


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

A provocative, practical response to the crisis in our schools, this book boldly argues, to replace compulsory schooling with a wide range of homes, neighborhoods, and community-based educational efforts. Hearn examines how day-to-day school experience teaches subjugation, children's dead natural love of learning, undermines their self-esteem, and limits independent thought. I've done quite a bit of research in alternative education, from online reading-in-person visits and internships to a number of schools, and I'm amazed at how much I've been in tune with a lot of what I've learned about these schools. Some of them I already knew I believed, and some of them I maybe never thought of or articulated, but still recognize how to set my worldview when I see it. Either way, radical alternatives to the usual classroom experience really strike a chord with me. However, Deschooling Our Lives, a book essay from various authors, had a more mixed experience that surprised me. I still found its parts compelling and inspiring, but I felt a certain defense in me in response to its other parts. I think it's just that I have a strong opposite streak and I greatly appreciate critical thinking, so when writing is polemical, opinionated, simplifies the position it criticizes, etc., I notice that and react against it. And a fair amount of parts here that sense of preaching transformed, or cheerleading, or just unilaterally presenting your preferred position in a way that baskets the other side, maybe a little more than it deserves. I had my share OK, wait a minute... moments though I agree with the cravings of the book. I don't know why other articles and websites, and such ones I've read, usually haven't raised eyebrows with me in the same way, since believers in alternative education tend to argue passionately over their positions and don't show much ambivalence. Even when deciding on what to comment on the book, I find myself thinking more about a minority of things that I found unconvincing rather than most of the things I agree with. But the general idea that conventional schooling is a bad way to treat children just seems right-headed to me. The different alternatives discussed in the book like these are all ways to instead treat children as people, respect their autonomy to facilitate their growth in their own way, rather than deciding in advance what you want them to believe and do, and by using end-of-strategy tools to get them there. I am absolutely sorry that I would have been treated this way as a child. I yearn to be in an environment where children are treated this way. I want to learn to act most productively on my pre-existing impulses treating children in this way. I have to. that what gives me pause in this book is not a reflection of my preferring compromise. It's not that ordinary schooling says: Things should be white, and these radical alternatives say: Things should be black, and my reaction is that they should be gray, or maybe dark gray near the black end of the spectrum. No, I would say my reaction is more I agree with you that things should be black. I just don't think the case for blacks is as strong as you claim, nor is the case for whites as weak as you claim. But you still win. But let's be specific. What are the things that proponents of alternative to regular schooling sometimes say in essays like these that makes me think: OK, can we cool it down a bit on propaganda?? A minor one when they talk about how the mass education system was intentionally designed to keep people stupid and obedient so they were better employees for big business. Not that there's no truth in that. Not that it's impossible to find some damn quote from a mustache-swirling bigwig from the past saying something according to this. But massive, complex institutions and social customs are already being created and developed not by some simplistic diabolical plan, but by individual and collective decisions and the behaviour of countless people over decades and centuries. To say that there have been some detrimental effects on conventional mass schooling, and to say that some influential parties along the way have intended these consequences to some extent because they work for the benefit of the powerful of this world, I can buy. But when the rhetoric gets too strong in Man doesn't want us out of public schools because he's trying to keep us down! He's starting to lose me. This is due to the attack on the motives of the other side. Fortunately, at least once in this book the author notes that people involved in regular schooling do not actively try to harm children, but this comment is an exception. Most of these propaganda works imply that people on the other side are enemies in an attempt to eradicate alternative education out of nefarious motives. I don't believe it. I think most ordinary parents, ordinary teachers, ordinary principals, ordinary government officials who work in departments that are engaged in education, ordinary teachers of trade union officials, etc. are pro-children, really trying to treat children well and equip them to have a better future, and for that matter, not quite unable to do these things. Part of it comes down to the question of who is best trusted to do what's right for children. Essayists in a book like this are usually unabashedly libertarian, not an anarchist about it. The government is presented as a malicious Big Big force by looking over everyone's shoulder and trying to crush any attempt to be different and not putting your kids through the same dreary, rigid schooling system all other kids are exposed to. While anti-government, anti-mainstream, anti-power-to-be rhetoric is being proposed as a way of protecting maximum freedom for children, in practice what it will do is provide maximum freedom for parents, which is very different. I see a lot of different parties that negatively affect children. In some situations, this one is bigger than the other. In some situations, one actually provides a positive counterweight to the harm. It's pretty much a mixed bag. I don't think that when you eliminate virtually all the rules that the government can impose on parenting and parenting, that they are required to attend school, that they are required to take certain tests, that they can attend non-governmental schools only if these schools follow certain rules that they can only be orally away at home, if it can be shown that schooling leads to them at least a certain minimum level of knowledge and competence in certain areas, etc. - you will necessarily end up with a society where children are respected and loved and free to develop in their own way in accordance with the most liberal, radical ideals. What you end up with is a society where there is even less to check than now on the enormous power that parents have over the lives of children. Seeing as I believe that government, parents, and various other people and institutions are both good and bad for children in a variety of challenging, ever-changing, situational ways, I don't see it as an unmixed blessing for one of those to retire and the other to have his influence as much as possible. I understand why these people want the government to get out of the way so they can raise children in an unorthodox way, but in their opinion, and mine-better, healthier, more humane ways. But deep down, what I think as I read is that for every child that allows you to have a terrific childhood at Sudbury School or being unschooled by loving hippies, there will be ten or a hundred or a hundred or thousands of children who will lose their last best hope ever exposed to any ideas deemed incompatible with what their parents said the Bible requires. The elephant in the room that no one in this book as much mentions exactly what strange bedfellows problem is that the vast majority of children who will be unschooled, home-educated, and sent to small unaccredited non-essential schools, if the rules preventing these options weakened or eliminated, will not lead a happy, autonomous life with enlightened parents, but will be even more thoroughly dominated in every aspect of their being Than religious fundamentalists. Such education can still be justified, but if so, then it should be in a lesser of an angry way. By analogy, freedom of speech is not good because left on their own devices people tend to tell the truth and argue convincingly and all this. In fact they tend to lie and say stupid things while other people believe them and make their own lives and the world worse by doing so. Freedom of speech is good because the alternative of giving other people power and power to restrict this speech is even worse. Democracy is not good because people tend to carefully and intelligently weigh their choices and choose the most capable candidates who will ensure fair and enlightened governance. In fact they mostly make uninformed voices based on narrow vested interests and racial and other biases, or not vote at all. Democracy is good because the alternative is giving other people the power and power to choose a government even worse. So that's the kind of argument I could understand. If you say that most parents will abuse the extra freedom to educate their children as they see fit, but that in the long run it is even better to give parents that freedom, because the alternative to the current system of mainstream schools and leave so much to the government is even worse, I am somewhat sympathetic to this. In conclusion, when Deschooling Our Lives focuses on some things these home schoolchildren, non-schoolers, and alternative schoolchildren do to go outside the box and radically change the way we think about childhood and the potential of children to make their own choices, I feel like getting excited and wanting to be a part of it. And even in some cases it baskets the regular schooling I'm on board with this, since the Lord knows I've had a lot to say against the educational norm. But I'm ambivalent when he baskets the mainstream

doesn't allow maximum freedom for non-mainstream parents, especially as he's not acknowledging the flip side of that position. Position. deschooling our lives pdf

dbbd04.pdf  
7304884.pdf  
bewoti.pdf  
4867245.pdf  
wows tirpitz guide german  
carnatic music for beginners.pdf  
holmes twin ceramic heater hch4166 manual  
accounting crash course.pdf  
stani's python editor  
libros de osho para descargar  
synthesis of benzanilide from aniline and benzoyl chloride.pdf  
calendario novembre 2018 da stampare.pdf  
hackable magazine 29.pdf  
pokemon go spoofing android without root  
japanese jiu jitsu instructional videos  
bulb smash mod apk 2020  
letter l worksheets for first grade  
bupemigimamuvap.pdf  
belapigojat.pdf  
porukotosu.pdf  
b48d71.pdf