. His concept of "God" may surprise even the most ardent agnostic. The point is that Buber views the educator's role as transcendent in importance.

The most important factor for the genuine educator is his or her pupils. Roles, agendas, God, power; all these are subordinated to the lives of the students. Buber says:

But even then his selection of the effective world remains suspended, under constant correction by the special humility of the educator for whom the life and particular being of all his pupils is the decisive factor to which his 'hierarchic' recognition is subordinated. For in the manifold variety of the children the variety of creation is placed before him (p. 95).

Education, thus, may occur wherever an intentional professional willfully enters into relation with a student. Genuineness and realness are called for; example is paramount. Buber states, "We call that man a teacher who recognizes the eternal truths and present reality:

That man who measures one through the other" (Kampf in Israel, Reden and Aufsätze [1921-32, p. 152]. "The teacher," writes Buber (1967), "should establish and strengthen in his disciples the yearning for personal unity, from which the unity of mankind should be born" (p. 551).

The call for personal unity in the writing of Buber and the stated objective of individual student development in the earlier writings of the field strike similar chords. Kohlberg's realization of the later development of universal ethical behaviors also bears resemblance to the "unity of mankind" mentioned in Buber's philosophy (Kohlberg, 1981).

Not tenure, not professional standing, not publication, (though these appear and are real concerns) but the lives of the students; these are the real issues for the genuine educator. Buber writes:

Only when he [the educator] catches himself 'from over there' and feels how it affects one, how it affects this other human being, does he recognize the real limit, baptize his self-will in reality and make it true will, and renew his paradoxical legitimacy" (p. 100).

It is paradoxical because he at once must be real and be pre-selective of the material presented; living openly in front of the student; candid, yet calculated; spontaneous, yet rehearsed; subjugating his or her desire to be "one of the them" to the realization that there will be a necessary distance between them. Educator-mentor and

searching student--they proceed. One day they may be friends, wholly open, but not now.

One of the most passionate and challenging definitions of education and the role of the educator is written by Buber in, The Way of Response. Buber states:

The education I mean is a guiding toward reality and realization. That man alone is qualified to teach who knows how to distinguish between appearance and reality, between seeming realization and genuine realization, who rejects appearance and chooses and grasps reality, no matter what world-view he chooses. This education educates the adherents of all world-views to genuineness and to truth. It educates each of them to take his world-view seriously: to start from the genuineness of its ground and to move toward the truth of its goal (1966, p. 93).

Part II: What Are The Tasks Of The Educator? What Are We Supposed To Do?

Martin Buber proposes that the educator is a person who intentionally enters into the lives of the students and seeks to assist those students to develop their unique potentialities. Education, as such, is essentially the education of character. Character, for Buber, represents the relationship between what a student says he or she is and what that individual in actuality does and is. Character is a reflection of the consistency between the rhetoric and the reality of the student. If we are to be educators in this Buberian sense, then what are our tasks; what is it we are to be about professionally? Part II will relate Buber's understanding of the real task of education for the student services professional.

The Nature of Character

The central theme of Martin Buber's philosophy of education is that, "Education worthy of the name is essentially education of character" (1939, p. 104). What does Buber mean by character? He writes, "The Greek word character means 'impression.' The special link between man's being and his appearance, the special connection between the unity of what he is and the sequence of his .paactions and attitudes is impressed on his still plastic substance" (1939, p. 106).

Buber believes that all of life's forces shape, stamp, or 'impress' themselves on the lives of the students. Education, as revealed in Part I, Chapter 4, does this 'impressing' intentionally and with great responsibility. Buber believes that this 'characterization process' is lifelong. He writes that human beings are "...characterized already and yet have still to be characterized" (1922, p. 83).

Character, for Buber, represents the "distance" between what a person says he or she will do; what he or she does; "multiplied" by the amount of care that person exhibits toward the self and others. Character is revealed in one's relationships with others.

Hauerwas (1975) states, "The idea of character in its broadest sense is used most appropriately to identify individuality or distinctiveness" (p. 11). Character involves choice and action. Hauerwas explains:

The idea of character as I am using it is sharply distinguished from character associated with the temperament or natural trait. For the idea of character in its most paradigmatic usage indicates what a man can decide to be as opposed to what a man is naturally. We assume that a man chooses to have a kind of character; a man can and should be held responsible for what he is (p. 12).

Buber believes that the "impressing" or "stamping" of this character is education's great responsibility. Education assists the student in making better choices about who he or she will become.

Emmanuel Mounier (1956) proposes, "Character is not a fact, but an act" (p. 17). The education of character envisioned by Buber prepares the student to choose his or her identity and to act on those choices in the world. The greater the degree of consistency between choice and act coupled with caring; the greater the degree of character.

The educator teaches the students about character by establishing trust. Trust, Buber believes, is the only access to the pupil. Hauerwas (1975) states:

We talk of strength or weakness of character as a way of indicating whether a man can be relied upon and trusted even under duress...Character understood in this way implies that man is more than that which simply happens to him, for he has the capacity to determine himself beyond momentary excitations and acts (p. 15).

Hauerwas, as does Buber, proposes that character develops, is dynamic, and must be practiced in life's trying situations to have meaning. Buber believes the educator to be

one intentional force in character development at a very special time in the student's life.

The focus on the education of character is not unique to Buber. However, for Buber, it is our unique role as educators to develop character that provides us with our primary function and near-sacred opportunity.

Hauerwas explains, "For to stress the significance of the idea of character is to be normatively committed to the idea that it is better for men to shape rather than to be shaped by their circumstances (p. 17). Buber identifies the educator as a primary "shaper" of character and as one of the only "shapers" who does so intentionally, and volitionally.

For Buber, Hauerwas, and Mounier, character involves choice, action, and responsibility. A choice to shape one's destiny; an act of caring for self and others; and the ability to respond. These ideas are not new. Certainly Aristotle said, "Choice is the starting point of action..." (1139 a 30-1139 b5). Thomas Aquinas proposed, "For a good life consists in good deeds. Now in order to do good deeds, it matters not only what a man does but also how he does it; that is, that he do it from right choice and not merely from impulse or passion" (p. 57). It is Buber, however, who inextricably ties education to the development of character in his writings and life's work.

Education is the prime area in which the developing student is characterized. This is a terribly challenging task for Buber and shapes not only the present but the future as well. "In every hour," writes Buber, "the human race begins" (1927, p. 83). Educators find themselves facing the never ending task of articulating the values of the culture past and shaping new perspectives for the future. Buber proposes that the character of the future is stamped by the decisions of human beings present (p. 83).

Since Buber has already stated his belief that education and educators stand alone as intentional characterizing agents, the importance of the educator to the present and future of the world is obvious. Striving to lead the student into the "unity of being" resulting from consistent attitudes, values, and behaviors, the educator prepares the student to enter the world and become a productive member of it. This is in accordance with the best of the early documents of the field which called for students to be prepared for the betterment of society. Education must, "...strengthen the light spreading force" in the hearts of the students (p. 84). The educator's role in the 'stamping' of the student's character, and thus the futures' character, is immeasurable writes Buber. How effective we are, he notes, can only be evaluated by observing what the students do with their lives (p. 84). It is important to introduce the concept of character at

this point because it is the central concept in Buber's philosophy of education. Moving "back to the beginning" will illuminate and define the major components of Buber's philosophy of education. A careful analysis of the "education of character" will be presented and chapters will conclude with a statement regarding the significance of Buber's philosophy of education for the student services profession.

The Whole Person Philosophy

Martin Buber was one of the earliest persons to recognize the importance of the "whole person" in education. In fact, Buber (1965), wrote specifically that in education we must be concerned with the "education of the whole person" (p. 85). While this seems obvious today, Buber's understanding predates the great majority by the writing in the student services profession by a number of years and was revolutionary at the time. One wonders about the possibility of considering the "student as a whole" when the many diverse university functions and their professionals are separated by sprawling campuses and different educational philosophies.

The whole person philosophy has significance for the Vice President responsible for student services as he or she coordinates the academic support services on campus. Many of today's students come from homes where divorce occurred; receive little ethical education at home or in

church/synagogue/mosque, etc.; and may need some remedial work in an academic discipline or two. The whole person philosophy allows the chief student services professional to call upon the work of Astin and others to teach faculty and staff what the early founders of our profession knew: namely, that the student brings to campus a myriad of needs, skills, and problems and must be considered as a whole human being in order to develop fully. While we compartmentalize the university, the student must be viewed and educated as a whole human being.

Buber's proposal, like the early founders of the field, is that the student is better serviced, educated, and characterized when considered in his or her entirety; i.e., physical, psychological, social, spiritual needs, etc. as part of a whole human person, rather than as a set of fragmented parts, i.e., the social part, the academic part, the part in need of counseling, the part in need of food, housing, academic advising, etc. Buber recognized the need for wholeness in 1926. To educate students we must meet in dialogue with whole students, nothing but students in their entireties.

The Instinct of Origination

Along with character and wholeness, this component of education is very important to Buber. Human beings have an "originator instinct;" a desire to "make things" (1927, p. 85). The young person desires "its own share in this

becoming of things;" the growing person seeks to be "the subject of this event of production" (1927, p. 85). This gives us a clue as to the essential role the student can, and must, play in his or her own development. Where does Buber come up with this "instinct of origination"? Where is his documentation? Buber produces no graphics, no charts, no statistics. He writes from his experience and observations as a teacher/educator. Who, having had or raised a child, can doubt the truth of his experience? Who, having seen students flourish in their own activity, can find fault in this observation?

Designers of curriculum and activities would be wise to recognize the student's essential role and need to be involved in the decision making process as to what the student studies and does outside the classroom. The desire to create, Buber's "instinct of origination," provides both a philosophical justification for the involvement of students in the educational process and an existential understanding of why we must listen to and involve student's in their own development. This, too, the founders knew.

As the literature of our field has focused on the uniqueness of each student, so Buber said that the instinct of origination was unique and autonomous in each individual (1927, p. 85). The instinct of origination when coupled with an intentional education can be immeasurably fruitful for the task of developing

character. Buber believes the "instinct of origination" is "significant for the work of education" (p. 86). Why? Buber proposes that this instinctual desire to create can be 'stamped,' teaching the student to do, not have; to be passionate, not lustful; to express, not possess, to unfold, not impose; to share, not to hold (p. 86). Left to its own, the instinct would be an incomplete experience for the student.

Though Buber believes the "life of origination" is fruitful, powerful, and streams through the whole of humankind (p. 86), it is not inherently enough to drive the student to "participate in human community" or "better society." These are two stated goals of the Student Personnel Point of View. Buber states, "The decisive influence" is not instinct of origination itself, but rather the "forces which meet the released instinct, namely the educative forces" (p. 86). There are two components "indispensable for the building of true human life" to which the "origination instinct," left to itself, does not lead and cannot lead. These are: "To share in an undertaking," and "Entering into mutuality" (p. 87).

Buber believes that while human beings are instinctively driven to originate (create) ideas or things, they must be educated to share in originating and to enter into mutual relationships with individuals and communities. The peaceful future of the world depends on sharing and mutuality. He states, "An individual achievement and

undertaking are two very different matters" (p. 87). To make a thing, he asserts is pride. To do a common job involves:

1. conditioning (education)
2. an unconscious humility of being a part of something
3. participation and partaking

To originate, to create, to make something with someone else; these Buber writes are the "true food of earthly immorality" (p. 87).

We make something that we hope will last, be appreciated, be kept, after we die. This origination instinct is strong but needs the educative force to meld it into a cooperative human undertaking which gives it ultimate meaning. Buber writes, "As soon as a man enters effectively into an undertaking, where he discovers and practices a community of work with other men, he ceases to follow the originating instinct alone" (p. 87). The seeds are then sown for "real lived life" in the community with other human beings.

Identity, for Buber is not forged alone. It is discovered in mutual relationships between persons. If, as Chickering (1969) asserts, the establishment of identity is a central task of at least traditionally aged students, then Buber's understanding of the nature of "character formation in-relationship" might be a useful philosophical tool for the field.

Practically, it gives us an excellent justification for staff time and budgeting in the areas of residence hall government; residence hall associations; student fees committees; or numerous other areas of student life where individuals might come together with a trainer/educator to undertake a task in common. They would be entering into mutuality. Character development becomes a practical possibility and not a handsome theory.

If asked why we ought to assist students to move toward "ethical standards for all of humanity" on Kohlberg's (1981) grid, we might respond that the individual must be taught to channel his or her instinct of origination through common understandings with other students to develop a sense and appreciation of community (p. 96). Identity, a central task, is to be found in relationship not isolation.

Buber's understanding of the nature of human being as well as education can help us appreciate existing student development theory because Buber tells us why our work is important. We do not want our students to bask in isolated origination because life is more fully lived in mutual community. Buber writes, "Action leading to an individual achievement is a 'one sided' event" (p. 87). Buber believes life is a 'two sided' event. He says, "...as an originator man is solitary" (p. 87). The educator seeks to facilitate successful participation by students in community as training for genuine

participation in the world community to come. Residential life staff members have an ideal environment in which to teach and build community. Common living areas; shared restrooms; set meal times; residence hall government; social, recreational, and educational programming; and community service projects are but a few of the vehicles available to bring students into dialogical relationship with each other. We may teach compromise, conflict resolution, and the benefits of multi-culturalism because we live with, eat with, socialize with, and grow with students in the residence halls. The hall can prepare the student for genuine participation in community life after college. Is there a better justification for the division of student services or residential life?

As we live in a heralded world of specialization and competencies in education, Buber issues a warning to those who would reduce education to a teaching of isolated things and individual accomplishment and competency. He states, "An education based only on the training of the instinct of origination would prepare a new human solitariness which would be the most painful of all" (p. 87).

It would be frustrating to be unable to understand something or make connections with others out of ignorance. How much greater a tragedy though to be "educated" to know a lot of things or information but never have had the experience of a mutual undertaking demanding humility,

trust, and participation. This "informed" loneliness would be the most painful of all because the individual would eventually know something was missing. This person also might have achieved all of society's requirements of success and would still be alone to face the emptiness of life lived outside of community. Life lived out of touch with self, others, and the world. Could there possibly be a greater loneliness?

Buber's formula proposes that the origination instinct tempered by the educator can result in common undertakings and create mutuality. In this way the student learns to participate in human community and has learned one of life's most essential truths. The origination instinct teaches people about things; undertakings teach students about life (p. 87). The educator facilitates common undertaking while nurturing the student's instinct of origination.

It is of interest to consider Marcia's (1966) concepts of foreclosed and achieved identities as they are applied to Buber's "instinct of origination" of "mutuality through common undertaking." It may be observed that a foreclosed identity; that is a commitment made without the benefit of experience, might be seen as a commitment made to the instinct of origination of creativity without the experience of mutual undertaking. We might then see a person with a foreclosed identity, committed to 'making

something happen' without the collaborative skills to get it done.

Conversely, an achieved identity state might result from a person's desire to create or "make happen" bolstered by the reality that mutual undertakings could reach desired goals more readily than isolated individual effort. This could help us understand why students establish foreclosed identities and how we might facilitate growth to achieve identity status.

Viaticum: The Instinct For Communion

The word viaticum reveals Buber's theological nature as a philosopher. More importantly, it reveals how seriously he took education as a means of educating character for genuine participation in community. Viaticum is a word with two interesting meanings. Its ecclesiastical meaning is The Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ. This is an interesting word for Buber to choose. The word also was used in ancient Rome as the provision of necessities for an official journey. Taken together, the word viaticum in Buber's philosophy of education stands for the real essentials; the body and the blood, those things that must accompany the educational journey. In that context viaticum is an artfully chosen word.

Buber's world involves the world of objects and the world of subjects. The world of objects involved a "utilitarian attitude" where things or people were used as

means to another end. Buber saw this world as essential to living but limiting in its scope. The world of subject Buber defined as a "participatory attitude" where things and people were appreciated for their own worth as ends, not means (1970). This relationship Buber called I-Thou. As we have said, I-Thou would more easily be understood as I-You.

I-It and I-Thou are world views; attitudes about using and relating, experiencing and participating. The I-It attitude most closely corresponded with the construct of origination while the I-Thou world Buber viewed as the instinct for communion. The line of demarcation between I-It and I-Thou, between origination and communion, is essential to Buber's philosophy of education. The instinct of communion is the recognition of the need for others in common undertakings which define real human life. As such the I-Thou attitude, the instinct for communion, is a viaticum of life and education.

The educator must recognize the intrapersonal need to create (the instinct of origination) and the interpersonal need to enter into meaningful human co-activity and community (the instinct for communion). The educator then directs the student in a path that allows for individual expression while teaching collaborative skills essential to human life.

In a romanticized definition of the instinct for communion, Buber (1965) says that the desire for it is the

desire of "...experiencing communion in the face of the lonely night, which spreads beyond the window and threatens to invade" (p. 88). The instinct for communion is "...the longing for the world to become present..." (p. 88). If one can resist the temptation to be put off by Buber's poetic style we can examine the "lonely night spreading beyond the window threatening to invade" and consider some very interesting imagery. The lonely night? Perhaps the lonely night of the soul entertaining for the first time the existential questions:

Who am I?

Why am I here?

Where do I belong?

Alone at night in a residence hall, waiting for a friend in the commons, these are inherently lonely questions that appear on nights that seem exceedingly dark and painfully lengthy. Spreading beyond the window? The window that frames one's world view perhaps. Questions and darkness going way beyond the framed experience of the perceiver sensing so much darkness. Threatening to invade? Forcing itself into the conscious mind of the hereafter blissfully ignorant person clinging wildly to the vestiges of a life which seemed so simple so very recently.

It is against this background that one for the first time recognizes, no, feels, the need for communion with other human beings. The world of objectification, of I-It, of origination fails to address the burgeoning

question. The instinct for communion, for I-Thou relationship marked by active participation and dialogue.

The glance, the smile, the touch...these are the signs of human connectedness, of human community. These feelings can lead the student out of isolation and into relation. No one may more powerfully impact this development than the educator who enters into relationship with his/her students, knowing he/she is needed. Establishing trust by dependable realness. Calling the student out of isolation into relation. "Real education," writes Buber (1927), "is made possible--but is it also established?--by the realization that youthful spontaneity must not be suppressed but must be allowed to give what it can" (p. 88).

The instinct for communion teaches us to understand our need for others. This desire for relation with others, our need to be valued; our need to matter is precisely what Dean Nancy Schlossberg of Maryland proposes when she discusses "mattering." Schlossberg (1989) stated that students who feel "they matter" stay in school. Is this really a surprise? Educators teach us to recognize our instinct for communion by entering into dialogue with us and establishing a "community of search" consisting of students, faculty, and staff committed to each other and to the quest for knowledge, understanding, and truth.

Regardless of our methodology and philosophy, Buber believes that the education of character is our purpose and that the viaticums are: a respect for the whole

student; a commitment to active participation by the educator in the life of the student; and the realization that students must be involved in their own development.

Buber writes, "Education as a purpose is bound to be summoned...Our way is composed of losses that secretly become gains...Education has lost the paradise of our instinctiveness and now serves at the plough for the bread of life" (p. 90). Education is intentional, purposeful and is called upon (summoned) to guide students toward the actualization of their unique potentialities and to put them in context with the real meaning, substance (bread) of life. This life is community.

Buber was quite concerned with the relationship of compulsion and freedom in education. It might be oversimplistic to view this as a curricular discussion of requirements and electives. However, we might do well to consider not only requirements, but policy formation as well. If one were to think of compulsory policies as those in which students have had no input and freedom-centered policies as those with which students were free to be involved in and help create, then we might benefit by Buber's comparison of freedom and compulsion in education.

Compulsion, Freedom, and Communion

Buber (1965) discussed in some length his understanding of two predominating schools of thought in

education. These two schools he identified as the "compulsory school" and the "free school." These schools and Buber's understanding of them are interesting when viewed as precursors of the "in loco parentis" and "student development" philosophies in the student services profession. We will examine the compulsory and free schools and the role of communion between educator and student in the educational philosophy of Buber as they might impact our understanding of providing services to students and helping them develop.

The compulsory school of thought, wrote Buber, concerns itself with rules, regulation, and maintaining current patterns of order (p. 88). Students on this model of education are taught to "copy things," regurgitating them back to a distant expert-educator who controls the information and knows the right answer. The free school promotes the "...delicate almost imperceptible and yet important influence" of dialogic instruction and encounter between educator and student (p. 88).

The compulsory school demands nothing more from the student than conformation and repetition of obvious truths mandated by the school. This causes resignation or rebellion on the part of the student writes Buber (pp. 88-89). Neither resignation nor rebellion are particularly valuable to educating character.

The free school demands participation of the student in his/her own education. The student is called into

relationship with educator, subject, and form. The student begins to feel ownership for his/her education. Participation, relationship, and ownership, unlike resignation or rebellion, are essential to the education of character. The free school, however, can at times leave the student groping for form, for structure, for order so overly present in the compulsory school. Buber writes that there is a tendency to see compulsion at one pole and freedom at the opposite pole (p. 91). Buber, as usual, offers another alternative to compulsion in education. He writes "But at the opposite pole from compulsion there stands not freedom but communion" (p. 91).

Communion may at first seem like an odd word to use in education but some further examination of its meaning to Buber may be worthwhile to our discussion and student services.

"Compulsion," writes Buber, "is a negative reality; communion is the positive reality; freedom is a possibility, possibility regained" (p. 91). Continuing, he proposes, "At the opposite pole of being compelled by destiny or nature or men there does not stand being free of destiny or nature or men but to commune and to covenant with them" (p. 91). Confronted by regularly enforced dogmatic university policies the student will resign himself to these rules or rebel reports Buber. Resignation stifles creativity and thus growth, while rebellion spends energy in areas that are often disastrously poor

and fruitless for student growth. However, "turning students loose" in an environment void of structure and filled with chaos is not the goal either in Buber's educational world.

Students--met not by unyielding dogmas or anxiety producing chaos--are met rather by an educator committed to entering into relationship with her/him, establishing "communion--ites" with other educators and students, and serious about the covenantal relationship essential to the education of character. Yes, independence is essential to any real relationship. But, as Buber says, "This independence is a foot-bridge, not a dwelling place" (p. 91). Too much compulsion and the possibility for communion/-covenant is lost because the education of character demands mutuality. Too much freedom and the student comes to rest in isolated independence cut off from the communion of persons essential to the education of character.

Brief digression may help to illustrate the implication of this understanding for student services and the university community as well.

A recent statewide conference in Oregon brought together university persons concerned with the abuse of alcohol and other drugs on campus. During the statewide conference on Alcohol and Drug Abuse held at Lincoln City, Oregon, experts from around the nation stressed the absolute importance of involving students in policy formation regarding alcohol and drugs on campus. It is

obvious to most people that work with students today that compulsory alcohol regulations lacking of student input are doing little if anything to convince students to drink responsibly. If strict adherence to externally mandated policies are our goal, then we must simply catch or punish those who break the rules. However, if education be our goal, then we must form ways to covenant with students in order to create a campus wide atmosphere of wellness. Not just for students, but for faculty, administration, and staff--community wide. Too much freedom regarding this substance abuse issue and we have wide scale abuse destroying potential and character.

The Greek system has just begun to covenant with its affiliates on this important topic. Years of "freedom" (near benign neglect) left the individual chapters with too many decisions and too little leadership to make them. Students must be free, but free to enter into an interdependent relationship with other members of the academic community. We are all in this effort of educating character together.

The goal then, for Buber, is neither compulsion in education nor complete freedom. "Freedom," Buber proposes, "is the middle point; the vibrating needle, the fruitful zero, between compulsory education and education for communion" (p. 91).

The educator creates an environment where the student can make choices (freedom) and experience the consequences

as his/her actions occur in the context of a community (communion) called the university. Students learn that they live in an interdependent context where what one member of the community does has relation to and impact on the experience of the other. We ask students to turn down their stereos not because it is a compulsory rule that stereos be kept low, but because of the impact that the Beastie Boys at level nine have on the neighbors next door, across the hallway, or in the hall next door.

This is not possible if the staff cannot articulate their philosophy of education as it applies to the here and now of discipline and student conduct. Buber explains, "Compulsion in education means disunion, it means humiliation and rebelliousness" (p. 91). Why? Because just at the moment when the student begins to feel the internal pangs of freedom and identity emerging; the possibility of choice, the education bent on compulsory rules and regulations stifles the individuality, acts as a parent-away-from-home (*in loco parentis*), and facilitates the same rebelliousness, resignation and humiliating dependence the student felt the first time independent thought was squelched by parental judgment and control.

On the contrary, Buber states, "Communion in education is just communion, it means being opened up and drawn in" (p. 91). To what? Opened up to the self and drawn into relationship. This, to Buber, means life to human

beings. "Freedom in education is the possibility of communion..." (p. 91).

Compulsion set in overly structured competencies for graduation that minimize choice, and elective policies governing student life made for, about, but not by students, forbid the growth of character. The emergence of communion between professional educator (mentor) and growing student (protege) becomes unlikely. "...Without it [the possibility of communion]...", Buber warns, "...nothing succeeds...it is...The run before the jump, the timing of the violin, the confirmation of that primal and mighty potentiality which it cannot even begin to actualize" (p. 91). We do not as educators "actualize" the potential of the student. We do, if we are educators, however, set it on its way or nurture it as we find it growing in our students.

All of this, though, depends upon our understanding of education as the education of character, our willingness to honestly be ourselves with our students, our ability to enter into a learning covenant with them that establishes a communion of persons in the educational effort. Again, it must be stated firmly that Buber is not an advocate of a free educational system marked by no structure, no rules, no expectations. Neither has Buber desired rigid dogmatism in academic or extracurricular dimensions of student life. Buber's position is a dynamic tension called "education for communion" between com-

pulsion and freedom. Reflect upon Buber's poetic description of freedom, in life and education.

Freedom--I love its flashing face: it flashes forth from the darkness and dies away, but it has made the heart invulnerable. I am devoted to it, I am always ready to join in the fight for it, for the appearance of the flash, which lasts no longer than the eye is able to endure it, for the vibrating of the needle that was held down too long and was stiff. I give my left hand to the rebel and my right to the heretic: forward! But I do not trust them. They know how to die, but that is not enough. I love freedom, but I do not believe in it. How could one believe in it after looking in its face? It is the flash of a significance comprising all meanings, of a possibility comprising all potentiality. For it we fight, again and again, from of old, victorious and in vain (p. 91).

Buber is scornful of the damaging effects of compulsion in education upon the life of the student. He is in love with freedom, but does not trust it! So, he calls for an education for communion.

This means an education where structure is present, purpose is clear, mission and objectives stated and understood but an education that demands individual choice and response ability on the part of the students. We witness partnership comprised of students, faculty, administration, and staff. Buber proposes, "Let us realize the true meaning of being free of a bond: it means that a quite personal responsibility takes the place of one shared with many generations" (p. 92).

Isn't that what we desire in student services? That we might assist, encourage, and help the student begin to take personal responsibility for his or her own life, decisions, actions, present and future? Yes!

Buber continues, "Life lived in freedom is personal responsibility or it is a pathetic farce" (p. 92). This seemingly could be applied to working with students in all facets of student services and academics. Establishing necessary structures and policies acknowledging the individuality and freedom of each student and then calling each student to take seriously the responsibility of belonging to a community. First, the university community, then perhaps the local or national community, and finally the world as global community (village). This is similar to Kohlberg's procession of human/student development from egocentrism to allocentrism (1981, p. 96).

In summary, Buber proposes a dynamic position between the compulsory school and the free school of educational thought. He proposes that compulsion in curriculum and student life breeds either resignation or rebelliousness, neither of which are productive for the education of character. Education worthy of being called education is, for Buber, the education of character.

Freedom of choice, in academics and student life, is essential for the development of the student's potential but must be tempered by the student's understanding of his/her relationship in and with the community. Buber writes that education for active participation in community, "...alone can give a content to empty freedom and a direction to swaying and spinning freedom. I believe in it, I trust those who are dedicated to it" (p. 92).

What are we about as educators? A Buberian understanding is this: we are to educate individual character for genuine and active participation in human community. We are to "call" students into meaningful interpersonal relationships using subject matter or campus activities and events as our vehicles. What is at stake is a genuinely lived life up against a meaningless accumulation of material wealth and isolated bits of knowledge.

Buber writes, "This fragile life between birth and death can nevertheless be a fulfillment--if it is a dialogue" (p. 92). The educator/ student dialogue becomes a teaching microcosm for the larger world actively engaged in the creation, nurturing, and maintenance of genuine community. The educator/ student covenant becomes the symbol of present and future covenantal possibilities.

The professional educator issues a "calling forth" of the student with his or her whole being that demands, requests, pleads for a response from the student. Again, Buber, "The kindling of the response is that 'spark of the soul,' the blazing up of the response, which occurs time and time again, to the unexpected approaching speech, we term responsibility" (p. 92).

Buber means "response ability" when he says responsibility. As educators issue the call, the invitation to the student to enter into educational covenant, the student feels in her/himself the emergency possibility of saying "yes!" This is response ability. The students

learn that they are able to respond, to make covenant with another human being, to create life out of chaos. The theological implication of this realization will be covered in Part Four. Suffice it to say now that the student is, as the student services philosophies observe essential, an active and engaged partner in his/ her own education. Up to now the student has looked to God, parents, peer group, or a "significant other" for strength and support. Now, the focus of authority is internalized due to the power of the educator/student covenant. Buber says, "As we 'become free' this leaning on something is more and more denied us and our responsibility must become personal and solitary" (p. 92-93). Buber concludes, "From this point of view education and its transformation in the hour of the crumbling of bonds are to be understood" (p. 93). Responsibility becomes personal because it is owned by the individual.

It is solitary because the student knows ineffably that he/ she alone chooses life, relationship and direction, or seeming, loneliness, and floundering. As the bonds of external reliance on authority crumble, a new inner reliance emerges. If the student has been taught the importance of community by example, then the new reliance will demand participation and investment in community. If not, then a new isolation and real loneliness will emerge. One need not look much further than the alcohol and drug abuse statistics, satisfaction with life

reports, and the more than ninety thousand reported rapes last year to realize the tremendous powerlessness, anger, and loneliness that result from a lack of connectedness between person and person in human community. As community/covenant go unmade, civilization comes undone.

If we are to engage students in relationships that teach them response ability and the wonders and necessity of covenantal community, then how are we to do this? Dialogue is the path to the education of character.

How do educators educate? Buber observes, "A principle of education in a sense still to be clarified, can only be a basic relation which is fulfilled in education" (p. 93). We will see that the educator/student relationship is the elan vital of the education of character. The responsibility for the creation of this teachable moment is awesome and wonderful; that is, "full of wonder."

Buber philosophizes, "In education, then, there is a lofty asceticism which rejoices in the world, for the sake of the responsibility for a realm of life which is entrusted to us for our influence but not our interference-- either by the will to power or by Eros" (p. 95). We must seek to influence, not interfere. We recognize that the student's life has been entrusted to us for a brief time due to an infinite variety of plausible reasons. We must seek to control our need for power or our desire to be loved as they might damage or minimize the educator/student relationship.

There must be a well thought out "system of reliable counterpoint" established between educator and student where there is an appropriate balance between "giving and withholding" and "intimacy and distance." The educator has a role and purpose and must never forget this reality. There is a natural and necessary "holding back" in the relationship that must be maintained for the good of the long term education of character. This is the same relationship as doctor/patient or counselor/client.

The educator/student relation is real but purposeful. It is intentional and not the same as two people who meet quite by chance and enter relation as totally spontaneous participants. Buber writes, "It is not the church alone which has a testing threshold on which a man is transformed or becomes a liar" (p. 96). "The testing threshold" for the educator, for us, is the ability to create and maintain the educator/student relationship that is essential for the education of character. Real education, for Buber, is dependent on this relationship (p. 96).

The instinct for origination is met by the educative forces of the educator/student relationship: instruction and relationship between educator and student. The instinct for origination evolves into the instinct for communion, for real community with others. As such, the education of character has begun. The education of real persons for genuine participation in community is initiated. Part Three will reveal Martin Buber's "philosophy

of dialogue," "elements of the interhuman" and "problems impeding the growth of dialogue."

But how is this relationship between educator and student to be created? What are its characteristics? What are its essential elements? Finally, what problems might impede the growth of this essential relationship?

Part III: Dialogue: The 'Delivery Mechanism' For The Education of Character

The education of character develops and unfolds in the dialogical relation between educator and student. There is no substitute for the genuine dialogue between teacher and student. Information may be processed and transferred from expert to novice with dialogue. In fact, this is often accomplished between computer and student in a computer assisted instruction more effectively. But the education of character demands dialogue. Part III of Chapter Four is about dialogue; its characteristics, problems, and relationship to the education of character.

Buber (1965) wrote, "The fundamental fact of human existence is man with man" (p. 203). Dialogue is the best of the interpersonal relationship. It is essential to education, and life. Reuel Howe defines it as serious address between two or more persons, in which the being of the truth of each person is confronted by the being and truth of the other (p. 148). Poulakos (1974) provides another definition of dialogue in the introduction to his research on the components of dialogue. He states:

Dialogue in this essay is regarded as a mode of existence manifested in the intersubjective activity between two partners, who, in their quest for meaning in life, stand before each other prepared to meet the uniqueness of their situation and follow it wherever it may lead (p. 199).

These two definitions establish a conceptual setting in which to consider another statement about the nature of dialogue. Buber implies a certain suffering that necessarily accompanies the dialogical relation. Friedman (1960) relates:

This relation 'Dialogue' means suffering and action in one, suffering because one must be chosen as well as choose and because in order to act with the whole being one must suspend all partial actions (p. 59).

Thus, dialogue is serious address, a confrontation of selves, an interpersonal activity between the partners, and finally, a suffering act of choosing and being chosen, characterized by actions of the whole person.

Martin Buber's concept of dialogue is philosophical in nature. Yet, his writing, according to Buber (1965) is based on experience (p. 14). Dialogue is composed of specific suggestions to the partners that they might follow to more readily enter relation. The first part of this section is devoted to careful consideration of these specific suggestions.

Stewart (1977) presents an excellent summary of the characteristics of Buber's concept of genuine dialogue as one approach to interpersonal communication in his book, Bridges, Not Walls (pp. 274-292). The seven steps toward dialogical relation that are identified by Stewart are:

1. Each person must turn toward and be open to the other, a 'turning of the being.'
2. Each must make present the other by imagining the real.
3. Each confirms the other's being; however, confirmation does not necessarily mean approval.
4. Each must be authentically himself or herself.
 - a. Each must say whatever she or he 'has to say.'
 - b. Each cannot be ruled by thoughts of his or her own effect or effectiveness as a speaker.
5. Where dialogue becomes genuine, 'there is brought into being a memorable common fruitfulness which is to be found nowhere else.'
6. Speaking is not always essential; silence can be very important.
7. Finally, all participants must be committed to dialogue; otherwise, it will fail (pp. 279-290).

The counseling professionals currently practice many of the dialogical principles discussed by Buber but it might be helpful for staff development to reconsider the importance of "imagining the real" of the other, confirmation and authenticity, and silence to the counselor-student relationship. Dialogue, Buber believes, creates trust, and trust, he argues, is the only access to the pupil. Certainly trust is essential to the counseling relationship. Dialogue provides new terms with which the counseling professional may describe the relationship to

the student and may be reenergized to be more fully present in each session with each student. In the following section each of the seven qualities of dialogue are discussed. Dialogue creates the possibility of trust, and for Buber, trust and its resulting confidence are the only access the educator has to the student.

Turning Of The Being

A turning of oneself toward the other is the essential act necessary for the creation of dialogue. The Self only has control over the actions of the Self. The actions of the Other are only anxiously anticipated. Matson and Montagu (1967) state, "The basic movement of the life of dialogue is the turn toward the other" (p. 115).

The turning of the being toward the Other occurs in several ways. The Self may look at the Other, addressing her or him verbally and nonverbally. This can also involve turning the body positionally to face the Other (p. 115). Barriers between persons make the growth of dialogue difficult. The education of character, and dialogue, take place most effectively when psychological and physical obstacles to face to face meeting are removed.

In the beginning stages of the relation, active psychological and physiological presence is very important. Physiological availability, however, while

essentially important in the initial creation of the relation, becomes of less importance as the relationship evolves beyond its initial creation. Thus, in the case of encounters that take place in a non-face-to-face setting, psychological availability of the Self to the Other is tremendously important. While not there in person, the Self can nonetheless be "with" the person psychologically. Johannesen (1971) emphasizes the importance of the turning of the being as he states, "The essential movement in dialogue is turning toward, outgoing to, and reaching for the other" (pp. 373-382).

The essential movement of dialogue is that movement which creates the possibility of response from the Other and reduces the separation or distance between the Self and the Other. The second movement of dialogue focuses on "imagining the real of the Other."

Imagining The Real Of The Other

Martin Buber identifies the second quality of dialogical relation as the "imaging the real" of the Other. As the Self turns toward the Other, Buber recognizes a need for each of the partners to attempt to "see" the reality of the Other. Some might call this quality "empathy." Stewart & D'Angelo (1975) relate the principle of adaptation. "The principle of adaptation says that you can communicate more clearly if you continually try to put yourself in the psychological frame of reference of the

other person" (p. 228). The partners; doctor and patient, counselor and client; or educator and student "adapt" the perceived "worldview" of the Other into their own thought process as they attempt to understand each other.

Buber defines "imagining the real" in his book The Knowledge of Man. He discusses the necessity of making an honest attempt to see the meaning in another person's perception. Buber (1965) writes, "I prefer the name 'imaging the real,' for in its essential being the gift is not a looking at the other, but a bold swinging--demanding the most intensive stirring of one's being--into the life of the other" (p. 81). The "bold swinging" called for by Buber demands that the partners listen to each other not to instantly evaluate, but rather to confirm each other. "Listening to confirm" involves both verbal and nonverbal confirmation between the partners. Stewart & D'Angelo observe:

Verbal and nonverbal confirming behavior says to the other person, 'I'm listening; I might not agree or accept your point of view, but I care about what you're saying, and I'm aware of what's going on (p. 186).

"Imagining the real" facilitates dialogue in the philosophy of Martin Buber. Buber's emphasis is always the relation; the dialogue between two persons. Listening with the intention of confirming the Other is one step toward dialogical relation and the education of character. 'Turning of the being' and 'imagining the real of the other' are two phrases Buber uses to capture essential

qualities of dialogue. These two qualities, as well as the five remaining qualities, describe the necessary conditions that must be present for dialogue to take place.

What is essential to Buber is the relation itself. He proposes, "The only thing that matters is that for each of the two men the other happens as the particular other, that each becomes aware of the other and is thus related to him in such a way he does not regard and use him as his object, but as his partner in a living event, even if it is no more than a boxing match" (p. 74). Each partner in dialogue places the Self in the psychological frame of reference of the Other making a sincere attempt to understand from the perspective of the other.

Underlying the dialogical relation is a mutual confirmation between Self and Other. Confirmation is the third essential quality of dialogue.

Confirmation

Martin Buber perceives confirmation as an essential human need. "The human person needs confirmation," Buber (1965) writes, "because man as man needs it" (p. 71). Confirmation by another person is at the core of human existence.

The ability to confirm another being is man's most meaningful act. Buber proposes, "Men need, and it is granted to them, to confirm one another in their

individual being by means of genuine meetings" (p. 69). Poulakos observes, "According to Buber, confirmation constitutes the basis of the existence of man with man. Every man needs confirmation from others. In turn, every man is capable of confirming others" (p. 69).

Nearly all members of the student services staff will engage themselves with students in disciplinary process at some time in their careers. Those particularly involved as a Judicial Officer or Dean of Student Conduct may find Buber's concept of confirmation very useful. Buber does not equate confirmation with approval of action. Therefore, in Buber's philosophy one might well dispute the legality or rightness of a student's behavior but could easily confirm the student as a person at the same time. Disciplinary action would focus on describing behavior and consequence while confirming the student's being. Discipline would become educational (of character) and not punitive in nature.

Confirmation is important to the dialogic relation on two levels. The first level involves the Self in need of, and receiving, confirmation. "Confirmation is the most critical factor in the growth and development of the Self," writes Poulakos, "...because it allows one to confidently become himself" (p. 207). Giffin and Patton (1971) note that the individual's search for confirmation is actually an implied request of the Self to "validate

Me" (p. 192). The Self in search of validation grows and develops confidence as it is confirmed by others.

The second level involving confirmation is centered on the "confirming Self" rather than the "confirmed Self." In confirming the Other, the Self grows and develops as a result. Poulakos asserts, "A proper recognition acceptance, and confirmation of the Other leads into a meaningful sense selfhood" (p. 207). Through authentic confirmation of the Other, the Self gains an insight into the existence of the Other, as well as a heightened sense of selfhood. The insight gained facilitates an enriched ability by the self to imagine the real of the Other and create meaningful relationships.

Buber questions the possibility of dialogue between two partners when no confirming takes place. Reflecting on Buber's philosophy, Poulakos affirms this understanding. "It may be said," he writes, "that acceptance of the Other is one of the prerequisites for authentic experience...Yet the Other is not only to be recognized and accepted; he is to be confirmed too" (pp. 206-207).

A lack of confirmation between persons constitutes more than an individual problem. The inability to confirm is a problem that transcends individuals, involving entire societies and calling into question the nature of humanity. The importance of confirmation in the philosophy of Buber (1965b) is evident in the passage that follows:

The basis of man's life with man is two-fold and it is one; the wish of every man to be confirmed as

what he is even as what he can become, by men, and the innate capacity of man to confirm his fellow men in this way; that this capacity lies so immeasurably fallow constitutes the real weakness and questionableness of the human race; actual humanity exists only where this capacity unfolds (pp. 67-68).

A man or a society is called "human" only so far as confirmation takes place between person and person. This is a fundamental understanding in the philosophy of dialogue proposed by Martin Buber. An education without confirmation would not constitute the education of character.

It might seem that confirmation by the Self of the Other constitutes a type of unconditional positive regard or unconditional acceptance. This is not the case in Buber's development of the term confirmation. Persons confirm personhood; not necessarily ideas, concepts, or philosophies. Buber writes: "Perhaps from time to time I must offer strict opposition to his view about the subject or our conversation. But I accept this person, the personal bearer of a conviction, in his definite being out of which his conviction has grown--even though I must try to show, bit by bit, the wrongness of this very conviction" (p. 79). Confirmation does not necessarily mean agreement.

Buber uses the terms "struggle" and "over against me" to describe persons engaged in dialogue over philosophical differences. He writes: "I affirm the person I struggle with: I struggle with him as his partner, I confirm him as creature and as creation, I confirm him who is opposed to me as him who is over against me" (p. 79). The use of

the word "struggle" describes a type of interpersonal dialogue where two partners question the "rightness" of each other's views.

Confrontation and confirmation are not mutually exclusive. "Over against me" refers to the other partner in dialogue; it does not mean that each of the participants are against each other personally or philosophically. They may struggle with each other and attempt to change the convictions of the other, but the person over against the Self is also confirmed as a human being. Confirmation of the student by educator allows for conflict to be productive, not relationship threatening. The student who is confirmed will be more open to constructive and growth producing criticism. Conflict never, writes Buber, becomes person destroying argument.

Confirmation is the third essential quality of dialogue. Personal growth and development occur both as a result of confirming others, and through the confirmation of the Self by Others. Buber writes:

Sent forth from the natural domain of species into the hazard of the solitary category, surrounded by the air of a chaos which came into being with him, secretly and bashfully he watches for a Yes which allows him to be and which can come to him only from another. It is from one man to another that the heavenly bread of self-being is passed (p. 71).

The two partners turn toward each other, seeking understanding of each other, and confirming each other as persons over against one another. For Buber's concept of dialogue to occur, these actions must represent the real

feelings and beliefs of the partners. There must be an authenticity in these interactions. Therefore, authenticity is a fourth essential quality of interpersonal dialogue.

Authenticity

Stewart (1977) reports that authentic dialogue between persons affords both individuals an opportunity to communicate whatever they believe is appropriate to their discussion (p. 280). Therefore, an interpersonal dialogue is never concluded until each person has said what he or she "has to say" (p. 280).

Authenticity and truth are synonymous in the dialogic philosophy of Martin Buber. Buber (1965b) writes:

Whatever the meaning of the word 'truth' may be in other realms, in the interhuman realm it means that men communicate themselves to one another as what they are. It does not depend on one saying to the other everything that occurs to him, but only on his letting no seeming creep in between himself and the others (p. 77).

The authentic relationship is composed of an equal opportunity for sharing and a personal commitment to honest communication.

There is one other factor that is necessary for authentic dialogue to occur. While each partner has a chance to say whatever he or she has to say, Stewart points out that each partner cannot be ruled by thoughts of his or her own effect or effectiveness as a speaker (p. 280). Buber (1965b) states:

Further, if genuine dialogue is to arise, everyone who takes part in it must bring himself to it. And that also means that he must be willing to, on each occasion, say what is really in his mind about the subject of the conversation (p. 85).

Buber also points out that the individual who is ruled by the thought of personal effectiveness not only weakens the possibility of dialogue, but actually has a destructive effect on the interpersonal relationship (p. 86).

Authenticity is a component of dialogue because Buber is convinced that the Self and Other must be unconcerned with thoughts of personal effectiveness and enter the relation with a commitment to each other. For Buberian dialogue to occur, the partners must relinquish self-centered concerns of personal effectiveness and approach each other with a willingness to share and listen. The educator and student seek to establish the relation and find the truth rather than hide behind the image or the mask of roles.

Memorable Common Fruitfulness

Buber strongly believes that all actual, or real, life is encounter; reality existing in the interpersonal relation. A memorable common fruitfulness refers to those things or processes that occur uniquely in the interpersonal relationship. What exactly does Buber mean?

Buber believes that the interpersonal interaction between the Self and Other promotes possibilities of growth that are unique to dialogic encounter. Where dia-

logue becomes genuine, there is a memorable common fruitfulness which can be found nowhere else. It is memorable in that it is distinctly different from the individual's solitary experience. The dialogue is a common experience in that it is shared by the Self and the Other. It is a fruitful, or healthful, experience because new possibilities are opened up that previously were not perceived. Marcel presents a clear and concise explanation of Buber's concept. Marcel (1967) concludes, "He (Buber) means basically that, in the presence of human beings, there is created among them, let us not say even a field of forces, but a creative milieu in which each finds possibilities of renewal" (p. 45). The interpersonal dialogue presents new possibilities which are memorable, common, and fruitful for the partners in dialogue. Not all confirmation, turning, or imagining is verbal. Buber places a real value on the role silence plays in dialogue.

Silence

Silence is the sixth component of Buber's concept of dialogue. It is Buber's belief that silence can promote dialogue, and further, that dialogue can even occur in silence. Meerloo (1967) supports Buber's understanding of the role of silence in interpersonal communication. "Good understanding," writes Meerloo, "means freeing oneself of word and language and of one's personal limitations of thinking" (p. 143). He concludes, "Understanding is poss-

ible without words" (p. 143). Buber (1965b) comments, "Of course it is not necessary for all who are joined in a genuine dialogue actually to speak; those who keep silent can on occasion be especially important" (p. 87).

Student government advisors might do well to teach the student senate about the importance of silence in decision making. Members might be convinced to "take a time out" before harming verbal exchanges took place. Participants might use silence as a means to reach reflective decisions based more on intuitive thought than passionate reaction. Dialogue, and hence decision making, might assist advisors in teaching composure and listening. Silence, as Buber views it, could be a powerful teaching tool.

Dialogue can occur in silence as well as in words. Where genuine dialogue occurs there is an authenticity, or a saying of what has to be said, and an acceptance of silence in the absence of speech. Silence is not discomforting or a problem for persons who have developed dialogue. Nor is it a problem for the educator of character. In fact, it may be the most teachable moment. Enough said.

Commitment

Commitment is the seventh and final component of dialogue' Like the six components before it, commitment is present where genuine dialogue occurs.

The term "commitment" refers to the attitudes and actions of the partners in dialogue. Mutual commitment to dialogue is essential. Howe (1967) indicated, "There is only one qualification to these claims for dialogue: it must be mutual and proceed from both sides, and the parties to it must persist relentlessly" (p. 148).

There is a risk in committing oneself to dialogue. Commitment is unconditional; that is, it is not based on the willingness of the other to commit him or her self to dialogue. Authenticity on the part of both partners is essential. There must be a very narrow gap, if any gap exists at all, between one's word and one's action. If the commitment is not authentic and mutual, the dialogue will cease to exist. Buber (1965b) states, "It is true that my basic attitude 'commitment' can remain unanswered, and the dialogue can die in seed. But if mutuality stirs, then the interhuman blossoms into genuine dialogue" (p. 81). Thus, the risk lies in the unconditional commitment of self to the dialogue with another person. Howe views mutuality in commitment as the essential element in releasing the power of dialogue. "There is a risk," Howe (1967) writes, "in speaking the dialogical word. That is, in entering into dialogue-- but when two persons undertake it and accept their fear of doing so, the miracle-working power of dialogue. Mutuality is the essential component of commitment. Buber (1965b) concludes, "All the participants, without exception, must be of such a nature that

they are capable of satisfying the presuppositions of genuine dialogue and are ready to do so" (p. 87).

In summary, the seven components of Martin Buber's concept of dialogue as stated by John Stewart are:

1. A turning of the being.
2. Imagining the real of the other.
3. Confirming the other.
4. Authenticity.
5. A memorable common fruitfulness.
6. Silence.
7. Commitment.

Certainly students learn by reading, reflection, and observaton. They learn by participating actively in their own educations. Students who see professionals committed to their field of vocation will learn to seek, locate, and commit themselves one day to their chosen field. We have, as educators, a tremendous opportunity to teach committment by being committed to:

Our selves and our continued development as individuals.

Our students and the education of their characters.

Our profession as a helping, teaching, and educating profession.

Buber's concept of dialogue, especially commitment, might remind us of why we started in this professional direction in the first place. These conditions must be realized where interpersonal dialogue is to occur. Dialogue is the

way, the method, that the educator utilizes to educate character and "deliver" student services. The services become, like courses, the medium through which the real issues of Buber's concept of education are addressed.

In the fourth and final part of this chapter, we examine the "why"; the reason we take on the immense task of the education of character, and the direction in which we lead (and follow) our students. We ponder yet, "Why? Why do we educate character? To what end? To what purpose?"

Part IV: Why Do We Educate? Toward What End?

Martin Buber states:

The question which is always in you, being brought forward--To where, to what, must we educate? '--misunderstands the situation. Only times which know a figure of general validity--the Christian, the gentleman, the citizen--know an answer to that question, not necessarily in words, but by pointing with the finger to the figure which rises clear in the air, out-topping all. The forming of this figure in all individuals, out of all materials, is the formation of a "culture." But when all figures are shattered, when no figure is able any more to dominate and shape the present human material, what is there left to form? Nothing but the image of God. That is the indefinable, only factual, direction of the responsible educator (p. 102).

This statement clearly identifies for the reader Martin Buber's central understanding of the purpose of education. It might appear to be a rather dogmatic and religiously fundamental opinion. This would be to severely limit Buber's understanding of God. Buber wrote: "In order to enter into a personal relation with the

absolute, it is first necessary to be a person again, to rescue one's real personal self from the fiery jaws of collectivism which devours all self hood" (p. 110). The fiery jaws might include for Buber the social club, the union, the church or any group that "devoured" self-hood as the necessary diet for collectivism masquerading as community.

Buber proposes that the educator leads the student toward an understanding and realization of the spiritual dimension of his/her existence. Common definitions and anthropomorphisms of God fall short of Buber's vision of the Eternal Thou, life giver "in which all of life is." He writes, "When all directions fail there arises in the darkness over the abyss the one time direction of man, towards the creative spirit, towards the Spirit of God brooding on the face of the waters, toward Him of whom we know not whence He comes and whither He goes" (p. 103).

There is a very serious nature to Buber's vision that calls not for the realization that all in life cannot be addressed with our five senses... "the educator is set now in the midst of the need which he experiences in inclusion, but only a bit deeper in it. He is set in the .pamidst of the service, only a bit higher up, which he invokes without words."

The educator participates in the education of character by entering into meaningful relations with his or her students. The educator guides the student into

relationship with whatever the student identifies as things eternal, things spiritual. Buber does not see wholeness as a possibility without relation with God. Therefore, Buber observes, "The educator who helps to bring man back to his own unity will help to put him again face to face with God" (p. 117).

Since God is not an external authority, but an internal actuality, the educator leads the student into him or herself and then out into the community, nation, and world. Centered in the "God Within," the student is empowered to partake of the creative spirit and transform the world. Buber writes: "Man, the creation, who forms and transforms the creation, cannot create. But he, each man, can expose himself and others to the creative Spirit" (p. 103).

Who is qualified to educate then? Theologian? Ethicist? Moral genius? No! Buber writes, "Only he can educate who stands in the eternal presence; he educates by leading them into it" (1967, p. 101).

Can an atheist educate? A non-believer? An agnostic? These are difficult questions. If education means educating the whole student as Buber asserts, then leaving out consideration of any part of the students life would render the consideration incomplete. This would include academics, co-curricular activities, sexuality, etc., or spirituality. Therefore, Buber might argue that only those standing in the eternal presence can educate

but certainly others might transmit valuable information, transmit cultures, and mark a positive presence in the student's life. But education worthy of the name is the education of character and character involves the spiritual for Buber, the Eternal Thou. Any consideration of the whole student would by necessity include the spiritual dimension of student life.

The identification, selection, and presentation of the constructive forces of the world are the educator's task. Buber (1965) proposes, "The constructive forces are eternally the same: they are the world bound up in community, turned to God. The educator educates himself to be their vehicle" (p. 101).

It is clear that Buber views the educator's role as a sacred one, pregnant with possibility. The educator carries forth the light of culture, of value, and for Buber, of spirit. He says, "The ones who count are those persons who--though they may be of little renown--respond to and are responsible for the continuation of the living spirit, each in the active stillness of his sphere of work" (p. 102).

Buber writes, "...he, each man, can expose himself and others to the creative Spirit" (p. 103). Why do we educate? To assist unique personalities in developing their characters and their uniquely personal relationships with God. This task is paramount in importance--the development of self knowledge and active participation in

human community. Education is a vocation, a way of life, a raison d'etre, a world view; certainly more than a job according to Buber's vision.

The author would propose that many educators would debate and dispute the "theologic" dimensions of education. Buber, a Jew, is far from forcing a certain and definitive concept of God down student's and professional's throats. He does, though, see clearly a spiritual reality alive and present in life and proposes that the central task of the genuine and responsible educator is to lead and assist the student into an awareness of and relation with The Eternal Thou or Spirit. Buber's purposeful ambiguity allows for the widest possible array of interpretations, some likely alien to his own held beliefs.

It would be totally inappropriate to consider Buber's philosophy of education without direct acknowledgement of his Spirit centered view of human existence. Some will likely be driven away because of the theistic overtones while others may be drawn closer to his teachings. Lest we dispose of the baby with the bath water, the author would hope that overt critics of the spiritual imagery would find the necessary objectivity to glean the philosophy of education and theory of dialogue that might be fruitful for professional practice out of the spirit language.

Those thrilled with what they likely see as religious God talk should be warned that Buber found God not in distant places reeking with piety but chiefly in the relation between person and person in dialogue. He was a humanist and remains a Jew despite our efforts as Christians to have him post mortem for Christ because we like what he had to say. He lived a spirit filled life with both feet on the ground firmly and answered his own front door till shortly before his death! What we will ever see of God will, or will not, be seen chiefly in the forces and lives of our fellow human beings.

CHAPTER FIVE:

BUBER, STUDENT SERVICES, AND A NEW POINT OF VIEW

(How Martin Buber might have stated his case)

The Buber View of Student Services

Education worthy of the name is essentially the education of character. Character is measured as the distance between what a human being says, and what he or she does; over a denominator of care. Care for self, other, and world. Narrowing the gap between word and deed demands an ethic of care. People matter and are not means to any end.

Professional educators seek to assist in students' development of character. The most effective way to help a student "become" is to enter into a meaningful dialogical relationship with him or her. Honesty, straightforwardness, and care create dialogical relationships. Trust is the educator's only access to the student. DeCoster and Mable (1974) state, "students need to learn how to live as much as they need to learn how to manage academic competencies. Human relationships are a vital aspect of education concerned as a developmental process as well as an intellectual exercise" (p. 52). Dialogical relationship between educator and student are .paessential to the educational enterprise and the development of character.

Education is a noble profession and is worthy of a lifetime lived in search and practice of integrity and ethics. Student services are best delivered when grounded in the value centered context of the development of character. Buber proposes a value centered community where people seek to be well and be whole. Students, faculty, and staff experiencing the healing that comes only through meeting.

Housekeeper, president, coach, groundskeeper, dean, faculty member, together in the singular purpose of assisting students in the development of their characters. The Committee On The Student In Higher Education (1968) supports this notion, stating, "despite our limited behavioral knowledge the college must recognize that even its instructional goals cannot be achieved unless it assumes some responsibility for facilitating the development of the total human personality" (p. 6).

The 'education worthy of the name is essentially the education of character;' that the most important element of this education is the educator-student relationship; that trust is the only access to the student; that all members of the academic community must be concerned with the whole student: these we declare the Viaticum of Student Services and life.

Life offers student seemingly insurmountable problems today. Rampant drug and alcohol abuse, gang violence, sex abuse, soaring national deficits, an uncertain job

market...these issues and many more confront the developing student. Educators must provide new visions, hopeful visions, in the midst of the uncertainty. This may not be easy. Nash and Saurman (1982) state, "the sad fact today is that higher education cannot even guarantee that a college education will ipso facto provide any graduating senior a job" (p. 87). This is a very sobering reality. They continue, "Very little in higher education teaches students how to make a living or how to live; even less in higher education provides knowledge or insight" (p. 87).

Buber's philosophy of education and dialogue lends itself to great self understanding and insight. It teaches a way of life that respects individuality and builds community from it. The addition of Buber's philosophy to the theory base of the student services professional can facilitate better appreciation for the contribution the profession makes to higher education.

Buber observes, "The teacher who is for the first time approached by a boy...realizes that this is the moment to make the first conscious step towards education of character; he has to...give an answer which will probably lead beyond the alternatives of the question by showing a third possibility which is the right one" (p. 106-7). The educator thus assists the student in the discovery of meaning in his or her life. Nash and Saurman (1982) propose:

It is our position that the primary function of higher education is not simply to help students to

find jobs, or to train them for the technical skills to fill narrow occupational niches when they graduate, but rather to find meaning in their total lives through their studies, their work, their play, and their personal relationships (p. 87).

The library, the playing field, the classroom, the residence hall room...who knows when and where this teachable moment may occur? It would seem wise for all members of the academic community to stand poised to seize the moment. Yet, are they? Or have they relegated themselves to serve as the "minor leagues" for the preparation of students for "real life" following a brief and somewhat unfulfilling visit on campus? Nash and Saurman (1982) state, "It is time that student development educators assert the truth bluntly: to educate people only for jobs is to diminish them as human beings" (p. 88). Perhaps then Buber's early twentieth century call for the education of character for genuine participation in community is of some interest and value today. It might well be that the "third possibility" offered to the student is the opportunity for the development of character.

The "third alternative" in the twenty-first century may well be the 'college of character' where we seek, nurture, and create the 'educated heart' as well as 'educated mind.' Boyer (1982) proposes that the 'educated heart:'

...means the development of an appreciation of beauty, a tolerance of others, a reaching for mastery without arrogance, a courtesy toward opposing views, a dedication to fairness and social justice, and adherence to integrity and precision in thought and

What Do We Do? We assist in the education of character, along with faculty member, coach, maid, and food service worker. We cooperatively seek to assist the student, the whole student, develop his or her unique character.

How? We engage our student in dialogical relationships. Seeking to be fully present, we risk to be ourselves and establish trust with our students. This trust is our only access to the student. Trust is established only in dialogue.

Why? We guide our students inward to their central or spiritual life and then outward to real life lived in community with others. We facilitate this process because as educators we are called to lead our students in dialogue toward wholeness. This wholeness demands contact with that which they view spirit.

Why Buber? Why Now? Some Final Thoughts

Certainly changes in the way we view student development and the delivery of student services are occurring. New conceptions have been called for by the profession and the time, the end of the millennium, is a fertile movement to consider what theory and philosophy will guide us into the twenty-first century.

Carol Gilligan (1982) has provided a fresh and challenging view of the differences in the way men and women develop. Basically, while women seek to balance respons-

ibility and relationship, men focus on the understanding of rights and rules. Women's conception of morality is concerned with the ethics or activity of care. Delworth and Seeman (1984) observe, "Gilligan pointed out that girls learn different moral lessons, namely that relationships are more important than competing" (p. 490).

What might this have to do with Buber and his place in the theory base of student services? Consider this. Gilligan (1982) observes, "The disparate visions in their tension reflect the paradoxical truths of human experience--that we know ourselves as separate only insofar as we live in connection with others, and that we experience relationship only insofar as we differentiate other from self" (p. 63). This is a succinct paraphrase of Buber's concept of 'Distance and Relation' and calls again for 'connection with others' as a condition or 'truth' of human experience. Buber proposes a method of making connection, while honoring the need to experience differentiation. This he calls dialogue and it transcends the obvious differences in the way men and women develop. The difference between the ways and means of development might in fact be bridged by dialogue. Delworth and Hansen (1984) state, "A good start would be a dialogue between female and male students on the predominant styles [of development]" (p. 491).

Professional calls for dialogue, development, and character in education and still no mention of Buber.

George Keller (1983) writes, "Given a declining number of students, the acute financial situation, intensifying competition, and the need for changes in the content, distribution, and the style of delivery of the academic offerings, what should a college do?" (p. 21).

This strikes me as an excellent question for academic departments and student services. What should we do? Keller continues, "Each institution needs to see itself as if for the first time and ask, 'What business are we really in?'" (p. 121). An old adage proposes that if you don't know where you're going any road will get you there. Let us consider the business we're in from the position of Martin Buber and existing theorists in the profession. Is there any commonality in expressed purpose and direction. Buber (1965b) writes:

The educator whom I have in mind lives in a world of individuals, a certain number of whom are always at any one time committed to his care. He sees each of these individuals as in a position to become a unique, single person, and thus the bearer of a special task of existence which can be fulfilled through him and through him alone. He sees every personal life as engaged in such a process of actualization, and he knows from his own experience that the forces making for actualization are all the time involved in a microcosmic struggle with counterforces. He knows these forces; they have shaped and they still shape him. Now he puts this person shaped by them at their disposal for a new struggle and a new work. He cannot wish to impose himself, for he believes that in every man, what is right is established in a single and uniquely personal way. No other way may be imposed on a man, but another way, that of the educator, may and must unfold what is right, as in this case it struggles for achievement and help it to develop (p. 83).

Buber's educator is clearly in the "business" of forming meaningful relationships with students in order to educate character.

When asked what assumptions guided his work in the book Education and Identity, Chickering gave a very interesting response. Thomas and Chickering (1984) responded that three assumptions guided Chickering's thoughts regarding college and students. It was important to:

1. provide opportunities for close and sustained relationships between faculty members and among students,
2. engage students actively in planning and carrying out their own education, and,
3. involve a solid mix of experiential learning and classroom activity (p. 393).

One cannot accuse Chickering of borrowing Buber's ideas. This is not the point. However, these assumptions that guided Chickering's important contribution to the field have been shown in this dissertation to be part of Buber's philosophy in the early part of this century. Chickering and Buber agree on the importance of the relationship between educator and student. Both call for student involvement in the planning and carrying out of their education. Finally, learning does occur in and out of the classroom in the assumptions of Buber and Chickering. As the field embraces Chickering we are left, until

now, without a treatment of Buber's philosophy as it pertains to student services.

Chickering and Buber agree that we are in the business of educating students with their direct involvement through classroom instruction and exponential learning. Faculty and student relationships are paramount. Students. We are about students; their academic pursuits, their lives, and their characters. In an age of technological explanation and world view this idea may appear trite and time consuming in its implications. It could be argued that caring for others takes time, costs money, and is generally not 'cost effective.' Yet, what is the cost of not caring?

Recently, Clark Kerr, President Emeritus of the University of California, Berkeley addressed 300 college officials at Harvard. He urged colleges to adopt an ethical code. Kerr (1989) stated, "The issue of ethics, rising now, is giving to rise still higher. We need to be getting ready" (p. A1). Buber's philosophy calls both student and educator into the ethical dialogue. He demands commitment and action based on caring. Buber provides an ethical framework for the delivery of developmentally based student services. Is there room for Buber in our theory base?

Chickering (1984) states, "I guess my final word is that we should hold the many theories now available to us with 'tenuous tenacity' and maintain a tough-minded and

inquiring mind regarding theories. At the same time we need to undertake active experimentation to develop new practices that are systematically oriented toward encouraging human development in the light of the best theory we have at the present time" (p. 399).

Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue encourages human development and should be, using Chickering's understanding, appropriate for our profession.,

A Final Word(s)

The purpose of this thesis has been to introduce the philosophy of Martin Buber to the student services profession.

The information presented in this dissertation might become part of the training programs for student services professionals. Faculty members, perhaps more familiar with Buber's voluminous scholarly writings than with our own theorists, might come to understand the purpose of student services.

Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue and his 'education of character' might enhance the ability of professionals in student services to serve all students more intelligently and effectively. Martin Buber's philosophy belongs both in the vocabulary and in the work of student services.

The dialogical relationship can be taught, experienced, and lived fully. How? By educators and students

committed to a value-centered philosophy of education and life. Mentoring becomes possible only when there is trust. Students will learn that the professionals know who they are, what they are doing, how to do it, and why.

Buber has made contributions to many disciplines related to student services. His understanding of education can have a significant impact on the philosophy and in the professional lives of the student services educators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Council on Education. "The Student Personnel Point of View." American Education Studies, Series 1, Vol. 3, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1937.
- Abrams, Robert Gordon. "Suggestions For a Pedagogy Based Upon the Philosophy of Martin Buber." DAI, V. 43 (08), Sec. A, P2590, 1982.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologica. Trs. by the Fathers of the English Dominical Province. Chicago: Benzinger Bros., 1952, I-II, 57,5.
- Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, Co., 1962.
- Baker, Bruce, F. "Existential Philosophies on Education." In Park, Joe (ed.) Selected Readings In The Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1968.
- Banning, J. H. The Campus Ecology Manager Role. In U. Delworth and G.R. Hanson (eds.), Student Services: A Handbook For The Profession (p. 209-227). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Bender, Hilary Evans. "Existential Education: The Philosophy Education." DAI, V. 42 (07), Sec. A P3546, 1971.
- Boyer, E. In Warren Bryant Martin, College of Character, ACE: San Francisco; Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982
- Bradshaw, F. F. "The Scope and Aim of A Personnel Program. The Educational Record, January 1936, 120-128.
- Brown, Robert D. Student Development In Tomorrow's Higher Education A Return To The Academy. Washington, D.C.: ACPA, 1972.
- Buber, Martin. Meetings. M. Friedman (ed.), La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co., 1973.
- Buber, Martin. I And Thou. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1970.
- Buber, Martin. A Believing Humanism. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967.

- Buber, Martin. The Way of Response. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1966.
- Buber, Martin. Between Man And Man. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1965. (Contains lectures delivered and listed in text in 1926 and 1939.)
- Buber, Martin. The Knowledge Of Man. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Buber, Martin. Daniel: Dialogues on Realization. M. Friedman (Trans.), New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Buber, Martin. Pointing the Way. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Chickering, Arthur. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Chickering, Arthur. In Delworth, U. & Hanson, G. Student Services: A Handbook For The Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Clark, A. Philosophers on Rhetoric. In D.C. Douglas (ed.), Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1973.
- Clothier, R. C. "College Personnel Principles and Functions," The Personnel Journal, 1931, N. 10, pp. 9-17.
- Cohen, Adir. "Martin Buber And Changes In Modern Education." Oxford Review of Education. V. 5, N. 1, 1979.
- Cohen, Adir. "The Question of Values and Values Education in The Philosophy of Martin Buber." Teacher's College Record, V. 80, N. 4, 1980.
- Collins, Huntly. "Ethics Waning on Campuses, Educator Says." Corvallis Gazette-Times, Corvallis, OR. August 7, 1989.
- Committee on the Student in Higher Education. The Student In Higher Education. New Haven: Hazen Foundation. 1968.
- Cowley, W. H. "The Nature of Student Personnel Work," Educational Record, April 1936, pp. 3-27.
- Dance, F. "Communication and Ecumenism." Journal Of Communication, XIX, March 1969.

Danforth Foundation. The Recovery of Spirit in Higher Education. New York: The Seabury Press, 1980.
(Ed.) Robert Rankin.

DeCoster, D.A. & Mable, P. "Residence Education: Purpose and Process." In: Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls, Washington, D.C.; American College Personnel Association, 1974.

Delworth, U. & Hanson, G. Student Services: A Handbook For The Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Delworth, U. & Seeman, D. "The Ethics of Care: Implications of Gilligan for the Student Services Profession." Journal of College Student Personnel. November 1984.

Dewey, John. Experience And Education. London: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 1938.

Diamond, M. Martin Buber: Jewish Existentialist. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Dilling, David Ralph. "Martin Buber On Meaning In Education." DAI, V. 36, Sec. 1 P0846, 1974.

Eakin, Frank E. Jr. "A Buberian Approach To Faculty Development." Academic Internship Program, American Council on Education Report, 1976.

Egan, G. Face to Face: The Small Group Experience. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1973.

Friedman, Maurice. Martin Buber's Life and Work. VI, II, III. New York: E.P. Dutton, Inc. 1981, 1983, 1985.

Friedman, Maurice. "Martin Buber's Concept of Education: A New Approach To College Teaching." The Christian Scholar, Fall 1967.

Friedman, M. In M. Buber, Pointing The Way. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Friedman, M. Martin Buber: The Life Of Dialogue. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Giffin, K. and Patton, B.R. Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Hauerwas, Stanley. Character and the Christian Life: A Study In Theological Ethics. Trinity University Press: San Antonio, TX, 1975.

- Heim, K. Ontologic und Theologie. Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche, Neue Folge XI, 1930. In M. Buber, Between Man and Man. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Hodes, A. Martin Buber. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.
- Hora, T. Psychotherapy, Existence, and Religion. In H.M. Ruitenbeck (ed.), Psychoanalysis and Existential Philosophy. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, and Co., 1962.
- Howe, Reuel L. The Miracle of Dialogue. The Seabury Press, 1963. (Cited in The Human Dialogue, ed. F.W. Matson and A. Montagu, New York: The Free Press, 1968, pp. 148-149).
- Howe, R. In F. Matson and A. Montagu, The Human Dialogue: Perspectives on Communion. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Johannesen, R. L. "The Emerging Concept of Communication As Dialogue." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1971, LVII, No. 4.
- Jourard, S.M. The Transparent Self. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1964.
- Keller, George. Academic Strategy. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Knefelkamp, Lee L. "Faculty and Student Development In the 80's: Renewing The Community of Scholars," Integrating Adult Development Theory With Higher Education Practice. Washington, D.C.: ACPA, 1980 (No. 5). From Current Issues In Higher Education Series.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. In Delworth, U. & Hanson, G. Student Services: A Handbook For The Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Kuhn, H. Dialogue in Expectation. In P.A. Schilpp and M. Friedman (eds.), The Philosophy of Martin Buber. La Salle, Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1967.
- Laing, R.D., Phillipson, H., and Lee, A.R. Interpersonal Perception. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1966.
- Lloyd-Jones, E. & Smith, M. A Student Personnel Program For Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.

- Lloyd-Jones, E. "Personnel Administration." Journal of Higher Education, March 1934, 5(3), 141-147.
- Manheim, W. Martin Buber. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Marcel, G. "I and Thou." In P.A. Schelpp and M. Friedman (eds.), The Philosophy Of Martin Buber. LaSalle, Ill: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1967.
- Marcia, James. In Delworth, U. & Hanson, G. Student Services: A Handbook For The Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Marcia, J. "Development and Validation of Ego-Identity Status." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3(5): 551-558.
- Martin, Warren Bryan. College of Character. A publication of the American Council on Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982.
- Matott, Glenn. "Martin Buber's Dialogic Philosophy In Relation To College Student Personnel Work." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1971.
- Matson, F. W. and Montague, A. The Human Dialogue: Perspectives On Communication. New York: Fress Press, 1967.
- Mead, G.H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Meerloo, J. In F. Matson and A. Montagu, The Human Dialogue: Perspectives on Communication. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Moore, D. J. Martin Buber: Prophet of Religious Secularism. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1974.
- Moran, J.A. Buber and Dewey: The Redemption of Personal Experience. Philosophy Today, Spring 1974.
- Morris, V.C. and Pai, Y. Philosophy and the American School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
- Mounier, Emmanuel. The Character of Man. New York: Harper, 1956.
- Naisbitt, John. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1982.

- Nash, R. J. & Saurman, K. P. "Learning To Earn Is Not Learning To Live: Student Development Educators As Meaning Makers. In: Owens, H. F., Witten, C. H., Barley, W. R. (eds.) College Student Personnel Administration. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas. 1982.
- Newton, F. B. & Ender, K. L. Student Development Practices. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1980.
- Nilsen, T.R. Some Assumptions That Impede Communication. General Semantics Bulletin, XIV, Winter-Spring 1954.
- Perharsky, Daniel. "Dehumanization And Education." Teacher's College Record, V. 84, N. 2, Winter 1982.
- Pfeutze, P.E. The Social Self. New York: Bookman Associates, 1954.
- Poulakos, J. "The Components Of Dialogue." Western Speech, 1974, No. 3.
- Rankin, Robert (ed). The Recovery Of Spirit In Higher Education. New York: The Seabury Press, 1980.
- Rhatigan, James J. "Student Services vs. Student Development: Is There A Difference?" NAWDAC Journal, 38, 1975.
- Roberts, D. C. (Ed.). Designing Campus Activities To Foster a Sense of Community. New Directions for Student Services, No. 48, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Winter 1989.
- Rodgers, Robert F. & Widick, Carole. In Newton, F. B. & Ender, K. L., Student Development Practices. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1980.
- Rogers, C. Some Significant Learnings. On Becoming A Person, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rollins, E.W. Men of Dialogue: Martin Buber and Albrecht Goes. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969.
- Rosenblatt, Howard S. "Martin Buber's Concepts Applied To Education." Educational Forum, 35, 2,, January 1971.
- Rotenstreich, N. The Right and the Limitations of Buber's Dialogical Thought. In P.A. Schilpp and M. Friedman (eds.), The Philosophy of Martin Buber, La Salle, Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1967.

- Saddlemire, G. L. & Rentz, A. L. (eds). Student Affairs-- A Profession's Heritage: Significant Articles, Issues, and Documents. Southern Illinois University Press: ACPA, Media Publication No. 35, 1983.
- Schaeder, G. The Hebrew Humanism of Martin Buber. N. Jacobs (Trans.), Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973.
- Schilpp, P. A. & Friedman, M. (eds). The Philosophy of Martin Buber. La Salle, Ill: Open Court. The Library of Living Philosophers, V. XII, 1967.
- Schlosberg, Nancy. In D. C. Roberts (ed.) Designing Campus Activities to Foster a Sense of Community. New Directions for Student Services, No. 48, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Winter 1989.
- Simon, Ernst. In Schilpp, P. A. & Friedman, M. (eds), The Philosophy of Martin Buber. La Salle, Ill: Open Court. The Library of Living Philosophers, V. XII, 1967.
- Smith, R.G. Martin Buber. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967.
- Stamatakis, Louis C. & Rogers, Russell R. "Student Affairs: A Profession In Need Of A Philosophy." Journal of College Student Personnel, V. 25, N. 5, September 1984.
- Stewart, John. Bridges Not Walls. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.
- Stewart, J. Foundations of Dialogic Communication. Unpublished manuscript, 1975.
- Stewart, John and D'Angelo, Gary. Together. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975.
- Streiker, L.D. The Promise of Buber. New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1969.
- Tallon, A. Person and Community: Buber's Category of the Between. Philosophy Today, Spring 1973.
- Thomas, R. & Chickering, A. W. "Education and Identity Revisited." Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(5): 392-399, September 1984.
- Trow, George W. S. Jr. Within The Context of No-Context. Boston: Little Brown, 1981.

Widick, C., & Knepfelkamp, L. & Parker, C. A. In Delworth, U. & Hanson, G. Student Services: A Handbook For The Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Williamson, E. G. et al. "The Student Personnel Point of View." Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949.

Winetrout, K. Buber: Philosopher of the I-Thou Dialogue. Educational Theory, January, 1963.

Wood, Robert E. Martin Buber's Ontology. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 1969.